Title

Double Agents: The Dual Logics and Dual Identities of Academic Deans in the Neoliberal University

Permalink

Author

Martin, Marie Christine

Publication Date

2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Double Agents: The Dual Logics and Dual Identities of Academic Deans in the
Neoliberal University

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Education

by

Marie Christine Martin

June 2018

Dissertation Committee:
      Dr. John S. Levin, Chairperson
      Dr. Margaret Nash
      Dr. Thomas Smith

The Dissertation of Marie Christine Martin is approved:

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

amazing group of friends and with you by my side I was able to accomplish feats of strength and endurance both in an out of the box.

To Leo, my four-legged son: Thank you for reminding me to take play breaks, and go outside and walk to clear my mind. Your snuggles, companionship, and unconditional love carried me through the worst of the stressful moments.

For the UCR Pipe Band playing Scotland the Brave: Whenever I doubted my ability to finish, I listened to you and pictured myself in my blue and gold regalia walking across the stage to be hooded.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Double Agents: The Dual Logics and Dual Identities of Academic Deans in the
Neoliberal University

by

Marie Christine Martin

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Education
University of California, Riverside, June 2018
Dr. John S. Levin, Chairperson

The literature suggests that neoliberalism, a term to describe the orientation of public

sector towards the market, has pervaded higher education institutions. However, the

assertions made in the majority of the literature on neoliberalism's presence in higher

education lack data to support these proclamations. Research has explored the neoliberal

behaviors of faculty (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015) and suggests that faculty engage in

neoliberal activities in the form of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997;

Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). However, the role of academic administrators, specifically

academic deans who occupy a unique position that overlaps both the academic and

administrative realms, and their participation in neoliberal behaviors are less understood.

This qualitative field investigation relies on 38 semi-structured interviews with 20

academic deans across multiple disciplines included in the sciences, social sciences, and

liberal arts at four public research universities in California—all University of California

campuses. Institutional theory and identity theory provide frameworks for understanding

of adoption of, and resistance to, neoliberal logics by academic deans and the ways in

which they reconcile neoliberal logics with academic logics. Findings indicate that academic deans in the research university blend neoliberal logics with academic logics and perceive these logics as not only compatible but also necessary in a highly competitive environment with limited resources. Furthermore, findings indicate that academic deans maintain an academic identity, the identity with the most salience (Burke & Stets, 2009) and professional capital in the academy, through the development of an academic aesthetic. The activation of the academic identity acts as a mechanism for the deans' reinforcement of academic logics in spite of neoliberal pressures. Academic deans are both actors of neoliberal ideologies and defenders of the academic ethos. Implications for the practice of academic deans and the role of faculty in higher education governance and management are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Research Problem

Universities are not isolated organizations; they are institutions embedded within a larger political and economic context (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002). The decrease of state funding in the U.S. has led to an increase in budget cuts and tuition hikes (Archibald & Feldman, 2011). The view of higher education as a private good, coupled with greater competition for limited resources, and an ever-growing unwillingness of the public to be taxed, has led to greater demands for accountability in universities and colleges (Palmer, 2013). Increased demands for accountability have resulted in the formation of national evaluation systems, a shift towards emphasis on efficiency, and a growing presence of market values in higher education (Clark, 2001; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002), or "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 8), as well as the public sector's adoption of private sector managerial practices, also known as new managerialism (Deem, 1998, 2004). Academic capitalism and new managerialism are mechanisms for the inculcation of neoliberalism, or market liberalism, into higher education institutions (Levin, 2017). These trends reveal the increased influence of external forces and a general deterioration of institutional autonomy—a "shift from the autonomous to the heteronomous university" (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002, p. 447).

Despite the loss of autonomy, universities are not "helpless victims of irresistible external demands" (Clark, 2001, p. 21). Rather, universities struggle with a "demand-response imbalance" (Clark, 2001, p. 10). An entrepreneurial response that seeks to

"reconcile new managerial values with traditional academic ones" (p. 14) can both remedy the imbalance as well as restore institutional autonomy (Clark, 2001). Higher education's application of traditional private sector managerial practices is known as "new managerialism" (Deem, 2004). The growing influence of new managerial values necessitates that universities pay constant attention "to the integration of academic personnel with managerial personnel" (Clark, 1997, p. 38).

This investigation focuses on university administrators, specifically academic deans at research universities, who reside in a unique role that overlaps both the neoliberal and traditional academic worlds. University deans are not immune to the influence of external demands. The resource constrained economic and socio-political environment gives rise both to accusations of waste and "administrative bloat" (Greene, Kisida, & Mills, 2010, p.1) and questions of institutional legitimacy. Thus, there are considerable expectations for institutional leaders to provide both fiscal acumen and academic legitimacy.

In the private sector, committees select managers based on their executive leadership experience, training, and skills; however, research university deans usually lack formal management training and experience (Strathe & Wilson, 2006). Search committees seek certain characteristics and expertise in academic manager candidates (Mech, 1997). Yet, these criteria are rarely based on the managerial requirements of the job and suggest little about the candidate's effectiveness or ability to manage a unit (Mech, 1997). Indeed, there is no clear relationship between the selection of a dean and

that individual's ability to respond to both neoliberal and traditional academic university environments.

In research universities, academic deans make budgetary decisions, handle personnel issues relating to students, faculty, and staff (Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999), fundraise (Foster, 2006), oversee strategic planning processes, and represent their college or school in the community (Smith, 2006). Few faculty members have training or experience in these managerial tasks (Strathe & Wilson, 2006). Socolow (1978) suggests that higher education may need academic administrators who are skilled managers rather than academics. However, recent research indicates that higher education institutions are not filling their academic administrative roles with business professionals (Harman, 2002). Indeed, in a culture that values scholars as "experts" in their field, academia does not value management "experts" in the selection and appointment of deans. This suggests that despite the assertion in the literature that neoliberal values have infiltrated higher education (Clark, 2001; Levin, 2007; Torres & Schugurensky, 2002), other values, or institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), may take greater priority for university administrators. The literature suggests that faculty engage in neoliberal behaviors (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015), such as academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004). However, the neoliberal behaviors of academic deans, who are former (and current) faculty as well as administrators described in the literature as members of the "dark side" (Palm, 2006, p. 59), have been understudied and limited only to studies of managerialism in the United Kingdom (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007) and academic capitalism in North Carolina (McClure &

Teitelbaum, 2016). The scarcity of literature on academic deans' neoliberal behaviors in public research universities, such as the University of California, with a strong, legislated history of shared governance (a potential defensive structure against the neoliberal regime), leaves questions unanswered and necessitates this present investigation.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to explain the ways in which academic deans negotiate institutional logics and their own professional identity as academics and managers in a public research university—an environment described by the literature as neoliberal and characterized by an emphasis on entrepreneurialism, the marketization and commodification of knowledge, or academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004), and the adoption of private sector managerial practices in the public sector, also known as new managerialism (Deem, 2004). Little is known about the experiences of academic deans. Although the scholarly research outlines the career paths of these individuals (Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), their tasks and responsibilities (Montez, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 2003), the mechanisms by which they are evaluated (Rosser, 2001), and the ways in which they learn their administrative role (Gmelch, 2000a), there are major gaps in the literature on how deans engage in neoliberal behaviors and reconcile potentially conflicting values, or institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), as managers and academics in a research university. Little is known about the experiences of academic deans and the role they play in the reinforcement of, or resistance to, neoliberal ideology. The literature on neoliberalism in higher education has neglected to make data-based conclusions about deans as a

4

managerial group. Aside from Gmelch's (2000a, 2000b) work on academic deans, the

majority of the literature on deans consists of "survival guides" and anecdotal accounts

from former administrators who lament their time on the "dark side" (Palm, 2006, p. 59).

As well, the existing literature on academic administrators and deans fails to address

effectively the neoliberal regime (Giroux, 2018; Levin, 2007) as a context in which a

dean works. This present investigation extends the limited literature (e.g., McClure, 2016;

McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016) on the market-based behaviors of academic deans. The

purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological investigation is to explain the ways in

which academic deans at public research universities negotiate and reconcile academic

logics with neoliberal logics and to consider the role that deans' identity plays in their

negotiation and reconciliation.

This present investigation will extend the literature on the experiences of

academic deans by providing data-driven findings on a topic that has rarely been

explored through qualitative methodological approaches. This investigation also

contributes to the literature on academic deans specifically and expands the literature on

higher education administrators generally. Moreover, this research moves the scholarship

one step closer towards the development of higher education-specific administrative

theory, a domain that is largely underdeveloped, dated, and reliant upon Birnbaum and

associates (Birnbaum, 1988; 1992; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993). Previous literature on

higher education administrators has tended to rely on theory borrowed from other

disciplines—such as management theory and general administrative theory (Birnbaum,

1988). Contemporary research is needed to develop higher education-specific

administrative theory that accounts for the behavior and experiences of academic deans in a neoliberal environment.

Literature Review

Deans: Who They Are and What We Know

This investigation centers on the administrative behaviors and values of academic deans at research universities in the United States. The existing scholarship on academic deans, specifically, is minimal (Martin, 1993). An extensive search of scholarly databases and libraries turned up a dismal number of publications on academic deans. Much of the literature that does exist on academic deans is not data driven. A significant proportion of the publications (e.g., Bright & Richards, 2001; Tucker & Bryan, 1991) on deans are written as guides, manuals, and job descriptions for current or prospective deans. These publications have practical applications for deans. They enumerate the various tasks and responsibilities of a dean, or pose questions for a dean to reflect upon under hypothetical, proposed scenarios. These types of texts might do little to advance scholarly understanding or research on academic deans and their behaviors in a neoliberal context; nevertheless, they provide useful information about the position and role of deans.

Deans occupy a unique position that overlaps both the administrative and the academic worlds (Del Favero, 2006). Deans "represent the culture of their colleges and universities" (Martin, 1993, p. 19); yet, with a foot in both worlds they sit at the center of two different cultures (Birnbaum, 1988; Del Favero, 2006). Although deans often originate from the faculty and hold faculty appointments (Isaac, 2007; Lorenz, 2012; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983), their day to day work is primarily

administrative in nature. They are managers within a highly bureaucratic structure (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) who "use their position to direct decisions" (Isaac, 2007, p. 51), oversee a variety of activities, and perform a multitude of tasks (Bright & Richards, 2001; Tucker & Bryan, 1991). Academic deans' responsibilities include budgets, personnel, student conflict resolution, faculty hiring, merit and promotion, strategic plan development, compliance, public relations, and representation of the department, college, or university at functions and meetings (Bright & Richards, 2001; Buller, 2007; Lee & VanHorn, 1983, Montez et al., 2003; Tucker & Bryan, 1991). These tasks are separate from actual behaviors and the former is covered in the literature far more frequently than the latter. Whereas a list of tasks clarifies what deans do, an explanation of behaviors demonstrates how deans do what they do and reveals the underlying motives, ethics, values, and norms that influence or drive what they do.

Yet, the literature on the behaviors of deans is insufficient to respond to these larger questions on the ways in which neoliberal behaviors manifest at the deans' level. In addition to addressing the roles and tasks of an administrator (Buller, 2006, 2007; Hecht et al., 1999; Lee & VanHorn, 1983, Tucker & Bryan, 1991), the contemporary literature on university administrators covers topics such as leadership (Birnbaum, 1992; Buller, 2007; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013; Isaac, 2007), career paths (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Carroll, 1991; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983; Strathe & Wilson, 2006; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), socialization (Del Favero, 2006; Gmelch, 2000a, 2000b; Speck, 2003), and transitions of faculty to and from administration (Achterberg, 2004; Firmin, 2008;

Foster, 2006; Glick, 2006; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Griffith, 2006; Henry, 2006; McCluskey-Titus & Cawthon, 2004; Palm, 2006; Smith, Rollins, & Smith, 2012; Strathe & Wilson, 2006). Even though deans' rhetoric is "filled with corporate discourse" (Isaac, 2007, p. 47), the majority of studies of deans focus instead on leadership styles and their implications, or factors that influence administrative behaviors, such as discipline and cognitive complexity (Del Favero, 2005, 2006), effectiveness (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002), and deans' influence on their colleges' well-being (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). To be effective leaders, deans must be astute cultural representatives of their units, who communicate well, and are competent managers, planners, analysts, and activists (Martin, 1993). Deans act as leaders and change agents within an organization (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). That is, the behaviors of academic deans matter to the organization; yet, leadership and leadership effectiveness are distinct from management behaviors (Kotter, 2008). The categorization of leadership styles provides clarity only on what approach academic deans utilize. In this investigation, I concern myself not with the effectiveness of leadership or management, but with the adoption and negotiation of values and the pursuit of legitimacy in managerial behaviors. The existing research, although it contributes to scholarly understanding of leadership, effectiveness, and the power of disciplinary associations, fails to reveal how academic deans navigate conflicting academic values and neoliberal values and how that tension becomes resolved (or not) in, and through, their management behaviors. Thus, an examination of the logics and values of academic deans, which undergird their behaviors, is worthy of investigation.

8

Arguably, deans' prioritization of academic or neoliberal values may be complicated by the duration of time deans spend in their role and the socialization they receive as former faculty, department chairs, and associate deans. Dean appointments are often temporary, or short-term (Gmelch, 1999; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Although deans originate from a variety of career paths (Moore et al., 1983; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), the majority of deans are hired from the faculty population (Moore et al., 1983). The majority (60%) served as department chairs or associate deans (40%) prior to their decanal appointments (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Research finds that approximately 22% of female deans and 26% of male deans intend to return to faculty after their term ends, only 23% of female deans and 28% of male deans view their deanship as a step towards a provost position (Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), and the remainder intend to either retire or stay as dean. Such a finding suggests that many deans view themselves as scholars, not necessarily long-term administrators. Furthermore, these findings challenge previous arguments that faculty leave the professoriate for administration in search of power and formal authority (Snyder, Howard, & Hammer, 1978). While reports indicate that most university presidents were once deans [and increasingly move straight from deanships to the presidency (Selingo, Chheng, & Clark, 2017)], it is not correct that all deans advance into provost or president roles. The literature suggests that other factors may influence decisions to enter administration— such as a sense of professional duty (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). Indeed, a large majority of deans take on this administrative role in order to contribute to their organization or influence faculty development (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002).

9

The pattern of advancement through other administrative roles, such as chair or associate dean, would suggest that individuals who serve as dean have a propensity towards leadership or management. Indeed, deans, as individuals, often assumed leadership roles throughout life starting with high school (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). As well, the majority of deans have been faculty members (Moore et al., 1983). Faculty undergo organizational socialization to learn the values and norms of the academy (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993); thus, faculty may be selected to serve as deans because they exemplify the values of faculty and are, therefore, trusted to serve as *primus inter pares*—first among equals (Brown, 2000).

The socialization process does not end in the faculty role. There are differences in the work of faculty and administrators (Achterberg, 2004; Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006). Most deans have no formal training (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) and face challenges as they strive to develop the skills necessary to survive or succeed as a dean (Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006; Griffith, 2006; Palm, 2006; Standifird, 2009). When a faculty member transitions to a dean, they undergo further socialization (Gmelch, 2000a, 2000b; Speck, 2003; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) and learn about their role from past administrative experience, relationships with faculty leaders, or trial and error (Del Favero, 2006). Yet, the socialization process may lead to more confusion than clarity. "The administrative arm of the academy functions under expectations biased by an unwritten code" (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002, p. 103). The directions, role, and reporting structure of the dean are not always clear (Martin, 1993). Stuck in a "Janus-like, " or dual-facing, circumstance (Gmelch & Burns, 1991, p. 18), the dean must serve in a

10

middle manager position (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002), with responsibilities to the faculty, staff, students, external community (Rhoades, 1990), donors, and their formal supervisor, the executive vice chancellor and provost. Although a majority of the deans express the view that they are effective and credible leaders—especially the women and minority deans— as deans are socialized into their new position, they undergo role ambiguity, role conflict, and stress dependent upon their own identity as well as their institutional type (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). This conflict may arise internally in an examination of their own professional selves as they "fulfill dual roles and have dual identities" (Lorenz, 2012, p. 628) and "seek to mitigate a tension between remaining true to their scholarship and performing properly as administrators" (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002, p. 101). Alternately, tensions and conflict may exist externally, as they receive contradictory messages of cutting costs from their provost while pressured simultaneously from their faculty to spend more (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). That is, to be a dean is to reside in contested waters, to negotiate, and to juggle divergent sets of values, norms, pressures, and identities.

Literature on Neoliberalism, Academic Capitalism, and New Managerialism and Deans

Tensions and conflict in the role of the dean may also arise from external, larger trends—such as neoliberalism and academic capitalism—that plague the public sector and reconfigure notions of institutional legitimacy in higher education environments (Giroux, 2010; Olssen & Peters, 2007; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In general, acts of resistance against neoliberalism in higher education and academic capitalism are missing

from the research literature (Slaughter, 2014). Although the current literature contributes to the scholarly community's understanding of how faculty become administrators, what they do, how they lead, the stress they endure, and how they are evaluated as administrators, the neoliberal and managerial behaviors of administrators within a neoliberal context remains an understudied research topic. Without data-driven, in-depth inquiries into managerial behaviors of academic deans at research universities in the United States there are few or no clear explanations, and thus scholarly understandings, of the ways in which this particular population enacts or resists neoliberal behaviors or negotiates and reconciles their academic values with values imposed on their institution by a neoliberal regime (Giroux, 2018; Levin, 2007). Thus, this investigation relies on what limited scholarship is available on deans and what can be inferred from the existing literature on neoliberalism, academic capitalism, and new managerialism on administrators and faculty in general.

Neoliberalism is embedded in faculty behaviors (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015) and manifests in the work of the faculty profession (Levin, 2017; Mountz, Bonds, Mansfield, Loyd, Hyndman, & Walton-Roberts, 2015). Faculty comply with neoliberal values that have become normalized and engage in self-surveillance (Davies & Bansel, 2010). In light of the research that demonstrates faculty engagement in neoliberal behaviors, academic deans who come from the faculty presumably also exhibit behaviors in line with neoliberal ideology.

What little scholarship on the managerial behaviors of university administrators does exist is restricted to research outside the United States and conducted primarily by

Deem and associates (Deem, 1998; 2004; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Deem & Hillyard, 2002; Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007). Deem (1998, 2004), Deem and Brehony (2005), and Deem, Hillyard, and Reed (2007)'s findings suggest that academic deans exhibit new managerial behaviors such as an emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness, benchmarks and performance indicators, surveillance, control, and the adoption of private sector business practices. However, these scholars fixate on new managerialism—a phenomenon endemic to state-controlled higher education environments, such as in Europe (Dill, 1997), but that translates differently in cultures with more market oriented systems of higher education (Dill, 1997), such as the United States, where academic capitalism and corporatism, not necessarily new managerialism, tend to be the rule of the higher education game. Nevertheless, new managerialism, more often referred to as new public management (NPM) in the United States, is reflected in higher education's adoption of various management fads aimed at organizational change such as Total Quality Management (TQM), Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB), Benchmarking, Strategic Planning, and Management By Objectives (MBO) [Birnbaum, 2000].

Most of the literature on academic capitalism has focused on academic capitalist behaviors in faculty and students (e. g. Collyer, 2015; Gonzalez, Martinez, & Ordu, 2014; Mars & Rhoades, 2012; Mars, Slaughter, & Rhoades, 2008; Mendoza & Berger, 2008; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Szelényi & Bresonis, 2014; Welsh, Glenna, Lacy, & Biscotti, 2008; Ylijoki, 2003) and often concentrates on faculty and students in STEM fields, excluding disciplines that are perceived as less oriented

toward the market. There have been calls in the literature for studies on administrators who engage in academic capitalist behaviors (e. g., Park [2011]). While some (e. g., Mendoza & Berger, 2008; Rhoades, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) have suggested that administrators, such as deans, are academic capitalist and neoliberal actors who exert higher levels of managerial control than in nostalgic academic times, only a few have captured this population in data-based studies on academic capitalism.

For example, in the United States, executive and managerial administrators reinforce academic capitalism by "building infrastructure, creating new programs, cultivating donors and raising funds, setting a vision around entrepreneurship, and changing policies" (McClure, 2016, p. 516). In addition to creating academic capitalist policies, "manager-deans" (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016, p. 798) and other executive and managerial administrators flex their "extended managerial capacity" (McClure, 2016, p. 798) to reinforce the academic capitalism in response to neoliberal state policy changes (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). Deans focus on the financial survival of their schools or colleges and perform market and market-like behaviors in order to adapt to financial exigency brought on by state policy (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). The extension of managerial authority and the adoption of academic capitalist leadership strategies is perceived of by deans as a necessary requirement for survival; nevertheless, the expression of academic capitalist behaviors does not equate to the total abandonment of the mission to educate and serve the public (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016).

Similarly, in Australia, Heads of Schools (Deans) and Heads of Department perpetuate the growth of academic capitalism in universities (Collyer, 2015). There are two types of responses to marketization (Collyer, 2015). Some resist the management ethos and marketization and some embrace and conform (Collyer, 2015); yet, both resisters and adopters perceive that traditional academic values and practices conflict with the marketization ethos. Administrators use their managerial capital to control and reshape the habitus of the academic profession (Collyer, 2015). Faculty engage in acts of conformance and resistance to these efforts to marketize the university (Collyer, 2015).

The literature on the neoliberal, managerial, and academic capitalist behaviors of administrators in the United Kingdom, United States, and Australia provides a foundation for understanding deans' behaviors; in addition, the gaps in these previous studies illuminate the necessary methodological parameters of my present investigation on deans. First, Deem and associates, Collyer (2015), and McClure (2016) focus on administrators broadly rather than concentrating on a single subpopulation of administrators. The aggregation of academic administrators into a single group is a widespread problem in the literature on administrators. While a few publications focus specifically on department chairs (Carroll, 1991; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Hecht et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2012), presidents (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Moore et al., 1983), or deans (Gmelch, 2000a; Moore et al., 1983; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000; Isaac, 2007), the majority of the literature clusters administrators homogenously irrespective of titles, institutional affiliation, and discipline. To conceptualize all administrators as a single-body is to ignore the nuances of difference inherent among

15

subpopulations of administrators. While overarching similarities may exist, each position (president, provost, dean, department chair, and the like) holds different responsibilities within higher education institutions (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007); therefore, research that fails to address such differences and their implications, or that fails to focus on one specific job title, will provide a limited and overgeneralized understanding of higher education administration.

Second, both Collyer (2015) and McClure (2016) gathered data from faculty, as well as all types of administrators, in order to capture the essence of administrative academic capitalism. Aside from McClure and Teitelbaum (2016), no study has relied on data on neoliberal behaviors gathered solely from deans' perspectives. A phenomenological investigation is needed which explores the neoliberal practices and values of deans from their own perspectives, across all disciplines at research universities.

Third and finally, much of the existing literature is based on data gathered outside the United States in countries such as Australia (Collyer, 2015) and the United Kingdom (Deem, 1998; 2004; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Deem & Hillyard, 2002; Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007). These countries' higher education structures and academic cultures differ from those in the United States. Thus, while these studies present a glimpse into the managerial and academic capitalist behaviors of administrators, the findings may not be transferable fully to the United States context. These are three limitations of the literature in which the foundation of this investigation of deans is built.

Theoretical Framework

The neoliberal regime (Giroux, 2018; Levin, 2007) forms the environmental context and impetus for this investigation as well as a conceptual framework. The literature asserts that neoliberal ideology has infiltrated higher education institutions (Ball, 2012). Neoliberalism is characterized by an emphasis on marketization and commercialization, including academic capitalism in universities, and the public sector's adoption of private sector managerial practices, or new managerialism, in public institutions. In essence, academic capitalist and new managerial behaviors are the manifestation of neoliberal ideology in universities. As universities and colleges operate in a competitive environment with limited resources (Archibald & Feldman, 2011), they engage in market-like behaviors (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Entrepreneurial tendencies, such as the commodification of knowledge, industry partnerships, technology transfer, licensing and patenting, service enterprises, and campus facility rentals, reflect a growing pattern of academic capitalism in higher education (Archibald & Feldman, 2011; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2008). The "do more with less" financial environment (a consequence of diminished state allocations according to scholars such as Slaughter and Leslie [1997]) has resulted in higher education institutions' adoption of managerial practices traditionally employed by private sector businesses—a phenomenon known as new managerialism (Deem, 1998), which has given rise to the term "manager-academic" (Deem, 2004, p. 107) as a label for academics who hold leadership and management roles. New managerialism is the institutional response to external pressures from a tax-weary, highly critical citizenry that scrutinizes public

expenditures on higher education, demands efficiency and accountability (Deem, 1998), and makes accusations of "administrative bloat" (Greene et al., 2010). Context matters; thus, the understandings and explanations of academic deans' behaviors hinges on a thorough consideration of the neoliberal environment in which they work and the ways in which this neoliberal environment does or does not influence their behaviors.

Institutional theory provides a framework for the understanding of institutional legitimacy in a neoliberal environment. Organizations gain legitimacy through conformity with the demands of external actors (Selznick, 1957; Scott, 1987, 2014) and through the integration of externally defined parameters into their structure (Meyer & Rowan, 1978). The institutionalization of an organization—in this case public research universities— is a fluid process (Scott, 1987) that occurs through the development of a "shared history" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 54). The institutionalized acts of an organization are socially constructed and maybe a "taken-for-granted part of [the] social reality" (Zucker, 1977, p. 728).

According to institutional theory, multiple institutional logics (collections of values) may exist concurrently and may compete with one another (Dacin, Goodstein, & Scott, 2002). Over time, institutional logics may be replaced, segregated, or blended (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). The adoption of institutional logics (norms and values) leads to the adoption of corresponding structures (Scott, 2004). In an environment of neoliberalism, limited resources, and increased accountability, institutional theory suggests that universities may adopt structures—such as managerial practices and behaviors (Clark, 2001) — in order to maintain legitimacy. However, higher education

institutions traditionally fill administrative positions with academics, not experienced managers (Harman, 2002). This suggests that traditional academic values are deeply embedded and have yet to be replaced fully with neoliberal values. Organizational members may accept or reject institutional logics and may engage in a variety of responses to the institutionalization of new logics (Scott, 2004). An examination of institutional logics must consider both the context of the institution as well as the organizational members responsible for the adoption of new logics (Scott, 2004). Institutional theory provides a possible explanation of individual behaviors and actions of academic deans in a neoliberal environment.

If neoliberal values are indeed in conflict with traditional academic values, these value conflicts may play out in the dean—a position that overlaps both the academic and administrative realms. Although academic deans may make a physical move from a faculty office to a dean's office as well as a positional move from faculty to administrator, a large proportion of academic administrators, such as chairs and deans, view the move to administration as temporary (Gmelch, 2004). The majority of deans identify as faculty primarily or faculty and administrators, but rarely as administrators solely (Wolverton et al., 1999). Those who identify as faculty or as a combination of faculty and administrator experience higher levels of ambiguity than those who identify as administrators only (Wolverton et al., 1999). Given the duality of the "manager-academic" (Deem, 2004) role and the lack of formal training (Mech, 1997; Strathe & Wilson, 2006), identity theory holds additional explanatory power for the experiences of academic deans as they navigate potentially conflicting values, norms, and roles.

Identity theory provides an analytical framework for the explanation of patterns in deans' behaviors and identities as there is a close relationship between behavior and identity (Burke & Stets, 2009). According to Burke and Stets (2009), there are three different types of identities: role identity, social identity, and person identities. In this investigation, I focus primarily on role identity and social identity. Role identity is defined by "the meanings people attribute to themselves while in various roles" or positions they hold (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 112). Social identities are determined by an individual's membership in certain social groups (Burke & Stets, 2009; Hogg & Abrams, 1988). Social identity is maintained through participation in behaviors, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes that correspond to the prototype of the ingroup and avoid alignment with an outgroup (Burke & Stets, 2009; Hogg, 2006).

The adoption of a social identity reinforces an individual's perception of themselves and counteracts feelings of uncertainty (Burke & Stets, 2009). Guided by meaning, individuals select behaviors that verify their identity (Burke & Stets, 2009) and achieve their goals (Mead, 1934). Stress results when an individual is unable to confirm their identity (Burke & Stets, 2009; Swann, 1983). As a result of the varying roles, groups, and personal traits an individual embodies, they may possess more than one identity (Burke & Stets, 2009). When an individual seeks to maintain one identity, they may encounter interference as a result of the maintenance of another identity—this results in conflict (Burke & Stets, 2009; Stets & Burke, 2000). Individuals adopt the most salient identity based on the situation (Burke & Stets, 2009). That is, each situation has varying

degrees of reward and cost, and individuals adopt the identity that is the most "profitable" from their perspective within a specific context (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 42).

I did not commence this investigation with identity theory in mind. Rather, the applicability of identity theory as an explanatory tool for patterns in the data arose during the cycles of analysis. In Chapter 3, I define identity theory in greater detail and elaborate on the ways in which I operationalized the theory during the analysis of data.

Research Questions

This qualitative, hermeneutic phenomenological field investigation seeks to answer the following overarching research questions and subquestions:

1. To what extent and in what ways do academic deans at research universities adopt neoliberal values and enact neoliberal behaviors?

2. What tensions, if any, exist between traditional academic values and neoliberal values in the work of academic deans?

    a. In what ways do academic deans replace, blend, or segregate (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012) traditional academic values and neoliberal values?

    b. What role does a dean's identity play in their negotiation of academic values and neoliberal values?

Methodology

This qualitative investigation adopted a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to inquiry, and focused on the "lived experiences" (Van Manen, 1990) of academic deans in a neoliberal environment at public research universities in California. Distinguishable

from traditional phenomenological approaches which seek to "bracket" the influence of the researcher on the investigation (Husserl, 1970; 1980), hermeneutic phenomenology embraces and acknowledges the role of the researcher as interpreter of participant portrayals of their experiences (Heidegger, 1962; Laverty, 2003; Lichtman, 2013). That is, this investigation intended to explain from the researcher's scholarly perspective the lived experiences of academic deans in their administrative role.

In this interpretive investigation, it was necessary to the credibility of my investigation that I pursue reflexivity and disclose my positionality as a researcher (Lichtman, 2013). For the last nine and a half years, I have worked at two different research universities. I spent the first two years of my professional career at the University of Utah Office of Sustainability working with both administrators and academic managers at all levels of the university to implement policies and educational programs aimed at creating a more sustainable and carbon neutral campus. In the last seven and a half years, I worked as Executive Assistant to the Dean for five different deans in two different academic departments at the University of California, Riverside (UCR). As well, over the last three years I have taken on an additional role as Director of Academic Services where I oversee the staff of an internal academic support unit within University Extension. My role as a university employee may be perceived by some as a liability to the legitimacy of my research as I may possess biases and perspectives that influence my interpretation of the data. Consequently, it was important that I acknowledged my positionality, maintained reflexivity, and self-reflected throughout the investigation in order to sort through any biases that could be construed as an influence

on the data and my analysis. I kept a section in my field notes dedicated to self-reflections on my role as researcher.

