UC Merced

UC Merced Previously Published Works

Title

Beyond the blame game: How faculty culture in higher education constrains change.

Permalink

Author

Camfield, Eileen

Publication Date

2023-12-13

Peer reviewed

Beyond the Blame Game: How Faculty Culture in Higher Education Constrains Change

Eileen Kogl Camfield, Ed.D.

Executive Director of Student Academic Support Services

University of the Pacific

When Kuh (2008) first published a list of high-impact practices (HIPs) that activated student engagement and optimized learning, there was great hope these directives would draw attention to needed pedagogy reform in higher education. Yet, over a decade later, the academy has not experienced widespread adoption of these practices (Johnson & Stage, 2018), a problem that is especially salient for students from underserved groups (Finley & McNair, 2013). Clearly, merely identifying a list of practices and communicating these to stakeholders has not been sufficient to completely change the status quo. As instructors are the ones expected to employ HIPs, understanding the reasons for the disconnect between the principles of best practice and failures in operationalization necessitates uncovering aspects of faculty acculturation and identity formation. Somewhat surprisingly, given the culture of inquiry that guides so much of academic life, relatively little is known about the dilemma faculty find themselves in as they navigate the pressures of institutional culture while attempting to optimize student success.

Amid the national outcry for accountability in higher education, student access and learning outcomes are under greater scrutiny, resource management is carefully monitored, and the general purposes and values of higher education are being re-examined. Universities are being asked to justify their continued existence. In order to make their cases, campuses attempt to better know themselves: they undergo program review, endeavor to create effective assessment tools, and track student persistence. One notable gap in this push for greater understanding is learning about faculty. True, campuses care about the kind and quality of degrees possessed by their faculty, and they sometimes care about demographic representation

amongst faculty. But, as will be discussed, much of this work had focused on aggregated segments of the faculty population; too little has been published about how faculty experience their work subjectively.

At the same time, critiques of higher education, such as *Academically Adrift* and *Our Underachieving Colleges,* blame faculty for failing to serve students in myriad ways. For example, in addressing low student-achievement rates, Bok (2006) specifically identified a pattern of neglect where professors hide behind academic freedom and simply change curricular requirements instead of doing the hard work of reforming pedagogical methods and ignore research on student development instead of changing their methods to match student needs. While not directly using the terms "lazy" and "cowardly," his descriptions imply these pejoratives. Moreover, in *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University*, Menand (2010) described a social replication process that results in a kind of academic herd mentality where professors come to resemble one another.

Understanding whether such accusations are justified necessitates a step outside of a "blame game" to instead see the nuanced and complex ways faculty identity is constrained by institutional culture. Further, if faculty are essential gatekeepers or access providers to the academy, we need to know more about them, in part, because problems experienced by college faculty may be the bellwethers of deeper problems that profoundly affect students, especially if they explain why pedagogical best practices have not been more widely adopted across all academic disciplines. As will be seen, faculty are often caught in a dilemma where they feel forced either to capitulate to institutional priorities that compete with a full expression of identity and with values that emphasize student-success-oriented pedagogy or to uphold what they most value and risk a compromised career trajectory. To illustrate how this dilemma plays out in the lived experience of college faculty, this chapter focuses on how academic identities can develop

over the course of a career in the belief that such a study can point the way to meaningful reform. William James (1896) used the term "forced options" to describe situations where one has no alternative but to make a choice. I will argue here that academic institutional culture often forces faculty to choose identities that are stifling. In other words, to be a professor requires accepting options that limit the full range of professional generativity and that fail to serve students. Such choices may initially appear trivial but in the aggregate become momentous.

To better understand the mechanism by which institutional culture forces faculty identity options, my analysis will be grounded in Bourdieu's (1984, 1988, 1991) theories about social reproduction and symbolic power. A brief overview: Bourdieu posited that culture is specifically situated in *field* or domain and is constructed through a number of processes and social realities that are defined through power and capital. Power and dominance can be overtly or physically expressed, but often they are more subtly manifested through invisible social norms or covert acts of coercion from those with high social capital. Bourdieu (1984) called this form of coercion *symbolic violence*. Here, I will argue that through the acculturation process to the field of higher education, faculty experience various forms of symbolic violence that coerce certain identity performances and constrain others. All enter the professoriate with visions about what it will mean to be a faculty member but then encounter the invisible social norms or the *habitus* (unconscious messages about the "correct" way things should be done that limit the scope of what is considered possible) that are both particular to their institutions and endemic in all of higher education today. New faculty also come to recognize which figures have symbolic academic capital (i.e., power through prestige) in the field and navigate their own standing in relation to these dominant exemplars. He also believed that true understanding comes only through surveying both the objective field itself and the subjective experience of agents operating in that field.

The structure of this chapter will mirror this integration of the objective and subjective by beginning with a review of relevant literature that speaks to the field of faculty identity and institutional culture and by then moving into an analysis of themes drawn from qualitative data gathered from six mid-career faculty members' experiences.

The impact of the symbolic violence perpetuated against these faculty is illustrated using intersectional analysis, demonstrating which elements of their identities are endorsed by institutional culture and which must be forced into hiding. In the end, what this study explains is not only the personal costs to faculty of navigating institutional culture but also the reasons why faculty may sometimes operate at crossed-purposes by unconsciously responding to *habitus* even when their stated pedagogical intentions and values may be to the contrary.

Review of the (Battle)Field of Faculty Identity and Institutional Culture

Bourdieu defined the academic *field* using the metaphor of a battlefield, where soldiers are simultaneously identified by their ranks and seek to change the structure of the ranking system (Wacquant, 1989). What follows are descriptions of some of the elements that currently define the field of U.S. higher education.

Into professorhood. Reybold (2003) offered an explicit and compelling model for faculty identity development to describe the transition from graduate school into the professoriate. Specifically, the pathways she identified–the Anointed, the Pilgrim, the Visionary, the Philosopher and the Drifter–described the evolving ways doctoral students shape their identities within the professoriate. These pathways may lead to very different experiences of work, as they represent different orientations to the profession and reflect differences in identity conceptualization. Subsequently, a newly-hired professor might experience discord and a range of anxieties relative to the respective identity pathway traveled in graduate school and the degree of reinforcement found at the new institution. At the conclusion of the article, Reybold made

some excellent suggestions for future research consideration. Namely, she lauded the value of further longitudinal inquiry into professional identity as a developmental process. Finally, she raised a concern about what happens when individuals with similar or differing identity trajectories interact, particularly in a student-advisor relationship, but by extension this interaction could be problematic in a department or across disciplines. What Reybold did not acknowledge is the fact that an individual might have multiple motivations for entering academia within her own self. In other words, one might be a "visionary-philosopher-pilgrim." How those intersecting motives compound or conflict within an institutional context is likely to have an effect on subsequent identity development. Additionally, how these identities develop over the course of a career is left unexamined. This chapter will address some of those gaps.

