FORCED OPTIONS:
FACULTY IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

by

Eileen Kogl Camfield

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Benerd School of Education
Educational Administration and Leadership

University of the Pacific
Stockton, CA
2012
Abstract

by Eileen Kogl Camfield

University of the Pacific
2012

Many faculty enter the professoriate with high ideals. They have identity conceptions of themselves as potential change-agents, expanding human knowledge and contributing to the greater good. Over time, for many, this idealism fades and is replaced with job dissatisfaction and bitterness. This study uses intersectionality as a theoretical frame to explore faculty identity development by examining the ways academic socialization into a competitive, hierarchical system privileges certain aspects of an individual’s identity while imperiling others. In presenting data based on hour-long qualitative interviews with six mid-career university faculty members in the social sciences or humanities, the specific mechanisms that trigger this change are revealed. These lost dimensions may be the very source of academic renewal, pluralistic integration, and personal gratification.

Keywords: faculty identity, higher education, intersectionality
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................ 6

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ...................................................................... 8

   Into Professorhood .......................................................................................... 8
   Institutional Culture ...................................................................................... 10
   Faculty Job Satisfaction ................................................................................ 12
   Add the Yin to the Yang ............................................................................... 15
   Understanding Identity Intersections and Advancing Democracy ............. 17

III. METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................ 22

   Research Question ........................................................................................ 22
   Data Collection and Methodology .................................................................. 22

IV. RESULTS: A PORTRAIT OF SIX PROFESSORS ......................................... 25

   Simon—Having Fun and Juggling Solo ....................................................... 25
   George—Working Underground .................................................................. 32
   Sarah—Attached and on the Ground ............................................................. 38
   Erin—Secretly Excellent .............................................................................. 45
   Juliana—Still Standing ................................................................................. 52
   Hal—Being and Doing ................................................................................. 58

V. DISCUSSION ...................................................................................................... 67

   Do All Professors Think Alike?..................................................................... 68
   Shifting from the Ideal to the Real............................................................... 69
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Amid national outcry for accountability in higher education, student access and learning outcomes are under greater scrutiny, resource management is carefully monitored, and the general purpose and value of higher education are being re-examined. Universities are being asked to justify their existence. In order to make the case, campuses attempt to better know themselves: They undergo program review, attempt to create effective assessment tools, and study student persistence. One notable gap in this push for greater understanding exists in learning about faculty. True, campuses care about the kind and quality of degrees possessed by their faculty, and they care about demographic representation amongst faculty. But, too little has been published about how faculty personally experience their work. If faculty are the respective gatekeepers or access providers of the academy, we need to know more about them. Moreover, problems experienced by faculty may be the bellwethers of deeper problems that affect all of higher education. This paper attempts to shed some light on faculty identity as it develops over the course of a career in the belief that the ways faculty experience their work can point to ways meaningful reform might be focused. William James (1896) used the term "forced options" to describe situations where one has no option but to make a choice. I will argue here that academic institutional culture often forces faculty to choose identities that are stifling. In other words, to be a professor requires accepting options
that limit the full range of self-expression. Such choices may initially appear trivial but in the aggregate become momentous.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Into Professorhood

To begin, Reybold (2003) offers an explicit model for faculty identity development to describe the transition from graduate school into the professoriate. Specifically, the pathways she identifies—the Anointed, the Pilgrim, the Visionary, the Philosopher and the Drifter—describe "the doctoral experience as an evolving epistemological relationship between the student and the professoriate" (p. 240). These pathways may lead to very different experiences of work, as they represent different orientations to the profession and reflect differences in identity conceptualization. The Anointed graduate student has had a close mentorship with a faculty member, which provides a sense of membership and acceptance into the profession. The Pilgrim has carefully plotted out a course, or an "accumulation of academic experiences" (p. 243) to secure a faculty position, perhaps through the use of functional, as opposed to relational, mentors. Because this planning is self-directed, the Pilgrim graduate student has been primarily responsible for her journey to the professoriate and takes full credit for success or failure. The Visionary "experiences the doctoral program as a calling toward a higher goal [like social change or educational reform] to be accomplished through the professoriate" (p. 245). Visionary professors are less concerned with tenure than with creating a positive impact for students beyond the classroom. The Philosopher becomes a professor as part of a "personal quest for intellectual growth and enlightenment" (p. 246).
The Drifter is not particularly committed to academe and may not even be sure she wants to be a professor. This pathway describes the least-evolved sense of academic identity.

Reybold (2003) identifies the range of anxieties a newly-hired professor might experience relative to the respective pathway she has traveled and the degree of identity reinforcement she finds at her new institution. Reybold queries the way academic culture defines professional reality and provides value and meaning to that reality, and she believes there is often a “discordant transition into the professoriate” (p. 251) when an individual’s sense of purpose, as defined in graduate school, conflicts with the hiring institution’s academic culture. At the conclusion of the article, Reybold makes some excellent suggestions for future research consideration. Namely, she lauds the value of further longitudinal inquiry into professional identity “as a developmental process and compared to other models of adult development such as perspective transformation (Cranton, 1996) and self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2001)” (p. 250). Finally, she raises a concern about what happens when individuals with similar or different identity trajectories interact, particularly in a student-advisor relationship, but by extension this interaction could be problematic in a department or across disciplines. What Reybold does not acknowledge is the fact that an individual might have multiple motivations for entering academia within her own self. In other words, you might be a “visionary-philosopher-pilgrim.” How those intersecting motives compound or conflict is likely to have an effect on subsequent identity development. Additionally, how these identities develop over the course of a career is left unexamined.
Institutional Culture

Differing from Reybold's (2003) work, other research on faculty identity focuses less on faculty as individuals and more on the institutional structure of the academy. Nevertheless, understanding this institutional culture is important, as it profoundly shapes the people who work within this system. Here the research is more comprehensive. Kezar and Lester (2009) summarize much of this work in their book *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration*. They identify higher education as a “siloed, bureaucratic, and hierarchical organization” (p. 22) characterized by fragmentation caused by specialization, disciplinary and department narrowness, paradigmatic differences, individualistic faculty training and socialization undergirded by reward systems that promote individualistic work. They also raise concerns about bureaucratic and hierarchical administrative structures that limit communication flow across the organization and discourage horizontal interaction in favor of top-down authority-based leadership. This latter tendency is facilitated by responsibility-centered management practices where “various units or schools are responsible for their own revenue developments and covering costs” (p. 33). Patricia Gumport (2001) laments this economic model coupled with academic restructuring and outcome assessment initiatives, as they create competition over resources that favors the quantifiable over the harder-to-measure “development of individual learning and human capital” (p. 91). The way this might influence faculty identity is grim: those pathways into the professoriate are transformed into a toll road.

Moreover, when Louis Menand (2010) looks at the politics of the professoriate, he is struck by the homogeneity of the group, going so far as to title a chapter “Why do
professors all think alike?” (p.128). He explains this by stating:

The higher the barriers to entry in an occupation, the more likely there are to be implicit codes that need to be mastered in addition to the explicit entrance requirements. And the profession of college professor has a pretty high threshold. In fact, the height of the threshold may explain a lot of what we see in these studies of professor’s politics. (p.141)

He cites recent national studies on the condition and future of the Ph.D. that were undertaken in an attempt to correct the pattern of “benign neglect” (p. 142) that has historically been an aspect of the culture of graduate education. He asserts that phenomenally high graduate school drop-out rates and shrinking job prospects have “to have an effect on professional self-conception” (p. 143). He traces the historical roots of this crisis to the 1970s, when increased professionalization of academic work caused the professoriate “to identify more with their disciplines than with their campuses” (p. 144). This professionalization led institutions to prize research above teaching and service, made the dissertation more difficult to write, and enhanced the selectivity of the profession. At the same time the market became flooded with Ph.D.s. Thus, the doctorate was both harder to get and less valuable. Additionally, in relying on graduate student labor to teach high-demand courses, like freshman composition, institutions became designed to produce A.B.D.s, not Ph.D.s. Further, in the 1990s faculty identity was influenced by an over-supply of Ph.D.s coupled with “attacks on the university for ‘political correctness,’ articula[ing] a widespread mood of disenchantment with the university as a congenial place to work” (p. 148). After 1996, the size of doctoral programs was cut down, but time-to-degree was still long. Thus, those who stuck with it had to be prepared for a highly competitive and lengthy apprenticeship. The nature of that apprenticeship was ill-defined, especially in the liberal arts. In contrast, the nature of
what constitutes scholarship is all-too-rigidly defined as something quantifiable and requiring expertise. Hence, Menand concludes that there is a great deal of social self-replication in academia: professors “are trained to teach people to do what they do and to know what they know” (p. 151). This is clearly an extremely narrow identity range: The toll road is down to one lane. He continues:

The obstacles to entering the academic profession are now so well-known that the students who brave them are already self-sorted before they apply to graduate school. . . . Students who go to graduate school already talk the talk, and they learn to walk the walk as well. There is less ferment from the bottom than is healthy in a field of intellectual inquiry. . . . The anxieties over placement and tenure do not encourage iconoclasm either. The academic profession in some areas is not reproducing itself so much as cloning itself. (p. 153)

This bodes ill for any faculty member who does not fit the norm. A curious lack of self-awareness exacerbates this problem. Faculty believe they are independent thinkers and are able to make objective decisions, but recent investigations into the world of academic judgment prove this is not the case. For example, Lamont (2009) discovered that far from being a logical process, "peer review is an interactional and an emotional undertaking" (p. 20). Perhaps if we could be more honest about this, academic culture would be more just and less polarized.

**Faculty Job Satisfaction**

Additional research looks at the impact of these institutional structures and cultures as they pertain to graduate student and faculty attrition, quality of life, and job satisfaction. Although not directly addressing questions of identity, this research suggests this impact is quite personal. Lovitts and Nelson (2000) report nationwide graduate student attrition rates at about 50 percent. Notably, major institutional differences in how graduate students are treated and regarded reveal a high correlation
between integration into a department's social and professional life and successful completion of the Ph.D. Lack of integration into the departmental community contributes most heavily to the departure of graduate students. The researchers discovered the lowest attrition rates were in the sciences, where students often work in laboratory groups focused on collaborative research and where intellectual and social interaction is most intense. The highest attrition rates are in the humanities, where study and research are most fully individualized and isolated. Ultimately, their evidence shows that attrition is deeply embedded in the organizational culture of graduate school and the structure and process of graduate education. They conclude that:

Students leave less because of what they bring with them to the university than because of what happens to them after they arrive. A student who enters a department whose culture and structure facilitate academic and personal integration is more likely to complete the Ph.D. than a student whose departmental culture is hostile or laissez-faire. (par. 30)

In this case, institutional culture not so much shapes faculty identity, as aborts it altogether.

Furthermore, attrition linked to institutional culture does not end in graduate school. Xu (2008) studied the underrepresentation of women faculty in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Comparing the intentions of attrition and turnover between genders in research and doctoral universities, she found that the two genders did not differ in their intentions to depart from academia. Women and men appear to be equally committed to their academic careers in STEM. However, women expressed dissatisfaction with an academic culture that provides them fewer opportunities, limited support, and inequity in leadership. Further, women identified this culture as one that discourages their free expression of ideas. A more inclusive,
collaborative culture is required to attract more women scientists and narrow the current
gender gap. Huston (2009) puts the attrition equation more directly:

When faculty leave, the primary element that [they report] is missing is
collegiality. Some faculty call it a lack of community. Study after study
demonstrates that faculty who leave or who plan to leave usually feel discouraged
or angry that no one supports them in meaningful ways, or, worse yet, that people
promise to support them but withdraw that support when it's needed most. (p. 240)

Positive personal relationships are essential to positive faculty identities.

For those who stay in the profession, institutional demands and culture
compromise faculty quality of life by inhibiting the expression of a full-range of identity.

DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, and Santos (2009) report the following:

Only 34.2 percent of faculty overall believe they have established a healthy
balance in their lives personally and professionally, with female faculty appearing
to have greater difficulty than male faculty in striking a balance (27.3 percent vs.
38.7 percent). College faculty appear to experience many sources of stress in
both their professional and personal lives. The top most commonly cited sources
of stress by faculty were self-imposed high expectations (80.1 percent). Across
virtually all stressor items, more women than men report experiencing stress. The
greatest gender differences are due to subtle discrimination, where more than
twice as many women (38.7 percent) than men (18.2 percent) cite subtle
discrimination in the form of prejudice, racism, and/or sexism as a source of
stress. (p. 4)

All this boils down to the issue of job satisfaction. Trower, Austin and Sorinelli
(2001) report a study of early-career faculty that shows a "troubling gap between the
vision and reality of an academic career" (p. 4) influenced by a lack of community, poor
work-life balance, and ambiguous, shifting, conflicting and ever-escalating tenure
expectations. Moreover, faculty struggling under those circumstances felt any complaint
or request for help would be perceived as weakness. As with the data on graduate student
attrition, Sabharwal and Corley (2009) find faculty job satisfaction is greatly affected by
collegial and student relationships, shaped by the leadership, climate and culture of the university. On the plus side, collegial relationships are often a source of support and a mechanism of building networking capability for faculty members. However, acrimonious relationships destroy satisfaction. Menand (2010) notes that “job satisfaction is actually higher among Ph.D.s with non academic careers than it is among academics” (p. 150).

Twale and DeLuca (2008) frame the problem even more bluntly. They refer to faculty incivility and the rise of an academic bully culture. They cite two primary sources as responsible for this culture. They believe the changing face of academe has brought new players, notably women and faculty of color, into a game formerly dominated by white men. This has caused a host of resentments and exclusions. Also, the increasingly corporate culture in academe creates greater competition for resources, encourages isolation, and devalues humanistic work. Moreover, university governance structures have not adapted quickly enough to respond adequately to these changes. Quite simply, "Our academic world is changing faster than the academic culture and organizational governance structure can accommodate" (p. xii).

