

2010-01-01

Faculty Inside A Changing University: Constructing Roles, Making Spaces

Leslie D. Gonzales

University of Texas at El Paso, lesliediane1999@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gonzales, Leslie D., "Faculty Inside A Changing University: Constructing Roles, Making Spaces" (2010). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 2685.

https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/2685

This is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

FACULTY INSIDE A CHANGING UNIVERSITY:
CONSTRUCTING ROLES, MAKING SPACES

LESLIE D. GONZALES

Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations

APPROVED:

Arturo Pacheco, Ph.D., Chair

Sara Grineski, Ph.D.

Rodolfo Rincones, Ph.D.

Kathleen A. Staudt, Ph.D.

Patricia Witherspoon, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Copyright

by

Leslie D. Gonzales

2010

DEDICATION

For my daughter, Sudeshna.
Te amo mucho, mi niña, Sue Bear.

FACULTY INSIDE A CHANGING UNIVERSITY:
CONSTRUCTING ROLES, MAKING SPACES

by

LESLIE D. GONZALES, M.A.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at El Paso
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

August 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Where does one begin when the gratitude and appreciation runs as deeply and widely as mine does? Let me begin by thanking all of the faculty members who completed my survey, and especially to those who agreed to be interviewed. I learned so much from our conversations and this work would not be possible without you.

To my wonderful committee, thank you; you are a team of true scholars. To Dr. Rincones, I thank you for reading so widely and encouraging me to do the same, allowing me and encouraging me to be conceptual, critical, and to always push my thinking to the margins. To Dr. Grineski, I am so happy that I met you and cannot describe how much I have learned from you over the last year or so. You make me believe that I can put on “my professor hat” as Goffman might say and that I will successfully make that transition sooner rather than later. To Dr. Staudt, you are my greatest fan and at the same time, my most diligent and critical friend. Thank you for showing me and inspiring me to think of the ways that my work can and will impact the real world. Between the borders of activism and scholarship is where I aspire to be and that is because of you. To Dr. Pacheco, the words do not come easily or adequately. Thank you, first and foremost, for encouraging me to stay in the program on those days when I thought I might be better off leaving. You helped me see the rich possibilities for a political scientist/sociologist, like me, in the field of education and encouraged me to use my theoretical bent despite the crazy looks I might inspire. Thank you for listening to my disorganized ideas, my clunky theorizing, and for the many, many sessions of “processing” this dissertation with me. Most of all, thank you for caring for me and my family and for reminding me that the most important things in life are not the articles that

I will write, the book(s) that I have spinning around in my head, or my work, in general. You remind me and let me be confident that the most important thing in my life is who I am at my core and who I am at my core is deeply connected to my family. Never before had I met a scholar who believed so deeply that family can be a source of enrichment, inspiration and depth for one's scholarly work until I met you, and as I look back, this lesson is the most beautiful one I have taken from you. I will sorely miss walking into your office to have our leisurely chats; thank you for always being there for me as a scholar and as a friend.

For my family: Mom, thank you for your love. You know me best and love me the same. Thank you for forcing me to do my A, B, C's even when I did not want to and for reading to me every day. I love you very much and am very proud that you are my mom. Your work ethic is inspiring and is a lesson that I carry in my heart every day of my life. For my Dad, I love you very much. Because of you, I learned to set goals for myself and have never allowed myself to seek the easy way out. I am driven and independent because you taught me to be. I will never forget the day you told me that it was okay to leave a job because there is nothing like "loving, enjoying what we do." Thank you for working so hard and enabling me to find what it is that I love. To my brother, I love you and am so proud of you. You always have such faith in me. Thank you for the late night conversations and the Pandora radio station that helped me get through much of this work.

For Ms. Maria, thank you for helping us raise Sudeshna. She is a beautiful person because of the influence you have had on her. For all the rides to campus, the late-night pick-me-ups and the many times you have taken care of my family so that I could

complete my work, I appreciate you more than I can express. Finally, for encouraging me to be the real me and to never let my high heels or work out sessions go; I thank you!

Finally, to my beautiful daughter, Sudeshna, and the world's most patient husband, Ruben. Sudeshna, thank you for being such a wonderful daughter, a true inspiration and one funny little munchkin. Although you have no idea, you gave me energy to complete this work. I can't wait to see the beautiful things you will do in your life. You amaze me every day and I am sure that you will continue to do so the rest of your life. I look forward to many more baking seasons with you, *mi chiquita*.

Ruben, *mi amor*, you give me so much. You listen, you cheer, you believe, and most of all you ground me. Thank you for always listening even when I am not the best listener. Thank you for believing and dreaming when my overly-structured mind does not allow me to dream or see the possibilities that lay ahead of us, as a family and as a couple. You are all heart, Ruben, and if it were not for you, my life would not be as complete and full as it is today. I am so proud to be your partner and to have you as mine.

For Ms. Elvia: thank you so much for your support and for your kind ways. I always enjoy our chats. To Ms. Michelle: thank you for keeping the program running and for always making me laugh! Thanks, Diana, for being a wonderful friend. I thank you for making me laugh, for the late-evening and early morning rides, and of course, for the Taco Tote lunches! For my dear friend, Amber, you are an amazing woman. Thank you for your friendship. You have such a good heart and have taught me so much about what matters in life. I never expected to make a friend like you, and now that I have, I

could not imagine my life without you. Thank for bringing both me and my family such kindness and joy and for always, always, understanding me without my having to say a word.

For all the women and men who have fought so that a person like me might be able to attend college, I thank you. There are unspoken heroes and trail-blazers all around us – you deserve thanks. May my work as a scholar, teacher, mentor and human being open doors for others like the ones you opened for me. That is what higher education is about; that is why I chose this field, and ultimately, that is why I chose to write this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

The notion of a multiversity was stamped into the higher education literature by Clark Kerr in 1963 when he spoke about the numerous purposes tied to U.S. higher education. Kerr highlighted how the University is often pulled in many directions at once, asked to fulfill promises of the cultural, educational, national, societal, and now, of the global kind. Perhaps, more than ever, the notion of the multiversity is relevant today. It is imperative to remember that these multiversities, however, are not empty spaces. They are occupied and brought to life by the people who work inside them, especially the faculty, who Gregorian (2005) names as the “heart and soul, the bone marrow and blood of universities.”

To this end, it is important to investigate and come closer to an understanding of what it is like to be a faculty member in today’s current context. In this study, I explore how a cross-section of faculty make sense of and carry out their work as professors as the university in which they work attempts to transition from a primarily teaching focused, regional university to a national research or “Tier One¹” university.

With an interpretive approach that draws from various data collection strategies, I show that faculty members make sense of this transition most often by drawing from two major sources: the institutional field and the immediate organizational culture. Most often, however, faculty members turn to the institutional field of higher education to understand what it means to be a professor at a “Tier One” University despite the fact “Tier One” is language that emanates from a set of benchmarks designed by the state

¹ Tier One is a concept that was used at the organizational and state level to describe this University’s aspirations to become a major national research university. Administrators and leaders attempted to “localize” the concept by applying their own criteria and creating slogans to and inform organizational members about the transition as well as to build support for it.

legislature. Furthermore, my research shows that “Tier One” is a concept that the University President co-opted and “localized” in her attempt to define this transition for organizational constituents.

While the vast majority of faculty members turn to the institutional field, as New Institutionalism (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991) might predict, to make sense of the transition unfolding at their university, this does not mean that all faculty simply import the institutionally prescribed notion of what it means to be a professor at a “Tier One” university. The analysis shows that to a great extent, faculty members construct a role and carry out their work in a way that seems plausible in light of the university’s culture and context. However, perhaps more importantly, the analysis shows that professors carry out their work in ways that seem practical to them in light of who they are as individuals whom carry an embodied personal and professional biography, history, and world view. Using Bourdieu’s theory of action, habitus, and field, I theorize that while the institutional field and organizational culture may provide standardized scripts and ideas for faculty members in terms of what faculty work could and should look like, one’s habitus acts as a mediating disposition that informs, but does not determine, how faculty make sense of their work, and ultimately, how faculty construct a role and a space for self.

My analysis revealed that faculty members (re)construct their role and carry out their work in three distinct ways: as Operationalizers, as Negotiators or as an Acquiescent. Amongst these three groups, there are important nuances which are outlined in the analysis and which have implications for understanding and investigating

organizational change, faculty work, faculty relations and the role that faculty members are playing in the larger field of higher education.

This work yields practical implications for how organizational change is engineered inside a university, especially in terms of the language that is employed to transform a deeply structured university mission and culture. Issues of trust and faith in leadership emerged as significant patterns in the analysis of the data, and often led to faculty members' skepticism and negation of their roles. Also, how administrative leaders conceive of change and how they involve faculty members in such key decision making processes are also key matters that should be given consideration. Although not new, it is suggested that in order to move a university, its faculty must "buy" into the initiative at hand. My analysis shows that not only are faculty not "on board," but that many of them really lack an appreciation for the historical role and context of the university as well as a sound understanding as to why the university has chosen to take on a new mission and what the new mission is really about – at least in the most technical sense.

Practical, but also philosophical, implications also address the kinds of roles that faculty are playing inside of this transition. These roles signal to faculty members' engagement not only in their own university, but also in the larger field of higher education. The fact that most faculty do not know, are not aware of or sometimes are not concerned about preserving the important functions of teaching, service, access at this transitioning university is reflective of both deeper cultural and structural issues that are pervading higher education today. These significant issues are addressed in the concluding chapter of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Study	5
1.2 Importance of Study	6
1.3 Organization of Dissertation	11
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
2.1 Historical Evolution of Higher Education & the Faculty Role.....	16
2.1a European Roots and Influence	16
2.1b The American Stamp on Higher Education.....	19
2.1c Inspired by the German Research Model	21
2.2 Higher Education Today	27
2.3 Faculty Work & Roles: Studied and Theorized	34
2.3a Macro Level Approaches	36
2.3b Meso Level Approaches	40
2.3c Micro Level Approaches	48
3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS	64
3.1 Conceptualizing the Study	64

3.2 New Institutionalism's Micro-Foundations	66
3.3 The Influence of Pierre Bourdieu	80
3.4 Why These Frameworks?	94
4. METHODOLOGY	98
4.1 An Interpretive, Mixed Methods Work.....	98
4.2 Epistemology and Mixed Methods Research.....	99
4.3 Research Design and Data Collection Strategies.....	101
4.3a On-line Survey.....	102
4.3b Interviews	109
4.3c Document Sources	121
4.4 Validity of the Study.....	123
5. THE SETTING.....	125
5.1 South West's Organizational Saga.....	125
5.2 Changing a Saga: South West's Tier One Aspirations	135
6. PRESENTATION OF DATA & ANALYSIS	146
6.1 Survey Data.....	146
6.1a Academic and Professional Background of SWU Faculty	147
6.1b SWU Faculty Work Context.....	151
6.1c Role Orientation of SWU Faculty	152
6.2 Sense Making Sources.....	157
6.2a Institutional Field as a Sense Making Source	158
6.2b Organizational Culture as a Sense Making Source.....	163
6.3 Constructing Roles, Making Spaces.....	166

6.3a The Operationalizers.....	169
6.3b Cosmopolitan Operationalizers in Action.....	186
6.3c local Cosmos in Action.....	206
6.3d The Negotiators	221
6.3e Local Cosmopolitans - Negotiators in Action	232
6.3f The Acquiescent.....	264
6.3g The Acquiescent in (In) Action.....	274
7. CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS	294
7.1a Discussion	295
7.2 Theoretical Implications.....	305
7.2a Using the Typology.....	305
7.2b Professors as People: Habitus as a Flexible Lens.....	306
7.2 Contributions to New Institutionalism.....	308
7.3 Implications for Practice	311
7.3a Language and Power	313
7.3b Organizational Responsibility	315
7.4 Concluding Thoughts.....	319
REFERENCES.....	323
APPENDIX A.....	347
APPENDIX B.....	349
APPENDIX C	352
APPENDIX D	355
APPENDIX E.....	358

APPENDIX F	361
APPENDIX G	363
CURRICULUM VITA	377

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The American professoriate and higher education, in general, are consistently described as institutions in flux (Schuster et al., 2006), and perhaps more precisely as institutions persistently stricken with crisis (Altbach, 2005; Birnbaum et al., 2001). It is no wonder some suggest, that American universities and professors face such strident and constant crises. As Kerr (2001) notes, American higher education has roots in so many places and periods throughout world history, each pointing the institution and its professors in a different direction.

For example, American higher education is marked by a strong teaching tradition (Kerr, 2001, p. 14) impressed during the early colonial era. In fact, teaching, as fashioned by the English, was based on the principal *in locus parentis* where teachers – not yet referred to as faculty members- were expected to function in place of parents (Rudolph, 1991). To this end, the earliest cohort of faculty members focused on shaping their students, most of whom were wealthy, white males, into pious, morally grounded social leaders. In general, the early professors were expected to do this by implementing a classical English liberal arts curriculum as well as religious teachings (Altbach, 2001).

Then more than two-hundred years after the first college opened its doors, in a post-Civil War America, many scholars returned to the U.S. from their own study in Germany. Exposed to the German system of higher education, these scholars sought to replicate their personal research and scholarly experience in U.S. colleges and the soon-to-be universities. Thus, the Germanic influence lent a focus on research,

scholarship and specialization. Advocates of the German model placed pure research and scholarship above all else in the university. The most devout advocates of the German model believed that instruction did not belong in the university at all (Flexner, 1968).

Almost simultaneously, however, the U.S. endeavored to make its own mark on higher education (Altbach, 2001). In the high democratic spirit of the day, the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 was adopted by Congress. The Land Grant Act transformed American higher education into a democratic symbol based on American pragmatism and utility, undergirded by the notion and hope that American professors had the kind of knowledge that could support the development of a strong agrarian and industrial economy at a local level. With this, faculty members at land-grant institutions were expected to work closely with small farmers, ranchers, and business people in order to help them improve practice and production (Kerr, 2001; Rudolph, 1991). Furthermore, the land-grant university offered opportunity to the sons of poor farmers and ranchers thereby pushing forward the Jeffersonian notion of education in a democratic society.