Institutional culture. Differing from Reybold's (2003) work, other research on faculty identity has focused less on faculty as individuals and more on the institutional structure of the academy. Nevertheless, understanding this institutional culture is important, as it profoundly shapes the people who work within this system. Here the research is more comprehensive. Kezar and Lester (2009) summarized much of this work in their book *Organizing Higher Education for Collaboration.* They identified higher education as a siloed, bureaucratic, and hierarchical organization characterized by fragmentation caused by specialization, disciplinary and department narrowness, paradigmatic differences, individualistic faculty training and socialization undergirded by reward systems that promote individualistic work. They also raised concerns about bureaucratic and hierarchical administrative structures that limit communication flow across the organization and discourage horizontal interaction in favor of top-down authority-based leadership. This latter tendency is facilitated by responsibility-centered management practices where individual units maintain fiscal autonomy. Gumport (2001) lamented this economic model coupled with academic restructuring and outcome assessment

initiatives, as they create competition over resources that favors the quantifiable over harder-to-measure qualitative or humanistic elements. To emphasize this latter point, while some of the troubles facing the academy are perennial, some things have truly changed, notably the pervasive power of money (Kirp, 2003). The ivory tower has increasingly been put up for sale as donors determine institutional priorities. The impact on faculty, Kirp revealed, is less institutional loyalty and more "free agency," less job security and more tension over wages, and less pursuit of the greater good and more self-interest. The ways all this might influence faculty identity development are grim. Those pathways into the professoriate are transformed into a toll road.

The toll road reduces down to one lane, if what Menand (2010) says about the self-selection process that drives certain types of students into graduate programs is true. He suggests this is an extreme form of social replication akin to cloning, boding ill for any faculty member who does not fit the norm. A curious lack of self-awareness exacerbates this problem. Faculty believe they are independent thinkers and are able to make objective decisions, but investigations into the world of academic judgment have shown this is not the case. For example, Lamont (2009) discovered that far from being a logical process, peer review is subjective, highly dependent on emotions and relationships. Perhaps if we could be more honest about this, academic culture would be more just and less polarized.

Faculty job satisfaction. Additional research has looked at the impact of these institutional structures and cultures as they pertain to faculty attrition, quality of life, and job satisfaction. Although not directly addressing questions of identity, this research suggests this impact is quite personal. Xu (2008) studied the underrepresentation of women faculty in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Comparing the intentions of attrition and turnover between genders in research and doctoral universities, she found that the two genders did not differ in their intentions to depart from academia. Women and men appeared to be

equally committed to their academic careers in STEM. However, women expressed dissatisfaction with an academic culture that provides them fewer opportunities, limited support, and inequity in leadership. Further, women identified this culture as one that discourages their free expression of ideas. A more inclusive, collaborative culture is required to attract more women scientists and narrow the current gender gap.

Other studies connect exclusion to faculty attrition more directly: Trower, Austin and Sorinelli (2001) studied early-career faculty and showed a worrisome gap between what had been hoped for in graduate school and what is actually experienced in the professoriate, a disconnect influenced by a lack of community, poor work-life balance, and ambiguous, shifting, conflicting and ever-escalating tenure expectations. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found faculty job satisfaction is greatly affected by collegial and student relationships and is shaped by the leadership, climate and culture of the university. For those who stay in the profession, institutional demands and culture compromise faculty quality of life by inhibiting the expression of a full-range of identity. DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, and Santos (2009) reported only about one-third of faculty believe they have a healthy work-life balance. Moreover, faculty struggling under those circumstances believed any complaint or request for help would be perceived as weakness. Still to this day, faculty leave when their work environment lacks collegiality and they feel like they do not belong in the academy (Mathews, Scungo, & Benson, 2018; Webber, 2018). Thus, positive personal relationships and meaningful support are essential to positive faculty identities. Perhaps it is no surprise those Ph.D.s who do not work in academia have a higher level of job satisfaction than those who do (Menand, 2010).

Twale and DeLuca (2008) framed the problem even more bluntly. They referred to faculty incivility and the rise of an academic bully culture, identifying several changes that have caused this phenomena. They believe the changing face of academe has brought new players,

notably women and faculty of color, into a game formerly dominated by White men. This has caused a host of resentments and exclusions. Also, the increasingly corporate culture in academe has created greater competition for resources, encourages isolation, and devalues humanistic work. Moreover, university governance structures have not adapted quickly enough to respond adequately to these changes.

Understanding Symbolic Capital and Identity Intersections

Bourdieu (1984) described that way *habitus* reproduces cultural norms, coloring perceptions of what is taken-for-granted as normal and possible. The previous section detailed both the way the academy is structured and some of the impact that structure has on faculty identity and job satisfaction. To gain an even deeper understanding of how that identity is shaped – not just at the graduate level or at the transition point into the professoriate, but over the course of a career – those concerned must zero-in on the lived experience of faculty as they simultaneously capitulate to and resist elements of academic acculturation. Bourdieu told us that symbolic capital is associated with power and reputation within an established paradigm. In terms of higher education, those with symbolic capital and power are those who set institutional policy and are seen as contributing to the bottom line. However, such power is to great extent arbitrary in terms of what is claimed to have value (e.g., scholarship over teaching). Even so, those with higher levels of symbolic capital may exert overt or subtle symbolic violence against those with lower levels of prestige through structural or inter-personal actions. The coercive effect of symbolic violence in the academy can be illustrated through a conceptualization of faculty identity as multifaceted and threatened by forces that seek to perpetuate the status quo.

Feminist theory provides a theoretical lens that might facilitate exploration of how this threat operates. Intersectionality is a response to identity politics, which tends to see identity as singular and deterministic. In contrast, intersectionality begins with the assumption that human

identity is made up of multiple, fluid identities that can compound or conflict and are influenced by external power structures (Dhamoon, 2011). Such a conceptualization can help us understand the full dimensions of faculty identity and the ways it is shaped by institutional culture. Which aspects of this identity are encouraged by our institutions? Which are discouraged? What does this winnowing process cost? Hancock (2007) argued people must not be forced to privilege one aspect of identity to the detriment of another. Further, intersectionality has allowed practitioners, like Bettie (2000), to look at groups of people on their own terms, not as outsiders see them, to recognize previously unspoken and hidden issues and to posit that internal identity intersections were separate from external performance. This can provide a more accurate and complex explanation of what motivates individual choices and help us see how real people experience their lives.