Despite the potential risks to the data associated with being an "insider," my position as an employee of a research university as Executive Assistant to the Dean and my role as Director of Academic Services served as an asset to my investigation. There were several benefits that my positionality granted me: (1) I had extensive knowledge of deans' experiences and the daily work and life of deans; (2) I had access to deans at UCR as well as other University of California (UC) campuses; and, (3) I had substantial knowledge of the University of California system and UC institutions. My experience as a practitioner within the administrative world benefited me as I engaged in conversations with deans and aided me in establishing rapport with the participants. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that without my role, I may not have been able to obtain access to my sample of deans for my investigation.

Data Collection

There is no standard method for conducting phenomenological research; however, the literature suggests that the method should be dictated by the phenomenon in question (Hycner, 1999). This investigation used semi-structured interviews (Burgess, 2002; Seidman, 2012) as its sole source of data. Interviews were used to explain the behaviors of academic deans and the "lived experience" of deans in a neoliberal environment. Interviews allowed me to capture the ways in which academic deans made meaning of their experience (Seidman, 2012). During interviews, and in the period directly before and after interviews, I constructed field notes. Field notes included reflections and memos

on methods and procedures during data collection (Miles et al., 2014). On rare occasions, I was able to procure documents such as brochures for the college or school, powerpoint presentations given by deans to staff and faculty, and faculty policy manuals. However, I did not perform document analysis. Rather, documents provided prompts for interview questions and probes and a context for discussions that occurred during the interviews and, subsequently, for the analysis of the interview.

Phenomenologists seek to understand the "social and psychological phenomena from the perspectives of people involved" (Welman & Kruger, 1999, p. 189). Thus, I used purposeful sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) to select academic deans (Rosser, 2001; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000) who came to their role from faculty positions. I sought out deans at all stages of their career—deans who had recently assumed their role and deans who had been in their academic position for several years, as well as those who had recently retired or returned to the faculty. I included both male and female participants. The existing literature on academic administrators and new managerialism does not consider race as a factor, explicitly. Indeed, the omission of race in the literature may be due to limited numbers of non-White academic deans as the population of academic deans consists primarily of White males (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Hermanson, 1996; Greicar, 2009). I included racially diverse participants to obtain a broad perspective of the behaviors of academic deans; however, I was concerned with the phenomenon of academic deans as a whole.

Three contexts influence the academic profession: national setting, academic discipline, and institution type (Clark, 1987). Consequently, I collected data from public

research universities in the State of California in order to explore the phenomenon within an U.S. context. Specifically, I collected data at four University of California campuses. I included academic deans from the hard sciences, social sciences, business, professional schools, and arts and humanities disciplines.

The sites were selected due to three primary factors. First, I had a reasonable expectation that I would be able to negotiate access to these locations (Mason, 2002). Second, these sites were selected because they were likely locations to observe the phenomenon (Schofield, 2002). Research universities are influenced by both economic and commercial values as well as the traditional values of knowledge creation for the public good (Marginson, 2010). Research universities were suitable environments for an examination of academic deans as "manager-academics" (Deem, 2004). Third, research universities in the state of California were selected because the California Master Plan clearly defines the mission of the University of California (UC) system as a research institution. According to the California Master Plan, the University of California "shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research" (p. 3) and shall "provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over training for the professions" (p. 2) with the "sole authority in public higher education to award the doctor's degree in all fields of learning" (California State Department of Education, 1960, p. 3). The University of California is regularly ranked among the best universities globally (Mok, 2014). The UC is granted more NSF and NIH funding than any other institution in the country (University of California, 2015).

All participants were recruited via email. In the email, I provided a brief explanation of the purpose of the study and requested to facilitate two in-depth 60-90 minute interviews with 60 deans (Seidman, 2012) from four University of California campuses. I employed several strategies to try to obtain participants. I attempted to use initial interviews with deans as an opportunity to recruit other dean participants (snowball sampling [Bogdan & Biklen, 2011]). However, I was unable to recruit additional participants successfully through this approach as deans were unwilling to suggest their dean colleagues or reach out to them on my behalf to encourage their participation. In the one instance, where a dean did make suggestions for other potential candidates, the prospective deans did not meet criteria for participation. In addition to snowball sampling and selective sampling, I asked a member of my dissertation committee to reach out on my behalf to make an initial contact with potential dean participants. I then followed up with those prospective participants via email. I obtained two dean participants using this method of recruitment. The other 18 participants were obtained through a combination of selective sampling based on criteria and self-selection on the part of deans who agreed to participate. During the earlier phases of my recruitment process, I was concerned that I would not have enough female participants or participants from certain disciplines represented in the sample. In those cases, I used the follow-up email (the second and last recruitment email) to try to convey that their participation would be appreciated as I was seeking out the experiences of "women" or "deans of X discipline." However, I did not employ that tactic consistently as deans from some disciplines self-selected to participate more than others.

In the end, 20 deans were recruited from four University of California campuses. This number allowed me to meet Polkinghorne's (1995) standard for phenomenological study participant pools. I requested to facilitate two in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each of the 20 academic deans (Isaac, 2007; Seidman, 2012). All but two of the deans agreed to be interviewed twice and interviews ranged from 30 minutes to two hours, with the majority of interviews lasting approximately one hour. Four deans did not consent to be audio recorded and in those cases extensive notes were taken and verbatim quotations were captured whenever possible. All recorded interviews were transcribed for analysis. All participants were given pseudonyms to protect anonymity (Lichtman, 2013). All data and identifying information was kept in a secure location. Interview audio-files, transcriptions, field notes, and documents were held in electronic files and organized by participant (with an assigned pseudonym) and interview number. Personal identifying information and pseudonym key was kept in a separate electronic file under password protection.

Data Analysis

I conducted a narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008) of interviews, or what Polkinghorne (1995) refers to as "analysis of narrative" and Bochner and Riggs (2014) refer to as a "narratives-under-analysis," with the goal to analyze the narratives of the participants as opposed to the creation of a narrative product. Investigations that use analysis of narrative "treat stories as 'data' and use 'analysis' to arrive at themes that hold across stories" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 204). With "narratives-under-analysis," the stories are "subjected first to interpretive practices of transcription, then to further

interpretive practices of one form or another aimed at grounded clarification of the meaning of texts and their interactive production" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 210). This approach allowed me to analyze the narratives of academic deans and interpret the meanings embedded within the interviews in order to explain their experiences. I employed three approaches to the analysis of narrative. I performed thematic analysis (what was said); structural analysis (how it was said); and, the dialogic/performance analysis (how the conversation evolved between myself and the participant) [Bochner & Riggs, 2014].

Generally, qualitative data analysis involves organizing, reflecting, coding, and categorizing data into meaningful categories, and developing concepts from categories to shape the argument (Lichtman, 2013). Content analysis was carried out as well (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis consisted of "making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). The steps of content analysis included a cyclical process of unitizing data into segments of analysis, sampling, coding, data reduction, inferring phenomenon using analytical constructs, and generating answers to research questions (Krippendorff, 2004). This process allowed me to examine "linguistically constructed facts" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 75) about personal characteristics, relationships, behaviors, and realities (Krippendorff, 2004).

I identified themes in the interview transcripts and documents (Saldaña, 2014). I coded both during and after the interviews (Lichtman, 2013). I organized my coding and analysis by subject and participant. I generated descriptive, topical, and analytical codes

(Richards, 2009). After this initial coding process, I searched for patterns in the codes

that reflected components of institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012).

In order to identify the presence of neoliberal, academic capitalist, and new managerial

logics in the data, I applied codes such as efficiency, revenue generation,

entrepreneurship, growth (Clark, 2001; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), auditing, reporting,

measurable outcomes (Deem, 2004), and performativity (Ball, 2012). In order to identify

academic logics, I used codes such as knowledge generation, knowledge dissemination,

collegiality, autonomy, academic excellence, and shared governance (Levin, 2017; Scott,

2006). However, I remained open to the possibility of coding patterns that existed

outside these theoretical frameworks and concepts. Data that could be easily categorized

into codes were excluded unless patterns emerged from the data that implied the

necessity for a new category (Richards, 2009). I generated meaning by identifying

patterns, clustering, making metaphors, comparing and contrasting, identifying outliers,

and partitioning variables (Miles et al., 2014).

This investigation sought to capture the lived experiences of academic deans in a

neoliberal environment; however, I did not engage in member checking (Miles et al.,

2014; Richards, 2009), as it had the potential to compromise the data if participants

wanted to edit out sections of contentious or valuable data. However, I ensured clarity in

members' explanations during interviews by rephrasing the participants' wording back to

them and asking for clarification if my understanding was not clear (Jones, Torres, &

Arminio, 2014). Finally, to ensure trustworthiness of findings, my dissertation supervisor

reviewed and validated my coding for consistency in order to ensure coder reliability (Richards, 2009).

Structure of the Dissertation

The following chapters address in detail the literature, theory, and methods that form the basis for this qualitative investigation on academic deans at the University of California. In Chapter Two, I provide a review of the literature on neoliberalism and its manifestation in higher education in the form of academic capitalism and new managerialism. I address the limitations in the literature on neoliberalism in higher education and explain how this present investigation seeks to remedy those inadequacies. I review bodies of literature on my theoretical and conceptual frameworks, including institutional theory, institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), and identity theory (Stets & Burke, 2000; Burke & Stets, 2009). As well, I explore and explain the existing literature on academic administrators and academic deans, specifically. I assert that while the literature on academic deans provides a useful foundation for an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of academic deans, gaps remain in the scholarly understandings of the ways in which academic deans engage in, resist, and reinforce neoliberal behaviors and logics within the university.

In Chapter Three, I explain my methodology and methods, I restate my research questions, and I include a comprehensive description of my epistemological and ontological framework as a researcher, the methods of data collection, a justification for the site selection, including a brief history of the University of California, a review of ethical considerations and strategies for protection of participants' anonymity, analytical

frameworks used for analysis, approaches to analysis, and limitations of the study. Chapter Four includes an organized presentation of the findings of my investigation supported with data derived from 38 semi-structured interviews with academic deans at four University of California campuses. I structure my findings chapter in line with my research questions. I begin with an explanation of the ways in which academic deans engage in neoliberal behaviors and adopt neoliberal logics. I describe deans' blending of neoliberal and academic logics. I provide an explanation of the varied degrees to which academic deans adopt a managerial identity, and I address the role that the maintenance of the academic professional identity plays in deans' blending of neoliberal and academic logics. In Chapter 5, I discuss the conclusions and implications of my findings, link the investigation back to the literature, explain how my research extends theory, discuss the challenges I faced in methodology, make recommendations for future research, and enumerate recommendations for practice.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this investigation, it is the behaviors and values of academic deans that are of interest. Behaviors originate from, and are contextualized by, institutional expectations and socio-political trends and norms that are either inherent in, or infiltrate into, higher education environments (Martin, 1993). The investigation is framed by one large and overarching trend that has invaded higher education institutions in the United States (and internationally) and altered notions of legitimacy—neoliberalism (Giroux, 2010; Olssen & Peters, 2005). Neoliberalism, also called market liberalism, is a regime and socio-political context (Lynch, 2014) characterized by the reorientation of the public sector towards the market, exemplified in *performativity* (Ball, 2012), productivity, outputs, corporatization, commercialization (Bok, 2009), and the adoption of private sector business practices in the public sector (Crouch, 2011; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Quiggin, 2012). At the organizational level, neoliberalism manifests as new managerialism (Lynch, 2014) and academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

This literature review begins with a discussion of the theory that undergirds this investigation and accounts for institutional expectations and legitimacy—institutional theory. Next, I explore how institutional theory manifests at the individual level, through institutional logics. I define the two sets of logics under contention: academic logics and neoliberal logics. In this chapter, I provide an explanation of neoliberalism as an overarching regime along with its higher education offspring—academic capitalism. I elaborate on the origins of neoliberalism, what neoliberalism is, and how it shapes U. S.

higher education. Arguably, U. S. culture, heavily influenced by its capitalist socio-

economic and political structure, is the quintessential neoliberal environment (Rupert,

1990). As well, I touch on the concept of new managerialism—another technology of the

neoliberal regime (Deem & Brehony, 2005: Levin, 2017). I explain, new managerialism

as a concept associated primarily with higher education institutions in the UK, where

government intervention is more pronounced (Dill, 1997). As such, the manifestation of

new managerialism in a U. S. context differs slightly from the UK.

I then direct my attention to the manifestation of the neoliberal regime in

academic deans' behaviors and values—a regime that shapes internal as well as external

perceptions of legitimacy, and both challenges, and is reinforced by, organizational

socialization and expectations of what it means to be a dean in a research university. I

elaborate on the existing literature on academic administrators and deans which addresses

the neoliberal regime inadequately. Finally, I address how the literature on neoliberalism,

academic capitalism, and new managerialism has neglected to make data-based

observations and conclusions about deans as a distinct managerial group.

Part 1: Theoretical Framework

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory, specifically neo-institutional theory explains the relationship

between institutional legitimacy, institutional logics, and individual behaviors (Thornton

& Ocasio, 2008). Institutional theory provides a framework for understanding the

stability of institutions (Dacin, Scott, & Goodstein, 2002) and provides a mechanism for

understanding patterns of behavior within institutions. Organizational actors function

under "taken for granted" (Zucker, 1977, p. 728) assumptions about their environment. They accept "the way things are" (Scott, 1987, p. 496). Organizational members adhere to rationalized "myths" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 340) that are perceived as essential to the maintenance of legitimacy and the ability of the organization to obtain resources, persist, and survive (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Suchman, 1995). Legitimacy is "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

The process of institutionalization occurs as "social processes, obligations, or actualities come to take on a rule-like status in social thought and action" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 341). Thus, as organizations conform to the rules and norms derived from their membership to the greater institution, patterns appear across organizations and the result is isomorphism, or homogenization (Dey, Milem, & Berger, 1997; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Isomorphism occurs as a result of three types of pressure: coercive, mimetic, and normative (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Coercive pressures often come in the form of regulation, or the withholding of resources as leverage for organizational change (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Mimetic pressure arises when uncertainties are present and organizations respond by modeling their organization after other similar organizations with higher perceived legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Normative pressures occur within professional settings where professionals reinforce specific norms and expectations for the professional environment. Normative pressure manifests through socialization and hiring processes, or "filtering" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 152).

The rules and norms an organization follows are influenced by demands from external and internal actors (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Pache & Santos, 2010). In the case of higher education organizations, external actors can include funding agencies, state and federal governments, taxpayers, professional associations, or other actors with financial resources to withhold (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The managerial environment affects higher education organizational behaviors as "knowledge professionals now [have] to adhere to advice coming from the 'outside,' such as auditors, alumni, community advisory boards, parents, and venture capitalists" (Ward, 2012, p. 67). Internal actors can include staff, faculty, board members, volunteers, students, parents, and administrators.

Institutional Logics

The norms and patterns of behavior are the symptoms of "institutional logics" that guide an organization (Scott, 1987, 2014; Thornton et al., 2012) and define what is appropriate (Greenwood, Díaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010). More specifically, institutional logics are "the socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 101). The link between logics and practices has been established in the literature (Greenwood et al., 2010; Lounsbury, 2007; Thornton, 2004). "[M]anagerial practices are manifestations of, and legitimated by, institutional logics" (Greenwood et al., 2010, p. 521). Institutional logics are influenced by community and historical context (Greenwood et al., 2010). Logics become entrenched through the

creation of structures (Scott, 2004). Institutional logics act as a litmus test, or rubric, for the prediction of organizational members' behaviors (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008).

Nevertheless, organizational members are not ruled wholly by logics as if they were institutionalized lemmings. For this reason, I rely on neo-institutional theory, specifically, which accounts for the agency of organizational members (Scott, 2014) in the replacement, blending, assimilation, and segregation of old institutional logics with new logics. There are four forms of transformation that can occur in institutional logics: replacement, where "one institutional logic replaces another logic in an institutional field" (p. 164); blending, where "institutional logics are transformed by combining dimensions of diverse logics" (p. 165); segregation, where "different field-level logics emerge from a previously shared common origin" (p. 165); and assimilation, where "elements of one logic are combined into a prevalent logic" (Thornton et al., 2012, p. 165). When logics are replaced, one vocabulary of practice is substituted by another (Thornton et al., 2012). When logics are blended, different vocabularies of practice coalesce into one unique, new vocabulary of practice (Thornton et al., 2012). When logics are segregated, separate vocabularies of practice exist irrespective of the other (Thornton et al., 2012). Finally, when logics are assimilated, a dominant logic prevails but adopts elements of the secondary logic (Thornton et al., 2012).

Institutional theory is also a tool for the examination and explanation of institutional change and the deinstitutionalization of institutions (Dacin et al., 2002) Indeed, there are normative, mimetic, and coercive pressures to conform (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983); however, organizational actors may exercise agency in the face of

institutional demands. Organizational members possess the agency to respond to the institutionalization of new logics as they so choose (DiMaggio, 1988; Scott, 2004); they may accept the logic actively or passively, or they may overtly reject the logic (Scott, 2004). "[Institutional] logics and behaviors constitute repertoires that are available to individuals and organizations to employ in pursuit of their own interests" (Scott, 1987, p. 500). Institutional logics connect institutional structures with individual agency, behaviors, and thoughts (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Dissatisfaction with an institutional demand motivates the individual to enact agency (Pache & Santos, 2010). Autonomous actors who challenge new logics even after logics have been accepted publicly and adopted can alter the identity of the organization (Lok, 2010). Scott (2014) defines deinstitutionalization as "the processes by which institutions weaken and disappear" (p. 166). Deinstitutionalization suggests the replacement of old beliefs and practices with new beliefs and practices (Dacin et al., 2002). Institutional theory is used to explain higher level change across an institution (Dacin et al., 2002) or institutional change enacted at the micro-level by organizational members, or institutional entrepreneurs (DiMaggio, 1988).

Organizational behavior is similar to a tennis ball rallied on the organizational court between individual agency and institutionalized structures. As institutions are composed of diverse individuals with diverse roles, levels of authority and multiple institutional logics can exist simultaneously and vie for attention (Dacin et al., 2002). Generally, a dominant and stable logic prevails (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008); however, hybridization is also possible. Organizations, with institutional pluralism (Kraatz &

Block, 2008; Pache & Santos, 2010, 2013), that have two or more different sets of institutional logics, are referred to as hybrid organizations (Pache & Santos, 2013).

The research on organizational responses to competing logics is not conclusive. Organizations may respond differently to different demands (Dacin et al., 2002). The scholarship on institutional theory outlines five organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands: acquiescence, or the adoption of demands; compromise, or the partial adoption of some or all demands; avoidance, or the preclusion of the necessity to conform; defiance, or the explicit rejection of demands; and manipulation, or the act of altering the demands (Pache & Santos, 2010; Oliver, 1991).

Some strands of the literature suggest that organizations decouple or compromise in the face of competing logics (e. g., Bromily & Powell, 2012; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Decoupling occurs when organizations "symbolically endorse practices prescribed by one logic while actually implementing practices promoted by another logic, often one that is more aligned with organizational goals" (Pache & Santos, 2013, p. 974). For example, a university can promote the logic of the academy while simultaneously implementing policies, procedures, and structures that align with neoliberal, managerial, and revenue-seeking values. Conversely, a university can pander to the external constituencies of the legislature and the taxpayers by broadcasting its completion rates and post-graduation job placement, thus, espousing a neoliberal logic, while simultaneously sustaining behaviors and structures that reinforce traditional academic values, goals, and missions such as shared governance.

Two other strategies that organizations employ to cope with conflicting logics are compromise and combination (Kraatz & Block, 2008; Pache & Santos, 2013). Compromise occurs when organizations alter expectations of logics and lower standards of expectations enumerated by each set of conflicting logics (Pache & Santos, 2013). This approach allows for the partial satisfaction of expectations of stakeholders with different logic preferences (Pache & Santos, 2013). Combination occurs when organizations adopt behaviors from both sets of logics and attempt to please as many members of each constituency and respective logic (Pache & Santos, 2012)

Other studies contend that organizations with competing logics use selective coupling in order to manage and cope (Pache & Santos, 2013). Selective coupling occurs when organizations with conflicting logics "selectively couple intact elements prescribed by each logic" (Pache & Santos, 2013, p. 972). The ways in which selective coupling occurs, and the effectiveness of the coupling, may depend on the origin of the hybrid organization and the original embedded logic (Pache & Santos, 2013). Pache and Santos (2013) found that the adoption of social welfare logics in an organization with a primarily market logic occurred more often than the adoption of market logics by an organization that originated from a social welfare logic. When an organization's primary logic results in low legitimacy perceptions, then the organization will inculcate the contradicting logic in order to gain greater legitimacy (Pache & Santos, 2013). The manipulation of logics is used to gain legitimacy and acceptance (Pache & Santos, 2013). This activity of logic infiltration is referred to in the literature as a "Trojan horse" (Pache & Santos, 2013, p. 972). Just as Odysseus and his men entered Troy undercover inside the belly of a wooden

horse, likewise, "the strategic adoption by illegitimate actors of behaviors prescribed by the dominant logic in a field may enable them to gain acceptance for entering the field" (Pache & Santos, 2013, p. 994).

By definition, hybrid organizations embody incompatible logics (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011) and face challenges and threats to legitimacy as a consequence (Besharov & Smith, 2012; D'Aunno, Sutton, & Price, 1991; Pache & Santos, 2010, 2013). The adoption of a behavior in line with one logic may be in direct contradiction to another logic (Pache & Santos, 2013). Regardless of whether or not an organization decouples, compromises, or uses selective coupling, a natural tension arises in hybrid organizations that results in the organic formation of coalitions for each set of competing logics. Each coalition is likely to compete for their own preferred logic (Pache & Santos, 2013). The preferred logic for a coalition is usually the logic in which they were socialized to adopt (Pache & Santos, 2010). In organizations where the competing logics have been in place over an extended duration, members do not always comply with the socialized logic and prescription (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Pache & Santos, 2013). Arguably, environments such as higher education organizations, with authority dispersed amongst faculty and administrators, can create a ripe environment for the formation of coalitions, and the conflict of logics, across faculty and administrative lines.

In higher education, academic administrators are one source for the establishment or reinforcement of logics (Gumport, 2000). Institutional theory is an appropriate lens to examine competing logics at the micro-level through organizational members' individual

experiences with divergent expectations (Pache & Santos, 2010). However the literature is silent about the ways in which academic deans, who overlap both the administrative and academic worlds, experience, cope with, and manage competing logics. Institutional theory is used in interpretive, qualitative studies that aim to go beyond the mere counting of outcomes and adopted processes, and instead seek to understand individuals' struggle with, and motivation for, the adoption of certain behaviors (Suddaby, 2010). Context matters in analyses of institutional logics (Gumport, 2000). As such, this present qualitative investigation examines the tension between traditional academic logics and the logic of neoliberalism within academic deans at research universities. Academic deans, whether they admit to it or not, are managers, and managers "enunciate supportive myths and prescribe culturally congruent rituals" (Suchman, 1995, p. 577). Managers cannot detach themselves from the "belief system that renders the organization plausible. However, at the margin, managerial initiatives can make a substantial difference in the extent to which organizational activities are perceived as desirable, appropriate, and acceptable within any given cultural context" (Suchman, 1995, pp. 585-586). Managers employ various techniques in order to obtain or retain organizational legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). Thus, deans represent an ideal candidate for understanding the ways in which neoliberal and academic logics are rejected or reinforced. I explore the ways in which academic deans blend, replace, or segregate (Thornton et al., 2012) divergent academic and neoliberal values and the ways in which deans cope with, manage, and reconcile these competing logics. Whereas neoliberal logics elevate managerialism, prestige, individualism, performativity, measurable outcomes, and selectivity in student

admissions, tenure, evaluation, and merit and promotion, university logics value the

pursuit of discovery, dissemination of knowledge, faculty autonomy, academic freedom,

and bicameral governance (Levin, 2017; Scott, 2004). Scott (2004) noted that values may

exist simultaneously and yet contradict one another. Indeed, traditional academic values

are not compatible with neoliberal logics (Lynch, 2010). Next, I define and explain

neoliberalism, academic capitalism, and new managerialism in order to provide clarity

regarding neoliberal logics and I juxtapose these concepts and logics against academic

logics.

Academic logics and values. The culture of the academic profession may differ

across nation, discipline, and institutional type (Austin, 1990; Clark, 1987); therefore, for

the purposes of this investigation, traditional academic logics are associated with higher

education's most prestigious institution—the research university in the United States. The

term "traditional" is somewhat a misnomer in that despite the stability of higher

education as an institution, there has nevertheless been changes in the purpose and intent

of these organizations over time and throughout history (Clark, 1987). Thus, the notion of

"traditional" is unclear and requires, at the very least, a definition. These values originate

from the traditions of German research universities, British and colonial American

institutions, and a long history of higher education in the United States (Austin, 1990).

The logic of the research university, at its foundation, is rooted in its tripartite

mission of research (or the production of knowledge), teaching (or the dissemination of

knowledge), and service (both internal and to the community) [Austin, 1990]. In the

research university, research is the central focus, teaching is secondary, and service falls

into the third priority. Nevertheless, they are all essential components of the research university and of traditional notions of academe. As well, the logic of the research university includes highly selective admissions processes for students, internationalization, and the designation of Master's and Doctoral degrees in addition to Bachelor's degrees (Levin, 2017; Scott, 2006).

In the research university, a high value is placed on collegiality (Austin, 1990; Hatfield, 2006; Tapper, 2017). As well, academic freedom, or the ability to pursue intellectual endeavors free from the intrusion of political or social influence or censorship and without the fear of reprisal and professional autonomy are held in high regard by faculty and are core academic values (Austin, 1990; Elton & Pope, 1989). The logic of the university is further comprised of structures such as peer review, tenure, merit, rank and promotion, and shared governance (Austin, 1990; Levin, 2017; Scott, 2006). These structures protect both academic freedom and autonomy (Austin, 1990). There are several principles of academic practice, such as skepticism of authority, critical assessment of ideas by peers, the pursuit of knowledge and meaning, autonomy in work, authenticity and responsibility, and an emphasis on process over product (Boud, 1990).

Indeed, the academic profession is grounded in the values of "intellectual honesty and fairness" (Austin, 1990, p. 62). Research, the primary activity of the research university, can be called "science" irrespective of discipline, as it is a term that equates with the act of scientific inquiry or investigation for the purpose of gaining greater understanding. This activity, and its corresponding "ethos" (Merton, 1947, p. 116), is deeply rooted in the culture, values, and norms of the academy.

> The ethos of science is that affectively toned complex of values and norms which is held to be binding on the man of science. The norms are expressed in the form of prescriptions, proscriptions, and permissions. These are legitimatized in terms of institutional values. These imperatives, transmitted by precept and example and reinforced by sanctions, are in varying degrees internalized by the scientist, thus fashioning his "scientific conscience"… Although the ethos of science has not been codified, it can be inferred from the moral consensus of scientists as expressed in use and wont, in countless writings on "the scientific spirit" and in moral indignation directed toward contraventions of the ethos. (Merton, 1947, pp. 116-117).

Merton (1947) proposed four imperatives for maintaining the "ethos of modern science" (p. 118): universalism, communalism, disinterestedness, and organized skepticism. Universalism means that truth-claims are to be measured irrespective of the personal attributes of the claimant's personality, race, religion, class, or nationality (Merton, 1947). Science must be impersonal and free from bias (Merton, 1947). Communalism in science equates to the shared ownership of knowledge. The knowledge "does not enter into the exclusive possession of the discoverer" (Merton, 1947, p. 121). Science should be the "public domain" and "secrecy is the antithesis of this norm" (Merton, 1947, p. 122). The academy values openness and trust (Deem et al., 2007). Similar to universalism, which states that no scientist ought to have their work judged based on who they are, disinterestedness suggests that scientists ought not to have personal investments, motives, or benefits from their research (Merton, 1947). The final component of the researcher ethos is organized skepticism. That is, the researcher should suspend judgement "until the facts are at hand and the detached scrutiny of beliefs in terms of empirical and logical criteria have periodically involved science in conflict with other institutions" (Merton, 1947, p. 126). With academic values as logics for the basis of

comparison, I now to turn to definitions of neoliberalism, academic capitalism, and new managerialism as concepts, contexts, and logics.

Neoliberal logics and values. Neoliberalism is a "political economic paradigm" (Giroux, 2002, p. 425) in which "market driven notion[s] of individualism, competition, and consumption" take priority and corporate culture gain[s] ascendency" (Giroux, 2002, p. 426). The term neoliberalism embodies an intrinsic critique—an anti-neoliberal agenda (Levin, 2017). The adoption of neoliberalism as an environmental condition of the research site places the researcher in a position to examine the negative implications of neoliberal ideology and call out its consequences—in this case, for higher education. To use the word neoliberalism is, in and of itself, a critique of the *status quo*.

Under a neoliberal regime, "critical education, public morality, and civic responsibility" (Giroux, 2002, p. 427) are replaced with a profit-making mentality (Giroux, 2002). Everything is for sale in the neoliberal regime (Brown & Carasso, 2013; Flew, 2014; Levin, 2017). In the neoliberal regime, "performativity" is central (Ball, 2012; Crouch, 2011), and institutions base decision making on profit or efficiency goals. When the bottom line takes priority, issues of injustice are secondary (Levin, 2017), unacknowledged (Giroux, 2002), and even rationalized (Corak, 2012; Usher, 2004). The formation of the neoliberal regime represents "a shift from welfare to individual production" (Park, 2011, p. 89).