These multiple purposes of the university – the teaching, the pursuit of knowledge through pure research, the service provided by applied teaching and learning – make American higher education uniquely distinct and lend to the prestige and envy that American universities arouse world-wide (Altbach, 2001). However, each of these purposes is inspired by a certain philosophy, and mostly, these philosophies diverge. For instance, the German research and scholarship model is grounded in elitism and specialization whereas the service tenet is driven by America's democratic, populist and pragmatic whims. These multiple purposes, grounded in their conflicting

philosophies and orientations, set the stage for a higher education system that is as Kerr (2001) puts it “partially at war with itself” (p. 7), always facing some crisis or another, always pulling the professoriate in one direction or the other. In tracing the historical development of universities, it is evident that as universities make change or are changed, the work of the faculty and the role that faculty members are asked to play inside their university, also changes.

To this end, recent studies show that universities and their professors are amid a new wave of change and transition. Specifically, there is evidence that regardless of institutional type and history, many universities and colleges are breaking away from their regional, teaching and public service missions to adopt more research focused missions (Altbach, 2001; Arnone, 2003; McCormick et al., 2005; Morpew, 2009; Rusch et al., 2007). Some have referred to this pattern as “academic ladder climbing” (McCormick et al., 2005); others have called it “institutional” or “academic drift,” (Fairweather, 1996) while still others draw from institutional literature and describe it as mimicry or isomorphism (Melguizo et al., 2007; O’Meara, 2002).

There are those who believe academic drift is a crisis. Such opponents believe that institutional differentiation is one of the greatest strengths of the U.S. higher education system (Altbach, 2001; Birnbaum, 1983; Morpew, 2003; Stadtman, 1980). For instance, Stadtman (1980) suggests that the differentiation amongst America’s universities and college represent different kinds of learning opportunities, a range of educational opportunities that include low-cost to higher-cost options, and finally, that institutional variety makes it difficult for the academy to be controlled by any one authority. From this perspective, the regional, comprehensive, and/or teaching focused

universities that seeks a more research focused mission serves a unique role in American higher education, and drifting away from such purposes poses a threat to the functionality of the system.

On the other hand, there are others who believe that institutional differentiation has yielded a higher education system that affords an elite few a first rate education while the vast majority of students receive a lesser experience (Bastedo et al., 2003; Labaree, 2008). While arguments vary on the topic of institutional drift, it is apparent that when universities tinker with their mission in such dramatic ways, there are obvious implications for the role that faculty members are expected to play inside their universities (Fairweather, 1996; Grbich et al., 1998; O'Meara, 2002). To highlight the implications for faculty roles in these different settings, consider Clark's (1997) descriptions of a teaching and a research institution below:

These major locales exhibit vast differences in the very basis of academic life, namely, the balance of effort between undergraduate teaching and advanced research and research training. Teaching loads in the leading universities come in at around four to six hours a week, occasionally tapering down to two to three hours a class a week.... faculty commonly expect to spend at least half their time in research....We need not stray very far among the institutional types, however, before we encounter teaching loads that are 50, 100, and 200 percent higher....as we move from the research universities through the middle types to the two-year institutions, faculty involvement shifts from advanced students to beginning students; from highly selected students to an open-door clientele...(p. 26).

As more and more universities strive to climb the academic ladder, faculty roles and expectations begin to look increasingly similar and "publish or perish" has become the golden rule for today's academic – no matter where they work.

Although university leaders can revise mission statements and create new organizational trajectories, it is the people within the university that must ultimately carry

out this change. To move a university, to make it work, faculty must take part (Fairweather, 1995; Tuchman, 2009). Thus, it is important to investigate the experience, perspective, and sense-making of faculty as universities, across the institutional spectrum, strive to move up the ladder by adopting more research focused missions. Understanding from the faculty perspective what this sort of change means to their work and how they bring sense to their role is critical to understanding a pattern of organizational change that is becoming more and more common across higher education.

1.1 The Study

To study these important issues, I carried out an interpretive, mixed-methods study at South West University, a public regional university in west Texas. South West is the only public university in a U.S.-Mexico border region where more than 1 million people reside. With the next Texas public university more than one hundred miles away, South West is the only public higher education provider in a region that is quickly growing and highly under-educated. More than half of South West's 21,000 students are first-generation college-goers and the vast majority of South West students are characteristic of the new "traditional, non-traditional student majority" (Levin, 2007) in higher education. Specifically, more than 75% of South West students come from a Hispanic² background; most come from poor to very modest economic backgrounds

² Student demographics for year 2008 estimated that more than 75% of South West students are Hispanic while an additional 7.7% of students identified as Mexican National students. This means that about 83% of South West students are of a Spanish speaking/ Latina/o background. Given SWU's location, it is likely that most Hispanic students at SWU are of Mexican descent. However, Hispanic is the term used to describe people of a Spanish speaking background; the term includes groups of people with Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Spanish and other Latin origins. I recognize and appreciate the rich, unique heritage and histories of the various groups that are included in the category Hispanic. I use the term only for reasons of simplicity and continuity.

and most (50%+) work while attending school in order to meet personal, family, and student financial obligations.

Thus, South West's purpose has long been defined as one of teaching and regional service, and therefore, the professorial role has largely been focused on undergraduate teaching and research that has regional relevance and applicability. With a shift in South West's mission, it is sensible to question if the primary focus on undergraduate education and service will be overshadowed, despite university leaders attempt to convince stakeholders that this is not the case.

The challenges, but also the promises, that this transition brings to faculty can best be studied and understood through an up close examination of faculty perspectives and experiences. Also, though, such change efforts puts the role that faculty members play within Universities at stake and up for redefinition. It is important that scholars of higher education attempt to understand how faculty work and roles are constructed or redefined in cases of change, such as at SWU. To this end, this study has been guided by a set of broad as well as more concrete questions which include:

- What information and from where do faculty draw from in order to make sense of their role?
- What does organizational change, such as this look like from the faculty perspective?
- How do South West faculty members understand their role as professors as the university where they work redefines its mission?
- What role do faculty play inside this changing university?

1.2 Importance of Study

This study and the contributions it offers are important for a number of reasons, at a number of various levels. At the broadest level, this study can contribute to the field of higher education as it seeks to tackle how faculty members –both tenured and

tenure-track – deal with this increasingly common phenomenon known as institutional or academic drift (Fairweather, 1996; 2005; Morpew, 2002). In addition, this study is grounded in the perspectives and lived experiences of faculty members. This is important because much of the work that has been done on faculty work and life has been framed by macro or meso level lenses with the exception of Neumann's (2009) up close examination of faculty members' emotional attachment to their work.

In general, though, scholars take wide lenses such as the political-economy (Slaughter, 1985; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoads, 1996; 2005; Torres and Schugerensky, 2002) to hypothesize, theorize and study the work of faculty. Other scholars take a meso level lens which means that the organization, its structures, and its behaviors are used to study and explain what faculty do and why (consider Fairweather's extensive and informative body of work, 1993a, 1993b, 1995, 1996, 2005; Glassick et al., 1997; Melguizo & Strober, 2007; Rusch et al., 2008). While macro and meso level studies yield critical insights about the environments where faculty members carry out their work; these approaches color over the intricacies of everyday life and perhaps without meaning to, these studies usually present faculty members as passive and often extrinsically motivated individuals. Faculty members usually appear stripped of human agency and creativity. Thus, how and why faculty members go about their work in the ways that they do is lost when one studies and theorizes from afar.

In addition to the fact that much of the scholarship on faculty roles and work is situated in macro or meso level theories, is also true that the bulk of work consists of survey research (Fairweather's body of work; Jacobs, 2004; Leslie, 2002; Melguizo et

al., 2007; Milem, et al., 2003; Perna, 2001; Schuster et al., 2006).³ From this body of survey research, scholars of higher education have generated a number of important insights. For example, Fairweather's work has repeatedly shown that faculty are rewarded best when they yield research related products and Melguizo et al., (2007) find the same. From Bowen and Schuster (1986) and Schuster et al., 2006), there is evidence that the younger generations of scholars prefer research over other tenets of their work. From Jacobs (2004), Mason et al., (2004) Mason; 2009; Perna (2001) Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2007; 2009), higher education leaders and scholars have been alerted to the challenges that faculty members with families or those who aspire to have families face. These writers have raised concerns about talented scholars, especially women, who may opt out of the professoriate because of the pressures rendered by a "publish or perish" work life that has no boundaries (Mason et al, 2004). To this end, Milem et al., (2003) show that faculty members are working more than ever, dedicating more hours to both instruction and research, estimating that faculty work about sixty hours per week. However, just as macro and meso level studies provide a certain view of faculty work and roles, so does survey research; with each providing a helpful, yet limited and distanced rendering of actual lived experiences and perspectives of faculty members.

In response to the limitations in the literature, this study is built on the premise that an interpretive mixed methodology can provide a richer view of faculty experiences and perspectives. In this study, survey data are used to provide a contextual picture of South West as a university, the working conditions and work habits of South West

³ Colbeck (1998; 2000) and Neumann (2009) are exceptions.

professors, and information on faculty personal and professional background. The qualitative work consists of in-depth, loosely-structured interviews. They are designed to gather a deeper understanding of how faculty make sense of the organizational transition that is taking place at South West University, and especially, how they, as faculty members, bring some sense and legitimacy to the state of their professional lives during a time of strident organizational change.

This study is also poised to make a contribution as it takes a look at faculty members' experiences and perspectives at a rather typical university. South West is not a highly prestigious university; it has tended to a regional population and regional issues for most of its existence. This is important because the vast majority of scholarship on faculty has been conducted within the most elite arenas of higher education, mostly at major, well established research universities, and yet these institutions make up less than 2.1% of the total institutional population in the U.S. (Rhoades, 2007). Because of this, Rhoades urged higher education scholars to study faculty work and life across the institutional spectrum and particularly at institutions and amongst faculty groups that are located in the less prestigious spaces within the academy.

In addition to this work being carried out in a rather typical university, it responds to other gaps in the literature as well. Specifically, this study considers the perspective and experiences of faculty in cross-cutting, nuanced ways. Although faculty members are often referred to as a "profession," they are organized and organize themselves into significantly distinct groups. For instance, Becher (1995) Clark (1972; 1997), Leslie (2002) and others have shown how important the disciplines are to how faculty see and conduct their work. Moreover, the power and prestige ascribed to these distinct

disciplinary groups is well documented and could have implications for how faculty see, interpret, and act upon the pending organizational transition. This study has purposely sought to draw faculty perspectives from these various disciplines to account for the well documented cultural differences and perspectives associated with the respective groups.

Yet probably the most important distinction amongst faculty is whether one belongs to the tenured or tenure-track group. The distribution of power amongst these two groups of faculty is critical to consider in a study about organizational change and faculty roles.⁴ Whereas tenure-track faculty have some voice over matters of curricula and wide latitude with regard to their research agendas and instructional approach, the tenured faculty have a different, more substantial kind of power, particularly with regard to the fate of their tenure-track colleagues. Not only do tenured faculty members yield decision making power on a number of issues, including those related to the fate of tenure-track professors, but they also have rich social (networks and relationships) and institutional (organizational know-how, familiarity with resources – both human and technical) capital that they can tap into in order to make sense of and cope with organizational change. Thus, this study not only considers the intersection between faculty member and university, but it also looks at groups of very differently situated faculty as they construct their work lives in an institution that is dramatically changing.

⁴ This statement with regard to faculty power must be tempered and delimited. Scholars continually find that the American professoriate has lost power under the guise of “new managerialism” (Rhoades, 1996). New managerialism deals with the proliferation of the administrative cadre in higher education organizations where administrators (as well as external techno and bureaucrats) legislate and administer in ways that erode the traditional role that faculty members play in a shared governance system. Thus, faculty power, here, is meant to signal decisions over departmental matters, such as curriculum, their own instructional approach, work load distribution, and hiring decisions. For more on this topic, read Rhoades (1996), which provides a broad and theoretical overview of this perspective and Davies, et al., (2005) for a perspective on new managerialism and the gendered impact.

These nuanced approaches to my investigation make this dissertation a contribution to the literature on higher education, organizational change, and the professoriate.

1.3 Organization of Dissertation

In the following chapter, a review of the literature is provided. The literature review consists of a historical overview of the role of the professoriate. In this section, landmark legislation and major social events are considered for how they have impacted the field of higher education, and thus, the role of the professoriate. The historical review of the professoriate is then linked to contemporary studies of faculty work and faculty roles. Here, recent studies are used to explore how faculty members reportedly allocate time and effort to the various tenets of their work and also the importance or preference that faculty assign to each of their professional responsibilities. The literature review includes studies that apply various methodological and theoretical treatments while providing a long view of the professoriate as it has evolved since the beginning of U.S. higher education.

Following the literature review, a number of theoretical frameworks are discussed. These theoretical frameworks are grounded in various disciplines, and, suggest various epistemological, ontological, and methodological approaches. Thus, each framework offers unique suggestions for how one might study and explain how and why faculty members understand and construct their role in the ways that they do, particularly during a time of organizational change.

The first body of theoretical work consists of a set of organizational theories that have been strewn together. These theoretical perspectives include New Institutionalism, Neo Institutionalism, and Rosch and Reich's socialization learning model. Taken

together, these organizational theories espouse an interpretive and/or learning approach to understanding organization-actor relations. More specifically, New Institutionalism is a sociological theory of organizational analysis while Neo Institutionalism is a burgeoning theoretical perspective anchored in Berger and Luckman's social constructionist view, Garfinkel's (1963) ethnomethodology, Goffman's (1963) notion of role maintenance and Karl Weick's (2009) take on "making sense" in impermanent organizations.

NI, with its strong and sophisticated take on environmental or sectoral pressures, is further strengthened as I borrow from academic capitalism (Slaughter et al., 2004) to sharpen the environmental descriptions. Academic capitalism provides a political-economic perspective and argues that not only have higher education organizations adopted more entrepreneurial, revenue-generating behaviors to fill fiscal gaps that a neo-liberal state has left behind, but also that "these not-for-profit institutions [are] behaving more like private enterprises as the relationship between public and private entities shifts" (Rhoades, 2006, p. 385). Slaughter and Rhoades, Metcalfe and Slaughter (2006) as well as Torres et al., (2002) have studied what an academic capitalist learning regime means to the work that is expected and carried out by faculty members; their perspective is sharp and critical, and given some of the political and economic conditions related to South West's transition (and the condition of higher education, overall), such a perspective might help interrogate the meaning of this change by sharpening NI's a-critical approach to political-economy.