When applied to university faculty, intersectionality might reveal that the external performance of the professor role, as a highly trained expert, might be disconnected from internal experiences, and that disconnection might create negative feelings such as insecurity and loneliness. In exploring what aspects of themselves can and cannot be expressed in the academy, faculty may better be able to understand their feelings about their work and their colleagues. This could lead to meaningful conversations that could lead to institutional reform, especially if we can recognize that most faculty suffer to some extent under present conditions. To do this we must avoid "the 'oppression Olympics' where groups compete for the mantle of 'most oppressed' to gain the attention and political support of dominant groups…leaving the overall system of stratification unchanged" (Hancock, 2007, p. 68). In other words, one danger of identity-based politics is that it can pit one marginalized group against another: faculty of color versus women in the sciences, for example. Alternatively, intersectionality can reveal common ground that can allow different groups to come together and work for institutional reform. This

might best apply to the professoriate by revealing the way all faculty, not just women or ethnically marginalized groups, are diminished by the symbolic violence inherent in the academic system.

A number of scholars have been applying intersectional analysis not just to feminist issues, but more widely. Notably, Pifer (2011) used intersectionality to research faculty members' experience of collegial relationships in the context of academic departments. She asserted that collective identities, as determined by departments and institutions, can mask the multiple or divergent identities that characterize individuals. This masking can trigger both personal and professional challenges. The thrust of her argument aimed at revising methods of institutional research, and she outlined two possible approaches to using intersectionality. One, where specific researcher-determined identity categories (e.g., race. class, gender) are explored, may be useful in understanding how these identities function in a given context. However, this predetermination could reflect researcher bias or might favor one set of identity intersections while excluding others that are actually more significant. The other approach is to let participants identify and describe which aspects of their identities are most salient to them. She asserted this approach may give a more accurate, and therefore more useful, total picture. The qualitative interview process allowed her to discover that a faculty member who appeared to be well-connected and high-status, based on quantitative data, actually felt like an outsider in her department because of her age and (lack of) marital status. This underscores the importance of allowing faculty to tell their own stories and of recognizing their layered identities. Pifer concluded by observing that intersectionality also allows researchers to understand how faculty members can report having very different experiences within the same institutional context. What she does not report is that the reverse may be true as well: seemingly very different faculty

members may have similar feelings. This similarity may be key in developing the sense of common ground necessary for institutional reform.

Clearly, there is rich ground for further exploration, and social reproduction theory combined with intersectionality provide especially valuable critical lenses. Academic socialization into a competitive, hierarchical system privileges certain aspects of an individual's identity while imperiling others. These lost dimensions may be the very source of academic renewal, pluralistic integration, personal gratification, and deep commitment to best pedagogical practices. Recognizing how the struggle to maintain valued aspects of identity can be undermined by unseen institutional forces is a crucial first step in resolving the conflict. Making space for ways of resisting arbitrary and exclusionary exhibitions of power is the path towards increased equity. The pursuit of knowledge embedded in meaningful collegial relationships where all voices are valued is a vision for a robust, generative, and socially responsible academy.

Essential Questions and a Search for Answers

The scholarship previously summarized points to a significant problem. Many faculty enter the professoriate with high ideals. They often have identity conceptions of themselves as potential change-agents, expanding human knowledge and contributing to the greater good. For too many, somewhere along the way, this idealism fades and is replaced with job dissatisfaction and cynicism. Often students bear the brunt of their bitterness as the targets of faculty disparagement (Bayers & Camfield, 2018). What are the specific mechanisms that trigger this disillusionment? How do faculty experience institutional culture, internalize these experiences, and develop their professional identity?

To answer these questions, I conducted hour-long qualitative interviews with six mid-career university faculty members in the social sciences or humanities. I selected this demographic because it appears to be less thoroughly studied than other faculty populations,

women in STEM for example. Selecting mid-career faculty allowed me to examine the persistence of the initial inspiration that brought them into the academy–the extent to which imagined identities could be realized. Also, I intentionally chose faculty who appear to embody success stories, some might even be labeled "privileged." My logic was that if these survivors of the system report problems, something must really be awry at the core of the status quo. From those who responded to my call for participants, I chose three women and three men (identified by the pseudonyms Simon, George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana, and Hal) from three different mid-size universities (one public comprehensive, one public research, one private comprehensive) to capture what I thought would be varying experiences of the academy. Nevertheless, because of their mid-career status, many of them had shared similar experiences: four of the six have served as administrators; four have children; three have won teaching awards. All were presently serving as faculty, and all have tenure, with the exception of Juliana whose job security was differently protected. Overall, my intention is not to present a comprehensive study of diverse manifestations of faculty identity, rather to look at common themes in these six stories.

Using Pifer's (2011) model of intersectional analysis, where subjects identify salient components of their identities rather than responding to pre-determined categories, I opened my interview by asking each participant for a list of such components. Perhaps indicative of the vulnerability such revelations necessitate, Hal declined to offer any specific traits, claiming identity is not determined by the individual but is constructed through the perceptions of others. The rest of the group offered lists ranging from eight to thirty-one self-identified identity attributes (see sequence and details in Appendix A). I then asked specific questions about what inspired them to pursue a career in academia and how their subsequent experiences have lived up to that ideal. After the interviews, I transcribed the content and used both axial coding, to see how their identity paths conformed to Reybold's (2003) theory of faculty development, and

Pifer's (2011) open coding, to see what other identity themes emerged from their narratives, noting the identity elements that individuals believed were most valued by their academic institutions and those they believed had to be hidden or masked. Additionally, I categorized those traits that could be considered emotional or relational and those that participants identified as most personally valued. My hypothesis was that job satisfaction would be influenced by the degree to which faculty work has lived up to initial expectations and by the amount of congruence between the aspects of identity both personally and institutionally valued. Further, I posited that where there was discontinuity, faculty would have experienced forms of symbolic violence that forced into hiding those identity attributes that failed to conform to institutional expectations.

Faculty Identity Unpacked

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

In examining my data, I labeled those most satisfied with their work based on the degree to which reality lived up to initial career expectations. My hypotheses correctly predicted a

correlation between this contentment and a lower percentage of hidden or masked identity components, ranked here: Simon (0%), George (16%), Sarah (35%), Erin (27-47%), Juliana (35%), Hal (100%). I expected that this contentment would also be in relation to higher percentages of institutionally valued identity traits, ranked here: Simon (50%), George (35%), Sarah (35%), Erin (13%), Juliana (9%), Hal (0%). To this extent, my data confirm my hypotheses. Further, in selecting mid-career faculty, all of whom have a degree of job security, a population that has been relatively successful in navigating academic culture was examined. In other words, if there is a group that might exemplify privilege and high social capital, one would expect to find it here. My findings show that even among the advantaged, academic acculturation exacts a price. Moreover, it hints at how much more costly it is for under-represented groups.