Neoliberal governments and policy have implications for higher education institutions and their mission (Levin, 2017). Neoliberal governments and other constituencies have pushed higher education institutions towards economic goals and

market behaviors (Davies & Bansel, 2010; Levin, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The line "between public service and profit is now thoroughly blurred" (Ball, 2012, p. 23). Some scholars suggest that neoliberalism has become so pervasive that organizations and their actors take for granted the manifestations of neoliberal ideology and internalize the values as normal (Davies & Bansel, 2010; Ward, 2012). The unchecked acceptance is built into a neoliberal system that "systematically dismantles the will to critique, thus potentially shifting the very nature of what a university is and the ways in which academics understand their work" (Davies & Bansel, 2010, p. 5). In higher education, neoliberalism takes several forms. Neoliberalism redirects the work of academics towards "major administrative responsibilities" (Davies & Bansel, 2010, p. 7) and activities centered on measurable outcomes, which "set[s] the tyranny of metrics over and against professional judgement" (Ball, 2012, p. 20). In higher education, neoliberalism increases competition, individualism (Davies & Bansel, 2010), and inequality, and drives "public sector higher education to depend less upon government funding and rely more on an entrepreneurial pattern of behaviors that lead to the acquisition of private revenue streams, such as tuition and grant money" (Levin, 2017, p. 3). The neoliberal university fixates on efficiency and quality discourses, reinforced through a culture of auditing (Davies & Bansel, 2010) that corrodes professional autonomy (Lorenz, 2012). Under a neoliberal regime, students play the role of customers and consumers whose demands must be met (Olssen & Peters, 2005). In the neoliberal university, "faculty are transformed into both producers of a consumer good that is called education and sellers of the same" (Lorenz, 2012, p. 622). The neoliberal regime positions universities as

factories to produce, in economic terms, a skilled workforce, and the notion of higher education as a public good is rejected (Levin, 2017). Leaders are managers (Ward, 2012) and fundraisers, and the admission of students is merely a business transaction (Giroux, 2002). More broadly, neoliberalism threatens the professionalism and autonomy of university faculty (Levin, 2017; Ward, 2012) as faculty are subjected to higher levels of control, surveillance (Lorenz, 2012; Ward, 2012), and responsibility and accountability for the demonstration of measurable outputs, or "performativity" (Ball, 2012). In the university, then, research is commodified and non-revenue generating research is replaced with increased teaching workloads, part-time faculty are exploited for financial reasons, faculty have limited authority, tenure systems are unstable and challenged, and the generation of revenue takes precedence over academic freedom (Giroux, 2002, Ward, 2012).

Market principles have become the standard for institutional judgment (Crouch, 2011), and universities and colleges are assessed as firms. The adoption of market principles has altered the characteristics of accountability structures and goals for colleges and universities. In the 1990s, governments' accountability demands centered on strategies to guarantee that students received a quality education (Russell, 1993). In contrast, the focus of accountability has shifted away from the mission toward the measurement of outcomes, such as the number of graduates (Shulock & Moore, 2007), national rankings, or research productivity (Shore, 2008). As well, an "audit culture" (p. 280) has emerged and created an expectation that all members of the organization should engage in "accountancy" (p. 281) through technologies such as performance evaluations,

47

research assessment exercises, and reporting (Shore, 2008). Accountability measures reflect the expectations of external stakeholders. These new expectations have implications for the work of higher education institutions' members such as administrators and faculty (Cole, 2007; Fairweather, 2002; Gonzalez, Martinez & Ordu, 2014; Levin 2006; Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2011). In short, the literature suggests that higher education institutions have become managed institutions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Ward, 2012) that, as Reading (1996) asserts, are "in ruins" as centers of intellectual pursuit and institutions independent of political and economic market ideologies.

Academic capitalism and new managerialism are two subordinate manifestations of neoliberalism. As universities and colleges operate in a competitive environment with limited resources (Archibald & Feldman, 2011), they engage in market-like behaviors (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Entrepreneurial tendencies, such as the commodification of knowledge, industry partnerships, technology transfer, licensing and patenting, service enterprises, and campus facility rentals, reflect a growing pattern of academic capitalism in higher education (Archibald & Feldman, 2011; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2008). The "do more with less" financial environment has resulted in higher education institutions' adoption of managerial practices employed traditionally by private sector businesses—a phenomenon known as new managerialism (Deem, 1998), which has given rise to the term "manager-academic" (Deem, 2004, p. 107) as a label for academics who hold leadership and management roles. New managerialism is the institutional response to external pressures from a tax-weary, highly critical citizenry that scrutinizes public expenditures on higher education, demands efficiency and

accountability (Deem, 1998), and makes accusations of "administrative bloat" (Greene, Kisida, & Mills, 2010).

There is, however, important distinctions between new managerialism and academic capitalism—two concepts that might be conflated. To equate the two concepts with one another is to do a disservice to our understanding of each term and disregards the importance of the precision of language in scholarly endeavors. Although new managerialism and academic capitalism are cut from the same neoliberal cloth and intertwined closely, the two concepts are distinct from one another (Deem, 2001). Although there are clear distinctions among neoliberalism, new managerialism, and academic capitalism, these terms are used together, and occasionally interchangeably, within the literature. For example, Kauppinen (2012) describes academic capitalism as a "many-sided framework for developing understanding also of such a diverse phenomenon as the influence of neoliberalism, new managerialism, and calls for accountability, assessment, and rankings" (p. 545). Thus, the interchangeability of these terms within this literature review is a reflection of conflation in the larger literature. Nevertheless, I invoke these terms throughout my investigation and strive to clarify meaning whenever possible.

The term academic capitalism was popularized in the scholarly literature by Slaughter and Leslie (1997) as a concept and phenomenon in higher education that arose out of several larger socio-political changes and neoliberal policies. Those policies and trends included the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 which established policy on patents for federally funded research (Rubins, 2007; Welsh, Glenna, Lacy, & Biscotti, 2008) and led

to calls for universities to intertwine their research with industry (Gonzales, Martinez, & Ordu, 2014), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) [Gonzales et al., 2014] which increased global competition (Park, 2011), the massification of higher education (Välimaa, 2014), reductions to state funding for higher education (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), and investment from the National Science Foundation (NSF) for research into technologies that could be transferred for commercial purposes (Mendoza & Berger, 2008). These policies and trends ushered in a "new economy" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) and an era in which higher education was no longer considered a public good, (Park, 2011).

At its foundation, academic capitalism is defined as "institutional and professorial market or market-like efforts to secure external moneys" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 8). Market-like behaviors are defined as internal competition among faculty and between institutions for money from grants, endowment funds, tuition and fees, and industry partnerships; whereas market behaviors are activities that are directly for-profit, such as technology transfer, patents and licensing agreements, and industry partnerships with revenue components (Slaughter & Leslie, 2001). The literature refers to these market and market-like activities as the "third mission" (Filippakou & Williams, 2014, p. 72). Academic capitalism "blur[s] boundaries among markets, states, and higher education" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 11). The "academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime" (p. 5) is composed of two elements: the structures of neoliberal policy and government and the market behaviors of actors (Cantwell & Kauppinen, 2014).

Whereas academic capitalism is a concept concerned with the pursuit of funding and inputs (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), new managerialism is an ideology and an approach to the management of public sector organizations centered on efficiency, effectiveness, surveillance of professionals, audits, quality of outputs, cost-reduction (as opposed to revenue generation), and managerial control (Deem, 1998; Lynch, 2014). New managerialism, however, is a term and concept applied, along with "public management" in UK and European literature, and to some extent in Australian, Canadian, and European literature, whereas the term is infrequent in U. S. literature.

Part II: The Literature on Deans

Deans: Who They Are and What We Know

Thus, this investigation centers on the administrative behaviors and values of academic deans at research universities in the United States. The existing scholarship on academic deans, specifically, is minimal (Martin, 1993). An extensive search of scholarly databases and libraries turned up a dismal number of publications on academic deans. Much of the literature that does exist on academic deans is not data driven. A significant proportion of the publications (e.g., Bright & Richards, 2001; Tucker & Bryan, 1991) on deans are written as guides, manuals, and job descriptions for current or prospective deans. These publications have practical applications for deans. They enumerate the various tasks and responsibilities of a dean, or pose questions for a dean to reflect upon under hypothetical, proposed scenarios. These types of texts might do little to advance scholarly understanding or research on academic deans and their behaviors in a neoliberal

context; nevertheless, they provide useful information about the position and role of deans.

Deans occupy a unique position that overlaps both the administrative and the academic worlds (Del Favero, 2006). Deans "represent the culture of their colleges and universities" (Martin, 1993, p. 19); yet, with a foot in both worlds they sit at the center of two different cultures (Birnbaum, 1988; Del Favero, 2006). Although deans often originate from the faculty and hold faculty appointments (Isaac, 2007; Lorenz, 2012; Moore et al., 1983), their day to day work is primarily administrative in nature. They are managers within a highly bureaucratic structure (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) who "use their position to direct decisions" (Isaac, 2007, p. 51), oversee a variety of activities, and perform a multitude of tasks (Tucker & Bryan, 1991; Bright & Richards, 2001). Academic deans' responsibilities include budgets, personnel, student conflict resolution, faculty hiring, merit and promotion, strategic plan development, compliance, public relations, and representation of the department, college, or university at functions and meetings (Bright & Richards, 2001; Buller, 2007; Lee & VanHorn, 1983; Montez, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 2003; Tucker & Bryan, 1991). These tasks are separate from actual behaviors and the former is covered in the literature far more frequently than the latter. Whereas a list of tasks clarifies what deans do, an explanation of behaviors demonstrates how deans do what they do and reveals the underlying motives, ethics, values, and norms that influence or drive what they do.

Yet, the literature on the behaviors of deans is insufficient to respond to these larger questions on the ways in which neoliberal behaviors manifest at the deans' level.

In addition to addressing the roles and tasks of an administrator (Buller, 2006, 2007; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch & Tucker, 1999; Lee & VanHorn, 1983, Tucker & Bryan, 1991), the contemporary literature on university administrators covers topics such as leadership (Birnbaum, 1992; Buller, 2007; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013; Isaac, 2007), career paths (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Carroll, 1991; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983; Strathe & Wilson, 2006; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), socialization (Del Favero, 2006; Gmelch, 2000a, 2000b; Speck, 2003), and transitions of faculty to and from administration (Achterberg, 2004; Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006; Glick, 2006; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Griffith, 2006; Henry, 2006; McCluskey-Titus & Cawthon, 2004; Palm, 2006; Smith, Rollins, & Smith, 2012; Strathe & Wilson, 2006).

Even though deans' rhetoric is "filled with corporate discourse" (Isaac, 2007, p. 47), the majority of studies of deans focus instead on leadership styles and their implications, or factors that influence administrative behaviors, such as discipline and cognitive complexity (Del Favero, 2005, 2006), effectiveness (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002), and deans' influence on their colleges' well-being (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). To be effective leaders, deans must be culturally astute representatives of their units, who communicate well, and are good managers, planners, analysts, and activists (Martin, 1993). Deans act as leaders and change agents within an organization (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). That is, the behaviors of academic deans matter to the organization; yet, leadership and leadership effectiveness are distinct from management behaviors (Kotter, 2008). The categorization of leadership styles provides clarity only on

what approach academic deans utilize. In this investigation, I concern myself not with the effectiveness of leadership or management, but with the adoption and negotiation of values and the pursuit of legitimacy in managerial behaviors. The existing research, although it contributes to scholarly understanding of leadership, effectiveness, and the power of disciplinary associations, fails to reveal how academic deans navigate conflicting academic values and neoliberal values and how that tension becomes resolved (or not) in, and through, their management behaviors; thus, an examination of the values of academic deans, which undergird their behaviors, is worthy of investigation.

Arguably, deans' prioritization of academic over neoliberal values may be complicated by the duration of time deans spend in their role and the socialization they receive as former faculty and deans. Dean appointments are often temporary, or short-term (Gmelch, Wolverton, & Wolverton, 1999). Although deans originate from a variety of career paths (Moore et al., 1983; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), the majority of deans are hired from the faculty population (Moore et al., 1983). The majority (60%) served as department chairs or associate deans (40%) prior to their decanal appointments (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). Research finds that approximately 22% of female deans and 26% of male deans intend to return to faculty after their term ends, only 23% of female deans and 28% of male deans view their deanship as a step towards a provost position (Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), and the remainder intend to either retire or stay as dean. Such a finding suggests that many deans view themselves as scholars, not necessarily long-term administrators. Furthermore, these findings challenge previous arguments that faculty leave the professoriate for administration in search of power and

formal authority (Snyder, Howard, & Hammer, 1978). While reports indicate that most university presidents were once deans [and increasingly move straight from deanships to the presidency (Selingo, Chheng, & Clark, 2017)], it is not corret that all deans advance into provost or president roles. The literature suggests that other factors may influence decisions to enter administration—such as a sense of professional duty (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). Indeed, a large majority of deans take on this administrative role in order to contribute to their organization or influence faculty development (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002).

The pattern of advancement through other administrative roles, such as chair or associate dean, would suggest that individuals who serve as dean have a propensity towards leadership or management. Indeed, deans, as individuals, often assumed leadership roles throughout life starting with high school (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). As well, the majority of deans have been faculty members (Moore et al., 1983). Faculty undergo organizational socialization to learn the values and norms of the academy (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993); thus, faculty may be selected to serve as deans because they exemplify the values of faculty and are, therefore, trusted to serve as *primus inter pares*—first among equals (Brown, 2000).

The socialization process does not end in the faculty role. There are differences in the work of faculty and administrators (Achterberg, 2004; Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006). Most deans have no formal training (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) and face challenges as they strive to develop the skills necessary to succeed as a dean (Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006; Griffith, 2006; Palm, 2006; Standifird, 2009). When a faculty

member transitions to a dean, they undergo further socialization (Gmelch, 2000a, 2000b; Speck, 2003; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002) and learn about their role from past administrative experience, relationships with faculty leaders, or trial and error (Del Favero, 2006). Yet, the socialization process may lead to more confusion than clarity. "The administrative arm of the academy functions under expectations biased by an unwritten code" (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002, p. 103). The directions, role, and reporting structure of the dean are not always clear (Martin, 1993). Stuck in a "Janus-like" circumstance (Gmelch & Burns, 1991, p. 18), the dean must serve in a middle manager position (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002), with responsibilities to the faculty, staff, students, external community (Rhoades, 1990), donors, and their formal supervisor, the executive vice chancellor and provost. Although a majority of the deans express the view that they are effective and credible leaders—especially the women and minority deans— as deans are socialized into their new position, they undergo role ambiguity, role conflict, and stress dependent upon their own identity as well as their institutional type (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). This conflict may arise internally in an examination of their own professional selves as they "fulfill dual roles and have dual identities" (Lorenz, 2012, p. 628) and "seek to mitigate a tension between remaining true to their scholarship and performing properly as administrators" (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002, p. 101). Alternately, tensions and conflict may exist externally, as they receive contradictory messages of cutting costs from their provost while pressured simultaneously from their faculty to spend more (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). That is, to be a dean is to reside in

contested waters, to negotiate, and to juggle divergent sets of values, norms, pressures, and identities.

Literature on Neoliberalism, Academic Capitalism, and New Managerialism and Deans

Tensions and conflict in the role of the dean may also arise from external, larger trends—such as neoliberalism and academic capitalism—that plague the public sector and reconfigure notions of institutional legitimacy in higher education environment (Giroux, 2010; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In general, acts of resistance against neoliberalism in higher education and academic capitalism are missing from the research literature (Slaughter, 2014). Although the current literature contributes to the scholarly community's understanding of how faculty become administrators, what they do, how they lead, the stress they endure, and how they are evaluated as administrators, the managerial behaviors of administrators within a neoliberal context remains an understudied research topic. Without data-driven, in-depth inquiries into managerial behaviors of academic deans at research universities in the United States there are few or no clear explanations, and thus scholarly understandings, of the ways in which this particular population enacts or resists neoliberal behaviors or negotiates and reconciles their academic values with values imposed on their institution by a neoliberal regime. Thus, this investigation relies on what limited scholarship is available on deans and what can be inferred from the existing literature on neoliberalism, academic capitalism, and new managerialism on administrators and faculty in general.

Neoliberalism is embedded in faculty behaviors (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015) and manifests in the work of the faculty profession (Levin, 2017; Mountz, Bonds, Mansfield, Loyd, Hyndman, & Walton-Roberts et al., 2015). Faculty comply with neoliberal values that have become normalized and engage in self-surveillance (Davies & Bansel, 2010). In light of the research that demonstrates faculty engagement in neoliberal behaviors, academic deans who come from the faculty presumably also exhibit behaviors in line with neoliberal ideology.

What little scholarship on the managerial behaviors of university administrators does exist is restricted to research outside the United States and conducted primarily by Deem and associates (Deem, 1998; 2004; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Deem & Hillyard, 2005; Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007). Deem (1998, 2004), Deem and Brehony (2005), and Deem, Hillyard, and Reed (2007)'s findings suggest that academic deans exhibit new managerial behaviors such as an emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness, benchmarks and performance indicators, surveillance, control, and the adoption of private sector business practices. However, these scholars fixate on new managerialism—a phenomenon endemic to state-controlled higher education environments, such as in Europe (Dill, 1997), but that translates differently in cultures with more market oriented systems of higher education (Dill, 1997), such as the United States, where academic capitalism and corporatism, not necessarily new managerialism, tend to be the rule of the higher education game. Nevertheless, new managerialism, more often referred to as new public management (NPM) in the United States, is reflected in higher education's adoption of various management fads aimed at organizational change such as Total

Quality Management (TQM), Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB), Benchmarking, Strategic Planning, and Management By Objectives (MBO) [Birnbaum, 2000].

Most of the literature on academic capitalism has focused on academic capitalist behaviors in faculty and students (e. g. Collyer, 2015; Gonzalez, Martinez, & Ordu, 2014; Mars & Rhoades, 2012; Mars, Slaughter, & Rhoades, 2008; Mendoza & Berger, 2008; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Szelényi & Bresonis, 2014; Welsh, Glenna, Lacy, & Biscotti, 2008; Ylijoki, 2003) and often concentrates on faculty and students in STEM fields, excluding disciplines that are perceived as less oriented toward the market. There have been calls in the literature for studies on administrators who engage in academic capitalist behaviors [e. g., Park (2011)]. While some (e. g. Mendoza & Berger, 2008; Rhoades, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) have suggested that administrators, such as deans, are academic capitalist and neoliberal actors who exert higher levels of managerial control than in nostalgic academic times, only a few have captured this population in data-based studies on academic capitalism.

For example, in the United States, executive and managerial administrators also reinforce academic capitalism by "building infrastructure, creating new programs, cultivating donors and raising funds, setting a vision around entrepreneurship, and changing policies" (McClure, 2016, p. 516). In addition to creating academic capitalist policies, "manager-deans" (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016, p. 798) and other executive and managerial administrators flex their "extended managerial capacity" (McClure, 2016,

p. 798) to reinforce the academic capitalist regime in response to neoliberal state policy changes (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). Deans focus on the financial survival of their schools and perform market and market-like behaviors in order to adapt to financial exigency brought on by state policy (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016). The extension of managerial authority and the adoption of academic capitalist leadership strategies is perceived of by deans as a necessary requirement for survival; nevertheless, the expression of academic capitalist behaviors does not equate to the total abandonment of the mission to educate and serve the public (McClure & Teitelbaum, 2016).

Similarly, in Australia, Heads of Schools (Deans) and Heads of Department perpetuate the growth of academic capitalism in universities (Collyer, 2015). There are two types of responses to marketization (Collyer, 2015). Some resist the management ethos and marketization and some embrace and conform (Collyer, 2015); yet, both resisters and adopters perceive that traditional academic values and practices conflict with the marketization ethos. Administrators use their managerial capital to control and reshape the habitus of the academic profession (Collyer, 2015). Faculty engage in acts of conformance and resistance to these efforts to marketize the university (Collyer, 2015).

The literature on the neoliberal, managerial, and academic capitalist behaviors of administrators in the United Kingdom, United States, and Australia provides a foundation for understanding deans' behaviors; in addition, the gaps in these studies illuminate the necessary methodological parameters of my present investigation on deans. First, Deem and associates, Collyer (2015), and McClure (2016) focus on administrators broadly rather than concentrating on a single subpopulation of administrators. The aggregation of

academic administrators into a single group is a widespread problem in the literature on administrators. While a few publications focus specifically on department chairs (Carroll, 1991; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Hecht et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2012), presidents (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Moore et al., 1983), or deans (Gmelch, 2000a; Moore et al., 1983; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000; Isaac, 2007), the majority of the literature clusters administrators homogenously irrespective of titles, institutional affiliation, and discipline. To conceptualize all administrators as a single-body is to ignore the nuances of difference inherent among subpopulations of administrators. While overarching similarities may exist, each position (president, provost, dean, department chair, and the like) holds different responsibilities within higher education institutions (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007); therefore, research that fails to address such differences and their implications, or that fails to focus on one specific job title, will provide a limited and overgeneralized understanding of higher education administration.

Second, both Collyer (2015), McClure (2016) gathered data from faculty, as well as all types of administrators, in order to capture the essence of administrative academic capitalism. Aside from McClure and Teitelbaum (2016), no study has relied on data on neoliberal behaviors gathered solely from deans' perspectives. A phenomenological investigation is needed which explores the neoliberal practices and values of deans from their own perspectives, across all disciplines at research universities.

Third and finally, much of the existing literature is based on data gathered outside the United States in countries such as Australia (Collyer, 2015) and the United Kingdom (Deem, 1998; 2004; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Deem & Hillyard, 2005; Deem, Hillyard, &

Reed, 2007). These countries' higher education structures and academic cultures differ

from those in the United States. Thus, while these studies present a glimpse into the

managerial and academic capitalist behaviors of administrators, the findings may not be

transferable fully to the United States context. These are three limitations of the literature

in which the foundation of this investigation of deans is built.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

Researchers, regardless of whether or not they use qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods approaches, must give attention to three components of a research project. First are the philosophical assumptions that undergird the research—the personal epistemological and ontological perspectives, or worldview, of the researcher (Creswell, 2014). Second is the research design of the investigation, or the approaches to inquiry (Creswell, 2014). Third, researchers must identify and clarify the research methods their investigation will employ (Creswell, 2014). Although there is no singular approach to conduct research, it is best practice for the researcher to ensure that these three elements are compatible with one another. This chapter addresses these three interconnected components and explains the ways in which these components work together to form a logical and comprehensive investigation.

Ontological and Epistemological Orientation

A worldview is a "basic set of beliefs that guide action" (Guba, 1990, p. 17). In my research, I use an interpretive approach and I subscribe to the constructivist and social constructionist paradigm. Constructivism and constructionism are used interchangeably with frequency; they are closely related, yet, there are distinctions (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014). Constructionism is tied to ontology, or the nature of reality, and relates to the ways in which meaning is derived from social interaction (Crotty, 1998; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014; Pascale, 2011); whereas, constructivism is "more closely associated with epistemology, the nature of knowledge, and how individuals learn and

make meaning linking new knowledge to existing understanding" (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014, p. 17). Constructionism "posits that knowledge and meaning are always partial, conditional, perspectival—therefore, there is no possibility of timeless and universal knowledge" (Pascale, 2011, p. 50). In the constructionist paradigm, meaning is not created but constructed (Crotty, 1998). Construction of reality occurs within a social context as a result of interaction between individuals with one another and their world (Crotty, 1998).

Interpretivists are social constructionists who assume knowledge and meaning making are "produced through meaningful interpretations" (Pascale, 2011, p. 22). The purpose of interpretive research from a constructivist and constructionist paradigm is to make meaning and gain a deeper understanding of hidden aspects of a phenomenon (Crotty, 1998) and to examine what is taken for granted (Burr, 2003) rather than identify facts (Pascale, 2011). Constructivist researchers "position themselves in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their personal, cultural, and historical experiences" (Creswell, 2014, p. 8). I acknowledge the ways in which my presence during data collection shapes and influences the construction of participants' stories, responses, and construction of their own meaning. I recognize my role as interpreter of participant meanings. I account for my own perceptions and experiences in the interpretation of meaning. I seek to gain a deeper understanding of phenomenon and reject all notions of an identifiable, objective Truth. Rather, I seek out truths in the socially constructed, subjective sense.

Research Design: Approach to Inquiry

Hermeneutic Phenomenology

This qualitative field investigation adopts a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to inquiry, and focuses on the lived experiences (van Manen, 1990) of academic deans in a neoliberal environment at public research universities in California. Phenomenological approaches are used in order to capture the essence of participants' perceptions and experiences (Creswell, 2013; Degand, 2015). The primary purpose of phenomenological research is to capture a shared common nature, or universal essence, of the phenomenon in question (Creswell, 2013). The phenomena under examination in this qualitative field investigation are the experiences and the value enactment and corresponding identity construction of academic deans in neoliberal research universities in California. The phenomenological approach locates the essence of the phenomenon through close examination of the "what" and "how" of participants' lived experiences (Moustakas, 1994). This approach centers on what deans experience in a neoliberal university and how they respond to and interact with neoliberalism. As well, this identification explains what values and behaviors academic deans at neoliberal research universities enact and how they reconcile incompatible values through the maintenance of their self-ascribed professional identity.

Phenomenological research is deeply rooted in philosophical origins about being and knowing (Creswell, 2013). There are two traditional approaches to phenomenological research. The first approach requires that the researcher "bracket" herself or himself out of the study (Creswell, 2013). The intent of the bracketing process is to limit the

influence of the researcher and their interpretations of the investigation (Husserl, 1970; 1980). To achieve bracketing, the researcher must identify personal experiences with the phenomenon and set them aside for the purposes of investigation into the participants' perceptions and experiences (Creswell, 2013). Phenomenology *a lá* Husserl (1970, 1980) asks the researcher to suspend all pre-conceived judgments and perceptions about a phenomenon until the phenomenon can be "founded on a more certain basis" (Creswell, 2013, p. 77). Suspension of judgment in phenomenological research is referred to as "epoché" (Husserl, 1970, 1980). In contrast, hermeneutic phenomenology embraces and acknowledges the role of the researcher as interpreter of participant portrayals of their experiences (Heidegger, 1962; Laverty, 2003; Lichtman, 2013).

From a philosophical perspective, my own epistemological and ontological views align with the hermeneutic phenomenology defined by Heidegger (1962) and developed into a research method by van Manen (1990). As a researcher, I struggle to accept the idea that it is feasible to bracket myself and my experiences from the research fully. As a qualitative researcher and a social constructivist, I assume that knowledge is co-constructed and that the researcher has influence over both the framing of the research problem, the execution of the data collection, and the analysis. I play a major role in the creation of the narrative content I analyze (Riessman, 2008). As someone who accepts the notion of implicit, or latent, bias as inevitable, there is no way for me to bracket my experiences fully and see the data through the participants' perspectives alone.

However, "epoché," or the suspension of judgment (Creswell, 2013), is a reasonable and worthwhile activity to attempt, albeit with limitations, in

phenomenological research, as it increases the reliability and trustworthiness of findings. This investigation intended to explain from the researcher's scholarly perspective the lived experiences of academics deans in their administrative role. I embrace my role as interpreter of the data. I recognize my inability to bracket myself out from the research entirely. Nevertheless, I incorporate efforts to bracket, in what practical ways that I am able, pre-conceived knowledge gained from my own professional experience working as an Executive Assistant to four deans, as well as my knowledge of the scholarly literature on which the foundation of this investigation is built. Although the literature suggests that neoliberalism is embedded in academe (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015), I searched out evidence of neoliberalism and identified and accepted counter-evidence when contradictory findings presented in the data. As such, although I subscribe to a hermeneutic phenomenological approach, in the analysis of findings, I was careful not to assume or pre-suppose judgments about the phenomena. Yet, my presuppositions were inevitable; and, thus, after setting them aside in my search for evidence within the data, I returned to acknowledge and analyze the ways in which the data either reflected or rejected my own pre-conceptions.

Research Methods

Research Questions

This qualitative, hermeneutic phenomenological field investigation seeks to answer the following overarching research questions and subquestions:

1. To what extent and in what ways do academic deans at research universities adopt neoliberal values and enact neoliberal behaviors?

67

2. What tensions, if any, exist between traditional academic values and neoliberal values in the work of academic deans at the University of California?

   a. In what ways do academic deans replace, blend, or segregate (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012) traditional academic values and neoliberal values?

   b. What role does deans' professional identity play in the negotiation of academic values and neoliberal values?

Data Collection

There is no standard method for conducting phenomenological research; however, the literature suggests that the method should be dictated by the phenomena in question (Hycner, 1999). This investigation uses semi-structured interviews (Burgess, 2002; Seidman, 2012) as the primary source of data analysis. This data collection method was used to explain the behaviors and perspectives of academic deans and the "lived experience" of deans in a neoliberal environment.

Phenomenologists seek to understand the "social and psychological phenomena from the perspectives of people involved" (Welman & Kruger, 1999, p. 189). Thus, phenomenological research gathers data from a group of individuals who share a common experience of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Champions of the phenomenological approach suggest that phenomenological research should rely on multiple, in-depth interviews with a recommended 5 to 25 participants who experience the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Polkinghorne, 1989). In accordance with phenomenological tradition, this investigation relied on 38 semi-structured

interviews (Burgess, 2002; Seidman, 2013) with 20 academic deans at four University of California (UC) campuses.

I used purposeful sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) to select academic deans (Rosser, 2001; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000) who came to their role from faculty positions. To achieve maximum variation (Seidman, 2013), I sought out deans at all stages of their career—deans who had recently assumed their role and deans who had been in their academic position for several years, as well as those who had retired recently or returned to the faculty. Deans were either interim or permanent deans and served in the position for anywhere from a few months to several years. The participants included both male (13) and female (7) deans. I included both male and female participants, as research suggests women may have different approaches than men to cope with and respond to neoliberal tendencies such as new managerialism (Deem, 1998). As well, I wanted to make sure that both men and women were represented in the participant pool. The literature indicates that academic deans are primarily White males (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Hermanson, 1996; Greicar, 2009). Although some under-represented minorities were represented in my participant pool, the majority of the participants were Caucasian. Race was not used as a factor of analysis.

Three contexts influence the academic profession: national setting, academic discipline, and institution type (Clark, 1987). Consequently, I collected data from public research universities in the State of California in order to explore the phenomenon within a U. S. context. I interviewed deans from a variety of disciplines and colleges such as Sciences, Engineering, Humanities, Arts, Education, Business, and Health-related fields.

69

Due to the sample size, study sites, and the need to protect the anonymity of participants, specific disciplinary information is excluded from the findings and is not associated with the participant quotations. However, in order to provide context for the participants and findings, I utilize three classifications: Science, Social Science, and Liberal Arts. Under Science, I include: Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, and Health-related disciplines such as Medicine, Pharmacy, Public and Global Health, and Nursing. The category Social Science encompasses: Social Sciences, Public Policy, Education, and Law. The category of Liberal Arts consists of Arts and Humanities. Additionally, to further ensure anonymity participants were assigned pseudonyms. I use "Dean" coupled with a pseudonym for a last name to identify participants (e. g., Dean Spicer). Although the pseudonyms are gender neutral, participants' genders are identifiable in the findings section through the use of gendered pronouns.