Then, I review some of the major conceptual points in Bourdieu's work. Specifically, I consider Bourdieu's theory of action and habitus (Bourdieu et al., 1994;

Swartz, 1997). This is a power centered explanation of structure and human action and agency. Bourdieu's work impels one to consider conflicts within the academy, particularly with regard to the construction and judgment of knowledge-producers through schemes of symbolic power and measures of symbolic violence (Rincones et al., 2005). Some of Bourdieu's later work on "masculine domination" (2001) forces one to consider the sometimes implicit, but nonetheless present patriarchal influence in the academy. In this study, Bourdieu helps to sketch out potential lines of inquiry regarding the struggle and conflict involved when faculty members must attempt to make their work relevant and viable in a changing organization.

Finally, Bourdieu's work on habitus and agency is extended by considering more poignantly the tenets of Critical Race Theory (Collins, 2000), which posits that one embodies many identities all at once. As a result, one can intersect with major structures (at the macro and meso) level in different ways all at once. The work of CRT pushes one to think of the way that individuals might navigate this change at various intersections.

Although, several theoretical perspectives are reviewed, it is important to note the unique role that theory plays in an interpretive work. Erickson (1986) suggests that interpretive researchers, like *all* researchers, enter the field with some "conceptual issues of research interest" and as a result the interpretive researcher may "pursue deliberate lines of inquiry while in the field" (p. 6). However, an interpretive researcher is not married to these lines of inquiry, only alerted to them. Theories remind the researcher to be mindful of what previous scholars have found or wrote about, but the theories are not allowed to stymie the truly dynamic intentions of interpretive research.

To this end, Erickson writes that in interpretive work “induction and deduction are in constant dialogue.” Thus, the theoretical frameworks are intended to alert me to issues that previous scholars have noted as important or that I believe may be of significance to this study.⁵

Following the review of theoretical frameworks, chapter four presents the methodology employed in this study. Space is lent to the explanation and clarification as to what it means to carry out a mixed methods study that is grounded in the “pragmatic, interpretive tradition” (Creswell, 2008). The steps of the research study are detailed, beginning with a discussion about the design, piloting, and launching of the survey and the analytical process for survey data. Following this, I describe the loosely-structured interviews that I conducted with a subset of faculty survey respondents. I have attempted to outline in a very step-by-step fashion the analytical process that I employed throughout the entire data collection phase, especially with regard to the qualitative data⁶.

In chapter five, I “thickly describe” (Geertz, 1973) South West University and its organizational saga (Clark, 1972; 1997). Clark describes saga as “a collective understanding...in which participants have added affect...[that] turns a formal place into a beloved institution” (pg. 178). Sharing South West University’s saga mandates a look into its history to show how the university’s character and purpose has been woven together by university leadership, discourse, social and political circumstances. Readers

⁵ Creswell (2009) notes that one of the strengths of qualitative work is that the researcher can and often is more upfront with her biases, subjectivities, and that she is likely to discuss how her own personal background or view of the world had some hand in shaping the research. Such an approach is clearly divergent from most objective, quantitative studies where the researcher presents her study as value-free, objectively configured and carried out. I say more about my selection of frameworks in chapter three.

⁶ Also, I have included an audit trail in my appendices to show how I defined my categories and themes.

will learn that the saga of South West has been its commitment to excellent undergraduate teaching and access to higher education for a historically underserved population.

Following, the description of South West, in chapter six, survey and interview data are presented. The survey data (both open and close-ended) present a snapshot of the South West professoriate, their habits of work and their views on SWU's transition; the survey data also aided in the design of interview questions. The interview data as well as open-ended survey comments get at the heart of this study. In these formats, faculty were given ample opportunity to explore and explain what this change means to them and to their work. The major insights, categories and themes that emerged from my analysis are presented in chapter six.

In chapter seven, I discuss what my analysis implies for higher education, the professoriate, and the nature of organizational change. I conclude by outlining future lines of research. Unanswered questions and ideas that emerged in the analysis, but not enough so as to constitute a "theme" are teased out in terms of future possible research questions. The study's findings are set against what higher education researchers know about faculty work, faculty roles, and organizational change and how this work contributes to the established body of scholarship.

CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Evolution of Higher Education and the Faculty Role

Universities, Abraham Flexner (1968) once wrote, are “an expression of the age” (p. 3). At first, Flexner’s perspective might seem to convey the notion that Universities move easily, adopt and adapt rapidly to the given social, economic, and political climate. However, while the different ages may give a certain expression to the role and work of the university, American universities have a unique way of layering, adding, and squeezing in these new expressions rather than replacing older ones wholesale (read Altbach, 2001). Over time, the layering and squeezing in of new missions and purposes has given the American higher education a diverse and unique structure.

Unfolding in the heart of the university is the work of the professoriate, and any study which seeks to understand the role, work, and life of faculty, must first be nested in the context of American universities. Obviously, the work of the professoriate is deeply intertwined with the given social, political and economic moment that Universities face and how Universities choose to respond to such moments. In the following section of the literature review, the roots of the American university are described. Historical milestones of the legal, social, political, and economic nature are brought to light to demonstrate how the American University and the role of the professoriate have grown over their four hundred year history.

2.1a European Roots and Influence

The earliest form of American higher education was modeled after the English model tradition (Haskins, 1957, p. 24); only later would the makers and leaders of

higher education look to a broader, deeper European influence for inspiration. However, in a country that would not earn its independence for another century, higher learning was first organized in the colonial college, the first of which opened its doors in 1636 and was named Harvard. Rudolph (1991) notes that the fathers of Harvard “re-creat[ed] a little bit of old England in America” (p. 4) when they opened Harvard, modeled after Cambridge and Oxford, where “Puritan theology and Puritan aspiration” could be nurtured (p. 5).

The purposes of the early American colonial college were not simplistic. The fathers of Harvard saw for themselves a responsibility and an opportunity to “set the world strait as Englishmen” (p. 6). Harvard would create competent rulers for their new state, a learned clergy for the church, and for society, Harvard would produce “cultured men” (p. 6). Rather than faculty, Harvard students were taught letters and religion by their *tutors* who were, in turn, instructed to “take care to advance in all learning, divine and humane, each and every student who is or will be entrusted to your tutelage, according to their several ability, and especially to take care that their conduct and managers be honorable and without blame” (p. 6). Tutors, then, functioned very much like parents: living with students, watching over their learning and behaviors both inside and outside the class room.

The primary role of the tutor at this time in American higher education was to watch over their pupils and ensure that they were cared for, that they were learning and living in the spirit of Protestantism. Academic learning, of course, was equal to the import of Protestant formation, and the curriculum was the “proper amalgam of the medieval arts and sciences and of Renaissance interest in the study of literature and

belles-lettres” (Rudolph, 1991, p. 25). Students explored metaphysics, rhetoric, mathematics, ethics, and other subjects through the Greek and Latin languages. However, the classical learning and the tight paternalism sewn into the Protestant collegiate way brought challenge to the early college administrators. Students were resistant to the Puritan view of man, as one Harvard President explained, and it was best if the college teachers simply “let the boys alone!” (p. 107).

Moreover, the elitist and liberal arts orientation of the early colleges did not sit well in a young country nurturing democratic visions and a philosophy of practical utility, especially in post Civil War America (Veysey, 1965). While the founders of the early colleges envisioned the rearing of social, political and religious leaders, exclusively drawn from elite and well-to-do families who could afford to pay the college tuition (Rudolph, 1991), the American populace looked suspiciously on these elitist institutions. The working people of America often viewed universities as disconnected from real world events and practical problems. They doubted the colleges’ abilities to serve people, to build cities, to create and apply useful, relevant knowledge. In fact, tutors, many of whom were clergy, lost public esteem. Faculty members were viewed as men who “stood aside while red-blooded Americans sought the main chance” (Rudolph, p. 160). To this end, Rudolph notes:

The American colleges would therefore experience the same challenge as political parties, state constitutions, and economic institutions. They would be asked to *pass a test of utility*. They would have to answer the question of whether they were serving the needs of a people whose interest in yesterday hardly existed, and whose interest in today was remarkably limited to its usefulness for getting to tomorrow (p. 111, my emphasis).

This cultural and political moment in American history, then, presented the barely burgeoning American higher education system with a fresh set of challenges and

opportunities. A liberal arts curriculum, grounded in classic, but irrelevant languages, would no longer do in a society concerned with practical knowledge. The Puritanical and Protestant bases of higher education diminished in a country that was quickly industrializing and making secular more facets of life as the benefits and logic of science manifested in tangible economic ways. Responding, higher education leaders “promised to establish an American tradition of higher education” (p. 112).

The curriculum at many colleges underwent substantial revisions. Reformers aimed to shape the curriculum to be more meaningful to students and more relevant to the real world. The faculty, of course, would be responsible for carrying out such substantial changes. Veysey (1965) notes that faculty, even within the same department, had quite different views on the implementation of a more practical element in the curriculum. Nonetheless, the reform had begun and in the years following the Civil War, it would become far more evident what an American tradition of higher education would look like.

2.1b The American Stamp on Higher Education

As noted above, the American college began to be tugged in a new direction even before the Civil War. People, such as Ben Franklin, had voiced the need for “a new kind of higher education which would prepare young men directly for a wide variety of employments, including technological fields” (Veysey, p. 60). Others noted that the colleges must step away from religious underpinnings and incorporate a more secular and scientific curriculum.

These criticisms were answered as concretely as they had ever been with the adoption of the Morrill Act of 1862. In this year, Lincoln signed the legislation that would

connect university and faculty to the public good as never before, transforming higher education into a "symbol for democratic society" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 265). The Morrill Act of 1862 demanded that the university contribute to the development of stronger industry and agriculture in the U.S. The Universities were expected to do this, according to Kerr (2001), through "training that went beyond the creation of 'gentlemen,' and of teachers, preachers, lawyers, doctors, through research related to the technical advance of farming and manufacturing; through service to many and ultimately to all of the economic and political segments of society" (p. 36).

The legislation, tied as it was to incentivized federal monies, pushed university faculty to work closely with local farmers, placing professors at the center of critical public spaces in dramatic new ways. Kerr (2001) describes the land-grant movement as responsive to a "growing democratic, even egalitarian and populist, trend in the nation" and notes that nowhere before had universities been so closely linked with the daily life of so much of their societies" (p. 36). Ultimately, the passage of the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act made public service a central feature of the public university, and more importantly, it delivered on the establishment of an American higher education system. Public universities served populist, democratic, and national needs through a more open and accessible higher education experience, through a curriculum that allowed students to choose many of their courses, and through applied and practical instruction and research. Still, the structure of the University was not yet settled. Soon after the Land Grant Act was adopted, the American higher education system and its faculty would find themselves at a new crossroads. In the next section, the influences of the

German research model and graduate education are outlined and explored for the impact that they have had on the professoriate.

2.1c Inspired by the German Research Model

What is most unique about the transformative influence of the Germanic model on U.S. higher education is that the faculty were very much at the forefront of this milestone compared to the imposition of the federal government at the time of the Land-Grant Act. In fact, Veysey (1965) writes that this faculty represented a “‘third force’ in American higher education – standing apart both from the conservative defenders of the old-time college and from the practical-minded men who had given the movement toward the university its initial impetus” (p. 124). The swing towards utility, brought by the Morrill legislation, made some professors seek refuge in a more pure and scholarly place, a place where research and learning could unfold for the sake of research and learning rather than for immediate or practical utility. These were men who had been lured by the German university. To this end, Veysey notes:

Aspiring American [scholars] who visited Germany and returned with the phrase “scientific research” on their lips compounded this phrase from elements of German theory and practice which had had very different contexts in their original habit...The rigorous and precise examination of phenomena, whether natural or historical, inspired many Americans far more deeply than it may have inspired more German professors themselves” (1965; p.127).

Thus, 19th century American intellectuals returned from their travels enamored with the German research enterprise, particularly the research enterprise associated with the sciences. In fact Veysey (1965) notes that to a great extent, the American scholars who returned from their study in Germany misinterpreted the German

perspective on universities and research when they narrowed the purpose of the University to scientific scholarship (p. 127).

Nonetheless, American scholars selectively drew from their German scholarly experience and sought to implement their interpretations at home. The German influence on American scholars and its rather rapid incorporation into the structure of American higher education manifested in three specific ways. First, there was a sense that “pure” research and a search for knowledge that need not be tied to immediate practicality should be the prime purpose of universities and their faculties. Second, specialization became the hallmark of the day. Third, the new research tradition had to be nurtured and advanced, and this was to be done through the cultivation of young scholarly minds engaged in extended study in graduate school.

The fruition of German scholarship, as interpreted and nurtured by young American scholars came to life in 1876 when the first major research university, John Hopkins was opened. Hopkins embodied the focus on pure, unadulterated search of knowledge; it encouraged the specialization that still drives the search and production of knowledge today, and it began as institution dedicated solely to graduate education (Kerr, 2001, p. 10). Hopkins initiated what is recognized today as the research and scholarship machinery: high standards, the creation and refinement of professional education (medicine, especially), the research centers, journals, and courses led by professors with a very specialized body of knowledge. John Hopkins was a new kind of Research University and very different from its predecessor the “land-grant university.” Kerr (2001) notes that with Hopkins, “the modern University was born” (p. 10).

Many scholars suggest that the entrance of John Hopkins, the Research University, set the stage for the crystallization of the American higher education field as it led to the development of an “academic or institutional ladder” (Altbach, 2001; Kerr, 2001; Labaree, 2008; Veysey, 1965). At the top of the academic ladder, were the institutions driven by pure research *a la* John Hopkins with the abstract, specialized and perhaps seemingly impractical research agendas of faculty. Specialized knowledge and graduate students yearning to be scholars were markers of prestige and soon enough Harvard, Princeton, and Yale were striving after these standards set forth by the “Hopkins idea” (Kerr, 2001, p. 10). Inside these rising institutions, the increasing emphasis upon specialized research led to a profoundly negative impact on undergraduate education and teaching, particularly among “scientifically minded professors” who tended “to ignore the undergraduate college and to place a low value upon their function as teachers” (Veysey, 1965, p. 144).

Trailing in prestige were the federal land-grant Universities, where professors’ work and University purpose were still tightly wound with utility, public service, and instruction. However, in the years between 1860 to 1900 and 1940 to 1980, the federal government would pass legislation that encouraged Universities and their faculties to engage in more and more research activity. For instance, in 1887, the Hatch Act was passed which gave monies for Agricultural Experiment Stations to land-grant universities (Kerr, 2001). Later in the 1940’s, the federal government took suggestions from the National Defense Research Committee, led by Vannevar Bush, and asked University faculty scientists to develop war and defense technology (Kerr, 2001; Freeland, 1997). With the continual infusion and expansion of federal monies into land-

grant universities for research purposes, the prestige of these institutions rose rapidly, and some argue that the enhanced prestige was earned at the cost of undergraduate instruction (see Kerr, 2001, pp. 48-49).