However, in addition to what I expected, there were findings that my hypotheses did not predict, which I will explore more fully in the following sections. In short, social reproduction theory and intersectional analysis reveal that faculty identity is more complex than I imagined and that the very ways we define job satisfaction may need to be re-examined. While my interview subjects each had their unique stories, several significant themes emerged, indicating the most impactful forced options in academic culture that shape faculty identity. An issue rose to the level of being designated a theme when at least four of the six participants identified the concern as salient. Some of these themes challenge pre-existing data on faculty identity and suggest a commonality of experience that may provide the key for effective institutional reforms.

Anticipated identity: Shifting from the ideal to the real. Five of the six participants in this study decided to pursue a career in academia because of what they had experienced as undergraduates. George described having

a fantastic teacher—whose charisma, whose warmth, whose integrity, whose ability to

connect studying with living a life well – changed my life and made it richer and better.

The idea I could do the same struck me as important.

Sarah talked about the "incredibly nurturing" environment of her undergraduate college. Erin's

"mind was stimulated" by the analytical work of her discipline; she thought she would "enjoy"

the work and that it was "important and meaningful...to make the world a better place." Simon

said "I learned everything I know as an undergraduate." Hal was inspired as an undergraduate by

"what could be done with knowledge" and saw being a professor as "the best job in the world."

In many ways Juliana is an outlier in this study. First, she does not have a full-time

academic appointment. She chooses to teach on an adjunct basis in addition to her administrative

role in an academic support program. As these kinds of hybrid positions are becoming more

common in the academy, I believed it was relevant to include someone who bridges two

domains. Second, as a Latina, she embodies a possibly less-privileged demographic than the

other five participants. Her responses confirmed that challenges faced by more mainstream

faculty are even more pronounced for more marginalized faculty. Further, her reasons for

entering academia were somewhat different from the other five. She saw higher education as her

"way out of ignorance and poverty" and wanted to be a "champion" for students like herself who

are "different." As she put it, "I thought it was important to be a representative of a group that

isn't often represented in higher education in front of the classroom instead of cleaning the

classroom."

As inside-outsiders (i.e., undergraduates), all six imagined life inside the academy as

something a bit different from what they actually encountered. Using Reybold's (2003) terms,

George, Erin, and Juliana entered the profession as Visionaries, the most idealistic identity

orientation. Although he was not as forthcoming, I presume to say Hal also falls into this

category. The nature of this idealism is worth emphasizing: All of them wanted to make the world a better place. They dreamed of their scholarship, work in the university, and teaching as functioning together in varying degrees to achieve this end. They saw their calling extending outward in very human terms. All of them expressed frustration that their work has not lived up to their expectations. They shared a sadness over how dehumanizing academic culture can be and how slowly institutions change. Erin talked about learning to accept the role of being a "butterfly flapping" instead of a "world-changer." However, all of them have also retained commitments that sustain them. Nevertheless, they have had to form less ambitious identities. In short, while they still have sources of meaning and purpose, they also harbor a sense of loss.

This is not to say that they all were completely unprepared for what they encountered. George "watched the university where [he] got [his] bachelor's degree" and saw faculty did not always get along. He also recognized a lot of "strange people" would be his faculty colleagues and knew that higher education has "too many things to do and faculty don't agree on what is most important, and we have external pressures that coerce us to go in one direction or another." Also, early on Sarah recognized the "high theory" of her graduate program was at odds with what she had experienced as an undergraduate, so she was relieved to ultimately be hired at a university where she believed teaching would be valued.

Additionally, the identity compromises they have been forced to make have not been all bad, but were still unpredicted. In her early years as a professor, Erin came to realize that teaching "far outstripped" her initial expectations, perhaps in part because "she had no idea whether [she] would like it." Moreover, both Simon's and Sarah's identities could be initially characterized as Drifter-Philosophers, but their careers have taken very different paths. Simon has ceased to be a Drifter and has remained a Philosopher, a primarily inward-turning identity that allows him more direct control over the outcomes of his labors. He had lower expectations

from the start and now expresses no disappointment over his career path. He also shows little to no institutional loyalty or sense of community at his university. Further, he initially expected to be spending at least half his time on teaching, but now he "doesn't spend any time on teaching at all anymore." He observed that by the year 2000 "my classes were mostly done, and I didn't see the need to rewrite them or really do new courses." He admits that he doesn't "have close relationships" with his students but feels fulfilled in other ways.

In contrast, Sarah, who initially picked an academic career path as the "safe choice" instead of pursuing her "younger dream" of being a fiction writer, has become deeply committed to teaching and to her community. She finds meaning in serving the "big picture" and has become a Visionary. Later in her career, perhaps because she Drifted into administration (entering into it in part as an escape from her dysfunctional department rather than being "called" into service), she was at first okay with merely being "a voice at the table," but as she became more of a social justice Visionary, her somewhat gelded status was no longer acceptable. Rather than ditch her identity as a Visionary, she once again shifted her role in the university, returning to teaching and "caring increasingly about scholarship."

Overall, Visionary identities appear to be common entry-level orientations for faculty, but they also may be more vulnerable pathways into the professoriate than other routes. They can be more readily damaged by symbolic violence because the realization of "visions" depends on the cooperation of other people. True, many workers shift from the idealism they feel upon entering their professions after encountering the realities faced during the course of their careers. However, the mechanism of this shift described by these mid-career faculty members was troubling. While not the terms they used, all described experiences of de-humanization and varying degrees of symbolic violence forcing certain attributes of their identities into hiding.

One does not encounter symbolic violence in any field unless there are those with symbolic power. In an interview, Bourdieu described those with academic power as those who control institutional reproduction, for example through hiring and funding decisions. Accordingly, it is no surprise that my participants knew full well that the most prestigious members of the academic community were, as Erin put it, "tenured, White, full professors and members of the upper administration who set policy." The tone set by these successful leaders both reflects and shapes the *habitus* of an institution. As Bourdieu (1988) makes clear, anyone who diverges from the norms is bound to suffer. Yet what was interesting is the nature of that suffering for my subjects. One might imagine individuals either being coerced by seemingly-objective institutional policy or through inter-personal bullying, but these participants showed that the mechanisms of coercion operated on both levels. This confirms Bourdieu's commitment to breaking down arbitrary dichotomies. To borrow and re-frame the slogan "the personal is political," for faculty "the institutional is personal." What follows are the salient themes that characterized their struggles.