The sites were selected due to three primary factors. First, I had a reasonable expectation that I would be able to negotiate access to these locations (Mason, 2002). Second, these sites were selected because they were likely locations to observe the phenomenon (Schofield, 2002). Research universities are influenced by both economic and commercial values as well as the traditional values of knowledge creation for the public good (Marginson, 2010). Research universities are suitable environments for an examination of academic deans as "manager-academics" (Deem, 2004). Third, research universities in the state of California were selected because the California Master Plan (California State Department of Education, 1960) designates clearly the mission and

purpose of the University of California as "the primary state-supported academic agency for research" (p. 3). The roll of the UC system is to "provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over training for the professions" (p. 2). UC campuses possess the "sole authority in public higher education to award the doctor's degree in all fields of learning" (California State Department of Education, 1960, p. 3) within the California state higher education system. The University of California's ten campuses are public universities with a highest-research activity Carnegie classification. The UC is granted more NSF and NIH funding than any other institution in the country (University of California, 2015). The University of California is ranked regularly among the best research universities globally (Mok, 2014). The UC system represents an ideal model of a research university in the United States.

Interviews allowed me to capture the ways in which academic deans make meaning of their experience (Seidman, 2012). As I discuss later on in this chapter, these deans qualify as "elite" interviewees. I had to account for my subordinate role as a graduate student who interviews established academics and high ranking administrators. In order to address concerns that I had about control and power dynamics inherent in the interview process (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014), I structured the order of my questions with consideration for the level of discomfort likely to arise as a result of the question. In the first interview, I began with less uncomfortable or controversial questions. This allowed me to break the ice, build rapport, and gain trust from my participants. If I saw that a dean reacted to a question with discomfort, I either paused and

waited to see if they answered, reassured them of their anonymity, or suggested we come back to the question at the end of the interview. A researcher's physical presentation and appearance of age and authority (Pascoe, 2007) can influence the dynamic between the researcher and the participant. As well, there is a natural imbalance of power within an interview (Anyan, 2013; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014; Kvale, 2006). Deans qualify as elite interviewees who are accustomed to being in charge (Seidman, 2013). In the first interview, I chose deliberately to adopt a less powerful role (Hoffman, 2007). I presented myself as a naïve graduate student who wanted to learn more about the dean role. I dressed more casually as a student and acted as though I was just there to learn from the participant. I did not discuss my knowledge of deans and their role unless I was asked. Generally, deception in qualitative research is considered unethical (O'Neill, 2008); however, minor deception is harmless and sometimes necessary. Ethical qualitative research should seek not only to do not harm but to do good (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014). This small deception via omission of my own knowledge was not intended to harm or deceive the deans but rather to aid my ability to obtain data and manage my own bias. I did not want to influence information and I wanted to gain the participants' trust by allowing for them to be the expert in the room.

In the second interview, I asked more direct questions. I wanted to appear more assertive and confident. I dressed more professionally in dress pants, dress shirt, and suit jacket. I challenged the deans if the responses had a guarded or disingenuous quality. I invoked examples from my own work environment in an effort to probe into participants' responses and ask questions that could lead to responses they might have been unwilling

to articulate on their own. This covert approach allowed me to overcome instances of "deterrence power" ([Lukes, 1974] as cited in [Anyan, 2013, p. 3]), where the deans were reluctance to share or pivoted in their response to my direct questions.

The first interviews were used to gather the deans' professional backgrounds and career paths starting with their bachelor's degree and leading up to their current appointments as deans. I wanted to know if they had held previous administrative roles in their institution or in other institutions so that I had a context for how they assumed the role of dean. If the information was not offered up in the deans' narratives of their career path, I probed (Creswell, 2014) with questions about their motivation for becoming a dean and whether or not this was a position they had aspired to fill. In order to understand deans' professional identity, I asked the deans how they self-identified and in what ways the term "manager" or "dean" resonated with their own professional identity. As well, I wanted to determine their values and behaviors both prior to and following their initial decanal appointments. I asked the question, "What values and priorities drove your work as a faculty member?" I followed up that question with, "What values and priorities drive your work now as dean?" These questions helped me to identify similarities and differences in the work of faculty and deans and establish the primary tasks and responsibilities of the deans. In addition, I questioned deans about the percentage of time or total hours a week they allocated to administrative tasks, research, and teaching so that I could determine if the majority of their work week was spent on administration and management activities.

In order to understand the tensions and challenges deans confront as they negotiate both neoliberal or managerial and academic values, I asked deans to discuss a scenario in which they experienced a conflict or disagreement that arose with their faculty as a result of a decision they made or an action they took. I also inquired about instances in which deans were required to execute a mandate from their Provost or Executive Vice Chancellor that they either did not agree with entirely or that they viewed as unaligned with their values. I probed their responses to discover the ways in which they relayed these messages and mandates to their faculty and whether or not these were well received. At times, deans were reticent to share these stories with me. In some cases, I did not obtain the information completely to my satisfaction. In several instances, deans were comfortable sharing examples after I reassured them of their anonymity, and, in other cases, deans were forthcoming without my prompting. When I discussed their tensions and conflicts with the faculty, the interview would segue into questions about the autonomy and authority of the dean and their spheres of influence within the organization. I asked the deans question such as "Who has a seat at the table when you make decisions?," "How are faculty involved in decisions about the budget?," "How much autonomy do you have as dean?," and "Who is in charge here?" These questions helped me to understand the role of the dean as a manager and the hierarchical or non-hierarchical structures that existed in their organizational decision making. These questions allowed me to interpret examples of managerial behaviors and values within the greater context of the deans' environment.

In the second interview, I asked deans to reflect on their professional identity and the congruence or incongruence with which that identity aligns with the values and priorities and tasks that, currently, fill their day to day work as deans. This helped me to understand why deans identify with their discipline and their faculty identity even though they spend the majority of their time in administrative functions. I asked more pointed questions that helped me answer my questions about the presence or absence of neoliberal logics and academic logics and the ways in which they manifest in the deans' values, beliefs, and behaviors. I asked questions such as "When you allocate resources, do you think about return on investment?," "If you were given a large amount of money, how would you allocate those funds in your college/division?," "In what ways is the university like a business?," and "What metrics, benchmarks, or performance indicators do you use to make decisions?"

In order to capture the presence of managerial or academic capitalist behaviors, I asked questions such as "Is shared governance a myth or a reality? In what way?," "What is the relationship between academics and non-academics here?," "What stops you from getting what you want as dean?," and "Are you in a position to manage the work of faculty? If so, in what ways?" Finally, I pursued answers to questions that would reveal how deans negotiate neoliberal and academic logics and deal with tensions that arise from conflicting demands. Deans answered questions such as "Could you describe an event or instance in which you felt that the strategy you employed ended up to be inappropriate?," "Could you identify a situation in which you felt least equipped to handle the demands of being a dean? How did you manage that?," "What about your job

keeps you up at night?," "Describe a situation in which you felt your loyalty to your school/college and the central administration was divided," and "Do the structures of the university lead to collaboration or competition? In what ways?" Throughout the interviews, if I did not obtain sufficient information from participants' narratives or answers to my initial questions, I would ask probing follow-up questions such as "Tell me more about that," "How so? In what ways?" and "And what was that like for you?"

During interviews, and in the period directly before and after interviews, I constructed field notes. Field notes included notation of direct quotations during non-recorded interviews, my initial analysis of data, and my reflections and memos on methods and procedures during data collection (Miles et al., 2014). I used these reflections and memos to account for my own reflexivity (Creswell, 2013).

When I developed initial plans for my investigation, I intended to analyze documents, such as email correspondence, meeting agendas and minutes, newsletters, budgets, strategic plans, memos, speeches, policies, and marketing materials (Lichtman, 2013) created by or employed by academic deans. However, during data collection I encountered challenges that prevented me from obtaining the kind of documents that were pertinent to the research question. On rare occasions, I was able to procure documents such as brochures for the college or school, powerpoint presentations given by deans to staff and faculty, and faculty policy manuals. These documents were referenced during interviews, either by myself or by the dean. When documents were referenced, I requested to see them if they were not offered up to me directly by the dean. The documents I obtained were not analyzed as a source of data. That is, I did not perform

document analysis. Rather, documents provided prompts for interview questions and probes and a context for discussions that occurred during the interviews and, subsequently, for the analysis of the interview.

Human Research Review Board Approval and Protection of Human Subjects

Prior to the commencement of participant recruitment, IRB approval was obtained from the Human Research Review Board (HRRB) of the University of California, Riverside (see Appendix). The UCR HRRB approved the investigation with the contingent requirement that I obtain IRB approval from each of the study sites as well before proceeding with data collection. I then completed IRB applications for each campus and waited until approval was received to proceed with data collection (see Appendix). All participants were briefed on the risks and benefits of participation prior to my conducting of the interview. They signed an Informed Consent document that granted their consent to participate in either one or two interviews and were given the choice to allow the researcher to audio-record (Burgess, 2002) one or both interviews. In the event that the interview had to be conducted via telephone, I sent the Informed Consent with a brief explanation of the investigation and requested that the deans return a signed copy to me prior to the scheduled interview. I did not utilize an audio-recorder until permission was given in writing by deans. Prior to pressing record on the device, I notified the deans that audio-recording would begin and reminded them that they could request I turn off the audio-recorder at any time. Additionally, I obtained appropriate consent from the deans who contributed documents that provided context to the interviews, and personal information referenced in documents was redacted when

necessary to protect anonymity (Mason, 2002). Participants were each given an original, faxed, or scanned copy of a fully signed Informed Consent (see Appendix) along with a summary of the research purpose. Before the interview, I explained my interview agenda (Burgess, 2002), and participants were given the opportunity to ask questions about the research purpose and goals. Participants were informed of their ability to revoke consent at their discretion. The researcher maintained a secured copy of the Informed Consent for each participant.

Additionally, each participant was given a pseudonym to protect anonymity (Creswell, 2013; Lichtman, 2013). All data from interviews and document analysis were kept in a secure location. Interview audio-files, transcriptions, field notes, and documents were held in electronic files and organized by date of collection. Personal identifying information was kept in a separate electronic file under password protection.

Participant Recruitment

Recruitment began in May 2016 and was completed in July 2016. The criteria for participation was that the participant must have been a faculty member previously and must currently be a dean, or have recently been a dean within the last five years. I wanted to have as diverse a participant pool as possible that included both men and women and deans from various academic areas including the sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities, business, education, and professional schools. I developed a list of potential research sites in consultation with my dissertation supervisor and other faculty and administrators who have contacts at the potential sites. Out of the 10 University of California campuses, I compiled a list of all school, college, and divisional deans at each

of five selected campuses and collected their name, school/college, email, phone number, and assistant's name via searches of Google and my investigation sites' websites. This information was compiled into a spreadsheet that was used as a contact sheet for recruitment and was also used to keep records of confirmed interview dates, times, and locations. After further consultation with my dissertation supervisor and my employment supervisor, I decided to eliminate one of the five campuses due to both feasibility of access and the professional constraints of my full time employment during data collection.

In the end, I recruited deans at four UC campuses. This decision resulted in a total number of 60 prospective participants. To ensure the alignment of my data collection with my research problem, literature review, and theoretical and conceptual framework, I eliminated deans of Graduate Division and University Extension and Continuing Education. Graduate Division deans were eliminated because (1) I was wanted to focus on deans who were responsible directly to, and worked with, their faculty; and (2) I was interested in deans who were responsible for schools and colleges that related directly to their own discipline. In the case of Graduate Division deans, they do not have a direct faculty body they are responsible for, nor do they work directly in a department, division, school, or college of their specific discipline. I excluded University Extension and Continuing Education Deans because, in the University of California system, University Extension and Continuing Education units are entirely self-supporting, they receive no state funds, and they operate like businesses in order to generate their own revenue and operating budgets. I know this from personal experience working at UCR Extension.

Initially, I intended to use discipline as a factor of analysis; consequently, I eliminated deans of unique schools that were only present at one of the UC campuses in my sample. This was done to ensure anonymity and confidentiality for potential participants. As I neared the end of my data collection period, and as participants voiced their concern continually for their own anonymity and encouraged me to withhold any references to discipline or details that could be pieced together to identify participants, I was prompted to consider the elimination of discipline as a factor of analysis. Nevertheless, I had already achieved saturation in my data and decided not to pursue further data collection of deans from unique schools and colleges that I had previously excluded from the prospective participant list. As a result, this methodological decision further reduced the list of prospective participants. In the end, I attempted to recruit from a pool of 46 deans who met all aspects of my data collection protocol.

I made contact with prospective participants via email (see sample email approved by IRB in Appendix). In the email, I provided a brief explanation of the purpose of the study and requested to schedule two separate 60-90 minute interviews with each of the academic dean participants over a period of time in which their schedule allowed. I sent a second follow-up email two weeks after the original invitation if I did not receive a response from the first email. Deans often responded to confirm their willingness to participate and copied their Executive Assistants to set up a time to conduct the interview. As an Executive Assistant to a Dean, I knew that deans managed their own calendars to a varying degree and that it might be more effective to contact their Executive Assistants. Occasionally, I contacted personal assistants directly prior to

sending the follow up emails to ask if they should be copied on the email and ensure that I had the proper email contact. I only contacted each dean twice for recruitment so as to avoid any perception of pressure to participate. If deans agreed to participate, then further email or phone correspondence ensued. Usually, I was directed to work with their Executive Assistants to select a date, location, and format that worked best for each dean.

I employed several strategies to try to obtain participants. I attempted to use initial interviews with deans as an opportunity to recruit other dean participants (snowball sampling [Bogdan & Biklen, 2011]). However, I was unable to recruit additional participants successfully through this approach as deans were unwilling to suggest their dean colleagues or reach out to them on my behalf to encourage their participation. In the one instance, where a dean did make suggestions for other potential candidates, the prospective deans did not meet criteria for participation. In addition to snowball sampling and selective sampling, I asked a member of my dissertation committee to reach out on my behalf to make an initial contact with potential dean participants. I then followed up with those prospective participants via email. I obtained two dean participants using this method of recruitment. The other 18 participants were obtained through a combination of selective sampling based on criteria and self-selection on the part of deans who agreed to participate. During the earlier phases of my recruitment process, I was concerned that I would not have enough female participants or participants from certain disciplines represented in the sample. In those cases, I used the follow-up email (the second and last recruitment email) to try to convey that their participation would be appreciated as I was seeking out the experiences of "women" or "deans of X discipline." However, I did not

employ that tactic consistently as deans from some disciplines self-selected to participate more than others.

In the end, 20 deans were recruited from four University of California campuses. This number allowed me to meet Polkinghorne's (1995) standard for phenomenological study participant pools. I requested to facilitate two in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each of the 20 academic deans (Isaac, 2007; Seidman, 2012). I conducted a total of 38 interviews (32 face to face and 6 via telephone). All but two of the deans agreed to be interviewed twice and interviews ranged from 30 minutes to two hours, with the majority of interviews lasting approximately one hour. Four deans did not consent to be audio recorded and in those cases extensive notes were taken and verbatim quotations were captured whenever possible. All audio-recorded interviews were transcribed for analysis (Burgess, 2002; Seidman, 2013).

Study Site

The University of California opened in 1869 with only 38 students and 10 faculty members (Regents of the University of California, 2017). The institution has grown dramatically, and now consists of 238,700 students, over 198,300 faculty and staff, and 1.7 million living alumni globally (Regents of the University of California, 2017). These students and faculty are spread out across the entire University of California system. The University of California (UC) system consists of ten campuses located in Berkeley (UCB), Davis (UCD), Irvine (UCI), Los Angeles (UCLA), Merced (UCM), Riverside (UCR), Santa Barbara (UCSB), Santa Cruz (UCSC), San Diego (UCSD), and San Francisco (UCSF). The University of California is well known and ranked highly. Six of

the university's ten campuses are members of the prestigious Association of American Universities and the University of California is considered to be "the best university system in the world" (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 131).

The University's estimated operating revenues for 2016-2017 were $31.5 billion (University of California, 2017). In 2016-2017, the university received $3.13 billion of State General Fund Support, an estimated $1.3 billion in UC General Funds (primarily from Nonresident Supplementary Tuition and indirect cost recovery from federal grants and contracts), and over $3.3 billion in tuition and student fees (University of California, 2017). In the six years following the Great Recession, the University received more that $3.3 billion in project funds from corporations; the majority corporate dollars were from pharmaceutical companies and were allocated for clinical trials (University of California, 2016a). However, corporate funds have also been allocated towards research in a wide range of disciplines including engineering ($404M), physical sciences ($167M), and computer and information systems ($94M), agricultural and natural sciences ($46M), and biological sciences ($44M) receive the largest amount of corporate funding (University of California, 2016a). A smaller, but nevertheless significant amount is allocated to psychology ($18M), arts, humanities, and math ($16M), public health ($10M), and home economics ($10M) [University of California, 2016a]. In the 2015-2016 fiscal year, the University received $3.3 billion from federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) [University of California, 2016b). Nearly $2.7 billion in research dollars has also been provided by state government

agencies (University of California, 2016c). The University has contributed $46.3 billion

to the California economy (Regents of the University of California, 2017).

The University of California system shares a distinct set of values and culture

(Marginson, 2016). In 1998, University of California President, Richard C. Atkinson,

gave a speech at a UC Regent's Dinner in which he explained the three traditions that

made the University of California a "distinguished institution" (Atkinson, 1998, p. 64).

The President described free speech, shared governance, and academic excellence as the

three traditions that form "the bedrock on which the University of California is built"

(Atkinson, 1998, p. 66). The UC system is argued to have "the most powerful academic

senate of any university in the country" (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 136). As a result of strong

shared governance, a ladder system where faculty are ranked, and regular performance

reviews for all faculty, the UC is known for its culture of discipline and high academic

standards (Gonzalez, 2011). As a result of legislation, the culture of excellence extends

beyond the academy and is structurally embedded within the composition of the student

population. The 1960 Campus Master Plan established requirements for a selective

admissions policy that reserved an admissions spot at the University of California for the

the top 12.5% of California, high school graduates (California State Department of

Education, 1960; Gonzalez, 2011). Furthermore, the University of California is viewed as

a model for research universities internationally, subject to and influencer of both

globalization and neoliberal practices (Marginson, 2016). The University of California

campuses were selected as a site for this investigation because of their high research

productivity, their role as a major contributor to the state economy and workforce

development, and their value of shared governance and excellence. The characteristics of this institution make it and its campuses suitable sites for an investigation on deans' participation, perpetuation, and resistance to the neoliberal regime.

<div align="center">

Data Analysis Methods

</div>

Generally, qualitative data analysis involves organizing, reflecting, coding, and categorizing data into meaningful categories, and developing concepts from categories to shape the argument (Lichtman, 2013). In phenomenological research, data analysis is approached systematically (Creswell, 2013). Initially, the researcher locates "narrow units of analysis" (p. 79), such as significant statements, that can be clustered into broader, meaningful units of analysis in order to answer the question of "what" and "how" the individual experiences a phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). In order to capture the essence of the phenomenon in greater depth, I utilized two primary forms of data analysis that align methodologically with phenomenological research designs: directed content analysis (Creswell, 2013; Lichtman, 2013) and narrative analysis (Bochner & Riggs, 2014; Polkinghorne, 1995; Riessman, 2008).

Content Analysis

Content analysis was carried out for all interviews (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis consists of "making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). The steps of content analysis include a cyclical process of unitizing data into segments of analysis, sampling, coding, data reduction, inferring phenomenon using analytical constructs, and generating answers to research questions (Krippendorff, 2004). With this cyclical process

in mind, I coded and analyzed during and after the interviews (Lichtman, 2013) and continued this process throughout analysis and writing.

I generated descriptive, topical, and analytical codes (Richards, 2009). This process allowed me to examine "linguistically constructed facts" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 75) about personal characteristics, relationships, and behaviors (Krippendorff, 2004), and to bracket, or suspend, my pre-conceived judgments about the presence of neoliberalism in research universities. I used content analysis in an effort to identify substantial evidence in the data of the neoliberal regime and neoliberal ideologies.

I used directed content analysis (Hseih & Shannon, 2005) and searched for patterns in the codes that reflected components of my theoretical frameworks and conceptual frameworks: institutional theory, neoliberalism, and academic values. I employed deductive reasoning and used concepts derived from institutional theory, such as institutional logics (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Thornton et al., 2012), as an analytical tool to highlight themes in the data: such as neoliberal and academic values and the ways in which deans resolved tensions between these different values through replacement, segregation, or blending. Other codes from institutional theory included legitimacy, institutional norms, and external influence (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1978; Scott, 1987, 2004).

In order to identify the presence of neoliberalism, academic capitalism, and new managerial tendencies in the data, I searched for examples of efficiency, revenue generation, entrepreneurship, growth (Clark, 2001; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), auditing, reporting, and performance (Deem, 2004). I coded and categorized (Miles et al., 2014)

for neoliberal values and logics: managerialism (M), prestige (PR), individualism (I), performativity (PF), measurable outcomes (MO), reporting (R), and selectivity (S) in student admissions, tenure, evaluation, and merit and promotion. As well, I coded and categorized academic logics, or university logics: pursuit of discovery (PD), dissemination of knowledge (DK), faculty autonomy (A), academic freedom (AF), academic excellence (AE), and shared governance (SG) (Levin, 2017; Scott, 2006). The theoretical and conceptual based coding process helped to identify the presence of these different sets of logics in the narratives. However, I remained open to the possibility of coding patterns and categories that existed outside of these theoretical frameworks and concepts.

I generated meaning by identifying patterns, clustering, making metaphors, comparing and contrasting, identifying outliers, and partitioning variables (Miles et al., 2014). I created charts to organize and identify relationships between categories and codes (Miles et al., 2014). Data that were not categorized easily into codes were excluded unless I identified patterns that necessitated a new category (Richards, 2009). For example, the theme of identity was one unexpected pattern that I found in the data. Although I did not commence this investigation with identity theory in mind, the data directed my interpretation organically towards this theme. When variables seemed to be related but the relationship was unclear, I relied on theory to locate intervening variables (Miles et al., 2014). I was also careful to look for rival explanations and consider the data holistically rather than rely on extreme cases (Miles et al., 2014).

Narrative Analysis

In conjunction with the directed content analysis coding process, I used narrative analysis to explore the ways deans expressed and prioritized neoliberal and academic values as well as how deans negotiated perceived tensions between value sets by blending, segregating, or replacing one set of values with the other. Narrative analysis can be utilized to answer questions in regards to "how stories shape and can reshape a person's identity" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 202). Narrative analysis provided insight into the professed and contested identities of academic deans. The narratives of the academic deans are not used to test or verify identity theory, but instead my intent was to link the theory to narratives (Bochner & Riggs, 2014; Frank, 2004) in order to understand the construction, ambiguities, and contradictions inherent in deans' stories about their values and professional identities. Narrative analysis allowed me to "understand how personal identity is made in everyday, mundane interaction" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 210). In order to witness this identity development, I paid careful attention to the deans' narratives. This approach granted me access to deans' identities, cultures, and social worlds and the systems of meaning they apply within their self-narratives (Bochner & Riggs, 2014; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zibler, 1998).

I conducted a narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008) of interviews, or what Polkinghorne (1995) refers to as "analysis of narrative" and Bochner and Riggs (2014) refer to as a "narratives-under-analysis," with the goal to analyze the narratives of the participants as the unit of analysis in contrast to the creation of a narrative product. Investigations that use analysis of narrative "treat stories as 'data' and use 'analysis' to

88

arrive at themes that hold across stories" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 204). With "narratives-under-analysis," the stories are "subjected first to interpretive practices of transcription, then to further interpretive practices of one form or another aimed at grounded clarification of the meaning of texts and their interactive production" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 210). This approach allowed me to analyze the narratives of academic deans and interpret the meanings embedded within the interviews in order to explain their experiences. In line with Suddaby's (2010) call for applications of institutional theory that focus on the categories, language, work, and aesthetics, I paid special attention to the language deans' use in their narration, the descriptions of their work behaviors, and the ways in which they justify or explain behaviors and values that contradict or align with the academic or neoliberal logics.

I employed three approaches to the analysis of narrative: I conducted a thematic analysis (what was said), a structural analysis (how it was said), and the dialogic/performance analysis (how the conversation evolved between the participants and researcher) [Bochner & Riggs, 2014]. My approach compiled particulars from each case to produce larger mosaic of general knowledge about the "predetermined foci" (Kim, 2016, p. 196) of my investigation: the enacted and espoused identities, logics, behaviors, and values of academic deans. In this way, the data analysis took an inductive approach.

Narratives-under-analysis is a paradigmatic approach to the analysis of data in which the researcher examines participants' stories and artifacts for similar threads and patterns (Kim, 2016). With this approach in mind, I downplayed the unique

characteristics of each story in search for commonalities across all interviews. I identified

themes in stories within the interview transcripts (Saldaña, 2014) based upon my

analytical framework. This approach to narrative analysis is compatible with the

hermeneutic phenomenological research design as it uses patterns in the data to derive

general findings about the phenomenon in question. Direct quotations from participants

are ideal examples of larger patterns and themes across the data set and are included in

order to enhance the credibility of findings. Nevertheless, outliers and counter-examples

were identified during data analysis and are discussed in order to ensure trustworthiness

of findings (Creswell, 2013).

Identity theory provided an analytical framework for understanding and

explaining the patterns I saw in deans' self-identification as faculty, despite their roles

and behaviors that aligned with an administrative identity. I relied primarily on Burke and

Stets' (2009) conception of identity theory which utilizes a symbolic interactionism

perspective and roots notions of identity in individuals' meanings and perceptions of

roles they adopt within a social structure. Identity manifests both consciously and

unconsciously (Burke & Stets, 2009). Individuals possess more than one identity as a

result of the varying roles, groups, and personal traits they embody (Burke & Stets,

2009). Individuals may claim multiple role identities, and those role identities may be

hierarchical—with some role identities expressed more so than others (McCall &

Simmons, 1978). Determinants of the hierarchical order of multiple role identities include

how committed the individual is to the role, how much support the individual receives

from the role by others, and what intrinsic and extrinsic rewards an individual receives

for the role identity (Burke & Stets, 2009). However, these three elements do not equate automatically to the adoption of the identity with the highest prominence. Indeed, at times the less prominent identity is adopted because it holds more salience within a specific situation (Burke & Stets, 2009). Individuals adopt the identity that is most salient, or valued and appropriate, within the situation. That is, each situation has varying degrees of reward and cost, and individuals adopt the identity that is the most "profitable" from their perspective within a specific context (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 42).

Identities reflect behaviors and behaviors reflect identities (Burke & Stets, 2009). Individuals act in accordance with notions of who they think they are in order to verify their identity (Burke & Stets, 2009); that is, guided by meaning, they choose behaviors that confirm their identity and they engage in self-verification activities by dressing and speaking the part (Burke & Stets, 2009). Furthermore, the identity with the most salience will inform and influence the behavior choice (Stryker, 1980 [2002]). Identity theory posits that individuals act in a manner that helps them achieve their goals and work to alter their environment and themselves in an effort to reach their aspirations (Mead, 1934). Yet, the meanings and symbolic value of the behavior is more relevant than the behavior itself (Burke & Stets, 2009).

Individuals are highly motivated to verify their identity and achieve their identity standard (Burke & Stets, 2009). Attempts by others to disrupt an individual's self-verification may lead to stress and upset for the individual in need of self-verification (Burke & Stets, 2009; Swann, 1983). There are occasions in which an individual may encounter interference in the maintenance of one identity as a result of the maintenance

of another conflicting identity—this results in role conflict (Burke & Stets, 2009). Although a person may have multiple identities, these may not all be activated simultaneously (Burke & Stets, 2009).

There are three different types of identities: role identity, social identity, and person identities. Role identity is defined by "the meanings people attribute to themselves while in various roles" or positions they hold (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 112). Social identities are determined by an individual's membership in certain groups; and, person identity is associated with the characteristics that make an individual unique compared to others (Burke & Stets, 2009).

An individual's role identities determine the expectations for behavior of that individual within their social position. For example, a professor at a research university is a role with expectations to participate in research, teaching, and service. When the meanings of a role identity are not shared with others who fill the same role, individuals must negotiate and compromise with others who share the role but interpret the meanings and associated behaviors differently (McCall & Simmons, 1978). Identity theory suggests that for every identity there is a counter identity and each of these identities and counter identities possess corresponding goals and behaviors (Burke & Stets, 2009). The interaction of role identities and counter identities requires the negotiation of meanings and behaviors (McCall & Simmons, 1978).

Social identities correspond with membership in a social group (Burke & Stets, 2009; Hogg & Abrams, 1988). A social group is a group of individuals who identify as members of the same category (Burke & Stets, 2009). Those who are similar are

considered members of the in-group and those who differ are considered members of the outgroup (Burke & Stets, 2009). Social identity is maintained through allegiance to behaviors, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes that correspond to the prototype of the in-group (Burke & Stets, 2009; Hogg, 2006). The adoption of a social identity reinforces the self and counteracts feelings of uncertainty (Burke & Stets, 2009). Although there are distinctions between role identity and social identity, these two types of identity may overlap. For example, a person may be a faculty member (as their professional role in an organization) but they may also be a member of the faculty body (a social group with a distinct in-group and corresponding set of accepted behaviors and attributes) [Burke & Stets, 2009].

Finally, a person identity is linked to the characteristics one uses to define oneself as an individual irrespective of role or social identity. The person identity is the principal identity and is activated the most frequently because it is superior hierarchically to other identities and the identity with the most salience in all contexts (Burke, 2004). For example, a person may be compassionate and friendly regardless of their role or social group.

These three types of identities may be activated separately or simultaneously (Burke & Stets, 2009). If more than one identity is activated at the same time, identity theory posits that the more salient and prominent identity will be expressed more than the other(s) [Burke & Stets, 2009]. A person may be member of a single group and hold multiple role identities, or a person may be a member of multiple groups and hold a single identity, or may possess different identities in two groups that intersect (Burke &

Stets, 2009). Identity theory suggests that when multiple identities are activated simultaneously over time they will develop equally high salience and that the meanings of their identities will begin to overlap; however, this may depend on the compatibility and capability of the activation of both identities simultaneously (Burke & Stets, 2009).

Identity theory allows me to explain deans' adherence to their academic identity, their social identity, in preference to their dean identity, and their role identity. As well, I use the notion of salience to understand deans' responses to questions about professional identity in various contexts. In conjunction with institutional theory and the concept of institutional logics, identity theory provides a compatible framework for the understanding of how the interplay of multiple identities might, on the individual rather than institutional level, explain both how and why deans blend neoliberal and academic logics—as an inadvertent cognitive strategy for the reconciliation of potential dissonance and conflict between what they do as deans and who they identify as professionally. Finally, identity theory is a tool to support my interpretation that professional and social identity may be dominant over both role identity and new institutional logics as a source, or catalyst, for organizational members' behaviors. That is, deans' academic identity (their social identity) works to counteract the replacement of academic values with neoliberal values in a highly marketized, competitive, and resource constrained environment.