At the bottom of the newly formed academic ladder were institutions intended strictly for teaching⁷ and/or for preparing individuals for vocational work (Brint et al., 1991). Among these institutions were the less prestigious of liberal arts colleges, emerging comprehensive Universities, which typically offered a range of bachelor degrees and sometimes a limited menu of masters degrees, and schools dedicated to the preparation of teachers (normal schools).

According to Altbach (2001) and Veysey (1965), the basic structure of U.S. higher education was in place. Institutions were understood to fulfill a distinct purpose while the faculty inside universities were expected to accomplish a mix of teaching, research, and service, placing emphasis on the tenet of work which was most institutionally relevant. Thus, a faculty member carried out his work in ways that reflected the University's core mission. So while research and teaching was expected across all types of institutions, professors who worked in land-grant universities tended to serve local and regional populations through hands-on instruction and applied research. In turn, faculty members at normal schools, as well as the liberal arts colleges, were expected to emphasize the instructional role. Those in the modern, research universities were dedicated to their research and scholarly inquiry, often embedded in their own scholarly worlds, distanced from the sway of utility and populist

⁷ With the exception of a few of the oldest, most prestigious liberal arts colleges, which were established alongside Harvard, such as William and Mary, teaching colleges tended to be and remain located at the bottom of the academic ladder. For more on this topic, read Altbach (2001) and Brint and Karabel (1991).

whims in the wider U.S. (Veysey, 1965). The tenets of faculty work and their institutional differentiation had been set in place.

The importance of these distinct tenets would fluctuate (Slaughter, 1985). Following the adoption of the G.I. Bill in the 1940's, faculty across the institutional spectrum faced a more diverse student body as veterans returned from war and entered universities. In the same vein, higher education faculty faced another defining moment in the 1960's when the Civil Rights Era breathed life into movements for access and equity. It is estimated that during the 1960's, enrollment at Universities in the U.S. more than doubled, with women, minority, and low-income students entering higher education in great numbers for the first time (Kerr, 2001, p. 81). Kerr (2001) describes how the faculty by and large opposed the changes brought by the 1960's since:

the changes often called for more time, often much more time, spent with students....[Furthermore, these changes] were not oriented towards the advancement of knowledge but toward the improved environments for undergraduate students, usually in ways that cost faculty members in time and attention and emotion. Faculty members at Santa Cruz often complained of how time was taken from their research and how their emotions were drained by contact with students... (pp. 126-127).

Thus, this onslaught of new students meant that faculty members were expected to work closely with groups of students who had little, if any, higher education experience. As a result, the instructional tenet of faculty work rose to the top of institutional priorities for many American universities, even if it did not rise to the top of individual faculty priorities (Slaughter, 1985). This brief historical overview makes clear that University purpose, as constructed by University leaders, policy makers, and other external stakeholders can be used as an indicator for the kind of faculty work profile expected in different kinds of institutions at different points in time.

However, institutional differentiation – a characteristic that is both celebrated and criticized⁸ and which points universities in a certain functional direction - has been contested by many “aspiring universities” in recent decades. For example, during the 1987 reclassification process, the Carnegie Foundation found that 21 additional universities had managed to attain “research status” (Morphew, 2002). The trend towards research focus remains strong today. In 2009, Morphew wrote about a number of institutions engaged in “academic drift” (p. 247). When universities adopt more research intense missions, the expectations of faculty work will, of course, shift and if they do not completely shift, then they multiply or expand, which means that faculty are asked to do more and more.

For many, the larger political and economic environment has a great deal to do with the shifting of universities. Scholars of higher education note that universities have experienced difficult fiscal times in the decades following the “Golden Era” of higher education (circa 1940’s – 1960’s) (Kerr, 2001; Slaughter et al., 2004; Zusman, 2005). Some suggest that when a university attempts to reposition itself as a more prestigious institution by adopting a more research heavy agenda, it is in itself an attempt to capitalize on potential revenue generating opportunities, such as grants, contracts, university-industry partnerships, etc.

In the following section, I discuss the political and economic contexts of today’s higher education field. I show how some scholars believe that the political-economy is the impetus behind the academic drift taking place in the field, forcing universities to find

⁸ See Altbach (2001) and Morphew (2002; 2009) to review the strengths that are conventionally attributed to America’s institutionally differentiated approach to higher education. Read Labaree (2008) for a critique of the consequences of the system.

creative ways to raise badly needed resources and thus giving shape to the kinds of work that faculty do and for which they are rewarded.

2.2 Higher Education and the Professoriate Today

There are a number of explanations about why universities have attempted to climb the academic ladder and tinker with their missions, thereby changing the expectations of faculty work. Often, explanations are derived from resource dependency theories, which claim that organizations (like universities) make strategic changes that allow them to seek resources (mostly fiscal) to survive in a competitive environment (Greenwood et al., 2008; Morpew, 2002). Undeniably, the external influence of resource providers, such as state, students, and other funders are a crucial element that should be considered in an investigation of organizational change and the consequent expectations placed upon the professoriate. In this section of the literature review, I consider the current context in which higher education and the professoriate is embedded. I do so by discussing the political-economy (distribution of resources, policy decisions) at the federal and state level. I also attempt, however, to highlight how this political-economic environment feeds off of a deeper cultural ideology referred to as the “neo-liberal turn” (Harvey, 2007).

Most take the 1970’s as a significant turning point for higher education. In the 1970’s, a major world recession hit, and the federal government began to pull back on fiscal support,⁹ particularly along the lines of direct monies *not* tied to research, which it had provided to universities and colleges since the 1940’s and into the 1960’s. The year 1972 was a particularly pivotal one for U.S. higher education. This was the year of “the

⁹ Although research funding has remained quite stable, other sources of funding have receded.

historic decision to reject direct general purpose aid to institutions” in the Education Amendment (Zusman, 2005, p. 201). This meant that the federal government removed itself as direct resource provider to universities and colleges and that students were by and large turned into consumers (Gladieux et al., 2005; Kirp, 2003; Zusman, 2005), encouraged to shop for the higher education which seemed most fitting – whether it be at a public or private institution. After 1972, the vast majority of money for higher education from the federal government has flown into institutions either indirectly (student loans and grants) or has been tightly restricted to research purposes (research grants and precisely defined research expenses).

The restructuring of the allocation process signaled a major shift in how policy makers conceptualized higher education. Rather than a public good that it was willing to invest in, higher education was pitched as a private investment, a good for which the state and student should be responsible. States were expected to invest because Universities and Colleges are often believed to be economic engines for their regions.¹⁰ Students, on the other hand, were given the privilege and responsibility to act as “consumers” of higher education. Assuming perfect information, equal starting grounds, students were encouraged to select the higher education that seemed most fitting for them. It is a policy approach and decision nested in the powerful ideology of choice and markets - seductive notions that Harvey (2007) suggests appeal to both democratic and base human intuitions.

The changes in the field of higher education, the transformation of higher learning to a private rather than a public good is only one example of strident changes

¹⁰ See Feldman’s (2003; 2004) work, though, for a different view and analysis.

in public policy during this time period and should be situated as such. The 1970's marked what Harvey (2007) refers to as the "neoliberal turn." In short, the neoliberal turn might best be understood as a sort of knee-jerk reaction to Keynesian policies implemented following the Great Depression. Whereas Keynesian policies place great regulatory responsibility on the state regarding a wide range of human and social welfare issues, the neoliberal philosophy demands a hands-off approach.¹¹ In the U.S., one thinks of Nixonian stances and "Reganonomics" to best understand what the neo-liberal approach means to areas that were once recognized as public goods, like higher education.

Notions of choice, freedom, and the withdrawal of the federal government from but a few, selective spaces within higher education (student lending; research and grant making for specific purposes) placed states, as well as Universities, in a new kind of competitive, market-like environment. States responded to the change in federal behavior and resource distribution as market players are expected to respond to their competition. Thus, to a great degree, state leaders followed the precedent already set by the federal government and emphasized the private benefits derived from higher education. Instead of supporting higher education as a public good that brings mobility to individuals and recognizing that individual citizens do not live in a vacuum, and that they are part of a larger society, to which they will give back (via taxes, consumption, labor); legislators crafted and continue to craft policy that promotes higher education as a private good. On the other hand, legislators work hard to ensure a healthy business

¹¹ Harvey (2007) describes how the theoretical framework of neo-liberalism is quite conflicted with its practice. He outlines specific events where the neoliberal class has asked the state to intervene in order to protect business, private property, and individual freedoms to pursue business oriented goals.

climate (low taxation or tax breaks altogether; lax environmental and labor policy, etc), which typically results in lower taxes for big business, and less money for goods like higher education.¹² Therefore, state leaders aim to keep alive the notion that higher education is a worthy and attainable goal for all without increasing taxes or taking from other mandatory entitlement programs to support the higher education endeavor.

In other words, higher education is the “budget balancer” (McGuinness, 2005, p. 202) for state legislators. When state budgets fall short, fiscal support for higher education is often trimmed. To this end, McGuinness notes that “the long term direction of state policy [has been] away from institutional subsidies and low tuition to higher tuition and greater institutional reliance on tuition and other non-state revenue sources” (p.202). While state appropriations constitute smaller proportions of university budgets (Zemsky et al., 2006) higher education organizations are expected to operate efficiently, accessibly, and to provide a high quality education. The result has been heightening tuition costs, less scholarship and grant money for students (Tinto, 2008), and an increasing reliance on alternative sources of revenue, such as can be gleaned from grants, contracts, patents, and university-industry partnerships.¹³

In this environment, higher education faces complex challenges. By the time federal monies were pulled back in the 1970’s, the demand for four year degrees had already rocketed. Although the demand lessened in the 1980’s (Brint et al., 1991; Kerr, 2001), the curb was temporary and every year, more and more students seek a seat in post-secondary education. The persistent rise in enrollment is no surprise. Students,

¹² Read Anyon (1997) for a detailed analysis of the ways in which “healthy business” environments were provided for big business at the cost of public goods, such as education and other social welfare services.

¹³ Review the Measuring Up report cards to compare how states have financed higher education over the last few years. Very few states earn a passing grade.

from all walks of life, have been told that education is key to mobility. What is more, policy makers, parents, and society promised access. Thus, universities today, are expected to serve their growing student bodies with less (Zemsky et al., 2006).

To cope with these difficult fiscal circumstances, University leaders often stress and give merit to alternative, external revenue, which can be brought in through grants, contracts, privatization, endowment and other fundraising, and through the adoption of more business like practices, in general (Kirp, 2003; Powers, 2003).¹⁴ University leaders encourage faculty to engage private industry in partnerships, hoping that patents and/or copyrights will generate much needed revenue. Such behaviors were first encouraged with the Bayh-Dole Act in 1980 which “enabled universities to own patents based on faculty scientists' work on federal grants, to make profits from them” (Slaughter et al., 1993, p. 288). To this end, faculty members, especially in the sciences and engineering, are openly courted by private industry and gifts to universities from corporations have ballooned over the last three decades. Newman and colleagues (2004) report that between 1985 to 1995 corporate giving rose from \$850 million to \$4.25 billion.

The fact that business interests influence higher education practices is not completely new. Thorstein Veblen began to write about the troubling phenomena a century ago. Slaughter and Rhoades (1993) outline numerous specific partnerships

¹⁴ Business like practices might include the implementation of administration practices that were first used in the business world (total quality management, zero-based budgeting). Sometimes the implementation of business like discourse is a strong predecessor to concrete changes in practices and/or conceptualizations regarding the purpose and nature of higher education. For instance, rather than Admissions Counselors, individuals are now called Enrollment Managers. Many Universities are engaged in the “branding” of their Institution in order to compete for and attract students. Finally, other business like practices include the establishment of offices dedicated to patenting, copy right, and other intellectual property and technology transfer issues.

between University and the commercial or business world beginning as early as 1910. What is new, however, is the degree to which research and researchers (faculty as well as graduate student researchers) have been co-opted, selling their labor and sometimes withholding knowledge that would benefit a greater good because their silence is stipulated by contracts and agreements with research sponsors (Slaughter et al., 1996; Slaughter et al, 1997; Slaughter et al., 2005; Campbell, et al., 2004; Mendoza, 2007) in order to retain resources for their universities.

Taken together, these political, economic, and cultural variables that created a new set of circumstances for higher education also created a new set of circumstances for faculty members. Not only are faculty expected to engage in a mix of teaching, research, and service – placing emphasis on the tenet of their work that most closely matches institutional mission, but they are now also expected to produce funds for their universities. This has led higher education researchers to discuss the emergence of a fourth tenet of faculty work: grant writing and administration. In fact, Gonzales et al, (2008) interviewed a cross-section of faculty members from five disciplines at a university aiming to achieve a more prestigious, research focused status and found that “fundraising” is an increasingly important criterion considered for tenure and promotion. When an Education professor was asked to describe if any one thing “counts most” in terms of tenure and promotion, she responded:

the research does...fundraising is also big. There are going to be people who go up for tenure, that may have a decent amount of articles and good eval[uations] and some service, but because they have never brought in a penny, or a grant, then they may not make it... (Interview Transcript, 2007).

Other researchers confirm Gonzales' (2008) case study findings. For instance, Musselin (2007) writes that writing proposals, developing and managing contracts are no longer considered peripheral work activities for faculty members, but "rather [they] are recognized as important aspects of academic work...In Germany and in the U.S.A., the ability to raise money and to manage research projects based on external funding is one of the criteria for hiring professors" (p. 3). That external fund raising has become part and parcel of faculty work is still a relatively new development, which first began at research universities but is not quite common.

The current political, economic, and cultural environment is one that has driven all universities to seek creative strategies to replace federal and state funding sources. Many have turned to the pursuit of research and use the major research university as their model to understand how to use research and scholarship as a revenue stream (Tuchman, 2009). Also, more universities aim to raise their prestige and status so that they can compete for funding from external resource providers such as industry, granting agencies, donors, but also from top-paying or highly attractive students. Consequently, there has been a broadening and dramatic transformation of faculty roles across the institutional spectrum.