Elements of Symbolic Violence

Institutional structure: Too much to do, too little time. Regardless of initial identity pathway, all of the interview subjects reported having to make compromises due to institutional pressures or lack of support. Simon is not pursuing his ultimate dream of running a special program devoted to his sub-specialty; instead he is publishing and traveling (which he largely pays for out-of-pocket). He also frets over the difficulty of juggling too many projects and claims this is self-inflicted because he "can't say no." But, perhaps this is not solely due to his own choices and has something to do with the expectations and time pressures that characterize higher education today. George and Sarah both complained about technology not only making it possible for them to be "on call" 24/7, but playing into the expectation that they are so. Sarah

described an "accretion of duties" that undermines her family time. She and George also complained about the corporatization of the academy leading to a drive for "efficiency" that contradicts the humane values that drew them into the profession in the first place. Erin's teaching load makes it so she does not have time to work on her scholarship. Hal believes he has to "cut corners" to get everything done. Another aspect of this time problem has to do with perceptions of wasted time. Simon, Erin and Hal each complained about committee work that felt pointless, took too long, or involved faculty just "spinning in the wheel." Overall, too much to do in too little time is a factor that prevents them all from savoring the full expression of their identities.

Institutional rewards. In addition to these time pressures, there is the problem of what the institution rewards. For all of my interview subjects, the institution fails fully to endorse what they most care about professionally. Simon's feels his research could be better supported; all the rest feel teaching is undervalued. In fact, Erin endorsed a widely-held belief that the reward structure is actually set up to undercut those faculty members who actually do have shared values but which are not the "correct" shared values: "The reward structure is all about research…the institution itself does not really value teaching." Hal referred to this as "the lie of higher education today," that we pretend to value teaching but instead favor "rigid number counting." He believes "the rules change while you are in the middle of playing the game" and this "discontinuity becomes explosive." My hypotheses predicted this finding to the extent that the term "forced options" means that one's environment encourages certain ways of being over others. Therefore, I expected to discover some aspects of faculty identity would be rewarded and some would be forced into hiding.

However, what my hypothesis did not account for was the extent to which the academy can reward negative identity traits. Simon, George, Sarah and Erin all expressed ways their

institutions reinforce their self-imposed high expectations, a criteria determined to be highly linked with job stress and dissatisfaction (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, & Santos, 2009). Further, George believes his perfectionism, worry, and fear of failure have been cultivated by the academy. Juliana says her sense of self as "unsafe" and "silenced" are institutionally rewarded. The cultivation of these negative identity traits directly correlates with negative emotion—and, thus, negative emotion emerged as a powerful force that impacts faculty identity options.

       Negative emotion: Colleagues' inflated egos and lack of empathy. As discussed previously, existing literature identifies positive collegial relationships as one of the key sources of faculty job satisfaction. While all of the faculty I interviewed asserted that many of the people they work with are wonderful colleagues, each identified a cohort of individuals that compromise their job satisfaction. Simon criticized those who are "lazy" and those who claim unfairness when they do not automatically get the same rewards he believes he has worked hard for and uniquely deserved. George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana and Hal describe dealing with colleagues' ego problems and lack of empathy as huge challenges associated with committee work and university service. Here, the problem is one powerful person's negative identity intruding on other people's identities, a manifestation of symbolic violence. George was explicit in clarifying that while one can find difficult people in any workplace, "the university protects them; it's an important part of academic freedom, but it allows them to be protected to be jerks." He believes such incivility stems directly from academic training: "We are trained as faculty members to assert our research and challenge what we see as weakness in others' research. We are cultivated to be combatants in our thinking." This contributes to a competitive environment where people "count up points: I've got more publications than you, so I am a better person." He added that it only takes one person with this kind of mentality to teach junior people this is the way to behave and you have an "acculturation process in savagery."

Those that I interviewed expressed a range of negative feelings in reaction to such savagery. George, Sarah, Erin, and Hal resorted to profanity when describing certain colleagues' arrogance and incivility in committee work. In particular, Erin described this incivility as attacks on what she most values: She "gnashed her teeth" at a college who challenged those faculty who care about student learning by condescendingly asserting "'If your grades are too high in your classes that must mean you're not rigorous,' and 'you can't be a good professor if your average is a B.'" In response to these kinds of assaults, Juliana very consciously "buttons up" her blazer jacket-armor or retreats into silence. In these cases violence is done against Visionary perspectives because others are unwilling to listen or monopolize resources or meeting time for ends that conform to what the institution most values: hierarchy and well-defined scholarship.

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

Judgment and (lack of) mentoring. Another manifestation of symbolic violence is the way negative emotion shapes faculty identity through institutional judgment. George, Sarah, Erin and Hal expressed significant angst over their promotion and tenure processes. They voiced

arbitrariness, subjectivity, and shifting expectations as large parts of the problem with their experiences with this process. In identity terms, they did not know who they needed to be in order to succeed. In George's case, he got caught between two poles of the theory wars raging in his department because he did not neatly fit in either camp. Erin explicitly used the term "hazing," which by definition involves the persistent harassment of an initiate into a closed system. For some, this closed system felt like a straightjacket. Several talked about the reductive and "un-nuanced" ways worth was measured, ways that also failed to take into account how one's work changes over the course of a career.

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

Given the difficulty of coping with this kind of judgment, it is no wonder that George, Sarah, Erin and Hal were angry over the lack of formal mentoring they received. They all desired

more guidance in developing their professional identities. Part of the reason they did not receive this mentoring had to do with the faulty structures for socializing (or judging, or hazing) new faculty at their respective institutions. This difficulty was exacerbated by the time issues discussed previously.

Understanding Symbolic Violence

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

A gender divide…or not? However, creating better understanding of the problems that plague academic culture is not always easy. As I have been exploring, what might seem clear on the surface may be more complex underneath. Another example is the theme of gender identity as it emerged in these interviews. Initially, the problem seemed like a simple binary: male privilege versus female marginalization. Erin suffered under a sexist department head. Sarah complained about the "masculinist" culture that she sees contributing to the corporatization of higher education and the "masculine drive" that creates time pressure problems. She believed she

was supposed to develop theoretical "mastery" and believes women are "ambivalent about ambition" and competition – all of which she sees as symptomatic of being outsiders confronting a patriarchal system. She talked about the unfair service burden placed on women, especially women of color. Juliana exemplifies other problems experienced by that group as well when she explains "I am successful within the institution because I have been able to hide some things, cover others, and structure what I have to say in a way that is acceptable." She navigates her Latina identity by trying "to become as American, as homogenized, as I can be…otherwise I begin any discussion with five points against me." All of this may be true, but the problem is more nuanced than that.