Trustworthiness

This investigation seeks to capture the lived experiences of academic deans in a neoliberal environment; thus, it is appropriate to capture the deans' meanings.

Nevertheless, I did not engage in member checking of transcriptions, data analysis, or findings (Miles et al., 2014; Richards, 2009). This form of member checking was excluded intentionally as it had the potential to compromise the data if participants asked to edit out sections of contentious or valuable data. However, in order to ensure the trustworthiness of data, I clarified members' meanings by asking the deans to verify the intent of their statements during interviews. In order to accomplish this, I rephrased the participants' words back to them and asked for clarification if my understanding was not clear (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014). Periodically, I also used metaphors to capture participants' meanings. I expressed a metaphor in comparison to something a participant said, and the participant would verify or reject the applicability of the metaphor to their meaning. As well, I checked deans' statements with other dean participants. For example, after deans repeatedly identified themselves as faculty first and foremost, I used the follow up interviews with deans to question the deans about this prominent pattern in their self-ascribed professional identity. I asked each dean to respond to my finding, and this member check allowed me to verify analysis as well as provide potential explanations for the findings. In some cases, it also prompted deans who had previously identified as faculty to clarify why or to elaborate on what it meant to be a faculty member or a dean.

To ensure trustworthiness of findings, I used several validation strategies (Creswell, 2013). My dissertation supervisor listened to several of my interview recordings and read transcripts and acted as a peer reviewer, or debriefer, my research (Creswell, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As a peer reviewer, my supervisor asked me

difficult questions about my methods, provided support and guidance on my data collection and analysis, and responded to me whenever I encountered challenges in the data collection process (Creswell, 2013).

In addition to a modified form of member-checking and peer review, I also kept reflexive notes and memos throughout data collection in two journals (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The process of writing reflexive notes helped me to self-identify any potential bias as a researcher (Creswell, 2013). This process aided me in checking my own preconceived notions about the phenomenon. It was also necessary to the legitimacy of this investigation that I pursued reflexivity and disclosed my positionality and any bias that might influence my interpretation of the data to the reader (Lichtman, 2013; Merriam, 1988).

From time to time, the interviewee appeared agitated or critical or unfriendly and I experienced discomfort during or immediately following the interview. I was cognizant and reflective on the way the interview made me feel. I noted these instances in my reflexive journal entries after each interview to maintain a record of the interviewees' emotional state as well as my own emotional state. In order to minimize any bias these negative encounters may have produced, I coded and analyzed these interviews last. In Chapter 5, I address some of these negative encounters and discuss some participants' agitation and emotional state of being in the interview and the implications for the findings of this investigation. I suggest that interviewees' defensive behaviors during the interview may stem from both a reaction to the power dynamics of being interviewed by

a graduate student who is not their peer and a natural tendency of individuals to counteract feelings of vulnerability when they feel exposed.

Positionality of the Researcher

In the past nine years, I have worked in higher education administration at two research universities. In the first two years of my professional career at the University of Utah Office of Sustainability, I worked with both administrators and academic managers at all levels of the university to implement policies and educational programs aimed at creating a more sustainable and carbon neutral campus. Over the last seven years, I have served as the Executive Assistant to four different deans in the Graduate School of Education and University Extension departments.

University Extension operates in accord with neoliberal goals and principles due to the nature of our department's budget structure. University Extension is self-supporting and does not receive any state funds. University Extension offers academic programs but the department functions as a business. As a result of membership in a self-supported academic unit, I am required to think innovatively in order to generate revenue and to implement policies and procedures that are focused on efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability to our customers. As Director of Academic Services, it is my job to manage a unit that coordinates the Academic Senate approval process for all courses, certificates, and instructors. My unit is the "quality control" arm of University Extension and we ensure that Extension delivers academic programs that meet the University of California's standards for academic quality and rigor. I manage the instructor review process for hiring, the course evaluation process, instructor orientation, and instructor

professional development days. In addition, I am under increased pressure to implement programs and establish and track metrics for the measurement of student learning outcomes in our unit.

This work environment shapes my perceptions of the role of higher education in the community and in the larger context of society. My values as a researcher and a graduate student are at odds with the requirements of my professional role. On one hand, I value learning for the sake of learning and I support academic freedom for instructors. On the other hand, I am a mid-level manager in a university department that views, unapologetically, students as both "customers" and sources of revenue. I work in a department with the mission to provide practical jobs skills for the marketplace and workforce development. I am responsible for the reinforcement of standards for instructors. I design and maintain the syllabus template that instructors in my unit are required to utilize for their courses. I sit on a committee that reviews courses, assesses the effectiveness of online course instruction, and tracks daily and weekly online instructor engagement with students. For all instructors and courses in our unit, I evaluate whether or not the course workload is sufficient for the courses credits and credit hours, and I verify that the class has clear learning objectives and uses up-to-date course materials. The instructors at Extension are granted limited freedom. They are contract employees that may be eliminated at will. The content of the course is the property of University Extension, not the instructor. Additionally, as a Director of a non-revenue generating service unit, I am responsible for meeting the needs of Extension's academic units as efficiently and effectively as possible with a limited budget that is subjected to cuts as a

result of larger socio-economic and political activities. Thus, my personal values and my academic values are misaligned with my professional obligations and work environment.

My experience as an Executive Assistant to the Dean provides me with an inside look into the daily function of a dean's role within the department as well as within the larger context of the university and the community. Generally, I positioned myself as a naïve graduate student in the presence of my interviewees, and portrayed myself as someone who sought to learn more about the role of the dean and the challenges they faced in their work. In actuality, I was much more knowledgeable about my participants' daily work than I revealed. I often took on this naïve identity when I conducted an interview with a dean for the first time. As I proceeded further into data collection, I took a more assertive, knowledgeable approach in my conversations with participants and invoked my role as an Executive Assistant in a Dean's Office periodically in order to build rapport, question details about their story, or probe for further information. Although this could be perceived as a threat to the credibility of my findings, more often than not, I assumed that notifying the participant of my position could lead to a more frank discussion and to unprotected and credible answers to questions.

It was important throughout my research investigation that I acknowledge my positionality, maintain reflexivity, and self-reflect in order to sort through any biases that could be construed as an influence on the data and its analysis. I maintained a section in my field notes dedicated to self-reflections on my role as researcher. Despite the potential risks to the data associated with my role as an "insider," my position as an employee of a research university as Director of Academic Services and Executive

Assistant to the Dean also served as an asset to my investigation. There were several

benefits that my positionality granted me: (a) I had extensive knowledge of deans'

experiences and the daily work and life of deans; (b) I had access to deans at the

University of California (UC) campuses; and, (c) I had substantial knowledge of the

University of California system and UC institutions. My experience as a practitioner

within the administrative world benefitted me as I engaged in conversations with deans

and aided establishment of rapport with the participants. Indeed, without my professional

role, I may not have been able to access to the participants for my investigation.

Limitations

There are limitations in the data that warrant identification. Critics of the post-

positivist persuasion are likely to view this investigation's lack of triangulation and

member-checks of transcriptions and data analysis (Miles et al., 2014) as a limitation and

methodological weakness. Triangulation and direct member-checks were excluded

intentionally from the research design for three reasons. First, triangulation of data

collection method is not a methodological requirement of narrative research (Creswell,

2013). Instead, a phenomenological study that uses narrative analysis relies primarily on

the narratives and lived experience of the participants. Trust in the data is placed on the

participants themselves in their portrayal of the lived experience. The researcher's

function is to provide an in-depth description of the phenomenon and to arrive at the

heart, or the essence, of the phenomenon in question (Creswell, 2013). Second, in

hermeneutic phenomenological research, trust is placed in the researcher's interpretation

of data. Other strategies for validity are used to address credibility and trustworthiness of findings.

Third, deans qualify as elite interviewees. Elite interviewees are accustomed to controlling situations in which they find themselves and may engage in verbal and non-verbal attempts to maintain control of the power dynamics within an interview (Seidman, 2013). Indeed, I encountered several instances in both word and action where deans exerted their power over the interview situation by either ending the interview early or pivoting in response to direct questions (e.g., telling me I was asking the wrong question or questioning why I was asking a question). Elite interviewees are often reluctant to answer questions honestly, and may strive to present themselves in a particular manner (Brooks & Normore, 2015; Harvey, 2011). Deans may put on a performance in interviews and (intentionally or unintentionally) misrepresent themselves or mislead me (Goffman, 1959). The presentation of the self may be "real" or "contrived" (Goffman, 1959, pp. 70-71). A real performance is "not something purposefully put together at all, being an unintentional product of the individual's unself-conscious response to the facts of [his or her] situation" (Goffman, 1959, p. 70). A contrived performance is "painstakingly pasted together, one false item on another" (Goffman, 1959, p. 70).

In this investigation, as a result of the elite status of participants and the potential inclination of such participants to present themselves in a positive light, member-checks have the potential to compromise the data. If given the opportunity to check transcriptions of their interview or researcher analysis, deans may alter or censor the content of the interview and filter out valuable data. Although triangulation is not a

methodological requirement of phenomenological or narrative research, interviews may be problematical in that I, as the researcher, must rely on what the deans are comfortable with telling me. Indeed, the "act of telling is always a performance, a process of interpretation and communication in which the teller and the listener collaborate in sense-making" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 202). It is my responsibility as a researcher to "find the story in the experience" (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 203). As a methodological compromise, and to ensure the clarity in members' explanations during interviews, the researcher regularly rephrases the participants words back to them and asks for clarification when understanding is not clear (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014). I followed this pattern.

When I asked deans questions about their management behaviors, some deans were more likely to guard their answers or present an answer that made them appear more academic and less managerial or administrative. I was concerned at first that the deans' guarded answers would compromise my data and findings. I was worried that this dissertation would become a story about how the deans presented themselves in the interview and less about their neoliberal and managerial behaviors. However, what I found was that many deans were either (1) unapologetic and open about their neoliberal and managerial behaviors or (2) would later reveal their values, beliefs, and behaviors inadvertently as they answered less direct questions even if they skirted more direct questions. In my interviews, I was able use less direct questions to break down the façade presented by deans in answers to more direct questions in order to gain credible answers, those more aligned with theory.

As I conducted my cyclical process of data analysis, I paid close attention to the interview holistically and refrained from drawing conclusions about the findings based on a single comment within an interview (Miles et al., 2014; Seidman, 2013). This approach helped me to ensure that I considered outliers and unusual examples and at the same time did not confuse the dramatic for the pervasive (Seidman, 2013). I gave greater weight (Miles et al., 2014) to admissions of neoliberal and managerial behavior that deans made unintentionally than to comments made in response to more direct, confrontational questions. In order to conduct effective data analysis, I read between the lines, questioned the underlying motives (Douglas, 1976; Miles et al., 2014) of deans, and interpreted their presented behaviors and logics compared to their subconscious, or inadvertent, behaviors and logics.

In the next chapter, I present my findings supported by data from the interviews with 20 academic deans. I organize my findings chapter in line with my research questions. I begin with an explanation of the ways in which academic deans engage in neoliberal behaviors and adopt neoliberal logics. I describe deans' blending of neoliberal and academic logics, and I provide an explanation of the varied degrees to which academic deans adopt a managerial identity. Finally, I address the role that the maintenance of the academic professional identity plays in deans' blending of neoliberal and academic logics.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Academic Deans: Dual Logics and Dual Identities

This chapter addresses the findings of my investigation, and is divided into three sections. In the first section, I begin with evidence from the data of the neoliberal environment in which academic deans at the University of California conduct their day to day work. I explain deans' attitude of acceptance about their neoliberal work context and their responses to a condition that they perceive to be outside the realm of their control. This first section acts as a foundation on which to build my argument about the complex behaviors and logics adopted by academic deans in the University of California system. In the second section, I answer the research question: To what extent and in what ways have academic deans at the University of California adopted neoliberal values? I explain the neoliberal logics and behaviors that manifest in the rhetoric of the academic deans. Neoliberal logics are evident through the overt, and sometimes subtle, ways in which the deans express values and engage in behaviors focused on performativity, the marketization of their campuses, colleges, and divisions, comfort with the exploitation of graduate student labor, the valuation of faculty as assets, the view of students as customers and products, and competition and prestige-seeking both internally within the University of California and externally with other institutions of higher education. Neoliberal logics manifest in two additional forms: first, in the form of managerialism—through deans' participation in auditing, a fixation on efficiency, effectiveness, and outcomes, surveillance of faculty work, and compliance with the whims of central,

executive administration (e.g. Provosts, Vice Chancellors, and Chancellors). Second, neoliberal logics are present through deans' academic capitalist behaviors such as deans' participation in and advocacy of faculty participation in activities such as technology transfer, corporate partnerships, revenue generation, fundraising, and grant-seeking.

Simultaneously, in conjunction with evidence from the data of deans' neoliberal behaviors, I argue that academic deans express academic and university behaviors and logics. Deans respect shared governance and faculty autonomy, value knowledge production, collegiality, and trust, and they advocate for equity and access in knowledge dissemination with the perception that higher education is a public good that serves a social cause.

In the second section, I answer the second and third research questions: What tensions, if any, exist between traditional academic values and neoliberal values, and how do they manifest in the work of academic deans at the University of California? In what ways do academic deans replace, blend, or segregate (Thornton et al., 2012) traditional academic values and neoliberal values? I explain the ways in which deans blend or segregate neoliberal logics and academic logics. In spite of the literature that suggests that these two sets of logics are divergent and irreconcilable, deans conceptualize neoliberal and academic logics as compatible and justify and reconcile the implementation of neoliberal activities as a mechanism for the pursuit of academic activities.

In the third section of this chapter, I answer my fourth and final research question and address the relationship between the negotiation of values and logics with academic

deans' professional identity within the neoliberal university. I introduce the connection between professional identity and enacted logics and behaviors of an academic dean. I explain a phenomenon endemic in the data: deans' self-identification and maintenance of an academic identity. I describe how an academic identity is maintained through the development of what I call "the academic aesthetic," or the portrayal and presentation of the self as an academic.

After I discuss the mechanism for the maintenance of an academic identity (the how), I turn to address the rationale for the preservation of an academic identity (the why). In addition to the temporal nature of the dean's role, there are three other primary explanations for the maintenance of an academic identity. First, deans self-identify as academics, faculty, and with discipline based identities (e. g., anthropologist, chemist, economist) because the academic identity, and its corresponding activities, has professional capital in the academy. That is, in the research university, amongst their faculty colleagues, deans place a value on activities such as research, teaching, intellectual contributions, speaking engagements, publications, and grants. These academic activities are the coin of the realm in the academy, whereas administrative status, hierarchy, power, and management activities have minimal value in the academy and do not lead to the development of professional capital in academe. Although some deans express a sense of pride in their work as deans, according to most deans in this investigation, the tasks and responsibilities of the dean are seen by those in the academy as less important and less valuable to the organization than the faculty contribution.

The second explanation for the maintenance of an academic identity is that self-allegiance to an academic identity allows the dean to cope with their own cognitive dissonance and stress induced as a result of conscious (recognized) or subconscious (denied) internal, psychological tensions. These tensions stem from the incompatibility of the values and behaviors deans are socialized to adopt as faculty and the role, values, and behaviors deans are required to enact as administrators and members of the "dark side" within a neoliberal environment. Furthermore, an academic identity allows them to distance themselves from activities perceived of as managerial and to skirt responsibility and blame for actions seen by faculty as unfavorable. They are then able to redirect the origin of neoliberal behaviors to either their chairs or central, executive administration.

The third reason for deans' maintenance and self-identification as academics is managerial subterfuge. That is, faculty are notoriously unmanageable, and they are irreverent to authority. The deans maintain an academic identity through an "academic aesthetic," or the appearance of normative faculty behaviors. This strategy allows deans to occupy faculty spaces, influence outcomes, and assert their own decisions, goals, and vision without the perception from faculty that they have overstepped their bounds or threatened shared governance.

Evidence of the Neoliberal State in Higher Education

Although the existing literature provides evidence that neoliberalism has infiltrated higher education in the form of academic capitalism and managerialism, I did not want to assume that the neoliberal context was applicable to the deans' work environment. I was careful not to impose a framework on my participants and wanted to

107

find evidence in the data that pointed to the existence of a neoliberal context. Deans described their environment throughout the course of interviews. Although the deans described the current state of affairs in higher education as one with characteristics indicative of the neoliberal regime, it was rare for deans to invoke the terms neoliberal and neoliberalism overtly in interviews. One exception was Dean Quinn (Liberal Arts) who described the University of California system, "We are the neoliberal institution." Deans accepted their neoliberal work environment as part of a larger economic and socio-political context. They attributed the circumstances of their work context to external factors such as national and local trends in state reduction of budget allocations to higher education. They described a state of higher education where their institution and other institutions were starved of resources, engaged in high intensity competition, and accountable to the general public. With nostalgia, they referenced former eras where their university system was allocated sufficient public funding to execute the mission, and they lamented the status quo they now faced with diminished public support for higher education and decreased state investment. Although they lamented the reduction in state issued resources, they accepted their circumstances as an unalterable fact and context in which they must direct and manage their schools and colleges. The sentiment from the deans was that the privatization of the university as a result of state divestment was widely known and factual. Deans accepted this condition as normal for contemporary public universities both inside and outside the state of California. These deans described the infiltration of neoliberalism and the privatization of this historically public good.

> We receive now just over 8% of our budget from the state. We are one step away from being private universities, and anybody who's going to complain that Jerry

Brown isn't providing for us, or, you know, that the system just isn't supporting us properly, [as] we are a public university, just completely misunderstands the real world. (Dean Lapine, Liberal Arts)

I think we've reached a point in California, at least, where the historic commitment to the University of California is pretty much dead. I don't know if it can be revitalized. The notion that the University of California is a state-sponsored private university is getting pretty close to being real. (Dean Berkshire, Social Sciences)

We don't have enough resources from the legislature, from the governor, that we need to run the world class university [this campus] is… What the legislature invested in the University of California 50 years ago is a fraction in real dollars of what it invests today. There has been divestment of funding from the public sector. The reality is that it is like the law of gravity. That's like the second law of thermodynamics; it's the way the world is now… Faculty live in a world where they think that Jerry Brown writes a check for a billion dollars and sends it and it's done. That's not the reality. We're getting cents to the dollar from Sacramento. So, I think that the University of California is being transformed. That's the way it used to be. When Pat Brown was Governor he wrote a check for a million dollars and we built the greatest research university the world has ever seen. There's never a better public research university in the history of the world than the University of California. We live in another world now. (Dean Ricco, Social Sciences)

The divestment of state support in higher education was accepted as a given and the suggestion that the status quo could be any different was met with cynicism and frustration. "The last thing I think is [that] Jerry Brown and the legislature are going to send us the money we need to run [the school]. That doesn't work" (Dean Ricco, Social Sciences). Deans balked at any suggestion that the University of California campuses might receive sufficient funding to achieve the mission. "That's a fantasy world" (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences).

Deans indicated that the legislature's prevailing view of higher education as a private good and the decrease in state funding weighed heavily on the administration and was an impediment to accomplishing the teaching and research goals of the university.

Dean Scotts (Sciences) noted that the central administration focused their time on

revenue generation as a result of state divestment.

> The Provost and the Chancellor do have to worry about money… [Research labs]
> are very, very expensive to build. And they have to be paid for, and the state is not
> building buildings for the University of California anymore… They're not getting
> money from the state anymore.

Not only does the state of California limit the number of resources available to the

University of California system but also the state legislature holds the universities

accountable for what funding they do provide and call for cuts to spending. Deans

expressed the perceptions of those in state government of higher education institutions as

wasteful.

> I know the Governor and the state legislature thinks there is a lot of fat to cut.
> "Too many administrators. Too many staff supporting these faculty, these spoiled
> brats. They think they're smarter than everyone else in their ivory towers." All
> this stuff. (Dean Scotts, Sciences)

Despite the minimal funding from the state, the deans described an environment where

the state legislature had control and influence over the existence of their programs. One

dean offered a story in which a student who decided (perhaps justifiably) that their lack

of admission to an academic program was a result of bias. As a consequence, the student

reached out to the state legislature to seek action and the legislature responded by flexing

its muscle.

> This particular program had been an add-on to the state budget, as a special
> program. They could simply red-line out this one budget item, and kill our
> program overnight. And that's what they threatened to do unless we changed the
> program dramatically. (Dean Raiser, Sciences)

Deans reported that the tenuous nature of both state defunding and state control drove the

deans to obtain financial resources for their schools, colleges, and divisions through other

means. Although they remembered the past in higher education when resources were

more abundant and competition was less fierce, they acknowledged that the current state

of affairs in higher education is different and that revenue generating activities, such as

grant-seeking, in this highly competitive arena, were mandatory.

> It was relatively cheap. People built their career around inexpensive
> research…You have to figure out how to get the money… It is a fool's errand to
> run any part of the university without thinking about grants these days… You are
> going to have to get the money somehow. (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences).

In essence, deans resigned themselves to their circumstances. They did not deny the

financial and resource constraints they and their schools, colleges, and divisions faced.

The neoliberal context in which deans found themselves was not a local or

regional issue. The defunding of higher education and the research enterprise was

described by deans as a larger trend that occurred on a national scale, not just at the

University of California. Dean Birde (Sciences) elaborated on the necessity of higher

education institutions to find deans who are skilled at fundraising.

> I think that's reflecting the fact that all over this country, actually all over the
> world right now, you're seeing less government support of research. And so,
> you're having to look to the private sector. And so who better to do that than
> someone who's used to having the big party for the private donors?

Dean Birde's statement indicates that universities seek to select leaders who not

only understand and accept the resource-constrained, neoliberal environment of higher

education but also embrace and participate willingly in activities required within the

neoliberal university. Deans in this investigation went beyond mere acceptance of the

neoliberal condition of their institutions; they participated actively in neoliberal (i.e.,

managerial, and academic capitalist) activities. They described their participation in these

activities as a matter of necessity and combined the logics of neoliberalism with the

logics of the academy and the university. That is, deans' engagement in neoliberal

activities and logics did not replace the academic behaviors and logics fully. These two

logics and value sets were comingled in the rhetoric and behaviors of academic deans at

the University of California. Deans did their best to try to reconcile the pursuit of external

revenue sources with their academic mission.

> Jerry Brown is not giving us any more money. Janet Napolitano is not giving us any more money. California legislature is not giving us any [more] money. The Chancellor is not going to give us [more money] and we're home alone. If you want to take charge of the destiny, you need to understand what your resources are and you need to generate the kinds of resources that you need. (Dean Ricco, Social Sciences)

In an environment of diminished state funding, deans indicated that revenue generation

and reporting activities that are required in order to receive external grants were a matter

of social responsibility. "[W]ith the granting, thing is, federal dollars are tax dollars. So, I

feel completely comfortable in justifying... I need to justify to my grandma how her tax

dollars are being spent in my lab. I think that's part of our responsibility as scientists…

That's a part of our social responsibility" (Dean Kraus, Sciences). The ways in which

deans enact neoliberal logics and values, and rectify their corresponding values and

behaviors with academic values and goals, may depend upon both their resignation to

their resource-constrained environment as well as their tenuous circumstances as deans in

highly academic and research-centric universities.

    In this next section, I elaborate on the ways in which academic deans adopted

neoliberal logics and academic logics. I describe how these key members of the

administration and academy blend the two sets of logics together. Deans portray the

blending of these logics as not simply compatible, but rather the logics are presented by

these administrators as codependent and mandatory. The logics of the research university

and the academy can no longer be accomplished without the logics of neoliberalism. I

begin this next section with an explanation of the many ways academic deans adopt

neoliberal logics and values and engage in neoliberal behaviors.

The Blending of Neoliberal and Academic Logics in Academic Deans

The deans articulated an almost obsessive focus on prestige, notoriety, and

excellence. Neoliberal logics manifested in deans' discussions about national rankings,

product differentiation, and product superiority. Deans did attribute the pursuit of prestige

and notoriety to pressures from campus central administration and the Office of the

President. "The executive leadership on campus wants people to stand out. They want to

know 'What's your next national recognition award.' The current executive

administration has a notion sort of cascading down through the system, a desire for

recognition" (Dean Berkshire, Social Sciences). However, in other instances, deans were

the drivers of the pursuit of prestige and notoriety. Although notoriety and prestige can be

linked to the concept of excellence, a value not inherently in conflict with traditional

academic endeavors, there were examples where the pursuit of notoriety and prestige

took on a more neoliberal tone in the context of marketability rather than excellence in

quality of research or teaching. For example, Dean Palazzo's (Social Sciences) primary

goal was the construction of a new facility for his school.

> I hope that the school will have a new building. A totally new building—and it's
> not going to be a regular building; it's going to be a building people walk in [and
> say] 'Wow! This is a top [school]. This is a school I want to be part of; this is a

school I want to put money in; this is a school I want to become a faculty [here] or a student there]."

Dean Palazzo's goal is centered around attracting students and faculty with a building, similar to a well-designed and impressive display case at a department store. Although it can be inferred that he aspires to recruit the highest performing students and most productive faculty, he has internalized a neoliberal framework for prestige and notoriety. These neoliberal values and behaviors were viewed by deans as neither problematical nor incompatible with academic values, such as diversity of thought and racial, ethnic, and gender diversity within the institution. "You shouldn't have to sacrifice diversity for prestige… If you care about quality and you're looking for the most interesting ideas, ranking and prestige will take care of itself. It's folklore that diversity is in competition with excellence" (Dean Stevens, Social Sciences). Dean Stevens perceived that it was not only feasible but also logical to blend these neoliberal and academic values.

Deans engaged in performativity (Ball, 2012) and established and reinforced the use of measures and metrics of performance for their schools, colleges, and divisions. Deans described performativity as a required activity of the dean. "One person has to be held responsible for outcomes and performance metrics of the school and that person is the dean" (Dean Spicer, Social Sciences). It was "the dean's problem to solve" (Dean Berkshire, Social Sciences) performativity issues related to the metrics of faculty workload and the "collective productivity of the faculty, including fundraising" and grant-getting (Dean Berkshire, Social Sciences).

Deans engaged in the surveillance and monitoring of performance outcomes when they dispersed money to their divisions, thus reinforcing the neoliberal logic of

performativity. This was exemplified in an anecdote from Dean Stevens (Social Science),

who prefaced this statement by expressing her desire to avoid involvement in evaluations

and review panels. Nevertheless, she described how she evaluated performance indicators

whenever she allocated limited seed funds to faculty in her division for research projects

and the pursuit of larger grants.

> I really go for more seed funding, small enough that you can start and then the measure would be you got another, a larger grant or you were able to parlay it into recognition, more visibility for the faculty member and the division. So, I make sure that the money I give out for research for my division. I expect that some of them don't go anywhere, but the amount of money is small enough that… I can afford for them to experiment with that. If I give them, you know, large amounts of money. I'll have to spend more time supervising them, you know checking off their deliverables.

Dean Stevens' allocation of resources was determined by whether or not the resource

dispersal was likely to result in further resource (money) generation. She then engaged in

the surveillance of her faculty to whom she had allocated scarce resources to ensure they

were creating products. A seed money investment in faculty was worthwhile if it could be

parlayed into either more financial resources (one performance measure) or, at the very

least, notoriety for the division (a second performance measure). Dean Stevens'

participation in performativity behaviors, neoliberal logics, occurred simultaneously with

academic goals and logics. Dean Steven explains the primary goal that undergirds the

surveillance of outcomes for seed funding.

> That's why I like seed funding that will help you get a foundation grant. Then you give them out and faculty [are] able to take the research to the next level… That's what I want to accomplish. I'm not expecting that we're going to cure cancer with my research funding but they might formulate a new question or formulate a new approach. That's what I hope [to achieve] from seed money.

Dean Stevens blends neoliberal logics with academic logics in her description of this activity. To Dean Stevens's engagement in performativity and surveillance is compatible with the traditional academic goals of knowledge production and the pursuit of questions. These activities are not perceived of as incongruent, but rather coexist with one another, in the minds of this dean. The blending of academic and neoliberal logics was present in other descriptions of performativity and the link between performance and incentives.

Deans used terms borrowed from the marketplace and terms associated with the neoliberal value of performativity. "We have to have good outcomes. We measure good outcomes in a variety of ways" (Dean Stone, Sciences). However, in narratives about their work, they were quick to draw distinctions between private business practices and the "business" of public higher education. They described their job as managers of resources with academic goals.

> So, the business of it is to take the resources you have. My job is to take the resources I have and give the best quality education, the most cutting-edge quality of education, and to make sure students are treated fairly. That means I have to know how to use our resources, when to invest to start new classes, start new approaches, do new things. That's what makes my output. My output is a certain quality of education, a certain success rate of our students, a certain environment where people feel stimulated, having our faculty stay instead of leave. The academics, we don't like to think of it as a business. If you think of a business, the goal is to make a profit. My goal isn't to make a profit; my goal isn't to spend as little money as possible. My goal is to take what I have and produce the best I can and not worry about profit. (Dean Frost, Sciences)

Dean Frost blended the neoliberal values of product quality, measurable outputs, and productivity with the academic values of education, equity, fairness, intellectual growth, excellence, and innovation.

Deans described both negative and positive incentives embedded within the system of the university to encourage more performance or outputs. For traditional academic areas, resources, such as funding and space, were linked to positive performance outcomes. These resources were also withheld or withdrawn as negative reinforcement for under performance in areas such as research and publications. When prodded to explain what would result in negative incentives, Dean Scotts (Sciences) explained that faculty were allowed to keep their resources (space and money) if they maintained active research productivity and obtained grants.

> A negative incentive is not getting promoted or advanced. Losing your space, your research space [is a consequence]. Positive [incentives] are getting promoted faster than you would normally be promoted. To the extent that I have dispensable resources, meaning money, it means giving those resources to people who are actually going to, that I believe and my advisors believe are really going to, produce something important of value—transformative hopefully for California and the United States. Because that's our job, to make a world better… Not publishing papers…not getting, not having research money… I don't know how to describe it, you know, in very systematic terms, but certainly there's people that look like good investments, so you provide them with positive feedback. And people do need slaps on the back and praise… And surprisingly, they think the dean's opinion on this is more important than other people.