In the next section, I discuss in concrete terms the work of faculty members. I consider a mix of empirical and theoretical works that have investigated how faculty members conceive of and carry out their work in the current higher education environment. I review studies that apply a variety of lenses and methods to the study of faculty roles and work.

2.3 Faculty Work and Role: Theorized and Studied

Recently, the American Association of University Professors released a statement to explain what it is that faculty members do. They note that most people imagine the work of a professor quite simplistically. People “picture a professor in a classroom lecturing or perhaps someone in a lab coat conducting an experiment” (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/facultydolist>). However, as noted in several empirical studies, faculty work is a complex mix of various tasks. Typically, the work of faculty extends far beyond the classroom, well into the personal lives and homes of professors, occupying many more hours than the standard 40 hour work week. In fact, recent studies estimate that faculty work anywhere between 55 and 60 hours a week (Milem et al., 2000; Schuster et al., 2006).

Primarily, the work of the faculty member entails teaching (Bowen et al., 1986) and yet teaching is much more than preparing and delivering a lecture. It is also more than grading papers and providing feedback. Teaching is a multidimensional task that requires extensive background reading, creating and updating presentations, holding and attending office hours, and in this technological age, responding to students via email or other electronic formats. In many Universities, there is a focus on the development of on-line and hybrid courses which require faculty to be savvy with technological tools. More than these very important practical tasks, however, teaching is about developing critical thinking students who can apply knowledge in their daily lives.

As for the research tenet of faculty work, it is much more than simply collecting data and “writing it up.” Many faculty members have said at one point or another that much of their work is dedicated to thinking and reflection – the life of the mind. To this

end, there are a slew of books that are intended to advise faculty members how to move beyond the 'thinking' and into the writing. Moreover, research requires designing instruments, planning, obtaining permissions and clearances and often, data must be coded, recoded, entered, and transcribed. It requires interpersonal skills, institutional know-how, and can be quite tedious at many points. The research process is not a linear or one dimensional process.

Service is an interesting tenet of faculty work. Neumann et al., (2007) provides a convenient framework for understanding service. In this framework, service is described in three parts (1) the governance, management, and operation of the employing institution, in whole or in part, internally and externally; (2) the work of a [faculty person's] professional/disciplinary associations; and (3) the maintenance of disciplines and fields at large (see p. 282).

As was suggested in the previous section, faculty work now also entails a fourth tenet, which is grant writing and or other forms of fundraising. Slaughter et al., (2004) describes how tedious and labor intensive it can be to apply for and then manage grants, particularly the federal grants which render the most prestige for universities and faculty. In her small case study, Gonzales (2008) interviewed a faculty member who described his work as "more like a manager...hiring people and managing them" than a faculty member.

How these various tenets of work are interpreted, negotiated and pieced together is of course a central concern for higher education insiders and outsiders (Boyer, 1990; Fairweather, 1996; Gonzales et al., 2008; Lincoln, 2000; Lindholm, 2001; 2003; Slaughter et al., 2004). Insiders often lament how faculty work has become "co-opted"

by the market or that teaching has fallen to the wayside in today's "publish or perish" culture. Outsiders are frustrated with all the time that faculty seem to give to their research rather than to teaching. As a result, state legislators have begun to intrude on the autonomy of the profession by crafting legislation that mandate that public university faculty spend a certain number of their time on instructional duties.

Beyond anecdotal evidence, however, there are several empirical studies that have investigated the nature and unfolding of faculty work. In the section below, I describe major findings that use four different approaches. These approaches include macro level studies which use the political-economy, globalization or both to understand faculty work; meso level studies that take university documents and behaviors to understand why faculty do what they do; and micro level or survey based studies that ask faculty to assess their work preferences and habits. Other micro level studies take a more qualitative approach and have sought to uncover the nature of faculty work and these are reviewed as well.

2.3a Macro Level Approaches

In 1918, Thorstein Veblen critiqued the University for links it had with corporate America. Not only did he believe that universities were adopting business like practices to measure their success, but that in doing so, they were turning university and college learning into "little more than vocational school"

(http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/projects/centcat/centcats/fac/facch09_01.html). Veblen criticized that faculty work was driven by business interests (Ritzer et al., 2004). In the same vein, Slaughter (1985; 1987), Slaughter and Leslie (1997) and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004; 2005) have used a critical political-economic lens to theorize and

empirically study academic labor. In 1997, the term “academic capitalism” was coined by Slaughter and Leslie to shed light on the transformation of universities and their faculty members from public conduits of knowledge and service to private, resource seeking entrepreneurs. They write:

By using academic capitalism as our central concept, we define the reality of the nascent environment of public research universities, an environment full of contradictions, in which faculty and professional staff expend their human capital stocks increasingly in competitive situations. In these situations, university employees are employed simultaneously by the public sector and are increasingly autonomous from it. They are academics who act as capitalists from within the public sector; they are state-subsidized entrepreneurs (pp. 8-9).

Slaughter and Leslie and Slaughter and Rhoades arrived at this theory by working with and analyzing a number of state, federal, and institutional policies related to the production of patented and copyrighted faculty work, technology transfer, and other commercially oriented endeavors that involved university and faculty.

They found that universities excited and desperate for additional revenue reward faculty work that can be copyrighted, patented, or that can yield some sort of return. They found that state and federal policy as well as court decisions often support and facilitate such behaviors. Moreover, “some of the “royalty policies” that Slaughter and Rhoads analyzed allow “faculty to put the income in their bank accounts” (p.498) - a great incentive for a profession that has long been described as underpaid (Schuster et al., 2006; Veysey, 1965).

Under such conditions, the theorists suggest that not only is it plausible, but rational for faculty members to engage in market like behaviors. To this end, Slaughter et al., (2005) write about a case in which faculty scientists secretly took blood from a patient who had agreed, under the advice of his doctor, to participate in experiments ran

by UCLA. The scientists took blood from the leukemia struck patient –and without advising the patient – used this blood to create a cell line that led to “the foundation of a multi-billion dollar industry from which patent holders (the faculty scientists) could reap fortunes” (p. 71). After a series of court battles and legal decisions, the California Supreme Court ruled that “UCLA [faculty] and the regents of the University of California were doing their job, transferring university science to the new economy” (p. 72).

Using a similar approach, Torres and Schugurensky (2002) tracked policies, meetings, and other formal exchanges between universities in Latin America and powerful global economic institutions to draw conclusions about the role of faculty. Torres and Schugurensky write that neoliberal policies, as pushed forward by hegemonic powers, especially the U.S., have forced universities to “reconsider their social missions, academic priorities, and organizational structures” (p. 429). According to the authors, whereas universities were once concerned with equality, accessibility, and social transformation, they are now obsessed with notions of “excellence, efficiency, expenditures, and rates of return.” This shift in organizational priorities presses upon faculty, as new expectations for faculty work are established by the university. Demonstrating their point, Torres et al., consider how international private corporations partnered to form the “Business Higher Education Forum” in order to “link the efforts of corporations and universities in science and technology activities ... aligning higher education with the business and corporate sector...” (p. 436). The Forum influences faculty work in direct ways, as it focuses on “faculty and administrators as the main allied groups” (p. 437) and ensures their participation by highlighting the revenues that can be generated for both university and individual faculty

members. Although Torres et al., (2002) argument is organized around Latin American universities and faculty, it is strikingly similar to the critiques presented in Slaughter's body of work, where faculty members are cast as academic capitalists who are no longer disinterested scholars, seeking knowledge for knowledge sake, but who have an economic stake in the results of their work.

These perspectives, although quite critical, are important ones to consider. They help one understand the contemporary context of faculty work while highlighting the expectations and norms of faculty roles in public research universities. That the instructional role is no longer tied to teaching and learning, but to "producing" patentable products (Slaughter et al., 2004, p. 110) strikes at the primary purpose of institutions of higher education, which is to educate students. As universities across the spectrum strive towards more research focused missions, these are some of the issues that must be on the mind of faculty members.

The above cited works discuss the faculty role from a broad, global political-economic perspective. Specifically, the studies show how the free market, buttressed by strong neo-liberal rhetoric, has shaped the field of higher education and more specifically faculty work. Slaughter et al., (1997; 2004) shows how the norms and expectations of faculty work have shifted; faculty members are now capitalists, selling their stocks of knowledge.

Although much has been learned from these sorts of studies, what is learned is done so from a distance. Researchers who use such broad lenses to study the field of higher education and faculty work, more specifically, postulate that the political-economy (policies, court decisions, university decisions, and neo-liberal culture) trickles

into faculty work habits. However, by taking this approach, it is assumed that faculty fall in line with or have little to say about how a university responds to its various, external pressures. In later work, seeking to rectify what may have been an overzealous characterization of the professoriate, which stripped faculty of agency, Slaughter, Archerd, and Campbell (2004) qualitatively sought to understand how faculty scientists “negotiate” the boundaries and quandaries of the market. This and similar work are discussed in a later section of the literature to point out the critical insights that can be learned when a researcher looks more closely at such complex situations.

In the next section, the lens is narrowed and I come a bit closer to understanding the immediate work environment for faculty. Here, I present organizational and/or field level studies of faculty work. It should be pointed out that dividing the political-economic approach and organizational/field level approaches should not suggest that the two approaches are exclusive of one another. Organizational studies often (not always) center the field of higher education and the professoriate in the middle of a broader political economy¹⁵. What is unique, however, about organizational and field level studies is that they investigate faculty work by studying organizational decision making, structuring, and policy making processes.

2.3b Meso Level Approaches

This section contains empirical and theoretical studies that apply an organizational lens to study the professoriate. To use an organizational lens to study the professoriate means that one takes as her unit of analysis university documents,

¹⁵ It is important to note that in classic organizational studies, the environment was conceptualized in a much narrower fashion (e.g. economy *or* state). Newer lines of organizational analysis (such as New Institutionalism) have developed a much broader, cross-cutting conception of organizational environments.

policies, processes, and structures as well as speeches or decisions made by informal as well as formal leaders to draw conclusions about the role and work of faculty.

Organizational analyses of the faculty role can differ in terms of where the researcher settles her gaze. For instance, Becher (1995) and Lohmann (2004) write about the powerful influence of disciplines on faculty work and pay close attention to how the work and role of faculty is often contained within “ossified” (Lohmann, 2004) disciplinarian boundaries. Hammond (2004), Fairweather (1993a; 1995), Massey and Zemsky, (1994) spend considerable time discussing the important role that departments play in a faculty member’s life. Hammond (2004) refers to the department as the “basic building blocks of a university hierarchy” (p.97) in which faculty are organized. In fact, Fairweather (1993a) interviewed departmental leaders (Chairs) to examine the relationship between professed leadership values and faculty reward structures and faculty behavior. Still, others approach the university as a whole (Fairweather, 1993b; 1995; 1996; 2005; Glassick et al., 1997; Melguizo et al., 2007; Wright, 2004) in order to study and explain the faculty role.

It is important to note that, generally, there are two major epistemological approaches employed in organizational studies (Tierney, 1987; 2008). Studies rooted in the *classic* organizational perspective tend to produce pictures of organizational phenomena as functional and rational. Parsonian, in nature, the classic perspective presents organizations as “systems” with parts (people being parts) that work and move together in the name of preservation. Differentiation of tasks or evolution of roles is a central aspect to understanding an organization’s survival. Thus, sometimes without meaning to, such studies convey pictures of rational and conformist organizational

actors. This means that researchers work from the assumption that organizations are rational entities that respond to environmental stimuli and that their employees are also rational and perfectly informed actors who implement organizational policy without contestation.¹⁶¹⁷

On the other hand, there is a body of organizational literature that uses a constructivist point of view (Grbich, 1998; Powell et al., 1991; Powell et al., 2008; Tierney, 1987). Here, the assumption is that participants develop interpretations about the organization, its history, its messages, and so on (see Tierney, 2008). In this line of thinking, actors are not presented as passive organizational conformists or “cultural dopes” (Garfinkel, 1967). Instead, organizational actors take agency to make their way through organizational life. This tradition of work is often associated with interpretive qualitative work (Tierney, 2008) and has fed developing lines of ethnomethodological inquiry in organizational analysis (Burch, 2007; Powell et al., 1991; Zucker, 1991). With these important distinctions in mind, the review of empirical studies that follows draws from both epistemologies named above.

One of the most frequently cited organizational studies concerning faculty work is Glassick and colleagues’ 1997 study *Scholarship Assessed*. The Glassick study followed Ernest Boyer’s resounding call to reconsider scholarship in the early 1990’s. As President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Boyer’s

¹⁶ For a larger picture of organizational rationality, consider Birnbaum’s (1983) study of institutional diversity in which he applies ecology theory to understand if, why, and how universities changed between the 1960’s and 1980’s. For a more micro level picture of organizational actor rationality, consider some of Clark’s work in which he discussed how people tend to and work towards the preservation of a university’s saga. Also, consider Parson’s work on the university.

¹⁷ Also, this strand of organizational theory is grounded in the assumption that peoples’ rationality is guided by a set of “immovable values or culture” (Swidler, 1986) and that people are moved by a cathectic sort of investment that they have in others and that others had in them. Again, see Parson’s work, especially Social Structure of Action.

message literally threw the field of higher education into reformation discussions. Many universities publicly committed to revise faculty reward systems in order to include an expanded definition of scholarship, which would appreciate teaching and applied or action research.

In 1997, the Carnegie Foundation commissioned a follow-up study, *Scholarship Assessed*, in which Glassick and colleagues were to study to what degree universities redesigned *and* implemented policies embodying Boyer's call. The researchers found that most universities had done very little in terms of "redefining scholarship." The research teams' data collection strategies included surveys administered to chief academic officers at a cross-section of universities, an examination of faculty handbooks, and a review of the tenure guide-lines for a number of institutions. The study reports how little progress had been made towards Boyer's goal. The conclusions drawn from the study insinuate that faculty members had not made changes to their own work habits or views. The study, in other words, suggests that one can understand faculty work by reviewing university documents and gauging the perspectives of administrators.