Adding the Yin to the Yang

With this background, the question of how faculty identity develops within academia is all the more pressing. Something is clearly wrong in the state of higher education; the system has become distorted and unbalanced. One useful paradigm that might help us understand this imbalance and recognize how faculty experience their lives and establish their identities comes from feminist theory. The aspects of higher education today that negatively impact faculty lives might be described as “masculine,” according
to the definition offered by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule, as quoted in Jordan (1997). Academia is overwhelmingly competitive, hyper-rational, hierarchical, and individualistic, valuing ways of knowing that privilege expertise, abstract logic, mastery, and control. Jordan discusses the “way one conceptualizes ones ‘place’ in the world broadly affects interpretive, meaning-making, and value-generating activity” (p. 351).

However, if faculty identity is shaped by a “masculine” sense of place, what would happen if the academy became more “feminine?” I use this term with caution, because without a doubt there have been strong feminist voices in the academy, but many of these voices come from a “Stage Two” position, to use Downing and Roush’s (1985) model of feminist identity. Stage Two describes an identity “based on the [angry] negation of traditional femininity and the dominant [male] culture... [This is] a negative identity rather than an identity based on affirmation of strengths” (p. 372). In other words, I do not want to suggest women are the only victims of an academic system that rejects emotion and thwarts full representation of an integrated sense of self. In contrast to both Stage Two feminism and traditional conceptions of masculinity, Jordan (1997) values seeing the self as contextual and relational,

with the capacity to form gratifying connections, with creative action becoming possible though connection, and a greater sense of clarity and confidence arising within relationship, others will be perceived as participating in relational growth in a particular way that contributes to the connected sense of self. (p. 351)

She points out the academy has shaped areas of study along a masculine ideal and calls for a “larger paradigm shift from the primacy of separate self to the relational being...to further our understanding of [not just women's but] all human experience” (p. 354). This understanding must begin with uncovering those aspects of faculty identity that have, at times, been marginalized by the current system.
In their call for a more collaborative academy, while less explicit in feminist language, Kezar and Lester (2009) essentially make the same argument. They use hard evidence to back the claims that collaborative institutions confer advantages lacking in competitive hierarchies. They cite studies showing that collaboration on an institutional level can allow for innovation and learning, can create better solutions to complex problems by relying on multiple perspectives, can enable campuses to provide better service across the institution, can decrease costs and lead to greater efficiency, and can provide better sources of employee motivation through increased job satisfaction.

Across disciplines, within departments and in classrooms, collaboration can improve teaching and learning by preventing the “fragmentation that has affected and limited knowledge production” (p. 14), by increasing student engagement, by contributing “to an openness to diverse perspectives” (p. 16), and by fostering positive interactions between students and faculty, which in turn have an impact on student persistence and success.

**Understanding Identity Intersections and Advancing Democracy**

How might a structural shift toward collaboration influence faculty identity? Before we can answer that question, we must better understand how that identity is shaped now, not just at the graduate level or at the transition point into the professoriate, but over the course of a career. Feminist theory provides a lens that might allow us to explore this phenomenon. Intersectional analysis is a response to identity politics, which tends to see identity as singular and deterministic. Intersectionality begins with the assumption that human identity is made up of multiple, fluid identities that can compound or conflict and are influenced by external power structures (Dhamoon, 2011). This can help us understand the dimensions of faculty identity and the ways they are shaped by
institutional culture. Which aspects of this identity are encouraged by our institutions? Which are discouraged? What does this winnowing process cost? Hancock (2007) argues people must not be forced to privilege one aspect of identity to the detriment of another. Further, intersectionality has allowed practitioners, like Bettie (2000), to look at groups of people on their own terms, not as outsiders see them, to recognize previously “unarticulated and invisible” issues (p. 17). In her study of Latina teens, she discovered that while many observers interpreted the young women's fashion choices as expressions of gender norms, in reality these women were responding to social class cues. Bettie's intersectional lens made it possible for her to look for more complex explanations and to recognize that internal identity intersections were separate from an external performance of make-up and clothing style. Recognizing such internal identity intersections challenged the notion of unitary or overly simplified identity categories and provided a more accurate explanation of what motivated these girls' choices. Such an approach can mitigate reductionism and increase our holistic understanding of how real people experience their lives. When applied to university faculty, intersectionality might reveal that the external performance of the 'professor' role, as a highly trained expert, might be disconnected from internal experiences, and that disconnection might create negative feelings such as insecurity and loneliness. In exploring what aspects of themselves can and cannot be expressed in the academy, faculty may better be able to understand their feelings about their work and their colleagues. This may lead to meaningful reform of our institutions, especially if we can recognize that most faculty suffer to some extent under present conditions. To do this we must avoid “the 'oppression Olympics’ where groups compete for the mantle of 'most oppressed’ to gain the attention and political
support of dominant groups...leaving the overall system of stratification unchanged” (Hancock, 2007, p. 68). One danger of identity-based politics is that it can pit one marginalized group against another: Faculty of color versus women in the sciences, for example. Intersectionality can reveal common ground that can allow different groups to come together and work for institutional reform. This might best apply to faculty by revealing the way all faculty, not just women or ethnically marginalized groups, are diminished by the academic system.

Recently, theorists have been exploring the value of applying intersectional analysis not just to feminist issues, but more broadly. Dhamoon (2011), for example, argues that, through using intersectionality to look at the interaction between social processes and systems, we can address how not only individual identity but also social categories are organized and constructed. More importantly, we can inquire who controls these systems. With that understanding we are better poised to correct oppressive systems and advance “agendas for justice” (p. 233).

Notably, Pifer (2011) uses intersectionality to research faculty members’ experience of collegial relationships in the context of academic departments. She asserts,

Explorations of intersectionality in academic careers may illuminate the professional and personal challenges faced by faculty members whose multiple identities are not reflected in the collective identity of the department or institution, or who feel like outsiders within their scholarly homes because of the groups with which they most identify. (p. 29)

The thrust of her argument aims at revising methods of institutional research. She outlines two approaches to using intersectionality. One, where specific researcher-determined identity categories (e.g. race. class, gender) are explored, may be useful in understanding how these identities function in a given context. However, this
“predetermined emphasis on certain identities” (p. 30) may reflect researcher bias or may favor one set of identity intersections while excluding others that are actually more significant. The other approach is to let participants “identify and explain which components of their identities are most salient to them” (p. 31). She asserts this approach may give a more accurate, and therefore more useful, total picture. Pifer goes on to describe her mixed-methods research approach that combines quantitative social network analysis and qualitative individual interviews. She feels this combination best captures the richness and complexity of faculty identity experience. However, she also points out that the qualitative interview process allowed her to discover that a faculty member who appeared to be well-connected and high-status, based on the quantitative data, actually felt like an outsider in her department because she was “a middle-aged, mid-career, single, childless woman within a competitive academic environment” (p. 40). This underscores the importance of allowing faculty to tell their own stories and of recognizing their layered identities. Pifer concludes by observing that intersectionality also allows researchers to understand how faculty members can report having very different experiences within the same institutional context. What she does not report is that the reverse may be true as well: Seemingly very different faculty members may have similar feelings. This similarity may be key in developing the sense of common ground necessary for institutional reform.

Clearly, there is rich ground for further study, and intersectionality provides a useful critical lens. Academic socialization into a competitive, hierarchical system privileges certain aspects of an individual’s identity while imperiling others. These lost dimensions may be the very source of academic renewal, pluralistic integration, and
personal gratification. Ultimately, it is imperative that we recognize that this process of academic enculturation transcends gender. Therefore, what began as a recommendation to integrate “feminine” ways of knowing into the “masculine” academy may better be identified as a call for increased democracy. The pursuit of knowledge embedded in meaningful collegial relationships where all voices are valued is a vision for a robust, generative, and socially responsible academy.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research Question

The scholarship summarized in Chapter II points to a significant problem. Many faculty enter the professoriate with high ideals. They have identity conceptions of themselves as potential change-agents, expanding human knowledge and contributing to the greater good. For too many, somewhere along the way, this idealism fades and is replaced with job dissatisfaction and bitterness. What are the specific mechanisms that trigger this change? How do faculty experience institutional culture, internalize these experiences, and develop their professional identity?

Data Collection and Methodology

In order to answer these questions, I conducted hour-long qualitative interviews with six mid-career university faculty members in the social sciences or humanities. I selected this demographic because it appears to be less thoroughly studied than other faculty populations, women in STEM for example. Selecting mid-career faculty also allowed me to examine the persistence of the initial inspiration that brought them into the academy – the extent to which imagined identities could be realized. From those who responded to my call for participants, I chose three women and three men from three different universities to capture what I thought would be varying experiences of the academy. Nevertheless, because of their mid-career status, many of them have shared similar experiences: Four of the six have served as administrators; four have children;
three have won teaching awards. All are presently serving as faculty, and all have tenure, with the exception of one person whose job security is differently protected. All participants were informed that the goal of this study was better understanding of faculty identity and job satisfaction. They understood the potential risks involved in participation and were assured that any information they provided would be kept in strictest confidence (see Appendix A). Overall, my intention was not to present a comprehensive study of diverse manifestations of faculty identity, rather to dig deep into these six stories. I am inspired by Egan's (1997) concept of Mythic Understanding, specifically about uncovering the "concepts that best capture the affective importance of [a] topic" (p. 246). Egan tells us, "Narrative . . . can provide a powerfully engaging access to knowledge of all kinds" (p. 59). I hope these narratives deepen our knowledge about academic life.

Using Pifer's (2011) model of intersectional analysis, where subjects identify salient components of their identities rather than responding to pre-determined categories, I opened my interview by asking each participant for a list of such components. I then asked specific questions about what inspired them to pursue a career in academia and how their subsequent experiences have lived up to that ideal. [See Appendix B for list of interview questions and Appendix C for faculty lists of identity traits and my coding]. After the interviews, I transcribed the content and used both axial coding, to see how their identity paths conformed to Reybold's (2003) theory of faculty development, and Pifer's open coding, to see what other identity themes emerged from their narratives. My hypothesis was that job satisfaction would be influenced by the degree to which faculty work has lived up to initial expectations. This reliance on self-reporting is endorsed by
various researchers (Seligman, 2002); however, I anticipated that an intersectional lens
would reveal a more complex picture: Notably, it would show the degree to which faculty
have had to mask various aspects of their identities and the ways in which their identities
are supported by their institutional environments. Based on these measures, I present
these stories beginning with the faculty member who initially seemed most satisfied with
his work and end with the person who seemed least.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS: A PORTRAIT OF SIX PROFESSORS

Simon—Having Fun and Juggling Solo

Simon is a tenured, full professor with a ready wit and charismatic style. He lists eight terms as most descriptive of his identity; the attributes he believes are most important to his sense of self have to do with his disciplinary sub-field and his work as an editor, teacher and writer. He believes these four of his eight identity attributes are also endorsed by the university. He does not see this as at all problematic because the four unendorsed aspects of his identity have "nothing to do with work," as they either have to do with hobbies or his role as a father. This last role is the only explicitly emotional or relational term on his list. Simon describes himself as having "nothing to hide," and therefore it is unsurprising that of the six faculty I interviewed, he appears to be the most satisfied with his work. He was also the only one with fairly low initial aspirations for what his work would mean to his identity. Hence, when I asked if his work has lived up to his initial expectations, without hesitation he responds, "Oh yeah, a hundred times more. A hundred times better, in fact."

Simon laughingly said he initially entered academia because "I didn’t want a desk job... You know, you don’t really have a boss and you don’t have to do what other people tell you. I guess I wanted to stay in school forever." Reybold (2003) might have called him a Drifter. Yet Simon grew more serious and described having really good undergraduate teachers who inspired his commitment to his academia. He jokes "I
learned everything I know as an undergraduate." This would suggest he is more a
Philosopher. But, it was only in his "second round" of graduate school that he came to
commit to a specific discipline. Moreover, he said learning was quite simply fun: "It's
fun. That's the only reason [I do it]." I came to learn that this term is an important
descriptor for Simon; one might even say his identity is shaped in this pursuit. Things
that he deems "fun" are worth doing, worth putting time into; things that are "not fun" he
often equates with being "stupid" and not worth doing. So, for example he "dove into
being an academic" because it was "fun," being invited to travel to give plenary sessions
and for speaking engagements is "fun," and it might be "fun" to run a special program
devoted to his particular academic sub-field. However, being a department chair was
"not fun," "stupid committee work" is "a complete bore," and having lots of projects
going on simultaneously is "not always fun" because there is so much to juggle at once.
Sometimes he says his editorial work is a "pain in the ass" because "it's stupid
work...much of it I could have a secretary do. I don't need to be doing that stuff."

Undoubtedly, Simon defines himself through his scholarship, which is prolific.
During our conversation he showed me a blackboard he uses to keep track of all the
projects he is currently working on. There are nine books on this list, in addition to the
journal he co-edits. Interestingly, he didn't expect to be such a prolific writer. He says he
really didn't start writing seriously until shortly before he came up for tenure and
someone warned him that he might not have enough publications. In our conversation,
he initially displayed a very casual attitude toward the happenstances of his publications:
"I revised my dissertation into a book... [and] just happened to have landed a contract
with [one of the top academic publishers in the country]." Later, he describes being
contacted "just by chance" and "out of the blue" by someone from another press about writing a textbook; he says they "just sort of struck up a conversation" about how the idea could become a whole series, and which ultimately led him to edit many books. The journal he edits "just sort of fell in [his] lap." He just "happened to be on the ground floor as a starter when" his sub-field took off as a popular new discipline.