It would be too hasty if I simply blamed men for the problems in academia and saw women as the primary victims. Digging a little further, I must acknowledge the facts that it was two men in Sarah's department who tried to mentor her and it was two men who alerted Erin to the fact of her department head's sexism. George used his position of power to try to challenge sexism in his department. These exceptions might point to a new rule. I am not forgetting that Simon admitted to benefitting from male privilege and that he says the academy is a "perfectly pleasant" place to work. Indeed, he seems to believe that he is under no obligation to try to change higher education, despite the fact he has "heard about" wrongdoing. Because he has not experienced it directly, he ignores it. But what about George and Hal? George does not wear his masculinity as a badge of honor. Instead, he adopts a "hidden" identity to protect his emotionally sensitive self and resists the "leader" label, even though it is deeply embedded in his identity "as a man in our culture." Paradoxically, as George rejects a narrow definition of masculinity to embrace his other identities as a parent and a teacher, Juliana says she wears a blazer for protection against hostile colleagues. One way of analyzing this might be to report that George is trying to embrace a more feminine identity, while Juliana pursues a more masculine, and

therefore more powerful, identity—that they are essentially pursuing different ends. But such an interpretation misreads the symbols—both are attempting to negotiate a culture that forces them to radically alter what they most value in themselves and what makes them most alive. They are both victims of the symbolic violence endemic in their cultures. Additionally, while Hal adopts a hyper-theoretical veneer, how does he really see himself vis-à-vis his students? The descriptive term he chose is not just parent, but mother*:* "launching a new program is like a mother watching her child go off to the first day of school." There is something more going on here than simple sexism.

Cognitive bias. Indeed, the root of the problem in academia is not simply sexism, although it may be related to it; it is the denial of emotion. The cognitive bias in higher education affects all members of the system, although to varying degrees. Over and over again throughout these interviews, George, Sarah, Erin, Juliana, and Hal referred to a privileging of the analytical and expressed their pain over having to hide their feelings. They talked about people being turned into machines, teaching getting taken over by robots, human worth getting measured by quantified productivity requirements. They talked about how unsafe it is to be emotional, how ashamed they feel if they cry in front of their colleagues, and how they fear they will be dismissed as "airheads" if they have feelings. Juliana may often see herself as a puppy who "tucks her tail between her legs," but she will not "expose her belly." Paradoxically, she realizes that her sensitivity allows for "perspective taking" and that effective responses to a diverse community require emotionality, but for someone who is sensitive, "stinging words really do hurt." Operating under a similar burden, George described keeping his true identity underground and working as a "mole," even though the one thing he most wishes his colleagues knew about him was how sensitive he is. Like Juliana, the "wellspring" of Sarah's professional effectiveness is institutionally ignored even though she knows her emotionality is "what makes her a good

teacher, a connector, a team player" and is what helps her with "big-picture administrative problem-solving." Erin's nurturance can only be expressed in one of the three components of her work, and there, in her teaching, she has a "secret" following of admirers. In academia emotion not just seen as a deficiency, it perceived as a defect. However, not all emotion. Negative emotion (fear, shame, anger) is allowed to thrive, but positive emotion (empathy, nurturance, spirituality) is shunned and seen as anti-intellectual. Cognitive bias masks this reality.

Earlier, I described the forced loss of initial ideals as a form of de-humanization. At its worst, symbolic violence in the academy also de-humanizes by killing off the emotional aspects of faculty identity, especially the positively emotional parts. Do not think for a moment that this is not how people experience it. George, Juliana and Hal feel personally besieged. All three used life-or-death imagery to describe the perceived risks of revealing too much of themselves: George imagines "Everyone is shooting at you in the battle, including from behind" (i.e., from your own side); Hal says you must learn to "compromise or die." Juliana often asks herself "Is this the hill I am going to die on?" She also recognizes that her "gods have feet of clay," that the ivory tower has not lived up to what she had hoped it would be, that she must grieve "the death of [her] illusions." This, then, is the impact of symbolic violence.

Who is really the most satisfied? Given all this pain, Simon's relative isolation and detachment from his community and from his emotions may begin to look more enticing. Add to that the math that the higher the percentage of emotional or relational identity traits [Simon (12.5%), George (58%), Juliana (65%), Sarah (80%), Erin (80%), Hal (100%)], the less job satisfaction individuals expressed - especially when combined with the correlation between hidden identities and institutionally under-valued identities. However, Simon's narrative contains a number of contradictions and inconsistencies, suggesting he may be more confused or masked than he reports. This indicates not only the limitations of self-reported measures of happiness,

but intersectional analysis digs underneath the explicit to reveal a more complicated subtext. True, Simon has experienced the least amount of symbolic violence than my other participants, but he also uses the fewest terms to describe his identity, suggesting a fairly limited sense of self. Half of what he does express fully endorses the academic culture status quo. Reybold (2002) suggested the "Drifter" identity was vulnerable because such a person has a weak commitment to academe and might be more prone to "drift" away. Simon shows that a "drifter's" weak identity might also become so fully acculturated, in ways that discourage self-reflection, that richer more multifaceted identity development is foreclosed. Also, except for when he is expressing anger at his "lazy" colleagues, he uses fairly tepid language to describe his work, suggesting his experience of positive emotion has been somewhat truncated.

To contrast, while Simon described his work as merely "fun," that in no way compares to the deep joy the rest experience in their teaching. They use words like Flow, delight, highly thrilling, awesome, engaging, meaning-making, enlightenment, and love. From this we can conclude that in allowing an emotionally positive identity to flourish, faculty do risk experiencing some lows but there are some very high highs as compensation. While relationships with colleagues might be thwarted by a hostile academic culture, relationships with students give meaning. This kind of intersectional analysis suggests that my criteria for determining job satisfaction may be insufficient. While I initially ranked Simon as most satisfied, I am no longer content with that designation. This aligns with Pifer's (2011) realization that there can be quite a disconnect between external and internal experiences of identity. This work adds to the possibility of a layer of identity that a person might not be consciously aware of. Thus, faculty identity is more complex than one might initially imagine, requiring more sophisticated measures of satisfaction that can capture simultaneous frustrations and gratifications, mechanisms of masking and endorsing, and the interplay between the subjective and the contextual.

Another curious finding from this study is the elusive quality of symbolic capital in higher education. Earlier, I wrote about the participants having a clear sense of male, tenured, White professors as being "at the top of the food chain." Yet, Simon, George and Hal, who are male, tenured, White professors, do not seem to revel in their power. Simon juggles his multiple scholarly projects solo. George admits he is "freer," "more relaxed," and "worries less" now that he has tenure, but he also feels like he has been "socialized into being a coward" – so afraid of his colleagues' censure, because in the past that censure meant denial of tenure at another institution, that he shies from being a "bold risk taker." He also continues to feel pressure to churn out publications because his future raises will depend on these. No question that matters are easier now than when he was starting out his career, but there is an odd sense that, to borrow a saying from Gertrude Stein (1937), "there is no there there," (p. 289). Academia exacts a never-ending price.