In fact, Fairweather (1993a) examined the "beliefs of a national sample of department chairs about the relative importance of teaching and research in faculty rewards" (p. 45). Fairweather suggests that it is critical to understand administrator beliefs and behaviors in order to understand the role that faculty are asked to play in universities. Ultimately, Fairweather analyzes whether or not leaders' attitudes "fit" the kind of institution in which they work, and furthermore he wanted to know if there is a "correspondence between stated beliefs of administrators and faculty pay" (p. 45). He

finds that administrators' values "match" the institutional profile where they work. In other words, those who work at liberal arts colleges are more likely to stress the importance of teaching as a primary function of faculty work. However, despite institution type or the proclaimed values of administrators, faculty members were best paid when they yielded more research. Fairweather writes "[faculty] pay, which reflects...administrative values placed on faculty behavior, does not follow the stated values placed on teaching by department chairs" (64). Fairweather concludes that faculty work is heavily influenced by administrative decision making processes and reward systems.

Fairweather's body of work is quite expansive. In the majority of his work, he focuses on faculty work time allocation as a function of compensation (Fairweather, 1993b; 2005; with Rhoads, 1995). Thus, he studies organizational behaviors to shed light on faculty roles. Across his numerous studies, Fairweather continually finds that faculty members are rewarded for producing research and that, at times, teaching and rewards are negatively associated.

In more recent work, Fairweather (2005), again, notes the incredible movement to engage in policy discussions about faculty roles and rewards after Boyer's call to "reconsider scholarship" (p.401). Yet he is decidedly skeptical as to whether or not the "policy talk" (Tyack and Cuban, 1995) about faculty roles and rewards translated into action. Fairweather hypothesizes that faculty are not being paid or rewarded for time spent on teaching and service.

To test his hypothesis, Fairweather conducts a longitudinal analysis using the NSOPF-93 and NSOPF-99 in order to compare changes in faculty pay over time and to

assess the real impact of Boyer's call. To analyze the relationships between teaching and research behaviors with faculty pay over time, Fairweather conducted several statistical tests, including regression model analysis. Fairweather's regression model analysis showed that 47% and 67% of the variance in basic salary in 1992 and 41%-54% variance in basic salary in 1999 could be contributed to teaching and research profiles. Specifically, the regression demonstrates that spending more hours on teaching is related to lower basic salary for faculty members. To Fairweather's surprise, even at liberal arts universities, the most teaching oriented of institutions, time spent on teaching "changed from a neutral to a negative factor in pay" (p. 416).

Fairweather also conducted t-tests to compare the relationship between hours spent in classroom per week¹⁸ and salary at the two points in time (1998-1999 and 1992-1993). Using a Chow test, $p < .05$, to check for significance, Fairweather concluded that the "relationship between hours spent in the classroom *per week* and pay was substantially *more* negative in 1998-99 than in 1992-93 in the two most teaching-oriented institutions" (p. 412, emphasis original). Moreover, Fairweather finds that "publishing has become an even stronger positive predictor of pay in research universities" (p. 417).

Fairweather concludes that this positive association (between research and faculty salary) influence the way that faculty allocate their time. He notes that his findings jive with the majority of research on faculty work and pay. As in all his work, Fairweather offers words of advice to institutional leaders as well higher education researchers. He reasons that unless those with policy and decision making power in

¹⁸ Hours spent in the classroom is defined by the hours of time that a professor instructs (2 classes x 3 hours per week would translate to 6 hours "time spent in classroom."

universities (i.e., Chairs, Deans, Presidents) are willing to accept their own role and responsibility in the de-valuation of teaching, then faculty will continue to pursue heavier research agendas and push teaching aside.

Affirming Fairweather's findings is another recent study. This statistical analysis was conducted by Melguizo and Strober in 2007. Using the same NSOPF-99 data base as Fairweather (2005), Melguizo et al., (2007) use a "maximization of prestige" (rather than profit) model to study faculty pay as it is related to work time allocation. They posit that faculty members are embedded in an environment where the procurement of prestige and legitimacy are prime "currency" for tenure-track faculty members who want a successful future in academia. Indicators of "prestige" include research related products such as articles, books, research grants, patents, election to various national academies, and public visibility and prizes. Melguizo and Strober (2007) conclude that "faculty members are financially rewarded for enhancing the prestige of their institutions" (p.657).

In the end, they argue that higher education, and faculty work, for that matter is dominated by a "prestige market model." In other words, faculty gain monetary rewards for activities that confer prestige on self and institution (p. 661). They write:

If faculty are being rewarded financially for research output, so as to increase their institution's prestige, but are not being rewarded financially for spending time on teaching, there is a case to be made that higher education's reward systems do not parallel its rhetoric about the fundamental importance of both teaching and research Looking at faculty salaries through a prestige lens helps scholars and policymakers to ask serious questions about the implications of the current reward system in higher education (p. 664).

That Melguizo et al., begin by studying this problem by way of a "prestige maximization model" is sensible. Many researchers describe the field of higher

education's obsession with prestige attainment (O'Meara, 2002; Morphew, 2009; Newman et al., 2004; Sauder et al., 2009; Zemsky et al., 2006).

Ultimately, Melguizo and Strober find fault with tendency of universities to reward the research tenet of faculty work while leaving behind teaching and service. They suggest that when faculty members recognize these patterns, they tend to allocate more time to research activities and less to teaching, mentoring, and service. The Melguizo et al., (2007) study is a good example of how the faculty role can be studied from an organizational perspective, but it is also an example of how the actions, perspective, and experiences of organizational members can be hidden behind assumptions of a rational-actor perspective. In fact, Melguizo and Strober admit that "faculty behavior in a prestige maximizing model may result in an agency problem" (p. 665). One is left to question whether or not faculty members do in fact act as "rational actors" choosing behaviors that serve personal, monetary interests.

Taking an organizational level approach to study the role of faculty provides critical insights about the context in which faculty members are situated. Understanding the multiple intersections between university, its compartments, behaviors, and faculty provides a framework for exploring the various important structures and processes that impact faculty work and life. However, what organizational level analyses do not offer is a micro-level understanding of what these structures and processes mean to faculty. How faculty feel about certain contexts of their work cannot be addressed in such studies. In the next section, however, I provide a review of research on faculty work, which includes survey, qualitative, and ethnographic studies.

2.3c Micro Level Approaches

The vast majority of micro level work on faculty life and roles consists of survey research. Most of these studies draw from large national data sets and are intended to paint a picture of faculty demographics, work habits, and general career satisfaction. Through these studies, higher education scholars have learned a great deal about faculty work and life. Inequities within the professoriate related to compensation have been uncovered (Bellas, 1993; Perna, 2002), particularly along the lines of gender. Without quantitative survey, the higher education field could not attempt to address major gaps in the pipeline when it comes to representation of minority groups in higher education, in general, and in certain fields like engineering and science specifically. Thus, survey work is intended to answer a very specific kind of question with answers that can be quantitatively measured. Here, I review some of the major survey studies that have shed light on faculty work over the last few decades. I then move on to qualitative studies.

In 1986, Bowen and Schuster released a study on the perilous state of higher education's core resource: the faculty. In this book, they worried that the professoriate was slumping in many regards. They open the book with a decidedly concerned outlook:

Will America's college and universities be able to deliver teaching and learning of acceptable quantity and quality over the next several decades?....Perhaps the most critical influence of all will be the caliber of the faculties... (p. 3).

In this book, composed of massive amounts of survey research, gathered from a variety of sources, Bowen et al., (1986) define instruction as the main function of faculty members. In this book, they worry that incoming cohorts of faculty members may be

unable to provides solid instruction. After reviewing time allocation data, they show that the majority of faculty time across public, private, 2-year and 4-year organizations was spent on instruction. Yet they show that in the 1980's, the faculty role was expanding and that faculty found themselves expending more time to achieve their tasks (about 46-48 hours per week versus the standard 40) (p. 73). One portion of Bowen and Schuster (1986) work included a large number of interviews with faculty and administrators at a cross-section of campuses. The goals of these interviews were to better understand the condition of the professoriate by accessing the perceptions of faculty members. Their interviews resulted in four major themes: the faculty dispirited, the faculty fragmented, the faculty devalued, and the faculty dedicated.

The dispiritedness rose out of a number of factors including dissatisfaction with university leaders and collegiality. Bowen et al., (1986) note that the “shifting values” within academia seemed especially troublesome to some faculty members who believed that the “life of the mind” had been badly compromised. One of their interviewees noted:

Somehow the sheer joy of being a scholar has been eroded, and its not just because of the money. They have taken the fun out of teaching. You feel so pressured; it's hard to find time to sit and think. We have gotten into this publish-or-perish type syndrome where we publish trivia and we're not reflecting on what we're doing...We have lost our sense of scholarliness (p. 143).

Bowen and Schuster (1986) worried about the emerging tendency for universities and colleges to press research and scholarship as the most valuable tenets of faculty work. Their analysis showed that such shifts in university values often resulted in a fragmented faculty where assistant professors were isolated in a publish-or-perish world, where associate faculty felt displaced and distrustful of the “upstart new assistant

professors” and where the senior faculty members were skeptical of everyone and everything. Bowen and Schuster’s work shows the beginning of a professoriate pushed toward research, but their work did not seek to uncover how faculty negotiated or navigated these research oriented pressures.

More recent work includes Milem et al., (2000) examination of faculty work profiles over a twenty year period. Milem et al., (2000) acknowledge that many stake holders express concern about faculty time allocation, given the increased focus on research and prestige attainment in the field of higher education. However, Milem and colleagues set out to investigate if and to what extent faculty time allocation has changed across the tenets of faculty work and whether or not institutional type is a mediating factor in work time allocation.

By using secondary data sources, Milem et al., (2000) study faculty time allocation over two decades. Milem et al., (2000) write that, in general, faculty across all types of four year institutions spent increasingly more time engaged in research over the twenty year period. They also note that for the first time the gap between time allocated to research by faculty at major research universities and doctoral granting universities narrowed significantly in the 1970-1990 time period. However, using descriptive statistics, Milem et al., (2000) also argue that although faculty are spending more time on research, faculty are also reportedly spending more time on teaching. Milem and colleagues determine that “faculty at nearly every type of institution are spending more time engaged in research and more time teaching and preparing for teaching” (p. 467). Ultimately, they report that faculty members are working more than ever before.

Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) provide probably the most cross-cutting and thorough look into faculty life in their book *The American Faculty*. Not only do Schuster and Finkelstein support Milem et al., (2000) conclusion that faculty are working more than ever; they also support the conclusions drawn earlier by Bowen and Schuster (1986) who found that faculty members were increasingly being asked to produce more scholarship and that entering faculty members are much more research oriented than their older counterparts.

Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) spend a considerable amount of their time relaying what seems to be the ever more complex nature of faculty work. Using multiple types of data, but foregrounding their study in quantitative analyses, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) write “the general pressure of American higher education over the past decade to reduce costs and expand faculty productivity have translated into imperatives for faculty to do “more” – especially to ratchet up efforts that contribute directly to the improvement of undergraduate education” (p. 75). To this end, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) suggest that faculty work, today, is struck by two seemingly paradoxical imperatives: produce more scholarship, prestige, and status for self and university while improving and investing in the craft of undergraduate instruction. As a result, Schuster et al., (2006) find that the number of faculty working anywhere between 50-55 hours per week has doubled since 1972 (p. 81).

Schuster and colleague study faculty work in two ways: self-reported time allocation and self-reported preferred time allocation. How faculty most prefer to spend their time is what Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) refer to as “role orientation” (p. 85). They suggest that it is important to assess faculty work from both angles because

although faculty must respond to the demands and expectations of their work, as set forth in organizational policies and culture, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) suggest that faculty are likely to “gravitate” or “act out” their preferences (see p. 87). Whether or not faculty “gravitate” to their most preferred tenet of work was not fully explored in Schuster and Finkelstein; however, they do find that the majority of “early career” faculty members are research oriented, meaning that they reported that they most prefer to spend their time on research-related activities. Another one of their important findings includes the fact that faculty in the sciences and engineering prefer research to teaching and that men are also more “research oriented” (p. 89).

Olsen and Crawford (1998) explore the notion that faculty members’ orientation to work may not “fit.” Specifically, Olsen et al., study how faculty members cope when the expectations of their work do not “fit” their preconceived notions of work. Taking an “expectations met” model, which is grounded in socialization theory, Olsen and Crawford test a number of conditions to determine if one “route” to the faculty might best prepare and inform future faculty members about their career, the stressors of the job, and the nature of the work. They found that in year one, most faculty reported that their job met their expectations. Stress levels, however, were high in the first year, but so was job satisfaction. Unfortunately, by year five, faculties’ dissatisfaction with their work rose as faculty reported that the conditions of their work did not fit their expectations. Interestingly, by year five, most faculty reportedly leaned towards research more so than when they first entered their position, which Olsen et al., (1998) believes is indicative of the socialization power wrought in the tenure and promotion process. The authors did not explore if or how faculty might have “negotiated” conditions of their work to “fit” their

preconceptions, but instead their results suggest that faculty tend to bend to the orientation of the university.

Thus far, I have described faculty work and roles from a variety of angles. Whereas the macro level approaches are almost predisposed to reject theories of agency, the meso level studies also frequently take for granted that faculty members follow the demands of their university. However, there is a perspective which refuses to fall back on structural deterministic sort of arguments when it comes to explaining social phenomena. Survey research on faculty opinions, outlooks, and practices opens up this alternative line of inquiry, but given its positivistic grounding, survey research cannot convey how faculty might “make sense” of these objective realities. Qualitative work, however, is intended to answer such sense-making kinds of questions. In the following section, I review various qualitative studies that have sought to explore the professoriate up close.

The perspective that faculty and university need to “fit” in order for faculty to feel confident and able in their performance has evolved into common knowledge for higher education scholars, especially those who aspire to be faculty members. However, what happens when there is not a fit? In order to explore this question, scholars have begun to search out in a more systematic way the values, orientations, and preconceptions that faculty bring to their work. Consider the work of Lindholm (2004) who investigates faculty-university fit from an interactional perspective and who notes that it is critical to understand better the conditions that create a strong university-faculty fit, especially given the competitive labor market and the trending of intellectuals out of academia and into industry.

Delving into this problem, Lindholm (2004) teases out precisely what attracts faculty members into academia; she refers to these as the “individual level” attributes. Then, Lindholm (2004), in the same study, sought to understand what sort of “environmental influences” might have attracted current faculty members into the professoriate. For instance, she inquires about family upbringing, prior school experiences, and influential people. Through 36 interviews with faculty members at a large public research university, when asked “what attracted you to the profession,” she found individuals who emphasized the need for “autonomy” and a “sense of individuality” (p. 612). As for environmental level factors, Lindholm found that faculty members often spoke about their graduate school experience as key to their entering academia. Lindholm (2004) concludes that to understand faculty-university fit, one must try to account for multiple kinds of variables, such as personal, environmental, and other mediating factors.