Nevertheless, toward the end of the interview I interrogated this impression he had made and asked him if he felt he had just been lucky or if he felt he was more of a self-made man who had worked hard and gotten his due. His response was uncharacteristically vehement:

Nothing was given to me, that's for sure. No, I definitely made it. I think of the people who whine, who don't actually do much work and complain about everything a lot. It's just, "Put your nose to the grindstone! If you want something go and do it!" The thing that just perplexes me, and all, is that people can't just write a couple of articles. Just write! Do something! This is your field! You're supposed to enjoy doing this, and they whine about having to write. Why did you get into this business anyway? There's people around here who just don't seem to actually work much at all. I think I would go nuts. I would lose my mind if I just had to teach my classes and go home. What the hell else would I do?

This unexpected vehemence is one example of an inconsistency in Simon's self-presentation. Clearly, much as he projects a casual demeanor, underneath he is quite driven and holds himself to high productivity standards. These standards extend to his colleagues as well. He referred to one person, saying "a couple of articles in six years, that's pathetic." At another point he stated that "the expectations [for tenure] are really so low that [he doesn't] think it would be hard for anyone to succeed. . . . If they're lazy, then yes maybe." And yet, he hesitated when I asked if he felt people got what they deserved. At first, he said yes, but then he followed with "I'm sure there are people who work hard who don't get as awarded. I know for a fact there are things that are easier for me to do
because I am a man. I have an easier time in the classroom, no doubt about that." He recognized that his gender grants him a kind of automatic respect and that he doesn't "have to earn it." He describes, "I just show up and tell people to do things, and I scare them enough they believe me. I think it's harder for a woman." When I ask if he believes he has experienced privilege, he says yes, but

the way people have dealt with it, how should I say this and be really polite? I've seen people turn green because I got something and then decided "I have to do that too," and kick and scream and suggest that it was because they're a woman that they didn't get it too. I think that's probably not fair.

Simon also feels there are ways the university does not support him, and this has forced him to make compromises which have limited the full expression of his academic identity. Currently, he believes that his university does not recognize the nature of the editorial work he does. He observes that at his institution "you get course releases for running any stupid committee or for being [department] chair, but you don't for [editorial work], which is actually a lot more work, because I've done both." Looking back, he noted that when he first joined his department, no one took his particular sub-specialty very seriously. He was allowed to teach this subject only as a special topic course, drawing very few students. However, once that old guard retired he was able to market his field differently and attract ten times as many students. He is quick to add "I don't resent it," but at the same time he does seem to have a sense of having had the last laugh. He also felt that that old guard of faculty in his department was primarily interested in teaching, so his incipient interest in scholarship was not fully supported. However, he notes that academic culture has shifted over the years to demand more scholarship, and this has served his interests and identity well. He actually wishes his institution gave
even more support for research – more money for conference travel, more grants. He
wishes research was

encouraged in a way that is not scaring people, not threatening them or forcing
them, but just like making opportunities for them, making it much easier to go off
and spend a few months. I think a pre-tenure leave would make so much more
sense than waiting until you've spent all this time teaching and then say "Where's
your research?" It's dumb.

He recognizes that the institution is not going to invest in people unless they know they
are going to be around for the long-haul, but he believes you would get more people to
stay if you actually made it possible for them to do so. Further, he is disappointed that
the university has not invested in creating a special program devoted to his sub-field. He
expresses irritation that while the dean claimed to support the idea, no funds have been
allocated for the project and the development office blocks Simon's efforts to raise funds
himself. He is quick to add "my heart is not broken." He clearly has so many options
that if one thing doesn't pan out, there are many others to pursue. As he puts it, "I have
tons of other stuff to do."

In fact, this abundance of potential projects is perhaps his most difficult challenge.
He describes himself as a "juggler," "having to deal with six things at once." He never
knows exactly what to start working on and says "It's a pain. It's nerve wracking." Yet he
knows that "the stuff I don't like is the things I've made myself. It's the bed I have made.
Having a plate that's too full [is] very, very nerve wracking, but that's nothing to do with
the institution. It's just me." And, indeed, his days are very full. Beginning at 5:00 a.m.,
he answers e-mail until 10:00 a.m. and then dives into his writing, with time out for
classes on the days he teaches. That said, he later reported that he never works at home.
His work time is on campus from 8:00 a.m. to 500 p.m. After that he goes home to cook
dinner and be a father. By 9:00 p.m. he is asleep. He claims that he never works on weekends because he believes "it's good to separate" work life and home life. I asked if creating that separation gave him rejuvenating downtime, but he replied with a laugh, "I wouldn't say it's downtime. Actually I can't wait to get back here. Sometimes." These descriptions of his work schedule reveal another inconsistency: How could he begin e-mail at 5:00 a.m. and also claim to not start work until 8:00 a.m.? That's a discrepancy of fifteen working hours a week.

The primary way that his academic identity has turned out differently than he expected has to do with teaching. He says he initially expected that he would be spending at least half of his time teaching, but that has not been the case. When he first started, he spent a great deal of time creating ten new courses. The reason this was so time-consuming was that he ended up writing out all of his classes, another thing he didn't expect to end up doing. As he puts it, "I lecture. I do a proper lecture. I come in and I speak for two hours." Interestingly, aside from his use of the word "proper," he doesn't claim any specific pedagogical purpose in his choice of the lecture format. He states, "I don't know why, it's just the way it turned out." So, aside from an initial investment, in many ways he has put little into his identity as a teacher. At this point in his career he says he "doesn't spend any time on teaching at all anymore." Now that all his lectures have been written, he hasn't changed anything in more than ten years. As he put it, "[By the year 2000], my classes were mostly done, and I didn't see a need to rewrite them or do really new courses." Nevertheless, he values teaching because it creates "good synergy" to have to explain the ideas he is working on in his writing to students. He believes "it makes you a better writer." Once again, there appears to be a
contradiction in his self-description: How could he be incorporating the new ideas he is working on if he hasn't changed his lectures in over ten years?

Of his students themselves he says,

I like the students; they're perfectly fine. I know lots of people hate their students and say they're just a terrible pain in the neck, or whatever. I think they're fine. I don't adore them. I don't have close relationships with them, but they're good students.

Additionally, he teaches an on-line course to adults at another university where he gets to focus solely on his disciplinary sub-specialty. He visits that other university "a few times a semester" to meet these students who he says are "great people" who he "likes a lot." It was hard for me to determine on what he based his liking.

In terms of other relationships, he speaks positively about his departmental colleagues. While acknowledging there are departments that are "dysfunctional," he likes everyone in his own department and says they get along well. In his words, he "avoids administration as much as possible," although does have a social relationship with one dean. Indeed, given how gregarious Simon appears, he is strangely disconnected from his campus environment. His service work is "service to the profession, not necessarily to university committees." At another point he says, "I don't do any committee stuff anymore, really, unless it's department or higher" and then it seems only under duress; if, for example, a colleague is on leave. In fact, he strongly rejects "bullshit committee work that [doesn't] need to be done but [is] faculty spinning around in the wheel." He is "glad not to do that anymore." This may link to a lack of specific institutional loyalty. Simon confesses "If someone were to offer me a job running a [program specific to his disciplinary sub-specialty], I'd go in a second."
So, ultimately, what emerges is a portrait of an autonomous scholar whose identity as such is validated through his impressive publication record and international reputation. The aspects of his work that he finds dissatisfying he sees as either self-generated or "not important." While the institution might occasionally block a project he is interested in, he has plenty of other pursuits to occupy his time. He acknowledges that people at other institutions might be worse off and that injustices might occur: "I've heard things go on in other places. I guess it just hasn't happened to me." He reports that his feelings never get hurt because he sees himself as calling the shots, as the master of his own destiny. All in all, he sums his career up with "I know people who think academic life just sucks, and it doesn't; it's really very pleasant. A lot of free time. You can think whatever the hell you want."

George—Working Underground

George is a tenured full professor with an endowed chair. He uses 31 terms to describe his identity. The aspects he most values are his roles as a family man, as a creative, great teacher, as a full professor with an endowed chair and as devoted to the liberal arts. He feels 35% of his identity is endorsed by his university, but he notes that is not unequivocal endorsement. Also, some of those traits are negative: Perfectionist, worrier, afraid to fail, and silenced. He hides 16% of his identity, and all of these hidden aspects have to do with emotion. Overall, 58% of his identity is comprised of emotional or relational concepts.

As an undergraduate, his career path was inspired by "a fantastic teacher whose charisma, whose warmth, whose integrity, whose ability to connect studying with living a life well changed my life and made it richer and better...the idea I could do the same
struck me as important." This indicates his identity as a Visionary (Reybold, 2003).

Nevertheless, he "had to overcome family pressure to [follow a different profession], so it wasn't an easy decision by any stretch of the imagination." Through talking with others of his teachers, he "put the picture together and decided the benefits outweighed the troubles" and pursued a PhD. Therefore, along with being a Visionary, George is also a Pilgrim.

George ranks several dimensions of teaching as the most gratifying aspects of his work. One dimension is "when you're working with students and you're working with the material and when I'm on top of it and everything comes together, I have a profound sense of delight, of Flow." Another dimension has to do serving the greater good:

"[At my current institution] I have capable students who, for the most part, have low social capital, so I feel I am able to add so much more. I think this is where my own complicated class background comes in. . . . When I see kids coming out of the [working class] backgrounds like that of my grandfather or mother and recognizing that I have things to add to their lives that will make them happier, will make them more powerful as citizens and more effective as citizens, I'm doing what I came to do, which is improve the lives of individuals in our culture and to improve the culture as a whole by connecting those individuals with a larger frame.

Alongside his teaching, George is delighted to be in an environment where he is "not only encouraged but required to be a scholar." This is an ideal fit with his "intense curiosity," and he sees himself as a "born" scholar: "I cannot let a question go. I chase it down." He sees his scholarship as "a kind of service" because it often connects him to communities outside of the university. Ultimately, George rejected the "neat containers" that often separate teaching, scholarship and service, as he feels it is all connected, it should "all overflow." Interpersonally, he sang the praises of several key faculty members who were "very supportive." He enjoys working around "incredibly creative
people" and asserts: "Most of my colleagues are very nice and generous. They care about their teaching. They care about the world. I mean, they share so many of my values." He continues, "I have this profound sense of validation in my worldview, which, being a nerd in the rest of American culture is not valued."

However, he describes significant downsides to his career, some of which he was prepared for because he "watched the university where I got my bachelor's degree" and knew faculty did not always get along. He recognized a lot of "strange people" would be his faculty colleagues and knew that American higher education has "too many things to do and faculty don’t agree on what is most important, and we have external pressures that coerce us to go in one direction or another." He also faults the system for being overly "bureaucratic" and creating time pressure, making faculty feel that they have three full-time jobs instead of one. He says, "I don’t have enough time to do all the stuff I want to do. It makes me feel uncomfortable. It makes me feel disconnected from the students, so I don’t feel like I’m getting feedback." This situation is exacerbated by a constant deluge of e-mail: "Technology is exasperating because it breaks Flow... It makes interruptions constant." In turn, the very flexibility and freedom he relishes also means "there is no end" to the work: "When do I stop? When do I quit?" Thus, what he says is most difficult about his job is "balancing:" In particular, balancing his work life with his family life.

Further, despite the fact that he is very articulate and has a commanding presence, George describes three particular experiences where he struggled with having a voice. All three were cases in which he felt it was important to challenge exploitation, once of graduate students, twice of female colleagues. He talked at length about one particular case of standing up against what he perceived to be gender-based discrimination and
being "roundly criticized by half the faculty in my department.... It was very hard. It would have been much easier to have been quiet and gone along and watched the disaster unfold, but I didn't. . . . It was funny, in the meeting I was pitching and arguing articulately, and afterwards I broke into tears." What made this criticism so hurtful was the personal nature of the attack. Rather than conduct a reasoned, open discussion of the issues, one faculty member turned the discussion into a personal attack on George's integrity, and much of this took place in private. George reports some sense of vindication when, a few years later, this one faculty member was found guilty of sexual harassment in a completely separate case. Yet, departmental hostility was a large factor in what made George choose to accept an administrative position and ultimately take a job at another university. In other words, incivility destroys loyalty.

Clearly, dealing with difficult colleagues is another source of job stress. As much as he feels most of his colleagues are wonderful, he identifies a portion as "pains in the ass." He sees:

This handful of faculty members who always have to be right, who are passive aggressive, who—some of them are flat-out aggressive. All they care about is, number one, themselves, number two, their program. They don't look at the institution. They don't think there's maybe a bigger picture. They're fucking selfish pigs.

He acknowledges that people like this can be found in any workplace but says "the university protects them; it's an important part of academic freedom, but it allows us to be protected to be jerks." George identifies this incivility as basic academic culture: "We are trained as faculty members to assert our research and challenge what we see as weakness in others' research. We are cultivated to be combatants in our thinking." This competitive environment is one where you "count up points. I've got more research
publications than you, so I'm a better person." He notes it only takes one person with this kind of mentality to teach junior people this is the way to behave and you have an "acculturation process in savagery."

Moreover, institutional privileging of quantifiable data "drives [him] nuts." He asserts,

You cannot engage in questions about values when everything is enumerated. We are not a business, but we are coming to behave as if we are a business. The life of the mind is not a product. Students are not consumers.

Such a business model causes higher education to "lose its sense of purpose, lose its bearings" and "surrender its soul." For a Visionary (Reybold, 2003) this must be especially hard. For George the process of education should involve "intellectual intimacy. It's about being human." He reflects,

I think a lot of people run away from the emotional engagement of that, so they retreat to analysis. They retreat to something cold. And when you retreat to something cold, you can retreat to something colder, which is numbers.