Dean Scotts' comment demonstrates not only the neoliberal value of performativity present in deans that links resources such as funding and space to measurable performance outcomes but also the valuation of faculty as assets—another characteristic indicative of neoliberal logics. In the dean's explanation, faculty are described as producers, assets worthy or not worthy of investment based upon the rate and quality of their produced output—research publications. Dean Scotts interjects mid-explanation to clarify that the pursuit of performativity and incentive based productivity is justified and explained through the academic end goal—the betterment of the world both locally and

117

nationally. Dean Scotts blends the neoliberal logic of performativity and valuation of

faculty as assets and producers with the academic logic of social good.

Other deans took a more direct neoliberal tone and advocated for a market based

approach to topics such as space allocation. This dean recognized that a market-based,

performance based approach was problematical to the academic mission. "Now I

recognize that, you know, there's some education programs the university wants to

maintain even if they're not that, let's say, popular, but in general I think there should be

more resource allocation to the schools" (Dean Loveland, Social Sciences). Nevertheless,

the dean asserted that a market approach combined with the decentralization of resource

control down to the dean would help maximize efficiency.

> [T]he central administration, you know, controls all of the space, and people are
> fighting about getting it. You don't pay anything for any of that space, so, of
> course, everybody wants to hoard as much as they can and then [another] school
> comes around and they're fighting for space. And another school's got all sorts of
> space that everybody wants to hoard it… [I]f space was allocated on a market
> system, you know, there'd be a lot less hoarding because schools would have to
> pay for having space that they're not using very much. And the same thing
> with…every time we want to win negotiations and we want to give personnel a bit
> extra money or less money or this or that, there's…a small core of people at the
> central administration that are deciding all these things, which is a very inefficient
> and inflexible way of doing things. So, I think [our] school should have more
> control over their resources. (Dean Loveland, Social Sciences)

The dean's recognition of the negative effect this proposal has on smaller academic

programs was insufficient to convince him to reject his own suggestion to implement this

neoliberal approach to the management of resources. He emphasized as well neoliberal

values and logics in line with managerialism—efficiency—and lamented the lack of

control he had over his own school's decision making about resource allocation.

For deans from schools with clinical faculty, this performativity manifested in an incentive to see more patients for the purposes of generating revenue through clinical services.

> You actually develop business plans for every physician and they're sort of being held to that standard…You know, you set the score, set the margin for how much money you expect them to raise through the clinical practice, part of which is going to pay their salary and part of which will be bonus if they go above what they are expected to do, but a big chunk of that money is coming as revenue to the school. (Dean Raiser, Sciences)

Deans of clinical faculty were unapologetic and matter of fact in their explanations of performance based funding. The nature of the enterprise for professional schools of medicine or pharmacy differs dramatically from other academic program areas within the institution. These deans also expressed neoliberal and academic logics together; however, the presence of these divergent logics was segregated more than it was blended in professional school deans. For example, these deans did not describe an academic purpose to their performance based, revenue generating model. They did not see these neoliberal logics in competition with other academic logics they held. In addition to segregation of academic and neoliberal logics, deans of schools with clinical practice also blended neoliberal logics and academic logics. Moments after describing their performative behaviors as a dean and as a school, this same dean indicated that he did not think that the pursuit of revenue was incompatible with the pursuit of the mission.

> I don't see that there's a great schism here in terms of where we're going and what we're trying to do with our mission. You're here to bring in surgeons or other physicians into the practice. As long as our focus is selecting the students who meet our mission, and then providing educational opportunities that support our mission, we're going to have a product that pretty much represents what we are trying to accomplish. (Dean Raiser, Sciences)

119

Dean Raiser used neoliberal terms to describe the students as products; yet, as long as the

school remained mission-centered and aligned their admissions process and educational

opportunities with the mission, Dean Raiser saw no incongruence between the two

activities. These two logics were blended with one another, and the pursuit of the mission

was segregated from the pursuit of performativity and revenue generation.

The blending of academic and neoliberal logics was evident in deans from non-

clinical academic schools and colleges. For example, competition for funding was

perceived by deans as a motivation for higher quality work and productivity. Dean Marsh

(Sciences) was supportive of the competitive nature of revenue generating activities and

linked this to knowledge generation and quality research—values associated with

academic logic.

> I saw what happens at an institution that has guaranteed funding, and, on average, there were certainly a couple of exceptions who were terrific, had first rate publications and first rate journals, and got outside funding. But, there were a lot of people who were coasting. And I think that…was a function of the leadership that they'd had that didn't put a lot of pressure on… Again, a couple of individuals who absolutely were competitive but as an institution, it wasn't. So, it's very painful but…competition really results in great science.

Dean Marsh blended competition, a neoliberal value, with the pursuit of an academic

value: "great science." She saw these logics as not only compatible but also reliant on one

another. This example calls into question the literature that suggests neoliberal values are

replacing academic values. In actuality, academic deans at research universities, such as

Dean Marsh, perceive these logics as congruent.

Deans not only perceived grant pursuit as valuable to the production of rigorous

and sound science but also identified this source of revenue as a necessary requirement

for the attainment of the academic mission in a highly competitive, resource-scarce

environment. They advocated for clear brand identities—a phrase borrowed from the

private sector marketplace. In some cases, deans defended neoliberal behaviors and

logics assertively as the foundation for institutional survival.

> The first thing you have to do is soundly run and soundly finance the institution—
> the rest is all bullshit if you don't have that… It is a fool's errand to run any part
> of the university without thinking about grants these days. Fifty years ago…[i]t
> was relatively cheap. People built their career around inexpensive research. You
> have to piece together the money as best you can… You have to define a brand
> identity to make the money. This notion that if it's corporate money it's going to
> be a distortion to the mission is ridiculous. (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences)

Dean Sterling dismissed the notion that the pursuit of revenue and the adoption of a

market mentality would somehow contradict or cancel out the ability of his school and

campus to achieve their academic purpose. In actuality, he asserted that the pursuit of the

academic mission would not be feasible without grant-seeking behaviors. Dean Sterling

suggests that the tenuous financial conditions of the university in a highly competitive

higher education environment coupled with the growth over the last fifty years of costly

research required the amalgamation of both academic and neoliberal values.

Neoliberal logics were served by academic logics, and academic logics were

served by neoliberal logics. This was captured well in deans' references to research and

grant funding. Grants were described as necessary for the maintenance of research.

Research was also presented as a mechanism for revenue. "[This campus] is so big

because there's huge amounts of resources from research… There's benefits to being a

research university, to the state, to the nation, to the world" (Dean Scotts, Sciences). As

Dean Scotts indicates, research was responsible for the university's acquisition of needed

resources. Ultimately, research served a greater purpose, more so than simply a resource supplement. For deans, research produced not just financial resources but allowed for the attainment of local and global scale social benefits and the achievement of the primary academic value and mission of the university—knowledge generation. Research findings and knowledge could be applied to make improvements both locally, nationally, and globally.

Yet, the pursuit or revenue generation and the inherent competition embedded within such activities were not perceived as harmless to the academic mission by all deans. There were exceptions to the rule that neoliberal logics could be blended fully with academic logics. Others saw revenue-generating activities, such as fundraising for capital campaigns, as problematical and incongruent with the academic value of collaboration. The deans were provided with fundraising targets, and this activity created competition amongst the colleges and schools. Dean Hooks described the environment of her campus as collaborative; however, there were limits to collaboration in arenas with inherent competition.

> If it is about resources, for example, now that they've put the capital campaign out there…if every college is given what their goal is, then why? What's the incentive for units to collaborate around a particular donor because everyone wants to get credit for their college… So, when it comes down to resources, that's when the competition gets a little bit dicey. The collaboration [happens] if there's not a resource competition issue. If you can just do it without having to worry about that, then you're not introducing that element into it. (Dean Hooks, Liberal Arts)

That is, while competition for revenue indeed drove improvements in the quality of research as Dean Marsh indicated, competition also presented a barrier to collaboration at times. Competition for resources did not always lead to collaborative research

opportunities; on the contrary, it was a barrier to potential interdisciplinary partnerships within an institution.

In addition to the use of market terms such as "brand identity" (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences) in reference to the university and their colleges and schools, deans adopted business rhetoric in application to the organizational members. Deans used business-like terms and framed faculty research as a product. "You have you have a clear vision of the product, which is (a) the students we produce and (b) the research we produce" (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences). The conceptualization by deans of individuals as products was not limited to faculty alone. Deans conceived of students in neoliberal terms as customers to be served. Their students-as-customers' orientation was tempered by, and perceived as compatible with, the academic mission and academic values. The two value sets existed simultaneously and were either mixed or compartmentalized by deans.

> We have customers. They have to be satisfied. We have to make a bottom line or
> we don't exist. But it just isn't a business; there have to be principles involved. If
> it were just satisfaction, we would just be a diploma mill. (Dean Stone, Sciences)

Dean Stone adopted a neoliberal, market-term to describe the students, and suggested that serving the customers was a required task of the school. From a critical perspective, the notion that the students are customers to be satisfied is incongruent with the traditional assertion in the academy that faculty are content experts and curators of the learning process who define the curriculum and set expectations for the students' performance (Giroux, 2002). Dean Stone's narrative suggested that these students wielded the power

and authority over the school and faculty—they were individuals who must be satisfied. At first glance, Dean Stone projected values in accordance with neoliberal logics. She articulated her perspective further when she said that "the bottom line" drove the existence of the institution. However, her narrative changed direction by the third and fourth utterance where she declared that principles were ascendant and student satisfaction was not the end goal. She warned against the full adoption of a business-like approach which could lead to the creation of a "diploma mill." Dean Stone exemplified the ways in which deans expressed neoliberal logics hand in hand with academic logics and the lack of cognitive dissonance they encountered when blending or segregating these logics.

Deans expressed neoliberal values and conceptualized students not only as customers but also as products. They did not perceive the neoliberal label for students as antithetical to the academic mission of the university. For example, Dean Shepherd blended logics and justified neoliberal activities associated with the values of performativity, such as the pursuit of prestigious, highly productive faculty and high performing staff.

> This is a university; our number one mission is to educate… Those [students] are the number one products. We have a set of customers we have to serve: students and parents, faculty and staff, people who employ our students, agencies and companies who fund our research. If they are giving us money, I have to serve them. (Dean Shepherd, Sciences)

Here, the dean situated the value of education, or knowledge dissemination, in conjunction and compatible with neoliberal values of corporatization, marketization, and revenue generation. Although the mission to educate was presented as primary by Dean

Shepherd, he utilized market language in his description of students as both products to be generated and sold into the workforce and customers to be served. This *quid pro quo* relationship between the college and companies exchanged an educated workforce that could be employed for money for research. Deans engaged in the pursuit of corporate partnerships, and other neoliberal endeavors, and viewed these partnerships as positive actions and beneficial to the academic mission. Dean Birde described and praised the research collaboration and scientific advancement that can be derived from corporate partnerships.

> There are resources and then, of course, when you bring industry into the mix, industry has resources of its own. And if it's willing to put those resources into collaborations, well great… There's been a new vice chancellor for industry relations. And, he has totally changed the culture. And, as a result now, when I go talk to companies, they go, "Oh, yeah, you know." In fact, companies are coming here going, "How can we interface with you?" You know. It's really different. (Dean Birde, Sciences)

Dean Birde attributed the pursuit of corporate partnerships and resources to the initiatives of the new Vice Chancellor for Industry Relations. He noted that the Vice Chancellor had influenced and promoted cultural change at their campus toward neoliberal endeavors, which deans, such as him, reinforced. Dean Birde suggested that the central administration had influence over the activities of the deans and that deans were expected to participate in partnership creation and resource seeking activities.

Indeed, academic capitalist activities were often attributed to being driven by the upper echelon of administration, not by the deans. Deans were responsible for revenue-generation activities such as fundraising, meeting with donors, seeking out corporate partnerships, and encouraging their faculty to pursue grants. Although participation in

125

fundraising was a requirement of the deans' job, it was not a task innate to the personal

identity of all deans. "The provost and chancellor do have to worry about money…

Certainly I get pressure to fundraise, which I wouldn't say I'm a natural at, but I try to do

my best" (Dean Scotts, Sciences). The pressure to participate in neoliberal activities was

attributed to higher level administrators such as provosts, vice chancellors, and

chancellors. Deans portrayed upper level administrators as the drivers of a business-

oriented, money-centric agenda.

> The structure that the chancellor set up, [the chancellor] is on top, then vice
> chancellors are underneath; academic deans are at the bottom…We are still
> dealing with the main mission of campus—it is shifting from being academic to a
> non-academic environment. (Dean Shepherd, Sciences)

Power and influence of the deans varied based upon institutional, school, and department-

level structure. In some cases, deans indicated they had high levels of administrative

decision-making control; however, several deferred and delegated authority to their

associate deans and chairs.

> [T]he power…is elsewhere, you know? I'd say it's either in the department
> chairs—probably most in the department chairs, occasionally in the dean but…the
> department chairs are probably…where the power resides. I don't micromanage. I
> want people to be innovative and independent…within what limitations there are.
> (Dean Birde, Sciences)

Deans, such as Dean Birde, situated themselves as powerless against a neoliberal

regime driven by both upper level administrators and lower-level administrators. Indeed,

this approach may have been a rhetorical strategy in the interview to distance themselves

from responsibility for the reinforcement of neoliberal values and behaviors that would

be perceived negatively by their academic peers. An alternate explanation is that while

deans may have been able to justify and reconcile the amalgamation of neoliberal logics

126

such as competition, marketization, and revenue with academic logics such as knowledge generation and dissemination, they may have been hesitant to admit to participation in the managerial behaviors that stem from neoliberal logics. When the adoption of neoliberal values was perceived to serve the university's academic mission, deans expressed no tension. However, when deans reflected on the negative effects of neoliberal logics on their own work (increased pressure to fundraise), they sought to reconcile the two logic sets by blending, or segregating, or attributing negative effects and pressures to other administrators and external stakeholders.

Deans as Managers: Academic Values Espoused; Managerialism Enacted

All deans expressed adamantly that both faculty autonomy and shared governance were of profound importance to their institutional culture. When asked about their roles and responsibilities as managers, deans reported that academic values were ascendant over neoliberal values, such as managerialism. Most deans either denied their role as a manager or accepted their role as manager but were careful to place boundaries and limitations around that authority. Only a few deans indicated that they took an overtly managerial approach. Evidence of managerialism manifested more subtly in the data. Deans explained that impositions upon faculty autonomy were met with resistance and rejection of managerial behaviors by faculty. Deans stated that any attempt to replace academic administrators with professional management experts would be unlikely to take hold in the university. "I think the academy is very suspicious of professional managers because they don't have the academic interest of the institution at heart" (Dean Stevens, Social Science). The academy's suspicion of managerial approaches was reflected in the

structure of shared governance and the balance of power within the University of

California system.

> You realize very quickly that in a university, and like a corporation, the dean
> presumably has a lot of power. But, in fact, in the university, because faculty have
> tenure and faculty have a great deal of leeway in what they wish to do, the dean
> actually is not as powerful as people think him or her to be. (Dean Spicer, Social
> Sciences)

Nevertheless, the dean's managerial skills were often needed either to rally the

faculty around a decision or intercede when decisions could not be reached by faculty,

such as in merit and promotion reviews. "The division of responsibilities is very clear…

But again, the faculty are not unanimous. Sometimes there's a divided body even

amongst the faculty so then the dean's input becomes very critical" (Dean Spicer). In

cases where deans reported managerial behaviors, the managerial and performative

demands were placed on administrative support staff or other academic administrative

subordinates, such as chairs and associate deans, not faculty–who were described

repetitively as unmanageable due to shared governance and autonomy.

> [This university system] as a whole and [this campus] with a vengeance is a place
> where faculty have a shared role in decision making. Shared governance is not a
> myth here. [The faculty and I] never had a major fight. I never felt as a dean that I
> was in that situation. There should never be a situation where you haven't largely
> gotten people on board… I basically had to clean house on the administrative
> staff, who were hired ineptly. I have a huge respect for staff but as the people who
> work for me can attest—it is not a good idea not to perform. They [staff] make the
> deans look good—it's not the deans. A team does not mean it's a perfect
> democracy. (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences)

Because of deans' adherence to the cultural norms of their professional academic

environment and their reverence to the values of shared governance and faculty

autonomy, their expressions of managerialist behaviors had limitations. They segregated

neoliberal and academic logics and values into different realms of their professional work in response to structures that impeded their ability to blend both value sets completely.

Types of Deans: A Managerial Spectrum

Although the all deans adopted neoliberal logics and blended those logics with academic logics, neoliberal logics in the form of managerialism were activated and blended with academic logics to varying degrees. The adoption of managerialism was presented by deans on a spectrum. Some academic deans were more overt, openly managerial. They described themselves as both managers and deans and were comfortable with and even insistent on the use of private sector managerial approaches and rhetoric. Others were managers in denial or resentful accepters of neoliberal imperatives. A third type of dean rejected and resisted association with the manager label and all that it entailed. Although each dean did not fit completely into a managerial category of overt, resentful, or resistant, each dean leaned toward one more than the other. In this next section, I provide examples that illustrate the continuum of managerialism within the deans.

Overt managers were comfortable associating themselves with managerialism and professed their considerable power and influence within their colleges and universities. They expressed frustration with their faculty and limitations in their own authority. Dean Lapine (Liberal Arts) was at ease with the manager label and used other metaphors to describe his managerial approach.

> I use the "ship" metaphor. It is my job to steer the ship. It's also my job to provide the wind… I see myself as being both the engine driving the ship wherever it's going to go, not solely—everybody's got an oar. Everybody is blowing into the sail… My managerial position is at the front of the crowd but like a Janus face,

facing both directions. Because if I suddenly find myself out in the front of the spear and turn around and nobody is there, that's bad… Trying to take a place like this place where really nobody wants to go is just dumb. It happens. Deans do that. And they don't last very long, rightly. On the other hand, we've had deans on campus and even in this school who were only facing backwards. The departments love deans who just keep in touch with chairs and say "What do you want? What do you need? I'm yours entirely." That's also not good… It's a formula for cementing the status quo… [I]t's my job to take the vision beyond the limited bubbles. So, I need to keep pulling the chairs to think beyond any kind of complacency about where they are now. "Where do you want to go? What are your top five visionary elements? Who are the faculty who are going to be the leaders in 2020? 2025? How do we nurture them, how do we nurture you to be the next level down managerial level that works with me to keep the structure moving forward at all times?"… This is a vertical power structure… [T]his is not a radical democracy where everybody has an equal voice… My power, my level of authority, is more than a chair's level of authority. I answer to the vice provosts who answers to a provost who answers to a vice chancellor who answers to a chancellor. (Dean Lapine, Liberal Arts)

Dean Lapine recognized his role as director and visionary of the college. Although he indicated that everyone contributed to the effort to move the school forward, he described himself as responsible for steering the ship. Although some deans described the university as a horizontal hierarchy, Dean Lapine framed the structure as vertical and attributed greater levels of authority to himself and to those above him rather than to his chairs. This perspective and understanding positioned Dean Lapine in contrast to the academic logics of faculty autonomy and shared governance.

Deans classified as overt managers recognized that values such as shared governance, tenure, and faculty autonomy were held in high regard within the University of California but lamented that these academic logics were problematic to effectiveness and efficiency within the university. These neoliberal logics in the form of managerialism were expressed in this vignette from Dean Loveland (Social Sciences).

My opinions have changed over time. I became a lot more skeptical of faculty

governance. I mean, I look at some of the private universities like Vanderbilt or Stanford—universities that we are trying to compete with in terms of launching innovative programs and launching innovative research programs and hiring great faculty, and I see how nimble their administration can be comparted to the University of California where everything has to go through this very complicated process. [Now] I [see] things more from the administrative point of view. (Dean Loveland, Social Sciences)

This same dean also rejected the idea of tenure and asserted that it was merely a mechanism for faculty to stay employed even if they were no longer productive or useful.

I do not support the tenure system. I don't know when I started to become more and more skeptical about it but I don't support it. I don't think there is a lot of dead weight but there's dead weight. (Dean Loveland, Social Sciences)

Despite his prolific history of obtaining multimillion dollar grants and his passion for research, Dean Loveland identified himself as a manager and as a dean. He rejected traditional academic logics; and, in his narrative, he expressed frustration when his power and authority as a dean was usurped by the faculty or by his Provost. He adopted a managerial identity and expressed the limitations of his managerial role by the academic culture of shared governance and tenure, which he assumed limited his unit's productivity and innovation (both neoliberal and managerial logics).

When confronted directly about their power and influence as managers, several deans professed to be democratic and not highly managerial. However, these same deans expressed views that were in line with managerial ways of thinking and acting. That is, these deans were either in denial about their role in the perpetuation of neoliberal ideals or recognized that there was a managerial imperative but attempted to separate themselves from affiliation with those neoliberal logics and behaviors. When asked about

the ways in which she made decisions and how her faculty would perceive her, Dean

Frost described herself as a leader who garners views and advice from others and then

makes decisions. She describes this as being "pretty bold."

> I appoint the chairs with the democratic votes. But I also consult. I ask for people's input… [T]hey'll probably describe me as a strong leader, and I'm willing to be pretty bold about promoting diversity… [Y]ou can't make change when it comes to promoting diversity without being bold. So, I'd say I'm very engaged in what goes on in the departments… I'm not afraid to go down and step in. So, some people who know that I'm working against a tide are delighted that I'm willing to show some leadership and push things. People who don't agree with me would say I'm micro-managing.

However, in her second interview, Dean Frost struggled with my use of the word

"manager" and "management" labels for the work she performed as dean. She denied the

applicability of these terms.

> I don't know about "manage faculty." I think that's an odd word… I think management is an odd word when it comes to running an academic institution. I mean, my job is to facilitate scholarship and education and I don't think of it as— I'm not running a grocery store. I'm not even managing a hospital. I am trying to make sure I have to see that people teach and people are doing their research but somehow managing does not seem like the right word for an academic setting. (Dean Frost, Sciences)

Shortly after I asked questions about her management, Dean Frost abruptly ended the

interview with no explanation. Whether or not she had an issue she needed to attend to or

whether or not the questions and prompts about management left her unsettled and led to

discontinuation of the interview is debatable.

The third type of dean rejected and resisted managerialism. These deans deferred

power and authority to their staff, department chairs, and faculty, and they expressed

distain for administrators who overstepped their boundaries and threatened academic

traditions such as shared governance and faculty autonomy. Although he was not

reluctant to use neoliberal terms and express neoliberal logics, Dean Shepherd (Sciences) exemplified an anti-managerial approach. When describing his relationship with faculty and staff, he indicated that he "counted on [his] people" and he "authorize[d] them, 'Make decisions! Don't bring everything to me.'" In reference to faculty chairs in his department, he noted that he "did not have one on one meetings." Chairs were given the independence to lead and make decisions. "If you need to see me, schedule it. If you are a leader, you make a decision; you figure out who you need to get involved and for what reason" (Dean Shepherd, Sciences). Dean Shepherd admired and valued the process of shared governance, an academic tradition that he described as a "reality for the UC" and not just lip service. "Shared governance helps the system not to be impacted and derailed by incompetent deans, provosts, and chairs and chancellors." He rejected managerial roadblocks. "Traditional bureaucratic systems slow you down" (Dean Shepherd, Sciences). He described himself as managed by upper administration. "As an administrator, you have to fill up your activity report" (Dean Shepherd, Sciences). The surveillance he was under from his provost and the minimal control that senior administrator exercised over his college was a source of contention and frustration.

> We had intellectual disagreements. I respected what he was saying but since he was provost he made the final decisions… The structure that [the chancellor] has set up, his royal majesty is on top, then vice chancellors are underneath, academic deans are at the bottom—deans have been pushed to the 3rd and 4th level—this is damaging to the academic institutions. We are still dealing with the main mission of campus—it is shifting from being academic to a non-academic environment. (Dean Shepherd, Sciences)

He described a vertical hierarchy within the organization that limited deans' authority, and he perceived this structure as a threat to the university. Dean Shepherd lamented the

transition away from a system where academics held influence and control over institutional decision making. "The Vice Provost of Academic Personnel has become proactive. They tell the dean what should or shouldn't be in a letter [for merit and promotion]. They are trying to influence it." He attributed his own authority as dean to power granted to him and other administrators by the faculty. "Faculty let administration do their things as long as they don't cross the line, or go over them" (Dean Shepherd, Sciences). He eschewed any association with a managerial approach to leadership.

> The position [of dean] is not dictatorial. If you don't have the respect in your own field, you can't expect faculty to respect you… I always put myself in the role of serving rather than leading… Many times in groups at events I have jokingly said, "I am so and so, I work for these people." (Dean Shepherd, Sciences)

While the majority of deans tended towards one side or the other of the managerial continuum, each of them exhibited behaviors and expressed values that may have been classified on either extreme. No deans were classified solely into one these three categories.

The Role of Academic Identity

Although this investigation originated with a focus on institutional theory as an explanatory framework for understanding how logics are blended, or segregated, or replaced, there were obvious patterns in the data that led to my development of themes related to professional identity. The theme of identity provides additional explanatory power for the findings on deans' expressed logics and allowed me to explain not only what logics deans adopted but also why they may have adopted and subsequently blended or segregated them. The literature suggests that there is a link between professional identity and values (Trede, Macklin, & Bridges, 2012). Thus, deans' identities establish a

134

potential context and explanation for deans' complicated expression of both neoliberal and academic logics and behaviors.

The literature refers to the administrative world as "the dark side" (Palm, 2006, p. 59); thus, it may be assumed that faculty who adopt administrative roles, such as decanal appointments, abandon their identity as faculty and academics. On the contrary, in this investigation, deans identified themselves "first and foremost" (Dean Sterling, Social Sciences) with the faculty, or with an academic, identity. Deans maintained an academic aesthetic. That is, they strived to maintain an appearance, in whatever way possible, of the self-image of a scholar and an academic. Although they recognized their role identity as deans, they perceived this role as merely a position they filled; however, their role identity was not tied intimately to what they assumed was their authentic professional identity. Instead, the majority adhered to a social identity of a faculty member and all that this membership entailed. Yet, they adhered symbolically and not necessarily in actuality. Although they defined themselves professionally as faculty ("I've been a faculty member. I'm still a faculty member. I have many things that are still faculty motivations" [Dean Quinn, Liberal Arts]), they occupied dean positions and devoted the majority of their time in the performance of administrative tasks and management of their colleges and schools. They self-identified as faculty with notable consistency, in spite of their administrative behaviors.

Deans developed an academic aesthetic by surrounding and describing themselves with symbols that represented their professional and social identity as faculty. Dean Ricco's descriptions illustrate the maintenance of the academic identity through an

academic aesthetic. In his office, he gestured, with an expression of pride, all around him to the vast, filled bookshelves that lined his large office walls.

> These are all my books and all my publications and almost everyone has a student in it… I was an insanely successful academic… I have a lot of the awards everybody wants. I've written all the fancy books with the most impressive presses. (Dean Ricco, Social Sciences)

Although they portrayed themselves as faculty and scholars, the majority of deans did not maintain a research agenda. Deans who declared themselves active in research relied primarily on post-docs and graduate students in order to continue their productivity. "Most of my projects are done by members of my lab. I would like to spend more time in the research lab but I can't… It feels like a luxury to have even an hour, two hours, or an afternoon" (Dean Stevens, Social Sciences). On rare occasions, deans went to extremes to maintain their academic professional and social identity by working excessive hours to complete research in the early hours of the morning and at nights and on weekends when they were not obligated to perform their decanal duties. "It's probably 35 hours a week on dean stuff and then another 25 on research" (Dean Frost, Sciences). However, this approach to high research productivity while fulfilling the dean's role was the exception rather than the rule.

In cases where deans acknowledged they were administrators, their academic identity was also articulated and reinforced by their explanation of their continued participation in research or by their own tendency to be inquisitive. "I love analyzing things, so whatever I do, even now as an academic administrator, I'm very intellectual about it. Why do I do it, what works, what doesn't work, you know? I almost see it as an intellectual activity" (Dean Frost, Sciences).

Deans attributed their faculty, or academic, social, and professional identity to four general rationales. First, deans are selected at the University of California because they possess outstanding research records. Dean Shepherd (Sciences) explained the importance of a strong research record. "If you come from these institutions, academically, you have to be good. UC deans…are academically successful. These are the kind of academic values people do not put in job descriptions but they look at it." Second, the dean role was transitory and was not a position to which they aspired nor a position they considered held value in an environment where a strong academic record was a necessity.

> A lot of people see themselves eventually either stepping down from a dean [role] and doing professorial type, research type things, or retiring, in which case they might continue some academic life as an emeritus faculty member. Even those who have further administrative aspirations, I think they recognize that to be competitive in the administrative job market being a very strong academic…is very important. (Dean Loveland, Social Sciences)

In the academy, within their schools and colleges surrounded by their faculty peers, deans maintained their academic identity as faculty or as members of their discipline (e. g., historian or engineer) because it was the identity with the most professional capital in their work environment. That is, amongst the faculty social group, the basis for their professional identity, the academic identity possessed the lowest cost and the greatest rewards. Several deans indicated that the deanship was deemed a "lesser" role by the academic community.

> In academia, we tend to sort of cast, you know, look askance at academic administrators because they give up their [research]. They're not scholars anymore… I almost don't like to tell people I'm a dean, because I don't want them to think that I'm less committed to scholarship. (Dean Frost, Sciences)

The deans indicated that their academic colleagues perceived the role to be filled by individuals who were no longer productive in research; thus, they shied away from identifying themselves in such a capacity.

Third, deans rejected the dean identity because they feared perceptions of elitism both inside and outside the university. "It feels a little braggy. I think it puts people off a little bit" (Dean Stone, Sciences). Social identity theory utilizes the term "salience," to describe the likelihood that "an identity will be activated in a situation" (Stets & Burke, 2000, p. 229). Deans meet identity and behavioral demands and invoke labels that are most salient for the situation at hand. Deans altered their self-introductions and identity in response to the situation.

> I am a professor. Well, it depends on who it is. I guess it just depends if it's a university situation. It depends on who's in the room. If it's high level people in the room, I'm a dean. If it's lower level people in the room, I am a professor at a university and that's just for public palatability… When I say lower… It's like my mom and dad, they don't understand what a dean does other than what I tell them… It just depends on the audience. But I am also an administrator or a manager when I'm running my lab or when I'm running my classroom. (Dean Kraus, Sciences)

Deans managed their multiple identities and negotiated their personal identity (Stets & Burke, 2000) [the identity outside their profession], their social and professional identity (the faculty member, the anthropologist, the professor, the researcher), and their role identity in the context of the larger institution, their institutional identity (the dean, the administrator, the donor steward, the manager of public tax dollars). They adopted the professorial and teaching role with laypeople in public and personal spaces outside the university, the researcher and disciplinary (e. g. chemist, anthropologist) role within

academic-centric environments, and the administrative and dean role in environments

where either donors, their dean peers, or other higher level administrators were present.