In her dissertation, Lindholm (2001) theorizes that faculty members strive to make a “space” for themselves when the fit is not “right.” What Lindholm (2003) finds is that faculty members do “construct” a fit between self and university by drawing out the trade-offs or the benefits that they derive from working in academia. For example, although faculty often mention a “disconnection” between their own philosophy and priority for teaching and the university’s prioritizing of teaching, they focused on the benefits of being surrounded by intellectual people with whom they could engage in interesting conversations and collaborations; they also focused on the independence that an academic career affords. While Lindholm argues that faculty members construct

a fit, it seems that faculty members also construct a “logic” as to why they remain in a position that does not align with their own orientations or aspirations.

Lindholm’s (2001; 2003; 2004) body of work offers to the field of higher education an inside look at how faculty cope with their work when it fails to meet their expectations. She offers a short note about how women and minorities seemed to be attracted to the profession to make “social change.” However, Lindholm does not follow up in detail how such faculty members deal with this expectation, whether or not it is met, and if not, whether or not they attempt to squeeze it in as others have suggested (Archer, 2009; Gonzales et al., 2008; Huckaby, 2008).

Lindholm’s work is particularly valuable in a study like my own and there are a number of implicit lines of inquiry which emerged from her work. One aspect, which she hints at, but does not explicitly discuss is the impact of faculty values as they go about carrying their work. However, in 2002, O’Meara aimed to uncover how the values and beliefs that administrators and faculty have influence the assessment of “service as scholarship” at four universities. O’Meara employs Schein’s “values in use” (p. 59) theory to posit that values are not concrete or immovable, but that they are dynamic and can change through socialization.

Each of these universities, at the time of the O’Meara study, was dealing with significant change related to tenure and promotion. Historically, each university had been deeply committed to teaching and public service. However, in the 1980’s, these universities began to craft a more research focused mission. Newly imbued in the “research culture” of academia, these universities were struck when Boyer (1990) issued his message to “reconsider scholarship.” Following Boyer’s call, these

universities sought a return to their roots in an attempt to re-develop and once again, nurture an expanded view of scholarship.

O'Meara wanted to know how these shifting organizational missions, played out amongst faculty members who judged one another's work at tenure and promotion time. In her analysis, O'Meara categorizes faculty values and beliefs into two overarching themes: 1) values that support service as scholarship (in the Boyerian spirit) and 2) values against service as scholarship (see p. 67).

Challenging the Parsonian view of a functional organization, O'Meara concludes that faculty members do not simply comply to organizational pronouncements. Instead, faculty members use their own values and experiences to judge colleagues' work – sometimes in spite of their university's mission. Consider the following comment taken from O'Meara's article:

You might think that our faculty would be the first to embrace broader ways of thinking about scholarship and teaching and service but people articulate certain things and then fall back into old frameworks when they are evaluating applicants for promotion so that even though people could articulate, "Yes, scholarship is more than that esoteric piece in that obscure journal," once the esoteric piece was in front of them, they were drooling. You know, it was like—this is real. This is REAL scholarship. (a faculty comment, p. 74, emphasis in original).

O'Meara pushes back against universities, as do many of the other scholars already mentioned, and stresses that "asking faculty to one thing and then rewarding [them] for another is dysfunctional for individuals and for institutions" (p. 76). Citing the responsibility of universities to do a better job in terms of policy making and enforcement as well as coming to terms with the contradictions that they induce are all important implications in O'Meara's work. While it was not O'Meara's goal to show how faculty negotiate shifting organizational missions, she does shed light on how faculty

members can reinforce or subvert larger organizational objectives. In other words, the O'Meara study suggests that there is more to be learned from studying faculty perspectives inside a changing university.

Slaughter et al., (2004) also conducted qualitative work to better understand if and how faculty members are dealing with a kind of change that they argue is nested in an academic capitalistic regime. This piece of work by Slaughter et al., (2004) is particularly important. Not only do she and colleagues seek the perspective of faculty members in an on the ground study, but the questions they ask signal their wanting to find out more about change within the professoriate, and higher education in general, and how faculty negotiate that change.

Faculty revealed the "quandaries" that they face as relations between industry and academia blur. Not only do they describe how their work has indeed been impacted by the blurring of industry-academy lines, but they describe how they have dealt with the necessity to raise funds by re-conceptualizing it. Rather than discuss their fund-raising as attempts to be capitalists or entrepreneurs, they see their fund-raising as a way to support their teaching and basic research. Slaughter et al., (2004) note how many of the faculty scientists in their study entered academia because of their desire to teach. Given the shifting boundaries between industry and academy, they understand that in order to teach, they must have monies to support their labs, their students, and the discovery of knowledge.

Such insights are critical as they show faculty members taking an active role in the construction of their work world, legitimizing to some extent a set of ideas and activities (conducting research tied to private, interested funding sources) that was once

foreign or at least “forbidden” to the scientific enterprise (Bush, 1944; Freeland, 1997; Merton, 1958; Perorzoia, 2009). Constructing an understanding of one’s own work or making a space, as Lindholm (2001) might call it alerts one to the agency or at least the active role that faculty have in their work lives; it hints at the possibility that faculty are, in fact, able to squeeze the kind of work that they hope to engage in, into their work profile – despite larger organizational or field pressures.

With this in mind, then, I turn to a discussion of qualitative studies where researchers interviewed other faculty to examine faculty perspectives, experiences, and the potential for faculty member agency. These studies take a critical approach. Most position faculty work inside a neoliberal or academic capitalistic culture, such as is the case with Slaughter et al., (1997; 2004), but rather than posit that the neoliberal ideology cages in faculty members and faculty work, they believe that faculty members find ways to negate such pressures. Although they do not specifically study faculty in universities in transition, they do study universities that are engaged in the academic capitalism, which means that they are seeking more prestige, and that they are typically moving towards a research focus.

Archer’s (2009) enlightening work focuses on “young/er” academics’ construction of professional identity in a time of neo-liberalism and modernity. By “young/er,” Archer refers to academics under the age of 35 who grew up in the 1980’s. She sets up the study by acknowledging the overarching neo-liberal context in which young/er academics have grown and been socialized into the professoriate. However, Archer disagrees with the ways in which young/er academics and their roles are often characterized and she hopes to challenge this conception. Specifically, Archer refers to

Davies and Petersen's (2005) work in which they described [young/er] academics as "divided, disillusioned, and distressed individuals' whose ability to carry out the work they 'love' is constrained and subverted by the infiltration of neoliberalism (p.268).

Archer finds this depiction of young/er academics bleak and deterministic and aims to investigate to what extent it jives with young/er academics' conception of self. After interviewing eight academics at a cross section of British institutions coming from different disciplines, social class backgrounds, and ethnicities, Archer applies a Foucauldian discourse analytic lens along with a psycho-social lens to "help understand how academic identities are played out in 'everyday' practices" (see p. 269-270 for detailed methods and analytical approach). At the core of Archer's project is a desire to uncover if and how young/er academics can escape the depiction that they are conformist neoliberal subjects stripped of their agency.

In the discussion, Archer shows that academics strive to carve out small spaces for resistance and hope. For instance, she found two scholars who managed to "squeeze critical projects" out of "uncritical externally funded projects" (p.277). This finding is extremely important for two reasons. First, it shows that academics often find themselves involved in "uncritical" research as a result of the "research imperative" which is tied to the demand for faculty members to earn dollars for their university. Second, however, Archer finds that a few faculty manage to squeeze "critical work" – work that they want to do – from these projects. Even if the neoliberal ideology operates in higher education, Archer demonstrates that faculty can and do find ways to maintain a sense of self when they act creatively.

Also, drawing from Foucault, Huckaby (2008) shows how faculty members can take position as “specific intellectual,” which is a direct challenge to the positionality of a “universal intellectual.” Huckaby (2008) describes the work and position of a universal intellectual:

...[they are] writers of a normative master narrative of truth and justice, and spokesman for our collective conscience and consciousness...[on the other hand], a specific intellectual struggle is not for the truth, but for truth’s status, economic role, and political function. Specific intellectuals are situated within the immediate and concrete awareness of marginality through the specificity of their own lives and work (p. 772).

Huckaby (2008) aims to show that faculty members can resist the pressure of the university to conform and yield work that is rooted in hegemonic epistemology (positivism, rationalism, scientism) which preserves the status-quo. Although, Huckaby is not concerned specifically with any particular organization’s “mission drift;” her critique is one of modernity and neo-liberalism, which, as has been shown throughout the literature review, are tied to the pattern of mission drift.

She argues that neo-liberalism and modernity presses upon the majority of scholars and their scholarship. Through interviews, observations, and text analysis, Huckaby (2008) identifies scholars who she calls “specific intellectuals.” Such scholars find ways to “resist domination” by the university (p. 784). For example, one specific intellectual called “New Jack Professor” described how he maintains his commitment to critical, social justice work in very practical ways that involve his work as a professor. He says:

the fact that I come from a poor working-class background, I can bring experiences and analyses into the classroom that are non-traditional...some students find it refreshing, because it may coincide with some part of their background...other students find it distasteful” (p.773).

Thus, Archer (2008) and Huckaby (2008) demonstrate that it is possible for scholars to take agency, to work from “pockets of power” (Gonzales, forthcoming) and confront the university as it is rooted in a wider political-economic context.

Others take similar positions, wanting to explore the possibility of human agency, and do so by rendering counter stories. Counter stories are often, but not always, the product of African American, Latina/o, Native American, and/or other “minority” populations. In addition, most counter stories take a critical race or critical feminist perspective. In a book that takes auto-ethnography as its method, several Latina/o scholars describe how they have remained committed to self-defined notions of the “public good” while producing the research and scholarship that their universities expect (González & Padilla, 2008). Most, if not all of the contributing faculty members in this book, make note of the increasing expectations for faculty productivity and the increasing distance between universities and the public that they are intended to serve. Nonetheless, each faculty member remains committed to serving that public purpose.¹⁹ Many of these faculty members grapple with this process, but none seem willing to abandon it. For example, González (2008) writes:

Problem identification no longer begins at the national or state level, but at the local level. This is the new direction of my research: producing local knowledge to solve local problems. The question no longer should be how

¹⁹ Public purpose is a very subjective concept. Slaughter et al., 2004 work shows that faculty and students who are heavily engaged in what she terms “academic capitalism,” are able to locate the utility and public purposes of their work. For example, some of the scientists in her study constructed their ties to industry as a necessary strategy for securing their work, and thus their connection to teaching and students, in the university. In other words, the only way in which faculty could do the work that attracted them to academia (teaching, discovering knowledge for larger society) could only be achieved when they were able and competent fund-raisers. However, most critical scholars take the position that the public good is undermined when academics engage in market oriented, market sponsored, or market connected research and scholarship. Some might refer to the faculty scientist’s legitimization of their ties to industry as an “embodied” or “normalized” neoliberal discourse (see Davies et al., 2005; Foucault’s work, in general).

my research will make a significant contribution to the literature, but rather how my research will help solve local problems in a particular context (p. 129).

These works that take a qualitative and critical perspective, although few, lay a foundation for exploring how faculty members construct their role in the face of a higher education system that is governed by an overarching set of neo-liberal policies, practices, and ideologies; a set of conditions that have compelled universities to tinker with their missions, breaking away from historical teaching and service traditions and replacing them with more research focused agendas. Such studies document the value and insights that can be uncovered in an investigation conducted at the ground level of faculty experiences and perspectives.

Before moving on to lay out the conceptual frameworks that helped me sketch the parameters of this study, a brief summary of the literature and placement of my own scholarship is in order. From a historical perspective, it is possible to outline the evolution, and ultimately, the expansion of the faculty role in higher education. Macro level views draw attention to the fiscal tensions as well as the cultural and ideological transitions that unfolded circa 1970's. Such perspectives tend to cast faculty members as rational, economic-minded, and perhaps at worst, conformist actors in the field of higher education. Organizational studies that often take faculty work as a function of organizational behaviors, especially fiscal reward systems, also color over the intricacies of faculty work, perspectives, and perhaps most importantly, faculty agency.

Studies that draw from organizational-fit literature get us closer to understanding and pointing out that faculty members approach their work with a certain world view or vision, if you will, of what their work will look like and be about. Yet while this work

(Lindholm, 2001; 2003) points out the significance of university-faculty fit in terms of job satisfaction and how faculty work between their preconceptions and organizational realities, their approaches lack a critical interrogation of these findings and fail to look systematically at faculty work habits and practices.

My own work, then, sets out to look at how faculty members make sense of their role and their work as the university where they work attempts to make significant changes to its mission. Thus, I account for a pattern of change (academic drift) which is becoming more and more common in higher education, and in doing so, I work with theoretical frame works that help me to be mindful that faculty, university, field, and society are connected. This means that these levels should always be investigated in cross-cutting, critical ways. In the following section, I lay out the theoretical frameworks that offered conceptual power to me as I planned the best way to study this problem.

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

3.1 Conceptualizing the Study

In thinking about this research project, I wanted to be able to situate the experience, perspective, and sense-making of faculty inside a larger objective reality, just as Creswell (2008) suggests when he prescribes pragmatic interpretive research. Moreover, previous scholarship has demonstrated how important it is to account for the larger social, political, and economic contexts in the study of social phenomena. Specifically, Mills (1957) encourages scholars to think beyond the private troubles of individuals and to seek out how they connect to larger public issues. To this end, the frameworks take into account the wider environment that the professoriate is embedded in and attempt to connect the faculty member and faculty role to the organization as well as the larger environment.

The first framework used to help me sketch the outline of this study is New Institutionalism Micro Foundations or Neo Institutionalism, which draws from an ethnomethodological, constructivist, learning, or post-modern perspective. These three terms can and are often used interchangeably, but I will use post-modern throughout the rest of the dissertation. A post-modern slant is characterized by the belief that reality and knowledge are achieved through social construction (Berger and Luckman, 1967; Berger, Berger, and Kellner, 1967). Post-modernism rejects grand narratives and suggests that to understand, one must get closer to the experiences and lived realities of people. To this end, New Institutionalism is threaded with Rosch and Reich's (1996) model on faculty member learning and socialization to help me see the points at which

opportunities for faculty learning, interpreting, and eventually action taking might emerge.