Another one of the issues George struggles with paradoxically comes from his high-status position in the university. He experiences intense pressure to become an administrator, the obvious next step on the ladder of success in academia. He recognizes he has great skills as a leader:

I keep calling people back to our larger purpose. I think people like to be called back to that. Everybody hurts by this attenuated sense of what success is. They like, essentially, a preacher. ...They think they want to hear a good sermon.

But, despite numerous offers of various administrative positions, George keeps refusing because it "takes [him] away from the other parts of [his] life," including teaching and scholarship. He also believes people "don't want sermons seven days a week" and "would get tired of me pretty fast." His refusal costs him something. He recognizes:
I was cultivated to be a leader from the day my father first started paying attention to me... as a male, it's about being a leader. That's your job... to be the boss. I got that message constantly growing up.... There's no question my skill set connects to social expectations about a white man. ... I've got the whole package, what people expect a leader to be; it's part of the pressure. I'm cultivated to be this, even though it may not make me happy.

Later, he admits he is afraid to be a leader because he fears becoming a "target for attack." He elaborates by saying: [As a leader] "you are the lightening rod; you're out in front and everybody is shooting at you in the battle, including from behind. . . . I'm too sensitive for that. I think I don't have a thick enough skin." Academic leadership is life and death.

This is just one of several instances where George reveals aspects of his identity that are compromised by his position in the academy. He paused before telling me the main thing he wishes his academic community knew about him: "God, I don’t know. If they knew how thin my skin was, they might take advantage of it. I don’t know." Finally, he answers: "That family is important." He also recognizes that his experience of his work would be different if his emotional sensitivity could be appreciated more, and he does admit, "I let people I trust know that side of me." However, he continues,

I can't say the institutional culture makes it easy to find those people. There may be lots of us, but how do you know? Everyone's hidden. It's probable there are lots us. Who gets the kind of grades you need to get into a top-ranked Ph.D. program that'll get you the job but people who like to please? I don't think any competitive job environment allows for the kind of emotional openness that would allow us really to be colleagues, really to solve problems well.

All that said, he does feel "freer," "more relaxed," and says he "worries less" now that he is a tenured full professor. He believes he can now be a "bold thinker and risk taker," but he says it with a rueful chuckle: "The payoff is twenty-five years down the road." He acknowledges, "Untenured professors don’t really have academic freedom.
They have to be a little bit on the edge, or make people feel like they are doing something new when it's not, in order to get tenure...[but it can't be anything] unique. You've been socialized into being a coward." He sees a system that selects for conformity and "throws people out who are really innovative, unless they know how to hide." Consequently, to create institutional change he says: "I've often talked of myself as a mole. I'm underneath. I'm working underground."

Sarah—Attached and on the Ground

Sarah is a tenured associate professor who has recently returned to a faculty role after serving for several years in administration. The immediate impression one gets from her is that she is a good listener, a kind person who laughs easily. She describes her identity with twenty terms, of which the most personally meaningful are mother, teacher, lover of the arts, compassionate, connector, and passionate about diversity issues and social justice. 80% of her identity is defined in terms of emotion or relationships. She feels 35% of her identity is endorsed by the university -- as a teacher, a connector, a team player, a scholar, a big picture thinker, and as someone who is responsible and passionate about diversity issues and social justice. She also feels 35% of her identity must be hidden or is not valued by her institution. Specifically, she is not endorsed as a mother, spouse, friend, and sister/daughter, or as a passionate, overly sensitive, spiritual person. As will be shown, the issue of emotionality has been one of her biggest struggles. She also makes distinctions between external role identities and more internal values; however, she acknowledges the ways those things connect. Structuring her career in ways that align with those values has been an ongoing challenge.
Sarah entered academia because she loves both the subject and the work of her discipline, although she confesses becoming a professor was the "safe choice," as opposed to her "younger dream" of being a fiction writer. So somewhat like Simon, to use Reybold's (2003) terms, she was both a Drifter and a Philosopher. That said, graduate school was extremely difficult for her. She reports, "The first couple of years in grad school I wanted to quit, like, every week. I just hated it." The contrast between the "soft, liberal arts" focus of her undergraduate college and the hyper-competitive environment in graduate school wounded her identity. Her undergraduate college was "very nurturing" and "all about discovery and growth." Whereas, her "top ten" ranked graduate program was "high theory" and "totally alienating." She asserts, "It drew me away from what I loved about [my subject] in the first place." This dislike of abstract theory has persisted throughout her career, as she put it "I'm not that engaged in questions of disciplinary trends." Fortunately, she was able to find some theoretical approaches that "spoke to" her, notably those dealt with social justice and feminism. What kept her in the graduate program was teaching. "I loved the teaching. I was like okay, then, this is what I want to do."

Nevertheless, no question her passion about teaching ran counter to the institutional culture of her graduate program. This created a significant identity conflict and it "took [her] a long time to slough off... the pressure to do this sort of high theory and have this sense of mastery." She is adamant: "I didn't want to be that person." But, it "took [her] a long time to kind of figure out how to do scholarship in a way that...felt honest to [her]." Describing this process as a struggle to regain her confidence, she blames both her graduate experience and subsequently the department she was first hired
into for undermining her faith in herself. She describes her department at that time as "very uncollaborative" and lacking good leadership, where "problems were buried or thrown at junior faculty." This "departmental dysfunction" was exacerbated by "the death of a thousand cuts of your confidence...passive-aggressive stuff...snarky little comments from particularly the women in [the] department, but not exclusively." For Sarah, the gender component is significant. As she explains it:

I think women are often burdened with, particularly in a male-dominated field, a sense of insecurity. . . . I know from my part a sense of real ambivalence about ambition . . . feeling like I shouldn't be ambitious, but you are. Feeling like you shouldn't feel competitive, but you are. So, the competition comes out in these [subversive ways].

She believes some of this could have been avoided had she received better institutional mentoring. She recognizes a couple of men in her department made mentoring "gestures," but she also thinks she "was so insecure and scared" that she just couldn't accept mentors from within the department. Interestingly, Sarah's long-standing mentor is someone who was her professor as an undergraduate, even though neither of them is at that institution any longer. Sarah believes it has actually been healthy for her to have external mentorship, mentors "outside of the goldfish bowl of your institution."

Over time, the combination of this mentorship and "a lot of therapy" allowed her to claim a more authentic professional identity. However, she does not let the institution off the hook: "our institution is not equipped to train and support mentors...people are kind of on their own in a lot of ways." She does think things have gotten somewhat better since she first started, but she believes people are often too busy and that there is a "naïveté on how the ground is changing in terms of the expectations for scholarship."

While once her university prized teaching above all else, now "teaching and service take
a back seat." In her experience, promotion and tenure is all about "a very destructive, old-school, narrow notion of what scholarship is." She refers to this as "un-nuanced," a form of "accounting," with "no understanding of the fact that some forms of scholarship take longer to unfold, that faculty are complex people negotiating a complex institution." She laments the lack of a "holistic" understanding of someone's life as an ebbing and flowing of different kinds of contributions over a lifetime. Instead, she believes we have a system of quantification that de-humanizes individuals: "We have to be sort of machines that accomplish these things." Moreover, she points out covert sexism and racism: There is a "lack of recognition that service demands vary according to [gender]"...and that "women of color are particularly burdened." While she does see the fact of women of color getting disproportionately tapped for service as in some ways a good thing (in that there is a desire for diverse perspectives on various committees), it is still a symptom of an institutional problem of not having a critical mass of faculty of color. Sarah believes these faculty members often cannot say no to formal or informal requests for service because they don't have tenure. All told, she believes, "It's not a healthy place for junior faculty."

At this point, we began to discuss her more recent work in administration. The reasons she went into administration were a "mix of personal and professional." Moreover, she believes it was being in administration that allowed her to regain her confidence. Having institutional validation and "positive feedback and support" for the work she was doing were integral aspects of this process. For Sarah the good part of being in administration was "you stop giving a shit what people think of you." She affirms "I became really tough about that." Just as important for her sense of self-worth
was getting out of her department. She says, "I had to have distance from it to get a sense of why I was so unhappy in it." Somewhat ironically, given the stereotype many people have about administrators, she found the joy of administration was the teamwork. She had a sense that "egos were put aside" and that there was a "collaborative approach to problem solving" which was "very different from being a faculty member." Sarah enjoys "big picture work" and that was why she has always loved service, even back when she was a faculty member.

Sadly, administration proved to be something of a mixed bag; Sarah called it "the curse of being middle-management." By this she was referring to having a great deal of responsibility and very little power. Thus, she was in charge of many programs over which she had very little say. This became especially problematic when it came to dealing with faculty "who are really bad." Sarah is quick to assert that these folks were a very small percentage of the faculty, 5% maybe 10%, but they took up 90% of her time. And, when she says "bad," she means unethical, not just incompetent or difficult. In particular there were a couple of instances that were "hugely distressing," and it became clear to her how little power she actually had. It's important to note that up until this point, she had been aware of the limits of her power and was content to merely "influence" decisions, to "have a seat at the table." But, that "came to a breaking point" for her when those who were higher up in administration refused to act on a case that she felt was blatantly exploitative and unjust. This "breaking point" connected to an aspect of her identity that she feels she has to hide professionally, her emotionality. The struggle had to do with "dealing with people in power who are completely detached from their emotions...It is very, very tough." She describes trying to have a conversation
about this situation with one of her male colleagues, and it turned into a debate. As she put it, "He went into hyper-intellectual mode." She got very angry, upset, ended up in tears, and had to leave the room. She saw "a clear gender divide in the office" and "felt like she had to hide [her emotions] because [she] didn't want to be dismissed because [she is] a woman who has emotions." Later, she felt very validated when a male faculty member came in with the same concerns she had, but by then it was too late. She felt she had hit a wall and decided to leave her position to return to faculty.

This does not mean she is done with administration forever. She might go back one day, but she is clear that she does not want to "go up the ladder." She is also very conscious of the personal costs of the administrative track. For example, she recognizes that she will not get promoted very far within her own institution, so to pursue that track she would have to move her family, but she feels they have already been negatively impacted by the "grueling" hours she has already had to put in. She felt her kids were in daycare for too long; her sense of partnership with her husband was impacted; in short, it was "unsustainable." At this point in her career, she realizes she is having to really thoughtfully figure out my relationship to work, and it is always evolving. . . . Moving into administration helped me have a healthier relationship to work, so I wasn't so emotionally distressed about dysfunction...I got some distance that I needed, so I am definitely happier.

She understands the ways her institution has supported her identities as a connector, team player, teacher, and scholar. Further, it has validated her commitment to diversity and social justice issues and big picture thinking. However, she also has a sense that these are undercut by the "sheer accretion of duties." The institution demands "so many responsibilities." She exclaims: "You can't keep adding!" And yet, the dominant model she sees in academia is one of "masculine drive, drive, drive. You have to be married to
your job. You must be available 24/7; technology makes it so, and you're expected to be. Other peoples' poor planning becomes your emergency."

Further, she vehemently believes that all of her personal relationships outside of work are not supported institutionally. This includes the top two things she most values in her identity: Being a mother and spouse. She believes the university has a sense that those things are "not supposed to exist" and attributes this to a "corporate and masculinist" culture, although she points out that fathers are not supported at all either. She wishes the institution would "make room for [her] as a mother." Sarah also hides her spiritual side because she feels it would be seen as "anti-intellectual." As discussed earlier, her passionate and emotional sides are also consciously masked; however, she sees the irony of this in that she knows her emotionality is what makes her a good teacher, that her compassion helps her be a connector and team player, her passions help her with big-picture problem solving. All of these are skills the university supports, but as she sees it, they don't want the source of these talents: "The wellspring is dismissed."

Perhaps the metaphor for herself that Sarah is developing is the best way to capture her sense of identity at this stage of her career. She sees herself caught between two images. On one hand, she describes how administrators often criticize faculty as being "too far in the weeds," too caught up in their own narrow agendas. The alternative perspective that she says many administrators strive for is the "30,000 feet up" view, the big picture perspective. But, Sarah ultimately rejects this view as well, stating:

Anytime anyone says "30,000 feet" I see this classic picture of George W. Bush in Air Force One looking down over New Orleans after Katrina, and I imagine, this was never quoted, [him saying] "Oh, look at Lake Pontchartrain." Then, someone saying, "That's New Orleans, sir."
She connects this to her work at the university in that she says she can see "human people drowning in there," while some of her administrative colleagues might say "We acknowledge some workload issues, but put that aside. Our goal is efficiency, right?" In other words, Sarah resists compartmentalization, detachment, and moral disengagement in favor of a more grounded, balanced, and humane perspective. She seems to still be seeking a home where that can flourish; yet she is hopeful that the high degree of turnover in her department, resulting in the hiring of several "good people," will make a difference. She also feels ready to more fully embrace her identity as a scholar, stating "I care increasingly about scholarship."

**Erin—Secretly Excellent**

Erin is a tenured associate professor. Of the 15 terms she used to describe her identity, 80% are emotional or relational and those she most values overall are her identities as mother and wife, with the qualities of creativity and nurturance at the top of the list. None of these are fully endorsed by her institution, which she feels supports only 13% of her identity, and even some of those qualities are simultaneously undercut. Consequently, she reports 47% of her identity is partially hidden, with 27% fully hidden, in her professional life.