Escape, retreat, retrench. Just because frustrated faculty also experience some career gratification in spite of symbolic violence does not mean we should cease working on ways to minimize those frustrations. Finding ways to optimize positive relationships, build on them, and work to change the cognitively biased system should be top priority not just for faculty job satisfaction, but for the future of the academy. We must not gloss over the huge personal impact academic identity formation has on the individuals involved. All six of the faculty I interviewed told me about career decisions they have made, or coping mechanisms they have developed, in order to "escape" unbearable aspects of academic institutional culture. Even Simon, who seems the most content, dove into scholarship to avoid a department that did not value his academic sub-specialty and to avoid committee work that he detests. George first went into administration and then left one university to avoid a toxic department. Sarah also went into administration to avoid her "dysfunctional department." She needed "distance" to figure out why she was so

unhappy. Erin considered quitting academia altogether. Juliana wears her armor. Hal told me he

drinks, and even if that was just a joke, he obfuscates (refusing to directly answer many of my

interview questions and reveal aspects of his identity) and wears a cynical mask. These escape

strategies illustrate how important it is that we begin acknowledging the kinds of choices faculty

are being asked to make and the ways in which our institutions limit the full expression of our

humanity. In other words, we need to examine the kinds of options we are forcing on faculty.

The stakes are high. If we do not begin to resolve these problems, it will not merely be a question

of how faculty develop their identity and experience their work. Those people who are most fully

developed will leave academia altogether, a natural selection process that weeds the humanity

out of academe.

An additional consequence of symbolic violence against faculty is the unconscious

perpetuation of practices that can translate into symbolic violence against students. While this

was not a focus of this study, future work might examine how even the most well-intentioned

and democratic of professors might find themselves asserting their expertise and invalidating

student perspectives, or grading in ways that perpetuate social privilege. Bourdieu (1988) himself

described a process by which faculty unconsciously favored students from the upper classes, who

possessed high linguistic capital, over those from working classes—independent from the merit

of the ideas conveyed in their work. The wealthier students simply sounded smarter than the

poorer ones did. In other words, the invisible *habitus* of academic language expectations affected

faculty judgment. Bourdieu called such teachers "mystified mystifiers" and "the *first victims* of

the operations which they perform" because the *habitus* of the academy functions to make them

"think they are operating on a purely academic [level]" (p. 207). Because of this false belief, "the

system is able to perform a genuine *distortion of the meaning* of their practices, persuading them

to do what they would not deliberately do for 'all the money in the world'" (p. 207). As reflected

in this study, most of the participants talked about how much they care about teaching but also felt they must not appear to care "too much." What impact does such an identity compromise have on students?

Conclusion

To guard against such hidden institutional influences in their colleges and universities, faculty might do well to practice a form of Bourdieu's *epistemic reflexivity*, a collective undertaking which focuses on social and intellectual assumptions unconsciously hidden in analytic operations (Wacquant, 1992). Such a communal commitment to becoming more aware of the capacity for bias or hypocrisy and to a strict alignment between intentions and outcomes might militate against time wasted "spinning in the wheel" on academic committees, as Simon put it, or teaching practices that work at cross purposes (e.g., simultaneously encouraging and silencing student voice in class discussion), or the scholarship George observed that undercuts itself because it tries to be both innovative and derivative at the same time. True, most of the participants in this study reveal that they already have some of this kind of reflexive-awareness, but those who hold the reins of power—who are more deeply embedded in academic culture—do not appear to be participating in similar self-interrogation (e.g., Simon). Or, if they are, there is no incentive for them to change their behavior. In short, those that are most satisfied are least likely to challenge academic culture, and those that are most satisfied are likely those with the most power. What this means is that change is unlikely to come any time soon.

For change to happen, the dilemma faced by faculty where they believe they must mask the most cherished aspects of their identities or face ridicule and ostracism must be eliminated. The mechanisms that trigger this dilemma—the negative forced options—must be more openly acknowledged and studied. The academy must recognize that socialization into a competitive, hierarchical system that privileges certain facets of an individual's identity while imperiling

other aspects, especially the emotional and relational, triggers job dissatisfaction and may threaten student success. Masked aspects of identity may well be the source of academic renewal and connection, as well as personal gratification. Further study of a wider range of individuals can deepen our understanding of this phenomenon. Such research might also target more of the various pathways and sub-themes identified in this project. Moreover, because an intersectional lens reveals individual faculty identity is comprised of multiple identities, this research suggests that as we consider ways of making the academy more democratic, we must begin to think of pluralism as both an intrapersonal and interpersonal goal. The way we define job satisfaction and reflexivity must reflect this more complex and nuanced sense of self.

The issue is not simply a question of improving personal happiness and faculty job satisfaction. Twale and DeLuca (2008) told us, "Academic environments that successfully manage conflict through valuing openness, civility, and honest communication are more likely to survive" (p. 155). They go on to describe effective leadership as outward-focused and not ego centered. The necessary structural changes in academia that this study implies would allow that kind of civility and leadership to flourish. For example, long-term mentoring of senior faculty members might help them better facilitate the acquisition of symbolic power and more fully understand what that means in terms of their relationships with junior faculty. If emotions were more valued, differences could be discussed, common ground could be discovered, and collaboration could be more possible. This might have a ripple effect on all aspects of higher education, creating both better classroom experiences for students and more relevant research for the larger society. Therefore, to borrow a concept from social justice theory, we must move from a deficit model (Paris, 2012) to see emotion and relationships as assets, funds of feeling. We must redefine academic capital, re-humanizing the academy to create a space where positive feelings can flourish. Such a process involves inviting our relational selves (Jordan, 1997) to sit

at the analytical table. The pursuit of knowledge amongst fully-actualized human beings embedded in honest, meaningful, harmonious relationships within collaborative institutions is a vision for a robust, generative, and socially responsible academy—one that is culturally enriching and can change lives for the better.

For Further Consideration:

1. How, if at all, do these narratives change how you perceive college faculty? How generalizable do you think their experiences might be?

2. If institutional culture affects faculty in the ways described in this chapter, how in turn might it affect students? Do you imagine all student populations are affected equally or are some more vulnerable? Consider both how students are treated in classrooms and how curriculum and pedagogy are designed.

3. Given what you might know about organizational behavior and culture change theory, what are some strategies that might be effective for improving the constraining aspects of higher education?

References

Bayers, L. & Camfield, E.K. (10 March 2018). Student shaming and the need for academic empathy. *Hybrid Pedagogy*. Available at https://hybridpedagogy.org/student-shaming-academic-empathy/

Bettie, J. (2000). Women without class: Chicas, cholas, trash and the presence/absence of class identity. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, (26)*1, 1-35.