Fourth, and finally, deans rejected the dean role identity in order to dissociate

themselves from any responsibility for managerialism and neoliberal behaviors. At times,

this was a strategy to disconnect them from behaviors they, and the faculty, found

unsavory. "When you have a managerial or bureaucratic system in place, it is very

difficult to change. I didn't create paperwork for others either. Managing means you have

to create paperwork" (Dean Shepherd, Sciences). The maintenance of the academic

identity allowed deans to act as stealth managers and double agents and, thus, to

implement neoliberal initiatives with the appearance that they were academic-centric.

This phenomenon was exemplified in an extended narration from Dean Berkshire (Social

Studies) as he explained how he negotiated the demands of the faculty and the executive

administration.

> There is something about the job that requires you hide it a little…that makes it necessary that you appear to your colleagues on the faculty not to have been too enthusiastic about getting the [dean] job… You don't want to be seen as having abandoned your scholarly career because you will lose your credibility as an elder in the tribe. I think…that everybody would say they were less productive as a scholar, that they're sort of using their reputation as a scholar rather than creating a reputation as a scholar while they're in the dean's office. Why is that subterfuge necessary? I think it's necessary because the faculty from their first days on the job are sure that they cannot be deferential to status. They have to be deferential to scholarship… And, consequently, if you're using your status as a dean to get something done, you are using up your credibility rather than using it… While you are in the dean's job…you are marching to a different drummer than you were when you were on the faculty. [Y]ou have to minimize the impact that has on your relationship to the other members of the faculty. And so, you prefer them to think that you're their boy or girl. Doing subtle diplomacy with the executive administration, rather than that you are the agent of the executive administration… The representation of the faculty has to take place in the language that the executive administration can understand. The faculty has to

know you're trying to represent them, and the administration has to know that you know how to play the game. And you have to keep your own counsel about which of those guideposts you're closest to at any given moment… Because the executive administration has a tendency to keep things confidential, you don't have to portray yourself as a representative of the executive administration. But because the faculty tends not to keep things confidential about how management is going, you do have to portray yourself as representing the faculty. (Dean Berkshire, Social Sciences)

Dean Berkshire explains how the maintenance of an academic identity enables deans to manage tricky and tenuous situations that require negotiation between what the faculty prefers and what the executive administration mandates. In this way, deans are able to present themselves as agents of the faculty while simultaneously pushing and supporting management initiatives. Several deans indicated they used a stealth approach to the implementation of initiatives for revenue generation and the pursuit of prestige. Dean Stone (Sciences) explained, "I work with faculty and let them think it's their idea." Dean Kraus (Sciences) described a similar approach to motivate faculty to action.

I'm not putting this out publicly… The vision is to get [the college] into position where we're competitive with any other top fifty university. We have really good faculty… They're not pursuing the high level grants, and I don't understand why. They should be… We should be getting a lot more of these things but I'm not… I don't want this to be public because I think my faculty would be concerned… So, we listen to the faculty. "Well, we need more support for graduate students…we need more facility space, equipment," [faculty say]… So, then I'll come back and it's like, "So, you know there's these grants here that …would help us purchase some equipment. What do you think? Should we work on it?"

Since neoliberal behaviors, such as managerialism and academic capitalism, may be perceived of by faculty as antithetical to the academic mission, deans must be strategic in the way they implement these initiatives. This requires that they (1) blend neoliberal logics with academic logics and (2) maintain an academic aesthetic with their faculty by adhering to the academic identity and using stealth approaches to management. Thus,

140

allegiance to the social and professional identity as faculty is both a tool and a coping mechanism for dealing with tensions between academic and neoliberal logics. As members of the academy, University of California deans, who were drawn from the faculty body, associate themselves with the in-group (faculty) and attempt to distance themselves from association with the out-group (administrators) and members of the "dark side" (Palm, 2006, p. 59). University of California academic deans self-categorize as "faculty," and accentuate the "attitudes, beliefs and values, affective reactions, behavioral norms, styles of speech, and other properties that are believed to be correlated with the relevant intergroup [i. e. faculty]" (Stets & Burke, 2000, p. 225). Yet, as academic deans have a foot in both academic and administrative roles and cultures (Birnbaum, 1988; Del Favero, 2006), they exist in a position where membership in an in-group is also membership in an out-group and membership in an out-group is simultaneously membership in an opposite in-group. They must please both their faculty, their provosts and chancellors, and the larger public.

Identity theory suggests that individuals seek to self-verify their identities and that stress or discomfort arise when they are unable to verify (Burke & Stets, 2009). The adoption of a social identity (in this case, of a faculty member) reinforces the self and counteracts feelings of uncertainty (Burke & Stets, 2009). Individuals behave in a manner that helps them achieve their goals and alter their environment as well as themselves in an effort to reach their aspirations (Mead, 1934). That is, although they may maintain an academic identity, they must alter their behavior to meet the identity standards of the deans' role and engage in neoliberal logics in order to keep their job and ensure the

141

success of their college or school. Conversely, although they are deans in their day-to-day work, their social identity as faculty requires that they maintain an appearance of academic engagement and adherence to academic values in order to self-verify as faculty. Yet, the meanings and symbolic value of the behavior are more relevant than the behavior itself (Burke & Stets, 2009). This suggests that the adherence to the faculty identity may also stem from an unwillingness to associate oneself with the role of the dean—a role that requires engagement in neoliberal logics and behaviors—and a necessity to associate instead with the faculty identity. The maintenance of the academic identity, then, may stem from deans' cognitive dissonance and serve as a coping mechanism for reconciliation of their professional identity (faculty) and its corresponding academic logics with their role identity (dean) and its corresponding neoliberal logics. Negotiation (Stets & Burke, 2000) is required to engage in "proper role performance" (Stets & Burke, 2000, p. 227) and manage the interplay of multiple identities and their associated logics, values, and behaviors. Whether neoliberal logics and academic logics (perceived of in the literature as divergent and incompatible) are incompatible is irrelevant to the individual dean who must negotiate and reconcile multiple logics and blend and segregate values in order to save face socially with their complex identities and roles.

    In those cases where former faculty accepted and embraced their role identity as deans, the role was secondary to their primary social and professional identity as faculty. There was only one exception in which a dean embraced the dean identity unequivocally. In that singular case, the dean attributed their professional identity as a dean to reduced

research and teaching. However, similar accounts of limited teaching and research were invoked by deans who identified, without question, as faculty. Thus, the academic dean who adopted a sole identity as a dean was the exception to the rule. That academic deans held fast to their academic identity may account for the presence of academic values and the ways in which deans' narratives blended academic logics with neoliberal logics. Whereas the deans' administrative role instigated conformance to and adoption of neoliberal values and logics, their academic professional identity, irrespective of their dean role, may be the basis for narratives that supported academic values and logics.

This investigation reveals that academic deans at the University of California view the faculty identity as hierarchically superior to the dean identity. Consequently, they blend or segregate neoliberal and academic logics, values, and behaviors in order to rectify their role as dean with their academic values as faculty. Deans have either normalized, at best, or denied, at worst, any notion of a neoliberal threat to the academic mission. In Chapter 5, I discuss the conclusions and implications of my findings for higher education management in a neoliberal university. I link the data and findings from my investigation back to the existing literature on deans. I explain how my research extends theory on higher education management. As well, I discuss the challenges I faced during data collection. Finally, I make recommendations for future research, and I enumerate recommendations for practice.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Deans Adopt Dual Logics and Dual Identities

In this present investigation, I sought to answer the main research question: To what extent and in what ways do academic deans at research universities adopt neoliberal values and enact neoliberal behaviors? Motivated by the lack of qualitative research on academic deans, my intention with this investigation was to understand how neoliberal logics—logics the literature on higher education suggests are endemic to the institution—manifest in the role of the academic dean. To explain the interactions and manifestations of neoliberalism in academic deans, I drew upon institutional theory and the concept of institutional logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Institutional logics are embodied in the assumptions, values, norms, and behaviors of institutional actors and provide meaning to their social reality (Thornton et al., 2012). Thus, they provided a useful framework for conceptualizing neoliberal behaviors and values. Yet, the literature on administrative leadership in higher education suggested that other elements influence the role of the dean—their organizational socialization as faculty and their deeply embedded culture of academe. From this, I wanted to determine how and in what ways deans exemplified academic values. Academic deans in the research university maintain a foot in each of the academic and the administrative worlds. As a consequence, tensions may arise as a result of potentially conflicting roles and values. To address this, I included secondary research questions that led me to inquire about tensions that do or do not exist between traditional academic values and neoliberal values in the work of

academic deans at my research sites (University of California campuses). Institutional theory and the concept of institutional logics allowed me to understand how multiple logics can either coexist or be blended together and how new logics can replace older logics.

My findings indicate that academic deans from all disciplinary backgrounds at the University of California adopt neoliberal logics and engage in neoliberal behaviors. These behaviors include demands on them for performativity (Ball, 2012) for their colleges, schools, and faculty. As well, deans expect and demand academic capitalist activities such as revenue generation, competition, technology transfer, and corporate partnerships (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) from their colleges, schools, and faculty. These neoliberal logics manifest in values and behaviors such as the push for rankings and national recognition of top-rated programs, high research productivity, and grant acquisition. As well, they are captured in deans' rhetoric on students and faculty as assets to the organization and students as customers and products that need to be served and require development for the placement into the economic marketplace. These behaviors and commercial orientations reflected in the data are evidence of neoliberalism (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

My findings expand upon the work of Deem, Hillyard, and Reed (2007) who conceived of three types of academic managers in their study of Heads of Department, Deans, and Pro-Vice Chancellors in the United Kingdom: career managers, who are oriented towards management work and aspire to advance through the administrative rankings; reluctant managers, who serve as academic leaders because it is their turn to

145

serve but intend to return to the faculty; and, "good citizen" (p. 104) managers who fill management positions in order to aid their institutions but view the role as temporary and intend to either return to the faculty or retire. Although it was not the central focus of my research, deans at the University of California also came into their decanal positions for those three reasons.

   With Deem and associate's work in mind, I noted patterns in the data that the manifestations of managerialism, in academic deans specifically, existed on a continuum. My analysis of deans renders the conclusion that these leaders, although they project themselves as academics, faculty, and members of their discipline, are managers, who engage, whether they choose to admit it or not, in administrative and managerial tasks. These managerial behaviors arise in their surveillance of faculty work, their management of faculty initiatives, their ardent focus on outcomes that can be measured, and their own compliance with auditing of their own productivity and the productivity and effectiveness of their faculty. The deans expressed these managerialist tendencies on a continuum—some projected a well-formed and unapologetic managerial approach, some were hesitant to admit to managerial behaviors or did admit to them but explained that their managerial efforts were limited by institutional structures such as shared governance, and, finally, a smaller group of deans denied their involvement in managerialism. This third group, when questioned in interviews about the management of faculty, distanced themselves from association with managerial behaviors and activities; however, on a related topic they acknowledged their managerial behaviors, inadvertently.

The majority of the deans interviewed for this investigation adopted neoliberal logics without reservation. These neoliberal logics were embedded in their espoused values and behaviors to the extent that they were taken for granted. My findings support Davies and Bansel's (2010) and Ward's (2012) contention that market liberalism has infiltrated higher education to the point that it is no longer recognized as an anomaly. In extension of the scholarship on neoliberalism in higher education, my research takes this conclusion one step further and provides, through the use of institutional theory, both an explanation for why and a description of how the infiltration of neoliberal logics can be normalized, as well as resisted, in higher education institutions through key members of academic leadership. The twenty academic deans in this investigation embodied neoliberal logics but they did so simultaneously with academic logics. That is, they blended (Thornton et al., 2012) neoliberal and academic logics together or segregated (Thornton et al., 2012) them and expressed both logics without any perception of incompatibility. In addition to the adoption of neoliberal logics and behaviors, academic deans also maintained deeply held and espoused academic logics such as the value of faculty autonomy, shared governance, excellence and quality in knowledge creation, higher education as a social good, and trust and collegiality amongst faculty bodies and individuals. These academic logics were paired with neoliberal logics frequently in the narrations of deans. In some cases, these academic logics, such as shared governance and faculty autonomy, were described as ascendant over neoliberal logics of management. In other cases, neoliberal logics and behaviors were presented as a necessary mechanism for the achievement of academic ends. In a resource constrained university with high levels

147

of competition—a context deans accepted as normal and irreversible—academic deans perceived the pursuit of revenue generation, the management of assets, the surveillance of faculty, and a focus on performativity and measureable outcomes as the mechanism to achieve a greater social good and the academic mission. In the deans' perceptions, the business mission must go hand in hand with the academic mission. The deans did not conceptualize neoliberal logics as antithetical to academic logics. While my findings show that these neoliberal endeavors take place, they are carried out in conjunction with traditional academic activities and are perceived of, at least by academic deans in the University of California, as compatible, not contradictory.

The ways in which deans blended logics can be explained through institutional theory and the concept of institutional logics; however, one other explanation for the presence and blending of these logics was evident in the data. Consistent with the characteristics of qualitative research that evolves throughout data collection and analysis, this investigation of academic deans was no exception. While I understood the potential explanatory power of institutional logics to an investigation on neoliberalism in deans' behaviors, I did not anticipate the value that identity would play as an analytical tool until I was well into the middle of my data collection. A pattern suggestive of identity was prevalent during data collection and analysis which indicated that identity theory might provide an additional explanation for the ways in which the deans blended logics. Consequently, although institutional theory provided the initial framework for this investigation, identity theory (Burke & Stets, 2009) provided further explanation for how and why deans blended and segregated academic and neoliberal logics and values.

Overwhelmingly, deans identified professionally as faculty and were reticent to align themselves with a dean identity. For all but a few of the deans, their primary identity was associated with their professorial profession and/or their discipline based title (e. g., sociologist or medical doctor). Identity theory provided a framework for the explanation of how deans self-categorize (Stets & Burke, 2000) as faculty and explains how deans prioritize their academic identity over their administrative identity. As such, my data reinforce Burke and Stet's (2009) concept of salience in the activation of identity when multiple identities are held by an individual.

Social identity theory posits that individuals identify with socially based in-groups, groups perceived positively, and strive to distance themselves from out-groups, groups perceived negatively (Stets & Burke, 2000). In the academy, faculty are categorized as in-groups and administrators are categorized as out-groups, or members of the "dark side." Yet, the participants in my investigation described themselves as both. They activated both their social and professional identity as a faculty member and their role identity as a dean simultaneously. The role of a dean is what they perform but their role as a faculty member is who they understand as the self. Deans maintain their professional academic identity despite their behaviors that align with their dean role because their professional identities as academics have salience in their organization among their faculty colleagues. While they express values in an attempt to verify their social identity as academics, by the nature of their organizational and institutional responsibility, they also express values and enact behaviors in alignment with their role identity as deans.

Two Interpretations: Deficit and Anti-deficit Perspectives on the Dual Logics of Deans

My findings on University of California academic deans' activation of dual logics and dual identities may be interpreted from either an anti-deficit or deficit perspective. In the next section of this chapter, I present both lines of interpretation and their corresponding implications. I will begin with the perspective held by deans themselves— an anti-deficit perspective. The data in this investigation lead to conclusions that call into question previous literature that conceives of neoliberalism negatively as an infection that overtakes the traditions of the academy. My findings also call into question the severity of the infiltration of neoliberalism into higher education and challenge Deem's (1998, 2004) contention that trust, autonomy, and collegiality are eroded and replaced with the pursuit of outcomes data and business plans. From the deans' anti-deficit perspective, deans are stewards of both neoliberal and academic logics, and, thus, the presence of neoliberalism in higher education may not be as dire as Giroux (2002), Levin (2017), and Ward (2012) have forewarned. Neoliberalism is evident in academic leadership in the role of deans at research universities, but the severity of its consequences may be tempered by deeply held academic values and institutional structures, such as shared governance, that act as barriers against the replacement of academic logics with neoliberal logics.

Deans' activation of both identities and the placement of the academic identity as hierarchical to the role identity of dean explains how and why deans blend neoliberal and academic logics. Moreover, the findings of this investigation suggest that the academic

identities of deans are deeply rooted and thus prevent total domination of neoliberal logics within this influential leadership and administrative group. The academic identity and its corresponding academic values balance out the infiltration of neoliberalism into the institution. That is, warnings in the literature that neoliberalism threatens the mission of higher education by replacing higher social goals with private sector-like profit motives may be exaggerated in research university environments such as the University of California with strong cultures of shared governance, collegiality, trust in expertise, and a history of high quality research production and knowledge dissemination. A positive interpretation of the data suggests that neoliberal logics, although prevalent, are neither as menacing as described nor as powerful as the literature warns. Thus, while deans may have been criticized in the literature as members of the "dark side," a positive interpretation of the data leads to the potential conclusion that they may in actuality be the last bastion of hope against the neoliberal regime.

From a positive perspective, the data suggest that the culture of the academy and academic logics, reinforced through institutional members, are an unshakable force to be reckoned with should any social, political, or economic power seek to undo the foundations of the institution of the research university. The balance between neoliberal and academic logics in the institution is linked to the balance of neoliberal and academic logics and behaviors in the individual members of the institution. Deans play a key role in the maintenance of academic logics. Deans approach to the amalgamation of neoliberal and academic logics may stem from what one dean described in interviews as "the rules of the game." That is, there are structures within the university, such as shared

governance, hierarchical layers of leadership, external political and social pressures, and resource constraints, which deans must adjust to that are outside the realm of their control. This is the nature of higher education at present. In essence, deans do their best to advance an academic mission and maintain academic logics despite the neoliberal conditions in which they work.

It is in the interplay of identities and the negotiation of deans' values, logics, and roles that the institutional legitimacy (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008) of the university is both stabilized and destabilized. Deans represent both actors of the neoliberal regime and defenders of the academic ethos. How long deans can maintain this precarious balance as double agents will depend upon the continued maintenance of an academic culture, the continued appointment of scholars to dean positions, and the continued resistance to efforts to undermine and dismantle the structure of tenure and shared governance.

From a critical, deficit perspective, a positive interpretation of the data is the neoliberal conclusion. That is, a positive conclusion and interpretation of the data are a demonstration that the neoliberal regime has infiltrated the research university in full. That deans may hold these dual logics simultaneously, without reservation, and without perception of conflict is evidence alone that neoliberal logics have replaced academic logics and that the logics of the academy have been altered forever. From a critical perspective, the interpretation that neoliberalism is compatible with the traditions of the academy suggests that deans, as well as myself as researcher and interpreter of data, may be suffering from a type of Stockholm syndrome. The internalization and normalization of the conditions of performativity, academic capitalism, and managerialism result from a

152

phenomenon actually created by neoliberalism—an inability of individuals within the system to render critique of the regime itself (Davies & Bansel, 2010). To put it more bluntly, neoliberalism has pulled the wool over our eyes.

This investigation provides evidence of the neoliberal regime's widespread permeation into the fabric of higher education. Previous research has demonstrated that neoliberal ideology is embedded in faculty behaviors (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015) and manifests in faculty engagement in academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Findings from this investigation provide robust data that academic administrators are reinforcers of neoliberal logics—logics they have normalized within their schools and colleges. This investigation makes evident that managerialism is not a phenomenon prevalent only in national contexts such as the United Kingdom (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007), where the State has greater control over higher education institutions. Indeed, managerialism is present in the United States in public research universities and is exemplified through academic deans' behaviors and logics.

From a deficit perspective, the deans' engagement in neoliberal behaviors and portrayal of these logics as compatible suggest the fundamental alteration of the academic ethos and academic logics. If these deans are any indication, it may only be a matter of time before academic logics are replaced fully with neoliberal logics within the research university. From an anti-neoliberal standpoint, deans' manipulation of the academic identity as a tool for the implementation of neoliberal initiatives justifies the classification of these administrative leaders as members of the dark side and conceives of them as a threat, not a defender, of the academic ethos. The maintenance of an academic identity

153

may indeed be a strategy used by deans to cope with their lack of ability to verify their identity with their former faculty colleagues as a result of either a necessity, or their own choice, to engage in neoliberal behaviors and logics—logics deemed by their faculty peers as unacceptable within their social group. As a consequence, deans act as double agents who play for both sides—both the academic and administrative teams. This deficit perspective of deans' narratives suggest that they are, at best, puppets, whose strings are controlled by drivers of neoliberalism such as the executive administration or, at worst, conspirators, in the disintegration of the academy.

Challenges in Methods and Methodology

Consideration of both the negative and positive interpretations of the implications of this investigation leads to the necessity to discuss issues of trust in qualitative research. As such, I now turn to a discussion of some of the challenges I faced during data collection. My line of questions required that the deans reflect on their own identity and the alignment or misalignment that identity had with the day to day work they were required to do as deans. I sometimes threw out terms such as "manager" and "manage the work of faculty" into the discussion to capture deans' reactions to their association with such terms and concepts. Although some were comfortable with affiliation with these activities and identities, others were more reactive.

There are two explanations for this behavior in interviews and one emanates from identity theory. Identity theory suggests that individuals will seek to verify their identity through engagement in behaviors that meet their identity standard (Burke & Stets, 2009). When individuals are not able to verify their identity, they experience negative emotions.

154

Burke and Stets (2009) paraphrase Swann's (1983) assertion that "one sure way to get people stirred up is to tell them they are not who they think they are" (p. 69). Indeed, I experienced displays of power within interviews as several participants were "stirred up" following questions that I asked which they may have found unsettling. This reaction may stem from the discomfort of deans when confronted with the prospect that they may not, in their day to day work, embody the academic identity with which they want to self-associate. According to identity theory, this experience may have led them to behaviors that reaffirmed their own self-perceptions of their academic social identity. This could have manifested through deans' presentation of themselves as oriented towards academic logics to a greater degree in the interview than they may enact. The deans may have presented themselves in either a "real" or "contrived" (Goffman, 1959, pp. 70-71) manner. They may have curated, either consciously or subconsciously, the performance they wanted me, as the researcher, to perceive. The need for deans to present themselves as academics may stem from deeply rooted social and professional identities, or it may originate from a need to self-verify as academics in the presence of an academic (that is, me as the researcher).

An alternate explanation for deans' reactivity is derived from the literature on the challenges of conducting elite interviews (Brooks & Normore, 2015; Harvey, 2011; Mikecz, 2012). Deans may have attempted to avoid feelings of vulnerability through the reorientation of themselves as the authority in the room. Deans resituated themselves as authoritative during interviews by asking me why I was asking specific questions, criticizing the questions I asked, suggesting that I asked the wrong question, and then

redirecting the interview by answering the questions they wanted to answer. Although the majority of deans were welcoming and willing to engage in discussion about their work, others were late to interviews, ended the interview early, allowed multiple interruptions during the interview, or made it clear to me in their action and words that I was an imposition on their time. I noted instances such as these in my field notes and was cognizant of the ways in which these experiences might influence my data collection and interpretation. Consequently, I waited to code these interviews until I concluded all interviews and coded the less uncomfortable interviews first.

It is important to highlight these methodological challenges and the implications they have for findings. As this investigation was my dissertation work, my involvement in the interview process was necessary. My status as a graduate student may have influenced the power dynamics within the interviews. My affiliation with the University of California system and my employment as an Executive Assistant to the Dean may have resulted in a reluctance on the part of my participants to engage in an honest way in dialogue about their values and behaviors as academic deans. Nevertheless, this is a hermeneutic phenomenological investigation. In a phenomenological investigation, the intent is to understand and ultimately explain the lived experiences of participants in the way they want to present themselves. Yet, my hermeneutic approach also allows for my own interpretation and critical analysis of the data derived from participant interviews. While the perspectives of deans should be honored, they must also be interpreted.

Recommendations for Future Research

These challenges in methodology and methods do not delegitimize my findings; however, a discussion and reflection on these challenges may be beneficial to future research on academic deans and other high-level academic administrators. Future scholarship on neoliberal and managerial behaviors should consider the use of multiple interviewers, or co-principal investigators, of those with similar positional status as the participants, such as other faculty or administrators. The dynamics of the interviewer and interviewee matter (Shopes, 2011). Discussions between deans and me may have been less uncomfortable if the deans viewed their interviewer as a peer instead of a subordinate graduate student. As well, this investigation would have been strengthened through observation (Angrosino & Rosenberg, 2011; Mulhall, 2003). But there were barriers to observation. It was difficult to obtain a substantial number of participants. As elite interviewees, deans are difficult to access (Mikecz, 2012) and their schedules and obligations to their colleges and schools hamper a researcher's ability to obtain time on their calendars. Furthermore, as a graduate student with full-time employment and financial obligations, it was not feasible for me to conduct long-term observations. However, the inclusion of observations in the research design would allow for the collection of data that could be triangulated (Denzin, 1978) with data from the semi-structured interviews with deans. Observations would allow for verification of deans' expressed values and behaviors in interviews with their actual behaviors and expressed values in action in their day to day life as deans in the University of California.

In addition to the inclusion of observations and the inclusion of a peer to peer interviewer/interviewee research design, there are several potential lines of inquiry that researchers on academic deans, institutional logics, identity, and neoliberalism might pursue. First, this investigation was conducted at a public research university with a history of shared governance, a history that is enshrined in legislation (Levin, Morales Vazquez, & Martin, 2018). Future scholarship on the neoliberal behaviors of academic deans at other research institutions with no history or less of a history of shared governance may illuminate differences in data. Furthermore, an exploration of the neoliberal behaviors of academic deans at other institution types such as community colleges, comprehensive universities, private universities, and religiously-affiliated institutions would verify, or not, the patterns of these behaviors across U. S. higher education. According to scholarship (e. g., Clark, 1987), these contexts would affect the logics and identities of academic deans.

Additional inquiry is needed that explores the behaviors of academic deans from the perspective of other organizational members within the institution such as faculty, students, department chairs, provosts, and community members affiliated with the schools and colleges. Collection of data from deans' colleagues would provide insight into the managerial behaviors of academic deans and would result in a more robust conceptualization of these academic administrators' roles in the resistance to and or perpetuation of a neoliberal agenda.

The neoliberal behaviors of department chairs are also understudied and worthy of investigation through theoretical foundations. Levin, Martin, and López-Damián

(forthcoming, 2019) draw upon the findings of this investigation of deans and expand the literature on higher education management through an exploration of the role that department chairs at three research universities and three comprehensive universities play in the management of the academic profession. As well, these scholars explore the experiences of part time non-tenure track and full time tenure-track faculty within a neoliberal context.

Similar to the literature on deans, the literature on provosts and the upper echelons of higher education administration is minimal. Much of the scholarship covers what these executive administrators do and what their role is within the organization, but there is a lack of research that uses data collected directly from these groups on the role that these administrators play in the context of a neoliberal university.

In this investigation, although I answered my research questions, there are other questions left unanswered and these are prompts for future study. Are there other theories beyond institutional theory and identity theory that could explain the ways in which academic deans activate dual logics and identities in the neoliberal university? Does resource dependency theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) hold potential explanatory power? One way to examine this question would be to conduct a comparative analysis of deans at universities with limited resources and access to public funds and deans at a private university that holds a substantial endowment and is rife with resources—such as Harvard or Stanford.

Another line of inquiry left unanswered by this investigation is whether or not these neoliberal logics and behaviors evident in academic deans are a new phenomenon

in higher education. While the "neo" in neoliberalism translates into new, neoliberalism, or the orientation of the public sector towards the market, may not be a new phenomenon. In *Clark Kerr's University of California,* Gonzalez (2011) noted that Kerr, one of the fathers of American higher education and the University of California was influenced by the writings of Thorsten Veblen. Veblen's (1918) book, *The higher learning in America,* levied a critique of universities as business enterprises (Gonzalez, 2011). Veblen (1918) described the modern American university as an altered institution that had departed from a tradition of oversight by men of the cloth and had been replaced by a business enterprise run by businessmen who were "captains of industry" (Veblen, 1918, p. 185 as cited by Gonzalez, 2011, p. 26). These business men selected presidents who were "captains of erudition, whose office it is to turn the means in hand to account in the largest feasible output" (Veblen, 1918, p. 85). These university presidents "act not as clerics and faculty colleagues, but as businessmen and employers" (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 26). American universities *à la* Veblen (1918) were obsessed with "competition and prestige" (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 27). The conditions of the universities described at the time of Veblen's publication seem similar to modern day public universities. Veblen (1918) described the departments of the university as "competitor[s]" for "the apportionment of funds and equipment" (p. 112) where resources were controlled by "the businesslike university management" (p. 112). This competition extended "with similar departments in rival universities, for a clientele in the way of student registrations" (p. 112). The side-effect of competition was "decorative real estate, spectacular pageantry, and bureaucratic magnificence, [and] elusive statistics" (p. 175). Yet, Veblen (1918) noted that "the

university is after all a seat of learning…stultification…waits on any university directorate that shall dare to avow any other end as its objective. So the appearance of an unwavering devotion to the pursuit of knowledge must be kept up" (p. 176). In Veblen's university, the goals were "vocational ends and statistical showing" (p. 253).

Veblen's work suggested that neoliberal, or market ideology, was present in higher education as early as the start of the 20th century. Veblen wrote primarily of boards of trustees and presidents and described the delegation of the "bureaucratic organization and control of the administrative machinery" onto "those chiefs of clerical bureau called 'deans,' together with the many committees for the sifting of sawdust into which the faculty of a well-administered university is organized" (p. 253). He described committees as "designed chiefly to keep the faculty talking while the bureaucratic machine goes on its way under the guidance of the executive and his personal counsellors and lieutenants" (p. 253). According to Veblen's description, deans were actors within a bureaucratic machine, run by the executive (the President). This suggested that while deans may have been players in the bureaucracy, they may have been pawns in a businesslike, neoliberal enterprise. It is unclear whether or not, in Veblen's (1918) work, deans were perpetuators engaged in market behaviors or whether they were resisters. Nevertheless, Veblen (1918) provided historical documentation that the trends of marketization began early in modern 20th century American higher education. Despite the label, neoliberalism and its presence in higher education may not be new.

It could be argued that neoliberal ideologies have been exacerbated in the last 30-40 years. In the post-G. I. Bill era, the massification of higher education, the increase in

161

competition due to students' pursuit of out of state institutions, the globalization of higher education, the public push for greater accountability (Birnbaum, 2000), the public's unwillingness to be taxed, the shift in the perception of higher education as a private good rather than a public good, and the arrival of social media may have amplified higher education's orientation toward the market. According to Birnbaum (2000), by the 1970s, managerialism had entered the scene as scientific management was utilized to response to the growing complexity of higher education institutions. Evidence of neoliberal ideologies' presence in higher education institutions was also exemplified in the work of Keller (1983) who suggested that with increased competition, financial constraints, and retrenchment strategies, more traditional styles of unobtrusive management would cease to exist as they were replaced by overt, obtrusive approaches to management.