Initially Erin raised some excellent questions about identity itself and the kinds of questions I was asking. She confessed some confusion:

I think I am over-thinking this, but the nature of identity is not entirely clear to me. What makes somebody who they are? What is identity? That may be part of the problem. I don’t think being intelligent is really an important part of who I am. I realize I wouldn't have the profession I have if I weren't intelligent, but is it important to me to be intelligent? I don’t know. That one seems more other-directed. A lot of these are labels that you'd use to describe yourself to someone else. But, I'm not sure if internally it is that deeply significant to me, whereas the familial relationships are more internally important. . . . [My term] 'spiritual'
This need for congruence between heart and mind and gut was clear when she described why she chose to become an academic. As an undergraduate, her mind was stimulated by the analytical work of her discipline. Yet, she felt not only that she would "enjoy" the work, but also that the work was important and meaningful, in that it could help make the world a better place. Therefore, Reybold (2003) might characterize her as a combination of Philosopher and Visionary. However, reality has not entirely lived up to these ideals. She reports that while she does enjoy research, the reality of academic publishing is such that you might "publish an article in a pretty good journal and only six people read it. As far as changing the world through research, for me, at least at my level, not so much."

She has had to lower the bar of her expectations and recognizes that: "If six people read it, well, six degrees of separation, ripple effects, butterfly flapping in a distant universe, whatever, there are effects." So, from an initial aspirational identity of world-changer, she has become a butterfly. Further, the reality of academic life makes it "really hard to tackle big, huge, important questions." She laments, "I just don't have the time to do that, even before I had kids. . . . I teach a three-three load."

However, teaching has "far outstripped" her initial expectations, perhaps in part because she "had no idea whether I would like it." There was no let-down from an ideal. She explains her satisfaction by clarifying it's "not in the sense of having molded my students to be what I want them to be, but in the sense of helping them to think about who they are, what kind of lives they want to live." She hopes they are able to "think a little more deeply" about key aspects of society. Teaching also allows her to express the much-prized creative side of her identity.
Of the three dimensions of her work, the service aspect is most frustrating. As she phrased it, "There's so much bullshit." In part, the frustration comes, once again, because of a palpable gap between the ideal and the real. She described being tapped to serve on several curricular committees because she had a reputation for caring about teaching. Most of the people on these committees shared her commitment to students, and they all were "pretty high-minded" about the purpose of education and the value of the liberal arts, but the "institution itself doesn't really value teaching. . . . The reward structure is all about research." So, even when faculty members have shared values, these are undercut by institutional priorities. Erin says this is directly evident when incoming professors are assigned to teach liberal arts core classes and are told "Don't worry, it's not that important." Conversely, Erin finds it frustrating in a different way when there are people on these committees who do not share her values, fail to work for the greater good, and who make false claims. For example, she describes "gnashing her teeth" at a colleague who asserted, "If your grades are too high in your classes, that must mean you're not rigorous, and you can't be a good professor if your average is a B." And, then there is just the plain problem of "individuals being full of themselves" and "having ego so tied up in what is going on in ways that make [the work] unpleasant."

This conversation about committee work got us discussing whether or not Erin feels her voice is heard, if she feels respected at her university. Her response was mixed and reveals the particular complexity of institutional culture in its validation of an individual's identity. Erin reports that "individuals, who have had enough time to interact with me, respect me." She also feels like her current (female) department head respects her, but that was not the case with her former (male) head. Erin believes these gender
distinctions are important. This former head behaved unethically in blatantly favoring a male colleague in the department over Erin. Erin was friends with that colleague, and they would share their yearly evaluations. She reports, "Independently, when we were comparing notes, he observed, 'Gee, you're as productive as I am, but you are getting less credit than I am.'" Erin's husband later observed, "It's because you're a woman." This example is interesting on two levels. On one level, it illustrates the importance of sharing information within an institution. On another level, it is interesting that two men in Erin's life alerted her to the department head's sexism.

Not only did that head discredit Erin's productivity, she believes he "hazed" her over the publication of her book. He "chose to question" the quality of her publisher, even though he had not communicated his expectations ahead of time. She felt she was being judged by a "secret and shifting agenda." She told me subsequently,

The longer I've been doing this, the more I've been hearing that there's a lot of arbitrariness. They want the process to be somewhat secret or shifting so that they can let you in if they like you and keep you out if they don't.

Erin felt her department head wanted to keep her out and he "refused to give [her] the benefit of the doubt at all." And, it is hard for her to say what he held against her most, the fact that she is a woman or the fact that she is a good teacher. Her sense is that he dismisses both as "second class," and so the fact that she is a good teacher is some ways counted against her. She describes him as having "R1 envy" and thinking "you must be a lightweight if you care about teaching." So, in this way Erin's identities both as a woman and as a teacher are marginalized.

She also complained about a lack of mentorship. She says she had "no formal mentoring at all . . . [and] no real mentoring in graduate school either." So, she had no
real guide to help her build her identity as a professor. Her case is not an anomaly, as she reports, "There has actually been research done in my discipline that women report less satisfaction with mentoring than men do. It's a pretty male-dominated social science."

Because of her experience, after getting tenure, Erin has set out to cultivate an identity in herself as a mentor to junior faculty, especially women. But, at that earlier time, the best Erin had were people she could "commiserate" with, and this was "helpful" in that it was "supportive" to have her perception of reality acknowledged and validated. Although, "bitching about [the] department head" with her husband only got her so far – and it did get to the point that "the dog would leave the room when she heard [the department head's name] mentioned because she learned 'Mama's gonna get pissed.'" Ultimately, she was able to "grit it out," and she describes that period as "one of the most miserable times of my life." She seriously considered leaving the academy altogether, even before coming up for tenure, and might well have done so if her husband had received a job in another state. Fortunately, Erin did get tenure and her former head has left the university (to become an upper administrator at another university).

On top of the department-level angst, Erin describes the stress of constant judgment under the university's faculty review policy. Unlike at many universities where review is at the third year and then at the fifth or sixth year for tenure, Erin's university reviews faculty every single year by both the department head and an assessment committee. This is due to the fact that they are unionized, and the idea is "If we're not going to give people raises, promotions or tenure, we want them to have plenty of warning ahead of time." Erin sees that as a "good argument for having such frequent
reviews, but it means more opportunities for hazing also." It results in her feeling "very, very judged" and worried all the time that she might not be "quite good enough."

In general, she believes that institutionally the administration does not respect the faculty, and this is specifically demonstrated by a new policy that has created two tracks for faculty. The "unproductive" (or teaching) track has to teach a four-four course load, whereas the "active" (or publishing) track has a three-three load. To remain on the "active" track, faculty must produce two articles every five years, regardless of discipline. Erin explains, "So, a three-page psychology article with six authors is counted the same as a 30-page, single-authored article in my discipline. Not to mention a book." Not only does this policy communicate that teaching is not as highly valued as scholarship (just look at the language used to describe the two tracks), Erin says it "affects my research agenda" and thus her identity as a scholar. She prefers to do qualitative work, but will instead be co-authoring an article using another researcher's quantitative data in order to meet the university's "active publishing" quota. Moreover, she points out that once you get on the teaching track, it is very difficult to get off of it again, because you simply do not have the time to devote to research – "not if you are going to put your best effort into your teaching."

So, how does all this influence Erin's identity? To some extent I have indicated that influence throughout my description of her work, but I also asked her directly what aspects of her identity she felt were valued, endorsed or encouraged by her university. Right off, she named the aspects of her identity as an intellectual and professor as "by far" the most valued. However, immediately afterwards, she began to describe the ways those aspects of herself were simultaneously undermined, as in the example in the
previous paragraph. Moreover, she feels the role of "professor" has two components, the "researcher" and the "nurture" of students. Her institution "really values" the researchers (even though they are not an R1), as she puts it "the 'stars' are the people who seem to have no life outside of work, who work 70 hour weeks or 12 hour days or whatever they claim, which maybe they do." In contrast, while nurturing students "is not quite looked down on, it's not encouraged." She qualifies this by acknowledging that she has a kind of secret following on campus, a network of former students who recommend her classes to other students. Those who are "in the know, the individuals who, for instance, work for Residential Life" report back to her that she is hugely well-regarded. But, she says "the institution as a whole . . . values the rational, the research, the intelligence, not so much the inter-personal or emotional side of the profession." The paradox here is not lost on Erin. She feels she must hide her sensitive side in much of her professional identity, but she says "Not so much with students. They actually seem to appreciate knowing that I have emotions, that I'm a full human being." The one thing she said she wished more people knew about her at work was the fact "that I am a good teacher." She caught herself and added, "No wait, that people [like her former department head] valued teaching and knew what a good one I am." As she matures into her role as a tenured professor, she is becoming more of a champion for a holistic vision of people in the academy, and this is at least partially institutionally endorsed by the fact that she has been asked to teach Women's Studies classes. As Erin puts it, "I don't have to hide that I'm a feminist and a leftist."

Sadly, the aspect of her identity that she feels is most undervalued or discouraged by her institution is also the number one item on her most personally valued list: Mother.
Case in point, she explains that her university has no maternity leave policy. So, to have a baby, she "had to go through this incredible time-consuming rigmarole; administrators and my department secretary had to fill out all kinds of paperwork to make [my maternity leave] happen." She had to take paid sick leave for eight weeks and then unpaid leave for the other half of the semester. This caused her to lose some of her other benefits. She was forced to go onto her husband's health insurance plan and also describes being "wheeled off to have an emergency C-section" and having the thought flash through her mind "Oh God, I don't have life insurance anymore." Thus, we see (once again) the stifling of relationships, in this case one of humanity's most basic, within a bureaucratic academic culture.

Juliana—Still Standing

In many ways Juliana is an outlier in this study. First, she does not have a full-time academic appointment. Juliana chooses to teach on an adjunct basis in addition to her primary position as the director of a statewide academic support program housed on (but indirectly affiliated to) a specific university campus. However, as these kinds of hybrid positions are becoming more common in the academy, it is relevant to include someone who bridges two domains. Second, as a Latina female, she embodies a less privileged demographic than the other five interview subjects. Rather than undermining the purposes of my study, her position as an outlier suggests that the challenges faced by more mainstream faculty are even more pronounced for more marginalized faculty. Therefore, it is important to note that in her directorship position, she serves as a political lobbyist, a community leader, and student advocate. But, the confidence and power she expresses in this role are not translated into her role on the faculty, especially in meetings
with other faculty. In general, she lists 23 components to her identity and most personally values herself as someone who is passionate, compassionate, a change-agent, intelligent, playful, courageous, and Latina. Only 9% of her identity is endorsed by the university, her ethical and critical sides, and she feels she must hide 35% of who she is. 65% of her identity traits have to do with emotions or relationships.

Juliana's path into academia was non-traditional. She began with a job in retail. In noting the pay discrepancy between herself and college student seasonal workers, she came to realize that she was worthy of the status education could confer. From there, she enrolled as an undergraduate, went on to get her doctorate, and now has full-time employment. As she puts it, "I pursued higher education with a passion because it was my way out of ignorance and poverty." She wants to help students find their way out as well and sees herself as a champion for students like herself who are "different." She asserts: "I thought it was important to be a representative of a group that isn't often represented in higher education in front of the classroom instead of cleaning the classroom." Juliana is clearly, a Visionary (Reybold, 2003).

Not surprisingly Juliana finds teaching and her relationships with her students to be the most gratifying aspect of her work: "when students are willing to learn, it's a highly thrilling, engaging process." She describes the classroom as "most exciting," a "hands-on laboratory of 'who knows what's going to happen today' adventure." Teaching involves "being part of a greater activity that allows [her] to help students understand their ethical boundaries and [her] own." In this way she sees teaching as the "co-creation of knowledge" and a way of "empowering" students. She reports:

There's nothing more rewarding than . . . [having] a student just run up and give me a hug because there was something I said or did that made such an impact on
their lives that months later they remember that and come back and say "Thank you."

Juliana also enjoys scholarship, to "delve into subject matter and just pick at the threads until I have every nuance covered," and sees it connected to the work she does with students: "To share [my research] with students and try to infuse them with a love of being curious and trying to answer questions for themselves ... what a great way to make a living." Being able to pursue interests that are personally important and interesting provides a "flexibility that other institutions and certainly other methods of employment don't offer." Interpersonally, she also loves "building relationships with colleagues who are incredibly brilliant and allow me the time to shine in their sun to try to educate myself to a greater degree."

Unfortunately, there are also significant downsides to Juliana’s experience of her career. She believes:

The institution carries with it particular norms of interactions and behaviors. . . . Despite good intentions, if individuals are not aware of [that], they are going to act along the institution's norms. . . . They will be saying things that are insensitive and hurtful . . . and privilege allows them not to even think about it.

In terms of institutional hierarchy, as an adjunct faculty member, she believes her options for advancement are foreclosed and that her academic freedom is limited. She recognizes that "when committees are generated there are a whole host of seats available to tenured faculty and, maybe, one for an adjunct. Or, an adjunct is invited to listen but not speak or vote."

Juliana expresses real anguish over the way she feels she is silenced by many of her colleagues. Much of this experience is subtle and based on her perceptions in faculty meetings when "once someone like me, Latina female, who has a different perspective,
starts to speak, the interest level drops dramatically." She believes her colleagues
"privilege the ideas" of tenure-line, white faculty and "patronize" her. And, these
instances are not always so subtle. She reports she has

a career full of experiences where the Latina part of me has been discounted,
discouraged, discriminated against and chastised, punished . . . for doing my
job. I've been written up, been sent to stand in the corner in front of my
colleagues, made to eat crow in the kitchen in front of my colleagues. You name
it; I've pretty much experienced it.

Another way racism has been expressed is by a failure to recognize Juliana's value as an
individual. Specifically, she once expressed her concern over a reading that had been
included in the course reader that she felt perpetuated stereotypes about Mexicans. Her
objections were given a "polite listen," but no changes were made. Later, it was privately
reported to her that because there was another Latina faculty member on the reader
selection committee who supported the reading, at least one other person on the
committee felt that person's support "canceled out" Juliana's concerns. He expressed it
as, "What could we do? You have one Latina saying it's fine and another saying it isn't."
Such treatment makes Juliana feel patronized and powerless. She expresses her sense of
humiliation and vulnerability in stark terms: "Typically, in a year, there are three or four
different points in time where I have to ask myself, 'Is this the hill I'm going to die on?'
She clarifies her meaning of the word "die;" "Lose my career, lose my life, or just be so
hurt." Put another way, she sees herself as having two options: Risk her career or be
silent.