Bok, D. (2008). *Our underachieving colleges.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Original work published in 1979.)

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus.* (P. Collier, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published in 1984.)

Bourdieu, P. (1991*). Language and symbolic power.* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published in 1982.)

DeAngelo, L., Hurtado, S., Pryor, J.H., Kelly, K.R., & Santos, J.L. (2009). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2007-2008 HERI Faculty Survey.* Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Dhamoon, R.K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly, 64,* 230-243.

Finley, A. & McNair, T. (2013) *Assessing underserved students' engagement in high-impact practices*, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.

Gumport, P. (2001). Built to serve: The enduring legacy of public higher education. In P. Altbach, P. Gumport, & D.B. Johnstone (Eds.) *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 85-109)*.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hancock, A. M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining

intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics, 5*(1), 63-79.

James, W. (1896). *The will to believe*. Lecture to the Philosophers' Club at Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Johnson, S. R. & Stage, F. K. (2018). Academic engagement and student success: Do HIPs mean higher graduation rates? *Journal of Higher Education, 89*(5), 753-781.

Jordan, J.V. (1997). The relational self: A new perspective for understanding women's development. In M.E. Wilson & L.E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.), *ASHE Reader on College Student Development Theory* (pp. 347-355). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Kezar, A.J., & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A guide for campus leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kirp, D. L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the bottom line: The marketing of higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuh, G. (2008) *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.

Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mathews, K., Scungo, L. & Benson, T. (2018). *Findings from the first ever multi-institutional survey of faculty retention and exit.* Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.

Menand, L. (2010). *The marketplace of ideas: Reform and resistance in the American university.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton Publishers.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93-97.

Pifer, M. J. (2011). Intersectionality in context: A mixed-methods approach to researching the faculty experience. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2011*(151), 27-44.

Reybold, L.E. (2003). Pathways to the professoriate: The development of faculty identity in education. *Innovative Higher Education, 27(*4), 235-252.

Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *Social Science Journal, 46*(3), 550.

Stein, G. (1937). *Everybody's autobiography.* New York, NY: Random House.

Trower, C.A., Austin, A.E., & Sorcinelli, M.D. (2001). Paradise lost: How the academy converts enthusiastic recruits into early-career doubters. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin.*

Twale, D.J., & DeLuca, B.M. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1989). An interview with Pierre Bourdieu for a socio-analysis of intellectuals: On "homo academicus." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 34*, 1-29. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035401

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992) Toward a social praxeology: The structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology. In P. Bourdieu & L. A. Wacquant (Eds.), *An invitation to reflexive sociology* (pp. 1-60). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Webber, K. L. (2018). The working environment matters: Faculty member job satisfaction by institution type. *Research Dialogue 142,* TIAA Institute.

Xu, Y.J. (2008) Gender disparity in STEM disciplines: A study of faculty attrition and turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 49*(7)*,* 607-624.

Appendix A: FACULTY SELF-IDENTIFIED CORE IDENTITY TRAITS, CODED

Hal: "Being and Doing" Philosopher (latent Visionary)	Simon: "Having Fun and Juggling Solo" Drifter-Philosopher	Erin: "Secretly Excellent" Philosopher-Visionary	Sarah: "Attached and Grounded" Drifter-Philosopher-Visionary	Juliana: "Still Standing" Visionary	George: "Working Underground" Visionary-Philosopher
Declined to offer any specific traits; claimed identity was not determined by the individual but was constructed through the perceptions of others.	1. [academic sub-specialty] 2. teacher 3. writer 4. cook 5. potter 6. musician 7. father + 8. editor Most endorsed or valued by the academic institution in italics (4/8 = 50%) Most hidden or masked in academic institution underlined and noted with * (0%) Emotional/ Relational noted with + (1/8 = 12.5%) **Most personally valued in bold (all).**	1. mother * + 2. wife * + 3. sister/daughter + 4. friend + 5. creative 6. kind/ nurturing * + 7. spiritual * + 8. intelligent (also *) 9. leftist + 10. feminist * + 11. nature-loving + 12. gardener 13. professor + 14. writer + 15. emotionally sensitive * + Most valued by the academic institution (2/15 = 13%) Most hidden or masked in academic institution (4/15 = 27% totally masked; plus 3 that are partially masked: total 7/15 = 47%) * Emotional/relational (12/15 = 80%) + **Most personally valued in bold.**	1. mother * + 2. teacher + 3. spouse * + 4. friend * + 5. sister/daughter * + 6. lover of the arts + 7. compassionate/ empathetic + 8. a "connector" + 9. team player + 10. passionate * + 11. (overly) sensitive * + 12. scholar 13. "big picture" thinker 14. liberal + 15. Unitarian/ spiritual * + 16. feminist + 17. passionate about diversity issues and social justice + 18. female 19. white 20. (overly) responsible + Most valued by the academic institution (7/20 = 35%) Most hidden or masked in academic institution (7/20 = 35%) * Emotional/relational (16/20 = 80%) + **Most personally valued in bold.**	1. passionate * + 2. honest + 3. ethical + 4. compassionate + 5. sensitive * + 6. happy * + 7. critical 8. curious + 9. change-agent and hopeful + 10. equitable + 11. intelligent 12. playful * + 13. strong * + 14. courageous * + 15. bad-ass * + 16. female 17. Latina * 18. adjunct faculty 19. born poor, but now upper middle class 20. Buddhist + 21. married, no children + 22. Democrat/ liberal 23. social scientist Most valued by the academic institution (2/23 = 9%) Most hidden or masked in academic institution (8/23 = 35%) * Emotional/ relational (15/23 = 65%) + **Most personally valued in bold.**	1. family man * + 2. curious + 3. articulate + 4. perfectionistic + 5. worrier * + 6. great teacher + 7. citizen + 8. provider 9. competitive and sensitive * + 10. pleaser + 11. (ironically) conflict averse *+ 12. brave + 13. male 14. progressive/ democrat + 15. book lover + 16. builder 17. creative + 18. observant 19. ethical + 20. leader + 21. complicated class background 22. good friend (to a chosen few) + 23. messy 24. afraid to fail (also coded as instit. valued) * + 25. risk taker/ bold thinker/ integrative connector + 26. white 27. married with 2 children 28. agnostic 29. full professor w/ endowed chair 30. supporter of the liberal arts 31. silenced Most valued by the academic institution (11/31 = 35%) Most hidden or masked in academic institution (5/31 = 16%) * Emotional/relational (18/31 = 58%) + **Most personally valued in bold.**

Note: The name-label term in quotation marks was selected by the participant as best capturing how they see themselves in relation to the academy. The second term is derived from Reybold's (2003) model of pathways to the professorate.