In *Academic strategy,* Keller (1983) noted that "the kind of management higher education needs does not exist yet" (p. 58). He wrote that deans, provosts, and presidents create this new management approach "chink by chink" (p. 58) as they utilize corporate management practices and cite management research to justify activities in higher education. At the time, Keller (1983) explained that current activities, such as new training programs for administrators, more active administrative action, changes in governance, and the primacy of finance, technology, and planning, point to an impending shift in higher education management. This line of reasoning was followed by Leslie and Fretwell (1996), Clark (2001), and more recently Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy (2004), and Massy (2016).

What this investigation cannot ascertain is the degree to which universities, and therefore deans and other academic administrators, exemplify neoliberal behaviors and logics. Nor does this investigation uncover the development of market liberalism throughout the history of U. S. higher education. Most certainly, a historical analysis that utilizes document analysis of archival data would enrich the knowledge on the origination and development of neoliberalism in higher education in the United States and/or other national contexts. All of these potential lines of inquiry are an opportunity for a long-term future research agenda on neoliberalism and specialization in higher education management and leadership.

Contributions to the Literature on Academic Deans, Neoliberalism, and Theory

Nevertheless, this present investigation is a substantial contribution to the higher education literature for several reasons. First, the study of higher education itself is a relatively new field. Thus, there are areas of research in need of exploration. The majority of scholarship on higher education that has been completed focuses on issues of student affairs, diversity, access, and student persistence and attainment, under the label of "student success." The subject of higher education management in general is largely untouched.

Second, the literature on academic deans is limited primarily to descriptions of the dean's role, written as a manual for incoming new deans, and memoirs of previous deans written about their time on the "dark side." Save from Gmelch and Wolverton's (2002) body of work on deans, their socialization to the role, and the stress and role ambiguity they encounter, few have conducted data-driven investigations of academic deans.

Scholarship addresses the roles and tasks of an administrator (Buller, 2006, 2007; Hecht et al., 1999; Lee & VanHorn, 1983, Tucker & Bryan, 1991); the contemporary literature on university administrators covers topics such as leadership (Birnbaum, 1992; Buller, 2007; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013; Isaac, 2007), career paths (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Carroll, 1991; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983; Strathe & Wilson, 2006; Wolverton & Gonzales, 2000), socialization (Del Favero, 2006; Gmelch, 2000a, 2000b; Speck, 2003), transitions of faculty to and from administration (Achterberg, 2004; Firmin, 2008; Foster, 2006; Glick, 2006; Gmelch & Miskin, 1995; Gmelch & Parkay, 1999; Griffith, 2006; Henry, 2006; McCluskey-Titus & Cawthon, 2004; Palm, 2006; Smith, Rollins, & Smith, 2012; Strathe & Wilson, 2006), leadership styles and their implications, or factors that influence administrative behaviors, such as discipline and cognitive complexity (Del Favero, 2005, 2006), effectiveness (Martin, 1993; Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002), and deans' influence on their colleges' well-being (Wolverton & Gmelch, 2002). The literature on the behaviors of deans is insufficient to respond to the larger questions on the ways in which neoliberal behaviors manifest at the deans' level and how neoliberal logics are negotiated with academic logics. In response to this inadequacy in the literature on deans, I endeavored to use qualitative field methodology to answer questions about if, and how, neoliberal logics manifested in a key group of university leaders in a U. S. context. I wanted to understand and explain, using theoretical underpinnings, the ways in which these organizational actors negotiated, and coped with, neoliberal logics. I intended to explain if these logics were perceived of as compatible with academic logics. In the end, the data revealed an

164

unexpected connection to academic identity. This further enriched the findings of my investigation and highlighted an aspect of the scholarship on deans not captured previously in the literature.

In addition to advancing the scholarship on deans in general, this investigation emphasized the importance of academic deans' professional identity as a component in the management of higher education. Levin (2000) asserted that higher education managers were responsible for creating change, not managing change, and that the challenge for modern academic leadership was to adopt a "do no harm" (p. 39) approach. Management without harm requires that the leader manage "in accord with the values and beliefs of its members" and "adjust to changing conditions and yet preserve institutional and individual values" (Levin, 2000, p. 40). According to Levin (2000), higher education managers engage in corporate sector behaviors as a coping mechanism for dealing with change in the institution. This present investigation considered, rather, not how deans use corporate approaches as a coping mechanism, but instead how they cope with the neoliberal behaviors themselves and how they negotiate potential conflicts in their own logics and values derived from their professional academic identity. Findings suggest that deans, at least at the University of California, cope with neoliberal pressures of the institution through the activation and maintenance of their academic identity. Although this academic identity may be an aesthetic rather than an actuality, it acts to ground deans amidst an institutional environment that calls upon them, indeed, necessitates them, to engage in behaviors and values outside the socialized norms of their former peer group— their faculty colleagues. In essence, this investigation emphasizes the profound

165

importance of the academic identity in higher education administration as a stabilizer of core institutional values. Future development of an administrative theory specific to higher education relies on continued attention to the role of identity in higher education managers. Academic identity is a guide for administrative behaviors within the institution. For deans at the University of California, it is an important indicator of potential priorities, as are neoliberal pressures and logics.

The importance of identity in the data suggests the expansion of institutional theory and the concept of institutional logics for consideration of the presence of multiple identities in individuals as an explanation for the blending or segregation of potentially incongruent logics. Institutional logics provides for individual agency in the adoption and expression of logics within an institution but does not make clear the origins and motivations behind institutional members' choices in the activation of logics. A combination of institutional theory and identity theory allows for the cultivation of a substantial explanation of how values and beliefs become embedded, reinforced, and altered.

Recommendations for Practice

A primary recommendation that can be derived from the findings of this investigation is directed not towards administrators but towards faculty. The adoption of neoliberal behaviors and logics in academic deans in the research university necessitates that faculty engage meaningfully in governance and decision making. Faculty must participate actively in executive administrative searches. They must insist on sitting on search committees and must be vocal in their concerns and preferences for deans who

have engaged in research and who understand the culture of the academy. Participation of faculty in governance should extend beyond search committees into every aspect of university operations, such as institutional strategic planning, finance and budget prioritization, capital planning, and other realms of decision making usually reserved for the administration.

What the academy needs is to shift its rhetoric and attitudes about participation in committee work and service—the primary mechanism of shared governance within the institution. Research suggests that graduate students are not socialized to participate in service (Austin, 2002). A shift in organizational and institutional culture requires that faculty in all academic disciplines socialize their graduate students to understand the value and importance of service as the third pillar of the academic profession. Graduate students should be encouraged to participate in service as a component of their doctoral programs. As well, faculty bodies should advocate to elevate the value of service in the assessment of merit and promotion files. That said, tenure track faculty participation in shared governance is not sufficient to maintain traditional academic values and logics. As tenure track faculty numbers dwindle and are replaced by poorly paid contingent faculty (a side-effect of the neoliberal agenda), shared governance is diminished (Kezar, Lester, & Anderson, 2006), and the power and influence of faculty shift towards trustees and administrators (Giroux, 2009). In this environment, the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in governance will grow increasingly important. Tenure track faculty should support the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in shared governance (Kezar et al.,

2006) and should push for the compensation for involvement in service for contingent faculty.

The active engagement of faculty in committee work and service also aids in the stability of academic values, in that it creates faculty with knowledge about the inner workings and operations of the university and grooms faculty for leadership in academic administration (Bisbee, 2007). Faculty with strong research backgrounds who participate in service will carry their academic identities into the administration.

Yet, this investigation also holds implications for the practice of deans—both existing, new, and future deans. Deans should endeavor, however possible, to maintain a semi-active research agenda. Newly recruited deans should consider negotiation of a graduate student researcher or additional funds for post-doctoral scholars to work on research with them while they serve in an administrative capacity. Active participation in professional association annual meetings and conferences will aid academic deans in the reinforcement of their academic professional identity. As well, deans should, if possible, attempt to stay integrated into the rhythm of the academy by teaching. Even one course a year will help deans stay connected to their academic identity and aid them in keeping a pulse on the faculty world.

In addition, deans should give thoughtful consideration to the implications of decisions they make that align with neoliberal ideologies. They should take care to align initiatives with the academic mission of the university and should involve faculty in decision making. They should be transparent with their decision making and work to explain their intentions and motivations to staff, faculty, and students and be prepared to

receive and weigh the views and judgements of others. They should champion the cause

of slow scholarship (Mountz et al., 2015) and promote robust contributions to scholarship

rather than quantity of publications, national rankings, or prestige (Pusser & Marginson,

2013). Finally, they should be cautious of the subtle ways in which neoliberal logics may

start to replace academic logics. If they are to maintain a position as defenders of the

academic ethos, they must be willing to engage in resistance themselves wherever

possible.

REFERENCES

Achterberg, C. (2004). Look before you leap: Transitions from faculty to administration. *Academic Leader, 20*(8), pp. 1-2.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). Career paths for community college leaders. *AACC/Leadership Series, 3,* 1-16.

Angrosino, M., & Rosenberg, J. (2011). Observations on observation: Continuities and challenges. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 467-478). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Anyan, F. (2013). The influence of power shifts in data collection and analysis stages: A focus on qualitative research interview. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(8), 1-9.

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2011). *Why does college cost so much?* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Atkinson, R. C. (1998). Tradition at the University of California: Regents dinner September 1998. In P.A. Pelfrey (Ed.), *The pursuit of knowledge: Speeches and papers of Richard C. Atkinson* (2007, pp. 63-69). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 1990*(68), 61-74.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94-122.

Ball, S. J. (2012). Performativity, commodification, and commitment: An I-spy guide to the neoliberal university. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 60*(1), 17-28.

Becharov, M., & Smith, W. (2012). *Paradoxes of social enterprises: Sustaining utilitarian and normative identities simultaneously.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education.* Baltimore,MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and*

leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Scholar, steward, spanner, stranger: The four career paths of college presidents. *The Review of Higher Education, 24*(3), 203-217.

Bisbee, D. C. (2007). Looking for leaders: Current practices in leadership identification in higher education. *Planning and Changing, 38*(1/2), 77.

Bochner, A. P., & Riggs, N. A. (2014). Practicing narrative inquiry. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 195-222). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods, 5th*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bok, D. (2009). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boud, D. (1990). Assessment and the promotion of academic values. *Studies in Higher Education, 15*(1), 101-111.

Bright, D. F., & Richards, M. P. (2001). *The academic deanship: Individual careers and institutional roles*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bromily, R., & Powell, W. W. (2012). From smoke and mirros to walking the talk: Decoupling in the contemporary world. In J. P. Walsh & A. P. Brief (Eds.), *Academy of management annals* (Vol. 4, pp. 483-530), Essex, UK: Routledge.

Brooks, J. S., Normore, A. H. (2015). Qualitative research and educational leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management, 29*(7), 798-806.

Brown, M. C. (2000). *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE reader* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Custom.

Brown, R., & Carasso, H. (2013). *Everything for sale?: The marketization of UK higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Buller, J. L. (2006). *The essential department chair: A practical guide to college administration.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Buller, J. L. (2007). *The essential academic dean: A practical guide to college leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burgess, R. G. (2002). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Burke, P. J. (2004). Identities and social structure: The 2003 Cooley-Mead award address. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*(1), 5-15.

Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (2009). *Identity theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

California State Department of Education. (1960). *A master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975.* Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/MasterPlan1960.pdf

Cantwell, B., & Kauppinen, I. (2014). Academic capitalism in theory and research. In B. Cantwell & I. Kauppinen (Eds.), *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization* (pp. 4-9). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Carroll, J. B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 32*(6), 669-688.

Carroll, J. B., & Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? *New Directions for Higher Education, 126,* 3-10.

Clark, B. R. (1987). Introduction. In B. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings,* (pp. 1-9). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: The uniquenesses and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus, 126*(4), 21-42.

Clark, B. R. (2001). The entrepreneurial university: New Foundations for collegiality, autonomy, and achievement. *Higher Education Management, 13*(2), 9-24.

Cole, J. R. (2007). Academic freedom on American campuses in troubled times. In J. L.

Turk & Manson (Eds.), *Free speech in fearful times: After 9/11 in Canada, The U.S., Australia, and Europe* (pp. 162-198). Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd. Publishers.

Collyer, F. M. (2015). Practices of conformity and resistance in the marketization of the academy: Bourdieu, professionalism, and academic capitalism. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*(3), 315-331.

Corak, M. (2012). How to slide down the 'Great Gatsby curve'" Inequality, life chances, and public policy in the United States. Washington, DC: *Center for American Progress*.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches,* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crouch, C. (2011). *The strange non-death of neoliberalism.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

D'Aunno, T. A., Sutton, R. I., & Price, R. H. (1991). Isomorphism and external support in conflicting institutional environments: A study of drug abuse treatment units. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 636-661.

Dacin, M. R., Goodstein, J., Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *The Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 43-56.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2010). Governmentality and academic work: Shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers. *JCT Online, 26*(3), 5-20.

Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8*(1), 47-70.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education, 37*(1), 7-20.

Deem, R. (2004). The knowledge worker, the manager-academic, and the contemporary UK university: New and old forms of public management? *Financial*

Accountability and Management, 20(2), 107-127.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of "new managerialism" in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education, 31*(2), 217-235.

Deem, R., & Hillyard, S. (2002). Making time for management: The career lives of manager academics in UK universities. In G. Crow, & S. J. Heath (Eds.), *Social conceptions of time* (pp. 126-143). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Degand, D. (2015). A phenomenological multi-case study about social success skills, aspirations, and related media experiences. *The Qualitative Report, 20*(6), 872-900.

Del Favero, M. (2005). The social dimension of academic discipline as a discriminator of academic deans' administrative behaviors. *The Review of Higher Education*, *29*(1), 69-96.

Del Favero, M. (2006). Disciplinary variation in preparation for the academic dean role. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(3), 277-292.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Dey, E., Milem, J., & Berger, J. (1997). Changing Patterns of Publication Productivity: Accumulative Advantage or Institutional Isomorphism? *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 308-323. doi:1. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2673269 doi:1

Dill, D. D. (1997). Markets and higher education: an introduction. *Higher Education Policy*, *10*(3-4), 163-166.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-60.

Douglas, J. (1976). *Investigative social research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Elton, L., & Pope, M. (1989). Research supervision: The value of collegiality. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *19*(3), 267-276.

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26-48.

Filippakou, O., & Williams, G. (2014). Academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities as a new paradigm of 'development'. *Open Review of Educational Research, 1*(1), 70-83.

Firmin, M. W. (2008). Transitioning from administration to faculty: Addictions to break. *Journal of Practical Leadership, 3,* 144-148.

Flew, T. (2014). Six theories of neoliberalism. *Thesis Eleven, 122*(1), 49-71.

Foster, B. L. (2006). From faculty to administrator: Like going to a new planet. *New Directions for Higher Education, 134,* pp. 49-57.

Frank, A. W. (2004). *The renewal of generosity: Illness, medicine, how to live.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Democracy's nemesis: The rise of the corporate university. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *9*(5), 669-695.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Bare pedagogy and the scourge of neoliberalism: Rethinking higher education as a democratic public sphere. *The Educational Forum*, *74*(3), 184-196.

Giroux, H. A. (2018). *Terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Glick, M. D. (2006). Becoming "one of them" or "moving to the dark side." *New Directions for Higher Education, 134,* 87-93.

Gmelch, W. H. (1999). Building leadership capacity for institutional reform. *Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference of the Global Consortium of Higher Education and Research for Agriculture,* Ames, IA: Iowa State University, 77-84.

Gmelch, W. H. (2000a). Leadership succession: How new deans take charge and learn

the job. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 7*(3)*,* 68-87.

Gmelch, W. H. (2000b). Rites of passage: Transition to the deanship. Paper presented at The 56th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Chicago, IL, February 25-28, 2000.

Gmelch, W. H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education, 126,* 69-84.

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1991). Sources of Stress for Academic Department Chairs: A National Study. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.

Gmelch, W. H., & Mishkin, V. D. (1995). *Chairing an academic department: Survival skills for scholars* (Vol 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gmelch, W. H., & Parkay, F.W. (1999). *Becoming a department chair: Negotiating the transition from scholar to administrator.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Ontario, April 19-23, 1999.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., & Wolverton, M. L. (1999). *The Education dean's search for balance.* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC: February 24-27, 1999.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Hermanson, M. (1996). The 1996 national survey of academic deans in higher education. *Pullman, WA: The Center for Academic Leadership, Washington State University.*

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Gonzalez, C. (2011). *Clark Kerr's University of California: Leadership, diversity, and planning in higher education.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu, P. (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(7), 1097-1115.

Greene, J. P., Kisida, B., & Mills, J. (2010). Administrative bloat at American universities: The real reason for high costs in higher education. *Goldwater Institute Policy Report, No. 239,* 1-20. Retrieved from http://goldwaterinstitute.org/sites/default/files/Administrative%20Bloat.pdf

Greenwood, R., Diaz, A. M., Li, S. X., Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science, 21*(2), 521-539.

Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity & organizational responses. In J. P. Walsh & A. P. Brief (Eds.), *Academy of management annals,* (Vol. 5.). Essex, UK: Routledge

Greicar, M. B. (2009). *The professional preparation of academic deans.* (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University).

Griffith, J. C. (2006). Transition from faculty to administrator and transition back to the faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education, 134,* 67-77.

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-30). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, *39*(1), 67-91.

Harman, G. (2002). Academic leaders or corporate managers: Deans and heads in Australian higher education, 1977 to 1997. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 14*(2), 53-70.

Harvey, W. S. (2011). Strategies for conducting elite interviews. *Qualitative Research, 11*(4), 431-441.

Hatfield, R. D. (2006). Collegiality in higher education: Toward an understanding of the factors involved in collegiality. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 10*(1), 11.

Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper. (Original work published 1927)

Hendrickson, R. M., Lane, J. E., Harris, J. T., & Dorman, R. H. (2013). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two-and four-year institutions*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Henry, R. J. (2006). *Transitions between faculty and administrative careers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hoffman, E. (2007). Open-ended interviews, power, and emotional labour. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 36,* 318-346. doi: 10.1177/0891241606293134.

Hogg, M. A. (2006). Social identity theory. In P. J. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 111-136). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* London: Routledge.

Hseih, H. F., Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 12*, 1277-1288.

Husserl, E. (1970). *The idea of phenomenology*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Nijhoff.

Husserl, E. (1980). *Phenomenology and the foundations of the sciences.* Boston: Martinus Hijhoff Publishers. (Original work published 1952.)

Hycner, R. H. (1999). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Qualitative research* (Vol. 3, pp. 143-164). London: Sage.

Isaac, C. (2007). *Women deans: Patterns of power.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2013). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kauppinen, I. (2012). Towards transnational academic capitalism. *Higher Education, 64*, 543-556.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A., Lester, J., & Anderson, G. (2006). Challenging stereotypes that interfere with effective governance. *Thought and Action*, *22*(2), 121-134.

Kim, J. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Kotter, J. P. (2008). *Force for change: How leadership differs from management.* New York, NY: The Free Press, A Division of Simon and Schuster.

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp 243-275), London: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12*, 480-500. doi: 10.1177/1077800406286235.

Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: A comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2*(3), 21-35.

Lee, S. M., & Van Horn, J. C. (1983). *Academic administration.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Leslie, D., & Fretwell, E. K., Jr. (1996). *Wise moves in hard times*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levin, J. S. (2000). The practitioner's dilemma: Understanding and managing change in the academic institution. In A. M. Hoffman & R. W. Summers (Eds.) *Managing colleges and universities: Issues for leadership* (pp. 29-42). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century.* New York: Palgrave.

Levin, J. S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 62-88.

Levin, J. S. (2007). Neoliberal policies and community college faculty work. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 22, pp. 451-496). Springer Netherlands.

Levin, J. S. (2017). *Community colleges and new universities under neoliberal pressures: Institutional change, institutional stability.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Levin, J. S., & Aliyeva, A. (2015). Embedded neoliberalism within faculty behaviors. *The Review of Higher Education*, *38*(4), 537-563.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. (2011). *Community college faculty at work in the*

new economy. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levin, J. S., Martin, M. C., & López Damián, A. I. (forthcoming, 2019). *Neoliberalism and the organization and management of the academic profession.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Levin, J. S., Morales Vazquez, E., & Martin, M. C. Shared governance. In M. Amey & M. E. David (Eds.) *The Sage encyclopedia of higher education* (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Masiach, R., & Zibler, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lok, J. (2010). Institutional logics as identity projects. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(6), 1305-1335.

Lorenz, C. (2012). If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universities, neoliberalism, and new public management. *Critical Inquiry*, *38*(3), 599–629. http://doi.org/10.1086/664553.

Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academic Management, 50*(2), 289-307.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view*. London: Macmillan.

Lynch, K. (2010). Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 54-67.

Lynch, K. (2014). New managerialism, neoliberalism and ranking. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, *13*(2), 141-153.

Marginson, S. (2010, March). The limits of market reform in higher education. In *Higher Education Forum* (Vol. 7, pp. 1-19).

Marginson, S. (2016). *The dream is over: The crisis of Clark Kerr's California idea of higher education*. California: University of California Press.

Martin, J. L. (1993). Academic deans: An analysis of effective academic leadership at

research universities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 1993).

Mars, M. M. & Rhoades, G. (2012). Socially oriented student entrepreneurship: A study of student change agency in the academic capitalism context. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 435-459.

Mars, M. M., & Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The state-sponsored student entrepreneur. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(6), 638-670.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching,* (2nd ed.). London, Sage Publications.

Massy, W. F. (2016). *Reengineering the university: How to be mission centered, market smart, and margin conscious*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1978). *Identities and interactions*. New York, NY: Free Press.

McClure, K. R. (2016). Building the innovative and entrepreneurial university: An institutional case study of administrative academic capitalism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *87*(4), 516-543.

McClure, K. R., & Teitelbaum, K. (2016). Leading schools of education in the context of academic capitalism: Deans' responses to state policy changes. *Policy Futures in Education, 14*(6), 793-809.

McCluskey-Titus, P., & Cawthon, T. W. (2004). The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence: Making a transition from student affairs administrator to full-time faculty. *NASPA Journal, 41*(2), 317-335.

McCulloch, G. (2005). *Documentary research in education, history, and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mech, T. (1997). The managerial roles of chief academic officers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(3), 282-298.

Mendoza, P., & Berger, J. B. (2008). Academic capitalism and academic culture: A case study. *Educational Policy Analysis and Archives, 16*(23), 1-27.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merton, R. K. (1947). A note on science and democracy. *Journal of Legal & Political Science, 1*, 115-126.

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

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In Marshall W. Meyer (Ed.), *Environments and organizations,* (pp. 78-209), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mikecz, R. (2012). Interviewing elites: Addressing methodological issues. *Qualitative inquiry*, *18*(6), 482-493.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook,* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mok, H. (2014). U.S. News ranks 9 UC campuses among best in the world. *UC Newsroom.* Retrieved from http://universityofcalifornia.edu/news/us-news-ranks-9-uc-campuses-among-best-world

Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2003). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(2), 241-266.

Moore, K. M., Salimbene, A. M., Marlier, J. D., & Bragg, S. M. (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' careers. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(5), 500-515.

Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M.,…& Curran, W., (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 14*(4), 1235-1259.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mulhall, A. (2003). In the field: Notes on observation in qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 41*(3), 306-313.

O'Neill, P. (2008). Deception. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *Sage encyclopedia on qualitative research Methods,* (pp. 201-203). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 145-179.

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education*

Policy, 20(3), 313-345.

Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(3), 455-476.

Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organizations: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(4), 972-1001.

Palm, R. (2006). Perspectives from the dark side: The career transition from faculty to administrator. *New Directions for Higher Education, 134,* 59-65.

Palmer, J. (2013). State fiscal support for community colleges. In J.S. Levin and S.T. Kater (Eds.) *Understanding Community Colleges,* (171-184), New York, NY: Routledge.

Park, T. (2011). Academic capitalism and its impact on the American professoriate. *The Journal of the Professoriate, 6*(1), 84-99.

Pascale, C. (2011). *Cartographies of knowledge.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, You're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R., (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41-60). New York: Plenum.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5-23). Washington, DC: Falmer.

Pusser, B., & Marginson, S. (2013). University rankings in critical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(4), 544-568.

Quiggin, J. (2012). *Zombie economics: how dead ideas still walk among us*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Regents of the University of California. (2017). The UC system: Overview. Retrieved from https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-system

Rhoades, G. (1990). Change in an unanchored enterprise: Colleges of Education. *The Review of Higher Education, 13*(2), 187-214.

Rhoades, G., (2005). Capitalism, academic style, and shared governance. *Academe, 91*(3), 38-42.

Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. *American Academic, 1*(1), 37-59

Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods of the human sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Rosser, V. J. (2001). Women and their effectiveness as leaders: What makes the difference among deans? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA, April 2001.

Rubins, I. (2007). Risks and rewards of academic capitalism and the effects of presidential leadership in the entrepreneurial university. *Perspectives in Public Affairs, Spring 2007,* 3-18.

Rupert, M. E. (1990). Producing hegemony: State/society relations and the politics of productivity in the United States. *International Studies Quarterly, 34*(4), 427-456.

Russell, C. (1993). *Academic freedom.* New York: NY: Routledge.

Saldaña, J. (2014). Coding and analysis strategies. In Patricia Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 581-605), New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Schofield, J. W. (2002). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In A.M. Huberman & M.B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion*, (pp. 171-204), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: Medieval to postmodern transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(1), 1-39.

Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Adminsitrative Science Quarterly, 32*(4), 493-511.

Scott, W. R. (2004). Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. Chapter prepared for *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development.* Ken G. Smith and Michael A. Hitt (Eds.), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seidman, I. (2012). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Selingo, J., Chheng, S., & Clark, C. (2017). Pathways to the university presidency: The future of higher education leadership. A report by Deloitte's Center for Higher Education Excellence in conjunction with Georgia Tech's Center for 21st Century Universities. Retrieved from https://dupress.deloitte.com/content/dam/dup-us-en/articles/3861_Pathways-to-the-university-presidency/DUP_Pathways-to-the-university-presidency.pdf

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Shopes, L. (2011). Oral history. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp.451-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Shore, C. (2008). Audit culture and Illiberal governance Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory, 8*(3), 278-298.

Shulock, N., & Moore, C. (2007). *Rules of the game: How state policy creates barriers to degree completion and impedes student success in the California community colleges.* Sacramento, Ca: Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy.

Slaughter, S. (2014). Foreword. In B. Cantwell & I. Kauppinen (Eds.), *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization* (pp. vii-x), Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization, 8*(2), 154-161.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University

Press.

Smith, R. V. (2006). *Where you stand is where you sit: An academic administrator's handbook.* Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.

Smith, D. L., Rollins, K. B., & Smith, L. J. (2012). Back to the faculty: Transition from university department leadership. *Innovative Higher Education, 37*(1), 53-63.

Snyder, R. A., Howard, A., & Hammer, T. H. (1978). Mid-career change in academia: The decision to become an administrator. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13*, 229-241.

Socolow, D. J. (1978). How administrators get their jobs. *Change, 10*(May), 43-3, 54.

Speck, B. W. (2003). The role of doctoral programs in preparing faculty for multiple roles in the academy. *New Directions for Higher Education, 124,* 41-55.

Standifird, S. S. (2009). From faculty to administrator: The time management challenge. *The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education, 5*(1), 23-28.

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 224-237.

Strathe, M. I., & Wilson, V. W. (2006). Academic leadership: The pathway to and from. *New Directions for Higher Education, 134,* 5-13.

Stryker, S. (1980 [2002]). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version.* Caldwell, NJ: Blackburn Press.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571-610.

Suddaby, R. (2010). Challenges for institutional theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 19*(1), 14-20.

Swann, W. B., Jr., (1983). Self-verification: Brining social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls and A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 33-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Szelényi, K., & Bresonis, K. (2014). The public good and academic capitalism: Science and engineering doctoral students and faculty on the boundary of knowledge regimes. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(1), 126-153.

Tapper, T. (2017). Collegiality in Higher Education. *Encyclopedia of International*

Higher Education Systems and Institutions, 1-5.

Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, *840*, 99-128.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Enhancing Promotion, Tenure and Beyond: Faculty Socialization as a Cultural Process. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Torres, C. A., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin American in comparative perspective. *Higher Education, 43*, 429-455.

Trede, F., Macklin, R., & Bridges, D. (2012). Professional identity development: A review of the higher education literature. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(3), 365-384.

Tucker, A., & Brian, R. A. (1991). *The academic dean: Dove, dragon, and diplomat*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

University of California. (2015). The University of California at a glance. Retrieved from http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/default/files/uc_at_a_glance_011615.pdf

University of California. (2016a). Corporate project funding. Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/Corporate%20Research%20Funding.pdf

University of California. (2016b). Federal project funding. Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/Federal%20Research%20Funding.pdf.

University of California. (2016c). State agency partnerships. Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/state-funding-brief.pdf.

University of California. (2017). Budget for current operations: Summary and detail. Retrieved from http://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/_files/rbudget/2017-18budgetforcurrentoperations.pdf.

Usher, A. (2004). A new measuring stick: Is access to higher education in Canada equitable? *Canadian Higher Education Report Series.* Toronto, ON: Educational Policy Institute.

Välimaa, J. (2014). University revolutions and academic capitalism: A historical perspective. In B. Cantwell & I. Kauppinen (Eds.), *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization* (pp. 33-54). Balitmore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action Sensitive pedagogy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Veblen, T. (1918). The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men. New York, NY: B.W. Huebsch.

Ward, S. C. (2012). *Neoliberalism and the global restructuring of knowledge and education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Weisbrod, B. A., Ballou, J. P., & Asch, E. D. (2008). *Mission and money: Understanding the university.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Welman, J. C., & Kruger, S. J. (1999). *Research methodology for the business and administrative sciences*. Johannesburg, South Africa: International Thompson.

Welsh, R., Glenna, L., Lacy, W., & Biscotti, D. (2008). Close enough but not too far: Assessing the effects of university-industry research relationships and the rise of academic capitalism. *Research Policy, 37*, 1854-1864.

Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans: Leading from within.* Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Wolverton, M., & Gonzales, M. J., (2000). Career paths of academic deans. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Gmelch, W. H. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80-106.

Ylijoki, O. H. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education, 45*, 307-335.

Zemsky, R., Wegner, G. R., & Massy, W. F. (2005). *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Zucker, L. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 725-743.