Overall, in order to cope, she feels she has had to sacrifice many aspects of her
identity. She hides the passionate, sensitive, happy, playful, strong, courageous and
"bad-ass" parts of herself. Even of those traits she feels are endorsed by the university
some, like her ability to be critical, are only partially or even hypocritically valued in that she feels she can only be critical within parameters defined by the institutions. She believes, "I am successful within the institution because I have been able to hide some things, cover others, and structure what I have to say in a way that is acceptable." For example, regarding her identity as a Latina, she asserts, "I try to become as American, as homogenized, as I can be. . . . otherwise I begin any discussion with five points against me." Further, she feels she cannot be "passionate" because "in the university one must be analytical at all times. Passion does not have a place. . . . If you express passion, people think there is something wrong with you." Moreover, she worries that passion would be conflated with a Latina stereotype of being "out of control, irrational, unable to curb urges." In this same vein, she believes she cannot show that she is sensitive: "Don’t let them see you cry. . . . The killer bees would come out and one would be stung to death. There is no room in the institution for sensitivity. We are not trained to be sensitive of each other's feelings." She attributes this to a bias toward "rationality" and the "analytic." At the same time she realizes that sensitivity allows for "perspective taking, understanding privilege in the roles at play in the decisions we make, the ability to understand that not all positions are the same." She believes that effective responses to a diverse environment require emotionality, but for someone who is sensitive "stinging words really do hurt." The one thing she wishes more people on campus understood is that: "Those of us who are different, meaning we come from outside of the norm, are not defective." Too often she feels "lesser than," even though she has "a doctorate and a whole lot of teaching experience." As she puts it: "All of that
is for naught and can be taken away, stolen, in one simple, declarative, insensitive sentence.

Additionally, Juliana feels her courageous identity is discouraged through power dynamics that force her into defending her position or that dismiss her concerns. She describes: "So the courageous part of me tucks her tail between her legs and remains silent, which is unusual for me as an individual outside of this faculty role." Because she feels unsafe, she also suppresses her playful side: "I would no more tease and play with a faculty member that I would try to pull out my own teeth; the image I draw is a playful puppy rolling over and exposing its belly. I would never do that in this environment." Yet she admits, "I may be playful with students in the classroom. . . . I tease them to encourage them to reach a higher plane of knowledge." Yet, she has a carefully cultivated work persona: "I usually wear a blazer jacket when I'm in class and particularly when I'm out on campus because it's armor . . . to button up against what is to come."

These circumstances have ultimately led to the most painful aspect of her career: the fact that she has suffered the death of her ideals, or come to see that her "gods have feet of clay." Coming to the academy from her place of origin, she says, "I assumed that everyone was better. We are because we know better, but what is so defeating is that we choose to not act in a better way. . . . The death of one's illusions . . . very painful, very, very painful." She entered the academy hoping to make a difference and instead has found,

Change in higher education comes one death at a time . . . the grinding slowness to embrace change is so frustrating. We have an ideal in higher education of who the student should be, and we haven't changed that since the 1950s. Even though we say we do, in practice the most frustrating part is we really don't.
Nevertheless, she asserts she "still loves what I do," remains hopeful that "someday things will change," and takes solace in the rewarding moments with students when she can see she has made a difference. She gets through the day by "focusing on the positives and what I can do and the potential of being, staunchly, where I am. Go ahead, try to knock me off. I'll stay here no matter how hard you try." And, at night she dreams of an institutional culture that could know: "That I'm soft, that I'm sensitive, that what you say hurts," and that could be more "open, accepting, engaging, embracing."

Hal—Being and Doing

Hal is a tenured associate professor in the social sciences, but beyond that I cannot go – at least, according to Hal. By far, this last interview was the most challenging due to the fact that the subject refused to directly answer many of my questions. Instead, Hal spent a great deal of time lecturing me on the nature of identity, going off into theoretically abstract tangents. Often when I would try to pin him down on an opinion (e.g. "What is meaningful in your life?") he would avoid the question with a rhetorical question of his own (e.g. "What is meaning?"). However, despite the recursive, and sometimes contradictory, nature of the interview, I was able to glean a portrait of this faculty member. What I ultimately came to see is someone who at core is very vulnerable and caring but who masks that core identity so thoroughly, often through cynical humor, that he cannot directly discuss it, at least not with me. It might also be significant that he was the only interview subject who asked to see my interview questions ahead of time, carefully read the informed consent form before he signed it, and seemed slightly anxious about having his interview recorded.
As I said, initially Hal point-blank refused to play ball. When I asked him how he would describe himself, he said, "I don't." To clarify, he explained, "Identity is really a function of what the group decides. Your self-identity is in most cases a lie. You are not an accurate perceiver . . . it is a function of what the people around you think." I asked if there was anything he aspired to that he would like people to say about him. His answer: "No." I tried another tack and asked what would be the nicest compliment someone could pay him. He initially said that such a compliment would be "thank you," but then he shifted to:

The nicest compliment would be how [a] student's life turns out. . . . if students actually live lives that mean something to them. If you've had an influence on them, it shouldn't take the form of praise. It should be in what they've done, what their decisions are. If they have a clearer sense of who they are and what they want to be, then I think I've done my job. That's not something I should be thanked for. It's just what I do.

Clearly, there is something of a paradox in Hal's responses. On one hand, he wants his students to have a clear sense of self, but on the other hand, he claims that his own sense of self is primarily context-dependent and "other" determined. I tried to get at his identity another way by asking, "What makes you happy?" to which he answered "Absolutely nothing." Furthering this theme, he said "Happiness is not the goal, not the barometer by which you should measure your identity." Somewhat frustrated, I asked for specifics: "Why do you get up in the morning?" Hal replied, "To pull the bottle of bourbon back in bed with you, you've got to reach out." I took this as an attempt at humor, but it was worth noting that over the course of the interview, Hal made three references to alcohol use. He twice mentioned the bottle of bourbon in bed and at another time he defined a good day as one where "you can still end up breathing and not retreat into a bottle of scotch, particularly a bottle of crappy scotch." My guess was that this humor masked a
more sensitive self, and the end of the interview proved me correct. Hal returned to my question with a stoical answer and said,

[You get out of bed because] you have to. . . . The point is not to fold and collapse if the world doesn't go the way you want it to. You get up in the morning. You do your job. Ideally, I think one would want a sense of self-satisfaction from the job.

Hal was initially drawn to this job in college and refers to it as "the best job in the world" because "you get to read books and talk about ideas with people who are ideally your friends." He found his inspiration in college when he saw "what could be done with knowledge." He enjoyed "the intricacies of the work...the investigation of these very [identity] questions." Thus, according to Reybold (2003), he claims to be a Philosopher, but the idealism he revealed when describing his teaching showed he is also a Visionary. Hal clarified that the pursuit of a single question was not his goal and that instead the act of questioning itself is who he is: "There's no person separate from the deed." Who you are is what you do. I took this as the string that would lead me through the labyrinth and began to ask him about what he does. He talked about reading books, writing about them, and talking about them with students. Of this interaction with students, he hopes "that what you talk about educates and enlightens, improves upon, helps people sort through." When asked if his work has lived up to his expectations going in, Hal engaged in more verbal fencing: "It's not my place to judge that. . . . You respond to the institution." However, I pressed him by reminding him they were his own expectations after all. His ultimate response was quite poignant: "If you're any good, your work is never going to live up to your own expectations. . . . If you ever really feel satisfied with yourself, you should be very worried, very cautious." He is concerned about complacency and self-delusion, falsely justifying to ourselves that our "work isn't
completely futile." This in part is what fuels his unwillingness to acknowledge identity as something self-determined. He feels you need to have a "reality check" from the institution or environment. The interplay between your inner ideals and external world shapes who you are. He recognizes that you cannot purely be dependent on your social context: "You need something to protect you from the whims of an institution that changes its ideas based on . . . a response to the market."

Delving more directly into Hal's experiences of the three dimensions of his work (research, teaching and service), Hal says he enjoys research the most. This was surprising to me because Hal has the fewest publications of the six faculty I interviewed and most of the positive examples he used to illustrate his work had to do with teaching. Nevertheless, he said research is the most fun "because you're actually reading, investigating and writing about your ideals (pause) to ideally bring your concerns to a broader audience." Later he said,

In an ideal university environment, you're able to balance both the scholarship you do in isolation with the introduction and testing of those ideas in a classroom. . . . The service component should contribute and shape the broader institution of which you are a part and which in turn shapes you.

For all that Hal claims a kind of detachment and lack of driving personal vision, note the frequency of his use of the term "ideal" in the previous passage. Sadly, for Hal, he feels that balance between scholarship, teaching and service is "becoming harder and harder to strike." This has to do with multiple institutional pressures that are shaping him in ways he does not like.

Over the next stretch of the interview, Hal enumerated seven such coercive forces. First, he lists "teaching students who are increasingly unprepared for the college classroom or are socialized into norms that one doesn't share oneself." Second are the
demands on faculty time; the way faculty at his university are forced to become a "catch all for any gaps" that at other institutions would be filled by staff and administrators. He believes, "You're being asked to do more than anybody could possibly do or do it well."

And, because of this everyone has to make compromises "or drown or die." Hal's compromises involve "cutting corners," which he says "your colleagues wouldn't do at other places."

The third pressure is a complex one and has to do with dealing with are other people's conflicting agendas. Hal says this has led to his not having a clear sense of what his performance is being measured against. I asked if this was mainly a problem of communication, and he replied,

"It's much more devious that that. . . . You are given advice by people who have their own agendas and are always looking out for themselves, trying to make themselves look good. . . . so they give you one directive which might be at cross-purposes from your own agenda."

Much of this is rooted in what he calls "the lie of higher education today," which is that we value teaching, when the fact of the matter is that publication is what matters most. This lie leads not only to a miscommunication of the standards for promotion and tenure but to an "injustice in the system" that becomes about "rigid number counting." He feels when we "assess the value of an individual to an institution" there is often a "mismatch" between tenure standards and institutional demands with too little accounting for the "grey area" of what is really important. Moreover, in addition to conflicting agendas, Hal has experienced a frustrating shifting of standards: "The rules change while you are in the middle of playing the game." And this "discontinuity becomes explosive."

A fourth problem has to do with institutional scarcity, "trying to do too much with too little." Hal believes faculty are expected to "make a lot of ends meet," which
negatively impacts faculty time. They are expected to "double-down" to make everything happen. All the while, there are no exceptions being made about expectations for promotion. Linked to this is a fifth problem that has to do with efficiency. Hal believes "institutional routines here are out of step" with parallel institutions. He sees things that are done quickly or automatically elsewhere take "countless hours of faculty time" at his own university.

Dealing with difficult colleagues presents a sixth coercive force he must deal with. He does not enjoy interacting with those colleagues who have "an excessively rigid and narrow perception of their own identity." He further dismisses some of his colleagues with, "I know of people who are college professor by name and by rank and whose dispositions are, perhaps, the most off-putting, self-important, arrogant, and disqualifies them from being anything that would look like . . . an educator." In part, he feels these inflated self-conceptions arise as a form of self-protection. He went on to describe the ways he feels all academics are "plagued by a degree of self-doubt [as to whether their work is] good enough." Further, the very nature of the pursuit of knowledge rests on an assumption of your own fallibility. Hal believes this should result in faculty becoming more "reflective" and less willing to "assume authority." In contrast, authorities assume they can judge others because they have all the information: "The worst colleagues are the ones who think it's all about them, their material, their brilliance, and that you should just bow down before them." This prevents "relationships of trust."

Dealing with other human beings leads to having to deal with a whole range of emotions. Hal sees this as very much par for the course: If we didn't have these emotions, then we could just "farm [our work] out to robots." He added in a disgusted
undertone, "Which we are, we're working on that." He rejects the accusation of academics intellectualizing emotional problems. Instead, he says, "intellectualize is another word for 'make sense of' or 'give meaning to'... We have to be, not in control [of our] emotions, but understand them."

Thus, to use his concept, these are seven institutional "cues which shape [Hal's] identity." Moreover, there is one final image which Hal communicated that in my opinion speaks most powerfully to who he is. As much as he evaded direct questions about his core identity, once he started talking about teaching, it became very clear where his heart is. As I read through the transcript of my interview, I observed that on four separate occasions when Hal was describing his work with students, he made a significant analogy (italicized by me for emphasis in the following examples). He compared himself to a parent. This was especially interesting due to the fact that Hal is single and does not actually have children of his own. The first instance was back when he was talking about his goal for his work as not necessarily being about finding happiness: "The importance is not for you to be happy. The importance is that, I mean, parents understand this day in and day out. Parents of teenagers understand it quite well. . . . Your job is to help others." He also described teaching almost as an expression of love: A good teacher is one who "creates a context where students feel valued, feel that their contribution matters . . . as though their voice counts." A second time, when he was talking about his colleagues and relationships of trust, he shifted to talking about teaching students. He said,

I want them to trust that I have their best interests at heart. . . . They trust you to guide them. You think about it, it's more formal than parent to child, but, again, good parents do what? They teach children to help them be better people.
Later, he talked about the problem of having "competing masters," of having institutions expect "more than you can give, not recognizing the other things. ... it's not uncommon to what working mothers would encounter in prior generations or even today." He added, "To be a good mother is at odds with being a good career person, and you must pick between the two." Finally, at the end of the interview he reiterated, "An institution shapes you and you shape it in certain ways." I asked in what ways he felt he had shaped his institution and he described certain programs that he had helped create and has supported over the years. One of these he thinks he is "in the process of watching get destroyed" due to a change in leadership. He makes the analogy:

If you raise your child and your child suddenly steals your car and drives it into a ditch, you feel the betrayal but also, I think, a loss of your identity as (pauses) the parts of you that you invested in the upbringing of that child are no longer. (pause) This is what it means to be a good parent. ... There's a difference between raising a child from 0-10 and from 10-20.

He describes the tough transition from having a program shift from being completely dependent on its creator to developing a life of its own. He recognizes the need to trust that your colleagues are going to "shepherd" your creation and not "kill your children."

And yet, he confesses,

You have that fear just the same. The boy or the girl that comes to take your precious teenager out on a date. ... You have to understand that you're starting things that other people complete. That's not easy to do, and I think our institutions of higher learning are becoming more and more bad at doing that.

And so, there are often "painful decisions" that shape Hal's identity. He feels parentally connected with his students but also wants them to move on to become "their own people." He sees his sense of self as fundamentally dependent on external forces. Perhaps it is no surprise that he says identity is "always in flux" and he feels "always apprehensive." The interview closes with
You never know what's going to happen on any given day. It's kind of an insane
way to live, but that's the reality of it. You don't try and create more shit than you
deal out some days... I try to do less harm than is done.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

These interviews confirm much of what has already been uncovered about problems in academia. Institutions are plagued by bureaucracy, hierarchy, competition, conformity, and reductively quantified measures of human worth. All of these negatively impact faculty identity, sense of community, and quality of life. Further, George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana, and Hal report specific examples of incivility, suggesting the presence of an academic bully culture that creates unhappiness and silences dissent. Socialization structures reinforce and perpetuate these problems. That much was known. What this study reveals are the ways institutional culture shapes faculty identity and influences faculty job satisfaction. The specific mechanism by which this satisfaction is impacted has to do with the fact that faculty must mask their core, most valued, identities to survive. The impact of that masking emerged in the narratives.

In presenting my data, I sequenced those who seemed most satisfied with their work to those who seemed least content, according to the degree to which reality lived up to initial career expectations. My hypothesis correctly predicted a correlation between this contentment and a lower percentage of hidden or masked identity components: Simon (0%), George (16%), Sarah (35%), Erin (27-47%), Juliana (35%), Hal (100%). I expected that this contentment would also be in relation to higher percentages of institutionally valued identity traits: Simon (50%), George (35%), Sarah (35%), Erin
(13%), Juliana (9%), Hal (?)). To this extent, my data confirms my hypothesis. Further, in selecting mid-career faculty, all of whom have a degree of job security, this study examined a population that has been relatively successful in navigating academic culture. In other words, if there is a group that might exemplify privilege, you would expect to find it here. My findings show that even among the advantaged, academic acculturation exacts a price. Moreover, it hints at how much more costly it is for disadvantaged groups.

However, in addition to what I expected, there were findings that my hypothesis did not predict, which I will explore more fully in the following sections. In short, intersectional analysis reveals that faculty identity is more complex than I imagined and that the very ways we define job satisfaction may need to be re-examined. While my interview subjects each had their unique stories, several significant themes emerged, indicating the most impactful forced options in academic culture that shape faculty identity. Some of these themes challenge pre-existing data on faculty identity and also suggest a commonality of experience that may provide the key for effective institutional reforms.

**Do All Professors Think Alike?**

While Menand (2010) argues that the academy self-selects new faculty who replicate existing norms, my interviews suggest this is not the case. There is actually a great deal of diversity within faculty populations, but that diversity must be masked. George describes the way untenured faculty have to appear to be *avant garde* but that they cannot be truly original in their thinking. Juliana says she feels she must "act white" to be accepted in the dominant faculty group. Erin and Sarah have to hide their
spirituality or be dismissed as "lightweight." While these examples demonstrate the kind of conformity pressures faculty experience, this is not the same thing as Menand's claim that "Students who go to graduate school already talk the talk, and they learn to walk the walk as well" (p. 163). So, later when he says, "There is less ferment from the bottom than is healthy in a field of intellectual inquiry" (p. 163), such ferment could actually occur, if only faculty could express their full range of identity.

**Shifting from the Ideal to the Real**

One of the key ways my interview subjects described being unable to express the full range of their identities had to do with shifting from the idealism they felt upon entering academia to the realities they have faced during the course of their careers. I was not surprised to discover this shift. As I indicted previously, one reason I chose mid-career faculty was that I was interested in seeing how their identities had changed over time. Using Reybold's (2003) terms, George, Erin, and Juliana entered the profession as Visionaries, the most idealistic identity orientation. I presume to say Hal also falls into this category. The nature of this idealism is worth emphasizing: All of them wanted to make the world a better place. They dreamed of their scholarship, work in the university and teaching as functioning together to achieve this end. They saw their calling extending outward in very human terms. All of them express frustration that their work has not lived up to their expectations. They share a sadness over how dehumanizing academic culture can be and how slowly institutions change. They have had to learn to accept the role of "butterfly flapping" instead of "world-changer."

However, all of them have also retained a commitment to teaching that sustains them. Nevertheless, they have had to form less ambitious identities. In short, while they still
have sources of meaning and purpose, they also harbor a sense of loss. Both Simon's and Sarah's identities were characterized as initially Drifter-Philosophers, but their careers have taken very different paths. Simon has remained a Philosopher, a primarily inward-turning identity that allows him more direct control over the outcomes of his labors. He had lower expectations from the start and now expresses no disappointment over his career path. He also shows little to no institutional loyalty or sense of community at his university. In contrast, Sarah has become deeply committed to teaching and to her community. She finds meaning in serving the "big picture" and has become a Visionary. Perhaps because she Drifted into administration (entering into it in part as an escape from her department rather than being "called" into service), she was initially okay with merely being "a voice at the table," but as she became more of a Visionary, her somewhat gelded status was no longer acceptable. Thus, Visionary identities are more vulnerable, as the realization of "visions" depends on the cooperation of other people, but as will be discussed, in the end the benefits may outweigh the costs.

**Too Little Time**

Regardless of identity pathway, all of my interview subjects reported having to make compromises due to institutional pressures or lack of support. Simon is not running a special program; instead he is publishing and traveling (which he pays for out-of-pocket). He also frets over the difficulty of juggling too many projects and claims this is self-inflicted because he can't say no. But, perhaps this is not solely due to his own choices and has something to do with the expectations and time pressures that characterize higher education today. George and Sarah both complained about technology not only making it possible for them to be "on call" 24/7, but playing into the
expectation that they are so. Sarah described an "accretion of duties" that undermines her family time. She and George also complained about the corporatization of the academy leading to a drive for "efficiency" that contradicts the humane values that drew them into the profession in the first place. Erin's teaching load makes it so she doesn’t have time to work on her scholarship. Hal feels he has to "cut corners" to get everything done.

Another aspect of this time problem has to do with perceptions of wasted time. Simon, Erin and Hal each complained about committee work that felt pointless, took too long, or involved faculty just "spinning in the wheel." Overall, too little time is a factor that prevents them all from savoring the full expression of their identities.

**Institutional Rewards**

In addition to these time pressures, there is the problem of what the institution rewards. For all of my interview subjects, the institution fails fully to endorse what they most care about professionally: Simon's feels his research could be better supported; all the rest feel teaching is undervalued. My hypothesis predicted this finding to the extent that the term "forced options" means that one's environment encourages certain ways of being over others. I expected to discover some aspects of faculty identity would be rewarded and some would be forced into hiding. However, what my hypothesis did not account for was the extent to which the academy can reward negative identity traits. Simon, George, Sarah and Erin all express ways their institutions reinforce their self-imposed high expectations, a criteria determined to be highly linked with job stress and dissatisfaction (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly & Santos, 2009). Further, George believes his perfectionism, worry, and fear of failure have been cultivated by the academy. Juliana says her sense of self as "unsafe" and "silenced" are institutionally
rewarded. The cultivation of these negative identity traits directly correlates with negative emotion—and, thus, negative emotion emerged as a powerful force that impacts faculty identity options.

**Negative Emotion: Colleagues' Inflated Egos and Lack of Empathy**

Existing literature identifies positive collegial relationships as one of the key sources of faculty job satisfaction. While all of the faculty I interviewed asserted that many of the people they work with are wonderful colleagues, each identified a cohort of individuals that compromise their job satisfaction. Simon criticizes those who are "lazy" and those who claim unfairness when they don't automatically get the same rewards he believes has worked hard for and uniquely deserved. George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana and Hal describe dealing with colleagues' ego problems and lack of empathy as huge challenges associated with committee work and university service. Here, the problem is one person's negative identity intruding on other people's identities. Those that I interviewed expressed a range of negative feelings in reaction to this. George, Sarah, Erin, and Hal resorted to profanity when describing certain colleagues and committee work: Otherwise articulate individuals are reduced to cursing when faced with incivility. Juliana "buttons up" her jacket-armor or retreats into silence. In these cases they are prevented from expressing their Visionary perspectives because others are unwilling to listen and/or monopolize resources or meeting time for self-serving ends. Moreover, Sarah's story about upper administrators who refused to intervene to punish bad actors reveals the way the institution encourages such behavior.

The problem of ego or "star" power does not end there. Sarah and Erin compare themselves negatively to those who are perceived as "stars," who put in long hours and
seem to "have no life" outside of work. Neither woman wants to put in that kind of time, but both understand that they will never be up in the stratosphere unless they do. Thus, they are caught between two identities: The one they both identify as most personally meaningful (mother) and the one their profession vaunts as top tier. George also wishes he could spend more time with his family and resists becoming a leader. As long as that "star" identity is out there, they will always feel in second place, even though being a mid-career faculty member means that there are naturally other calls on ones identity. The institution does not allow for easy compromises.

Negative Emotion: Judgment and Mentoring

Another way negative emotion shapes faculty identity is through institutional judgment. Sarah, Erin and Hal expressed significant angst over their promotion and tenure processes. They voice arbitrariness, subjectivity, and shifting expectations as large parts of the problem with their experiences with this process. In identity terms, they did not know who they needed to be in order to succeed. Erin explicitly used the term "hazing," which by definition involves the persistent harassment of an initiate into a closed system. For some, this closed system felt like a straightjacket. Several talked about the reductive and "unnuanced" ways worth was measured, ways that also failed to take into account how ones work changes over the course of a career.

They all talked about the pressures of judgment in other ways as well. George discussed how difficult it was to stand up to his former department and express an unpopular opinion. His pain over the criticism he received was clear. Sarah talked about the "snarky comments" with which her colleagues judged her. Erin described the frequent review process required by her union as "very stressful." She also told how she
did not think she was respected by her former department head. His judgment resulted in "one of the most miserable times" in her life. Juliana feels so judged she continuously "structure[s] what [she has to] say in a way that is acceptable." She feels that to do otherwise would be to call forth the "killer bees." Hal expresses a "constant anxiety" that external judgment might reshape his identity. He also thinks all faculty are "plagued by a lot of self-doubt." Such vulnerability is seen as shameful. (Note, Simon exemplifies the problem when he refers to the expression of such feelings as "whining.") In short, fear of negative judgment impacts faculty identity by forcing people to invest energy into protecting their vulnerable selves. This energy could instead be better mobilized outward in the service of their more integrated identities to construct a more positive institutional environment.

Given the difficulty of coping with this kind of judgment, it is no wonder that Sarah, Erin and Hal were angry over the lack of formal mentoring they received. They all desired more guidance in developing their professional identities. Part of the reason they did not receive this mentoring had to do with the faulty structures for socializing (or judging, or hazing) new faculty at their respective institutions. This difficulty was exacerbated by the time issues discussed previously.

A Gender Divide...or Not?

Creating better understanding of the problems that plague academic culture is not always easy. As I have been exploring, what might seem clear on the surface may be more complex underneath. Another example is the theme of gender identity as it emerged in my interviews. Initially, the problem seemed like a simple binary: male privilege versus female marginalization. Sarah complained about the "masculinist"
culture that she sees contributing to the corporatization of higher education and the "masculine drive" that creates time pressure problems. She believed she was supposed to develop theoretical "mastery" and feels women are "ambivalent about ambition" and competition – all of which she sees as symptomatic of outsiders confronting a patriarchal system. She talked about the unfair service burden placed on women, especially women of color. Juliana exemplifies other problems experienced by that group as well. Erin suffered under a sexist department head. All of this is true, but the problem is more nuanced than that.

We would be too hasty if we simply blamed men for the problems in academia and saw women as the primary victims. Digging a little further, we must acknowledge the fact that it was two men in Sarah's department who tried to mentor her and it was two men who alerted Erin to the fact of her department head's sexism. George used his position of power to try to challenge sexism in his department. These exceptions might point to a new rule. I'm not forgetting that Simon admitted to benefitting from male privilege and that he says the academy is a "perfectly pleasant" place to work. Indeed, he seems to feel that he is under no obligation to try to change higher education, despite the fact he has "heard about" wrongdoing. Because he has not experienced it directly, he ignores it. But what about George and Hal? George does not wear his masculinity as a badge of honor. Instead, he adopts a "hidden" identity to protect his emotionally sensitive self and resists the "Leader" label, even though it is deeply embedded in his identity as a man in our culture. Paradoxically, as George rejects a narrow definition of masculinity to embrace his other identities as a parent and a teacher, Juliana wears a blazer for protection against hostile colleagues. One way of analyzing this might be to
report that George is trying to embrace a more feminine identity, while Juliana pursues a more masculine, and therefore more powerful, identity—that they are essentially pursuing different ends. But such an interpretation misreads the symbols: both are attempting to negotiate a culture that forces them to radically alter what they most value in themselves and what makes them most alive. They are both victims of their cultures. Additionally, Hal adopts a hyper-theoretical veneer, but how does he really see himself? Not just as a parent, but as a *mother*. There is something more going on here than simple sexism.

**Cognitive Bias**

Indeed, the root of the problem in academia is not simply sexism, although it may be related to it; it is the denial of emotion. The cognitive bias in higher education affects all members of the system, although to varying degrees. Over and over again throughout these interviews, George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana, and Hal refer to a privileging of the analytical and express their pain over having to hide their feelings. They talk about people being turned into machines, teaching getting taken over by robots, human worth getting measured by quantified productivity requirements. They talked about how unsafe it is to be emotional, how ashamed they feel if they cry in front of their colleagues, and how they fear they will be dismissed as "lightweight" if they have feelings. Juliana may see herself as a puppy who "tucks her tail between her legs," but she will not expose her belly. George has to keep his true identity underground as a "mole," even though the one thing he most wishes his colleagues knew about him was how sensitive he is. The "wellsprings" of Sarah's professional effectiveness are ignored. Erin's nurturance can only be expressed in one of the three components of her work, and there she has a "secret" following of admirers. In academia emotion is seen as a deficiency. However, it
is not all emotion: Negative emotion (fear, shame, anger) is allowed to thrive, but positive emotion (empathy, nurturance, spirituality) is shunned and seen as anti-intellectual. Cognitive bias masks this reality.

Earlier, I described the forced loss of ideals as a form of de-humanization. The academy also de-humanizes by killing off the emotional aspects of faculty identity, especially the positively emotional parts. Don't think for a moment that this isn't how people experience it. George, Juliana and Hal feel personally besieged. All three use life-or-death imagery to describe the perceived risks of revealing too much of themselves: George imagines "Everyone is shooting at you in the battle, including from behind;" Juliana asks "Is this the hill I am going to die on?" and Hal says you must learn to "compromise or die."

Who Is Really the Most Satisfied?

Given all this pain, Simon's relative isolation and detachment from his community and from his emotions may begin to look more enticing. Add to that the math that the higher the percentage of emotional or relational identity traits [Simon (12.5%), George (58%), Sarah (80%), Erin (80%), Juliana (65%), Hal (100%?)], the less job satisfaction individuals expressed—combined with the correlation to hidden identities and institutionally under-valued identities. However, Simon's narrative contains a number of contradictions and inconsistencies, suggesting he may be more confused or masked than he reports. This indicates not only the limitations of self-reported measures of happiness, but intersectional analysis digs underneath the explicit to reveal a more complicated subtext. Notably, Simon uses the fewest terms to describe his identity, suggesting a fairly limited sense of self, but that which he does express fully endorses academic culture as is.
Reybold (2002) suggested the "Drifter" identity was vulnerable because such a person has a weak commitment to academe and might be more prone to "drift" away. Simon shows that a "drifter's" weak identity might also become so fully acculturated, in ways that discourage self-reflection, that richer identity development is foreclosed. Also, except for when he is expressing anger at his "lazy" colleagues, he uses fairly tepid language to describe his work, suggesting his experience of positive emotion has been somewhat truncated. To contrast, while Simon described his work as merely "fun," that is no way compares to the deep joy the rest experience in their teaching. They use words like Flow, delight, highly thrilling, awesome, engaging, meaning-making, enlightenment, and love. From this we can conclude that in allowing an emotionally positive identity to flourish, faculty risk experiencing some lows but there are some very high highs as compensation. While relationships with colleagues might be thwarted by a hostile academic culture, relationships with students give meaning.

This kind of intersectional analysis suggests that my criteria for determining job satisfaction may be insufficient. While I initially ranked Simon as most satisfied, I am no longer content with that designation. This aligns with Pifer's (2011) realization that there can be quite a disconnect between external and internal experiences of identity. My study adds to that the possibility of a layer of identity that a person might not be consciously aware of. Thus, faculty identity is more complex than one might initially imagine, requiring more sophisticated measures of satisfaction that can capture simultaneous frustrations and gratifications, mechanisms of masking and endorsing, and the interplay between the subjective and the contextual.
Escape, Retreat, Retrench

Nevertheless, just because frustrated faculty also experience some gratification does not mean we should cease working on ways to minimize those frustrations. Finding ways to optimize positive relationships, build on them, and work to change the cognitively biased system should be top priority not just for faculty job satisfaction, but for the future of the academy. We must not gloss over the huge personal impact academic identity formation has on the individuals involved. All six of the faculty I interviewed told me about career decisions they have made, or coping mechanisms they have developed, in order to "escape" unbearable aspects of academic institutional culture. Even Simon, who seems the most content, dove into scholarship to avoid a department that didn't value his academic sub-specialty and to avoid committee work that he detests. George first went into administration and then left one university to avoid a toxic department. Sarah also went into administration to avoid her dysfunctional department. She needed "distance" to figure out why she was so unhappy. Erin considered quitting academia altogether. Juliana wears her armor. Hal drinks, and even if he doesn't, he obfuscates and wears a cynical mask. These escape strategies illustrate how important it is that we begin acknowledging the kinds of choices faculty are being asked to make and the ways in which our institutions limit the full expression of our humanity. In other words, we need to examine the kinds of options we are forcing on faculty. The stakes are high. If we do not begin to resolve these problems, it won't merely be a question of how faculty develop their identity and experience their work. Those people who are most fully developed will leave academia altogether.
Conclusion

Clearly, this analysis suggests that the mechanisms that trigger faculty job dissatisfaction—the negative forced options—have to do with academic socialization into a competitive, hierarchical system that privileges certain aspects of an individual’s identity, imperiling other aspects of identity, especially the emotional and relational. These lost dimensions may well be the source of academic renewal, connection, and personal gratification. Further study of a wider range of individuals can deepen our understanding of this phenomenon. Such research might also target the various pathways and sub-themes identified in this project. Moreover, because an intersectional lens reveals individual faculty identity is comprised of multiple identities, this research suggests that as we consider ways to make the academy more democratic, we must begin to think of pluralism as both an intrapersonal and interpersonal goal. The way we define job satisfaction must reflect this more complex and nuanced sense of self.

The issue is not simply a question of improving personal happiness and faculty job satisfaction. Twale and DeLuca (2008) tell us, "Academic environments that successfully manage conflict through valuing openness, civility, and honest communication are more likely to survive" (p. 155). They go on to describe effective leadership as outward-focused and not ego centered. The necessary structural changes in academia that this study implies would allow that kind of civility and leadership to flourish. If emotions were more valued, differences could be discussed, common ground could be discovered, and collaboration could be more possible. This might have a ripple effect on all aspects of higher education, creating both better classroom experiences for students and more relevant research for the larger society. Therefore, to borrow a
concept from social justice theory, we must move from a deficit model (Paris, 2012) to see emotion as an asset, a fund of feeling. We must re-humanize the academy to create a space where positive feelings can flourish. Such a process involves inviting our "relational selves" (Jordan, 1997) to sit at the analytical table. The pursuit of knowledge amongst fully-actualized human beings embedded in honest, meaningful, harmonious relationships within collaborative institutions is a vision for a robust, generative, and socially responsible academy—one that is culturally enriching and can change lives for the better.
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APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT

"Forced Options: Faculty Identity and Institutional Culture"

You are invited to participate in a research study which will involve gathering narrative information about how university faculty experience both their work and academic institutional culture with an eye to understanding how the two influence personal identity and academic job satisfaction. My name is Eileen Camfield, and I am a graduate student at the University of the Pacific, Benerd School of Education. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of the number of years you have been a faculty member and your position in either the humanities or social sciences. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to take part in an interview. Your participation in this study will last approximately one hour.

There are some possible risks involved for participants. These are the minimal risks of psychological impact, as some of the questions may elicit an emotional response. Because you will be talking about your identity and career, there are also moderate sociological and loss of confidentiality risks. There are some benefits to this research, particularly in better understanding the interplay between institutional culture and faculty identity we can create academic workplaces that optimize job satisfaction.

If you have any questions about the research at any time, please call me, Eileen Camfield, at (209) 474-8596 or Dr. Lynn Beck at (209) 946-2680. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research project please call the Research & Graduate Studies Office, University of the Pacific (209) 946-7367.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Measures to insure your confidentiality are that digital recording of the interview will be kept in a password protected file on investigator's computer, no names will be associated with the files, and data will be presented using pseudonyms. The data obtained will be maintained in a safe, locked location and will be destroyed after a period of three years after the study is completed. Moreover, participants are being drawn from three different universities for the express purpose of minimizing the abovementioned risks. In presenting this research, the names of these universities will not be stated, not will specific departmental affiliations be identified.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and your decision whether or not to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you
decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled, that you will receive a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. You will be offered a copy of this signed form to keep.

Signature

Date
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Qualitative Interview Questions: University Faculty Identity

The purpose of this interview is to help me better understand how faculty identity develops within the context of university culture. Your personal identity will be protected; however, if there are particular questions that you would prefer not to answer, you are under no obligation to do so. Additionally, if you want to stop the interview altogether, you are free to do so at any point.

1.) I would like to begin by mapping out the way you see yourself in its totality. Help me fill-in the facets of your identity you feel best capture who you are – these might be adjectives or demographic details.

Let's evaluate these facets of your identity...

2.) Which aspects of your identity are personally most important to you? Why?

3.) Which aspects are personally least important to you? Why?

Now, let's turn to your work at the university...

4.) Why did you choose this career? What did you hope to accomplish?

5.) Has your work lived up to these expectations? How so? How not?

6.) What do you like best about your current job?
   6a.) Which of the three domains of your work—teaching, research, service/administration—do you find most gratifying, if any? Why?
   6b.) On an interpersonal level, how satisfied do you feel about: your work teaching/with students...your interactions with colleagues...your interactions with administrators...the overall structure of the institution? [Rank on a 1-10 scale, 10 being fabulous, 1 being awful]

7.) What do you like least about your current job?
   7b.) Which of the three domains of your work—teaching, research, service/administration—do you find most frustrating, if any? Why?
8.) What facets of your identity (from the circle we drew in #1) are most valued, endorsed, and/or encouraged by the university? (Or, do any parts of your identity fit together (compound) to aid your success in academia?) How so?
   8a.) Which aspect(s) of your identity do you think people associate with you most?

9.) What facets are most hidden undervalued, and/or discouraged? (Or, might feel "at odds" or in conflict?) How so?

10.) How does your academic discipline influence your identity?

11.) How does (or has) your rank in the university influenced your identity?

12.) What metaphor or image would you use to describe yourself in the context of your work in the university?

13.) What is the one thing about yourself you wish more people at work knew about you? Why?

14.) How do you imagine your experience of your work would be different if you could express or utilize those hidden facets more?

15.) What aspect of your identity as a university faculty member have I not asked about that you think I need to know about?
APPENDIX C: FACULTY SELF-IDENTIFIED CORE IDENTITY TRAITS, CODED

Simon:

1. [academic sub-specialty]
2. teacher
3. writer
4. cook
5. potter
6. musician
7. father *
8. editor

Most endorsed or valued by the academic institution (4/8 = 50%)
Most hidden or masked in academic institution (0%)
* Emotional/Relational (1/8 = 12.5%)
Most personally valued (all)

George:

1. family man *
2. curious *
3. articulate
4. perfectionistic *
5. worrier *
6. great teacher *
7. citizen *
8. provider
9. competitive and sensitive *
10. likes to please *
11. (ironically) conflict averse *
12. brave *
13. male
14. progressive/democrat *
15. book lover *
16. builder
17. creative *
18. observant
19. ethical *
20. looked to as leader *
21. complicated class background
22. good friend (to a chosen few) *
23. messy
24. afraid to fail (also blue) *
25. risk taker/ bold thinker/integrative connector *
26. white
27. married with 2 children
28. agnostic
29. full professor w/ endowed chair
30. supporter of the liberal arts
31. silenced

Most endorsed or valued by the academic institution (11/31 = 35%)
Most hidden or masked in academic institution (5/31 = 16%)
* Emotional relational (18/31 = 58%)
Most personally valued

Sarah:
1. mother *
2. teacher *
3. spouse *
4. friend *
5. sister/daughter *
6. lover of the arts *
7. compassionate/empathetic *
8. a "connector" *
9. team player *
10. passionate *
11. (overly) sensitive *
12. scholar
13. "big picture" thinker
14. liberal *
15. Unitarian/spiritual *
16. feminist *
17. passionate about diversity issues and social justice *
18. female
19. white
20. (overly) responsible *

Most valued by the academic institution (7/20 = 35%)
Most hidden or masked in academic institution (7/20 = 35%)
Emotional/Relational (16/20 = 80%)
Most personally valued

Erin:

1. mother *
2. wife *
3. sister/daughter *
4. friend *
5. creative
6. kind/nurturing *
7. spiritual *
8. intelligent *
9. leftist *
10. feminist *
11. nature-loving *
12. gardener
13. professor *
14. writer *
15. emotionally sensitive *

Most valued by the academic institution (2/15 = 13%)
Most hidden or masked in academic institution (4/15 = 27% totally masked; * plus 3 that are partially masked: 7/15 = 47%)
Emotional/relational (12/15 = 80%)
Most personally valued

Juliana:

1. passionate *
2. honest *
3. ethical *
4. compassionate *
5. sensitive *
6. happy *
7. critical
8. curious *
9. change-agent and hopeful **
10. equitable *
11. intelligent
12. playful *
13. strong *
14. courageous *
15. bad-ass *
16. female
17. Latina
18. adjunct faculty
19. born poor, but now upper middle class
20. Buddhist
21. married, no children *
22. Democrat/liberal
23. [academic discipline]

Most valued by the academic institution (2/23 = 9%)
Most hidden or masked in academic institution (8/23 = 35%)
* Emotional/relational (15/23 = 65%)
Most personally valued

---

**Hal:**
Declined to offer any specific traits.