However, to more critically interrogate the intersection and exchanges that unfold between faculty member and university and amongst faculty members themselves, conceptual power is borrowed from Pierre Bourdieu's body of work on capital, habitus, and action. Bourdieu aims to show that one's subjective construction of the world is drawn from larger objective categories that have emerged from struggles for position and "world-making." These struggles for "world-making" are fought with different forms of capital gained through one's historical, structural, and experiential past. Individuals use their "capital" to mobilize through social life in an attempt to claim position and relevance for their world-view, their skill set, or whatever. With regard to this study, then, faculty possess different forms of capital that they use to define and advance their work as important, meaningful and legitimate to their peers as well as to the field of higher education.

Theoretically, Bourdieu's work forced me to consider the different kinds of "capital" that faculty may talk about and put to practice, and how such capital bears on the kind of faculty role that they construct, and on the relationship that the individual has not only to the organization, but with other faculty members as well. Finally, Bourdieu's work is enriched by other strands of critical theory, such as Collin's critical race theory (2000), which forces one to look at intersections across all social life.

These three theoretical perspectives helped me to think about what might be important to the unfolding of faculty life inside a changing university. Each perspective represents a significant body of work that sheds light on phenomena related to

organizational change, faculty work, faculty roles, and higher education as a field and each helped me to sketch the parameters of this study. Using these conceptual frameworks allowed me to design and execute a more creative, elaborate, multi-angled and flexible research project. As a scholar of higher education, I believe it is important to acknowledge the work that has been laid before me and which I stand on.

Yet as an independent scholar, and particularly with work that draws from the interpretive tradition, it is important to note that the theories did not bind my study or my perspective. On this issue, I agree with Lather (1986):

Building empirically grounded theory requires a relationship between data and theory. Data must be allowed to generate propositions in a dialectical manner that permits use of a priori theoretical frameworks, but which keeps a particular framework from becoming the container into which data must be poured... (p. 67).

On this note, I discuss each framework in depth.

3.2 New Institutionalism and its Micro-foundations

New Institutionalism is a distinct body of work among organizational theories. Generally speaking, NI emerged in the 1970's as a reaction to the scientific, structural functionalist, rational choice perspectives that dominated (and continue to dominate) most organizational theorizing. To understand NI, one must first understand its genesis. Thus, a brief explanation regarding the evolution of organizational theories is outlined below.

The oldest form of organizational theory is referred to as classical organizational theory. Shafritz et al., (2005) suggests that classical organizational theory emerged in the 1700's and was grounded in principles of the industrial revolution. These principles include the notion that "organizations exist to accomplish production-related goals"; that

there is “one best way to organize for production;” and “that way can be found through systematic, scientific inquiry”; that “production is maximized through a specialized division of labor,” and finally, that “people and organizations act in accordance with rational economic principles” (see p. 28). Classic organization theory includes seminal works by Adam Smith (1776), McCallum’s *Superintendent Report* (1856) whose gaze is on the economics of infrastructure, efficiency, and engineering and geared towards success (economic efficiency and functional roads), and of course Taylor’s (1916) *Principles of Scientific Management*. The classical school of organizational theory dominated well into the 1960’s and remains heavily influential today.

According to Shafritz et al., (2005), neoclassical theories emerged in the late 1940’s and 1950’s. These theories remained highly concerned with structure and achieving that structure through scientific, objective endeavors. For instance, March et al., (1959/1993) aimed to create a “science” for management. One of the most significant advances in this brand of theory, however, includes Merton’s recognition that Weber’s ideal type organization, grounded in objectivity, reason, and efficiency bred innate dysfunction. Merton wrote *Bureaucratic Structure and Personality* to shed light on the consequences of iron cage bureaucracies. Another central and highly important theme that emerged from neoclassicists is that organizations do not operate in a vacuum and that external influences can sway an organization to act outside of its rationally conceived domain. Furthermore, Selznick argued that organizations are not simply made of structures and positions, but that they are made of people with their own

sets of experiences, values, and ideals; these people, of course, fill those positions and carry out the work of the organization.²⁰

Fast-forward to the latter part of the 1950's and 1960's when Parsons put forward his work on organization and society as a functional system. Parsons noted that organizations are made of several parts (members) and he argued that these parts work together towards a collective or organizational goal because individuals have an innate desire to follow or comply with institutionally established goals, norms, and expectations as they seek to avoid rejection or punishment.

In reaction to this long tradition of scientific oriented, structural functionalist theorizing, New Institutionalism was born. NI is a sociological analysis of organizations (Hinings and Tolbert, 2009, p. 473; Powell and DiMaggio, 1991) that counters inherently conservative, functional views of organizations. NI theorists searched for ways to “explain [that] what we see in the world is inconsistent with the ways in which contemporary theories ask us to talk” (March and Olsen, 1984, p.747). DiMaggio and Powell (1991) write that “studies of organizational and political change routinely point to findings that are hard to square with either rational-actor or functionalist accounts” (p.3). Thus, NI seeks to show that the distance between rhetoric and reality is often due to local, organizational context and culture (Meyer and Rowan, 1977), and the role that humans play inside of organizations especially when it comes to holding together institutionalized views and practices (Powell et al., 1983; Zucker,1991).

²⁰ Selznick (1948, 1949) is known as one of the first “institutionalists” in organizational studies, largely because he recognized the irrational behavior of the Tennessee Valley Water Authorities as it co-opted functions outside of its rationally conceived form and purpose to remain competitive and viable.

Like the first strands of institutional analysis *a la* Selznick, NI emphasizes the relationship between organizations and environment, particularly the state. However, whereas the earliest version of institutional analysis considered the political process – and more specifically fiscal allocation - as the most important influence for organizations, NI suggests that powerful influences are leveraged through cultural or institutional agencies, such as accrediting bodies, news or media outlets, and related professional associations. NI theorists suggest that the influences exerted by these entities are not tied to fiscal resources, but instead to cultural resources like legitimacy and prestige.

The conceptualization of multiple kinds of influences came from Meyer and Rowan (1977). In the article, Meyer et al., moved NI theory forward and suggested that organizations are not only influenced by technical resources, which is mainly a political process of distribution, but also by their “institutional environment” or *field*. Meyer and Rowan pointed to the “symbolic elements capable of affecting organizational forms independent of resource flows and technical requirements” (p. 41), such as governing boards, professional associations, and relevant agencies. These cultural agencies develop particular processes, structures, and cultural expectations for organizations involved in respective fields. The processes, structures, and cultural expectations combine to form what can be called an “institutional template” (Hinings and Tolbert, 2008, p. 479). For instance, in contemporary higher education, it is expected that all organizations of higher education will make available some sort of Student Affairs Office to facilitate learning and engagement outside of the classroom. If a university were to fail to provide some sort of student affairs services, it would surely have to confront the

perception that it is not legitimately concerned about student experience. What is most perplexing and to some extent unsettling about the NI argument is that the organization is first and foremost concerned with “compliance” rather than with actual implementation or effectiveness (see Morpew, 2009).

Scott and Meyer (1983) further articulate environmental influences. In their 1983 essay, Scott and Meyer refer to what is called an organizational *sector*. A sector, they explain, is constituted by multiple agencies, clients, or constituents who have an interest in the organization and its work. Specifically, they argue that organizations are accountable to sectors in two ways. The first way in which organizations must deal with sectors, according to Scott and Meyer, is to confront and compete with organizations that provide similar products and services and serve the same function. Thus, Scott and Meyer point out the fact that organizations are embedded in sectors where they must compete with organizations that provide similar, if not the same, services.

The second way that organizations must address sector influence refers to how organizations are evaluated and compared to others in their sector. According to Hinings and Tolbert (2009), Scott and Meyer “distinguish between technical sectors, in which performance evaluation is largely identified with *market outcomes* (intra-field competition), and institutional sectors, in which performance evaluation (for legitimacy) is closely linked to *conformity and with institutional rules and regulation* and only indirectly tied to market outcomes” (p. 480, my emphasis). Thus, Scott and Meyer took Meyer and Rowan’s earlier work and refined it in order to show that organizations are influenced by both technical (fiscal) needs and inputs, which are often impacted by state fiscal allocation behavior, especially in the case of public entities, but that they are also

motivated by the attainment of institutional or cultural resources that are often symbolic, tacit, and established by those who participate in a field.

With regard to faculty members in the field of academia, the powerful influence of the cultural and institutionalizing field is built of publication and editorial boards, professional and/or discipline based associations, accreditation agencies, as well as state and federal legislative bodies, and rankings systems, such as the U.S. News Ranking system (Sauder et al., 2009), and the most elite, already legitimized universities. This idea is not new to the field of higher education. In 1959/2002, Riesman and Jenks wrote about the academic procession, in which he pointed out that a small group of U.S. universities and agencies generally set the tone for the rest. This means that colleges and universities in the higher education field become more and more similar, as they strive to meet the field's standards. In DiMaggio and Powell (1983), the causes of isomorphism were linked not only to political, fiscal, technical, and cultural agencies, but more specifically to professionals. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) agree that professionalization is the struggle to establish methods and conditions for one's work, and also, to control how the professionals are to be produced.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983), then, make clear for the first time that institutionalization or isomorphism is not a process done unto an organization and its members by a removed group of power elites, but instead that it is a process involving participation from organizations as well as their constituents.²¹ It appears that

²¹ This comment must be tempered. Clearly, government, though its fiscal allocation and regulatory processes, has a strong arm on public sector organizations. Moreover, big business can also yield a dominating sort of power when they hold resources that organizations need, such as when businesses press for a certain kind of research approach or academic curriculum that aligns with their needs (but see Brint et al., 1991 for a more nuanced explanation of business influences on community colleges).

organizations and their members, then, are stranded in a sort of “iron cage” that they help to create (DiMaggio et al., 1983). As Scott denotes (1991):

Organizations [and their members] are not only involved in a set of exchange relations with other social actors; they are also located in a network or framework of relationships, which their own activities create but which also acts to shape and constrain their possibilities for action (p. 171).

This means that organizations of higher education, along with the faculty-actors inside of them, are embedded in a field of relationships which they produce through their participation. At the same time, these very relations and structures press upon them in powerful, perhaps undesirable ways.

Thus, using NI's wide lens approach, faculty life or university change can not adequately be studied if one limits her/his analysis to the effects of public policy decisions or fiscal allocation alone. Instead, one must take account of the cross-cutting powers and influences that govern the sector of higher education, and more specifically, one must try to understand how individuals play into these relations. With the multiple environments that higher education and its faculty respond to, NI theorists point out that policies are adopted, structures are formed, and missions are altered, yet these strategies rarely, if ever, reflect on-the-ground organizational life.

This brings one of NI's most unique tenets into focus. NI theorists suggest that when organizations adopt structures or practices in order to achieve legitimacy, “[these adopted] formal structures dramatically reflect the myths of their institutional environments (or the institutional templates which they strive to fulfill) instead of the demands of their work activities” (Meyer and Rowan, 1977, p. 41). In other words, in striving to satisfy field level expectations, organizations are likely to leave local context

out of the formula. Some have spoken of the “loosely coupled” (Weick, 1982) character within larger organizations. “Loosely coupled-ness” hints at both structural organization and person level behaviors. For example, when the coordination between information, decision making, and evaluation are not in sync, policies and programs may be adopted, but not implemented and a lack of oversight allows this “loose fit” to persist (Weick, 2009. pp. 48-49). However, loose coupling also refers to the autonomy with which professionals often execute their work, which makes change very difficult.

To this end, NI theorists believe that the divergence between “rhetoric” and “reality” is largely due to the actor-organization intersection where actors must make sense of their given situation in light of the immediate context. Selznick (1992) praises “the new theorists” for “giving great weight to structured cognition.” Selznick writes “[structured cognition is] a very useful idea that reminds us that the interaction of culture and organization is mediated by [the] socially constructed mind, that is by perceptions and evaluations” (p. 274). In other words, NI brings to the forefront the messy, social aspect of organizational life.

Thus, departing from rational-actor models, NI scholars attempt to show that organizational life is a constitutive process, one where actors make sense of the organizational culture in which they are embedded and then deploy action accordingly. NI casts off the notion that organizational actors are passive conformists who seek, uncritically, to extend the success and life of the organization that they are a part of and sees actors that learn about and use the organizational culture that they are a part of. In this way, NI shares much affinity with the ethnomethodological and phenomenological

traditions, especially those put forward by Garfinkel (1963), Goffman (1963), and Berger and Luckmann (1966) respectively (Powell et al., 1991; Hinings et al., 2008).

The ethnomethodological approach sets up NI's theory of action as a less "rational, discursive, quasi-scientific process" (Powell and DiMaggio, 1991, p.20) and suggests instead that cognition operates "beneath the level of consciousness, [is] routine and conventional [based on] practical reason." At the same time, NI makes use of the ways that Erving Goffman countered some of the central tenants in Symbolic Interactionism (Mead, 1934), especially tenants advanced by Mead (1934) in which society was presented as "shared attitudes that consciously shape individuals' behaviors" (Appelrouth et al., 2008, p.317). Instead, Goffman took the position that society produces institutions, ideas, and scripts that direct human action. Of this, Goffman wrote:

...a definition of the situation is almost always to be found, but those who are in the situation ordinarily do not *create* this definition, even though their society often can be said to do so; ordinarily all they do is to assess correctly what the situation ought to be for them and then act accordingly (in Appelrouth et al., 2008, p.482).

Goffman suggests that people arrive at a "situation" which, although they cannot define, they can assess and then act accordingly. Taken together, these various theoretical underpinnings in NI means that faculty members learn the rules of academia through observations, interactions, and communications and that faculty store away such lessons in a "tool-kit." At the same time, NI holds on to the notion that organizational "situations' that faculty must deal with are actually manifestations of larger field dynamics, in which they, too, participate.

Unfortunately, Powell and DiMaggio (1991) write that “the link between micro and macro level analysis has not received much explicit attention from practitioners of the new institutionalism” (p.25). Indeed, there is much abstract theorizing in the NI literature with regard to processes of institutionalization and socialization, but not much has been done in terms of looking at these processes very closely with the exception of Brint and Karabel's work on community colleges and Powell's work on art museums. There is a need, however, to address these specific processes, particularly in this study. Thus, I merge Rosch and Reich's model of socialization with NI to draw an outline of significant learning opportunities that faculty members encounter as they enter a University and attempt to understand what is expected of them.

Rosch and Reich (1996) lay out a model or outline concerning the entrance of faculty members into a University. In this model, they seek to document and understand important learning opportunities for faculty members, particularly in terms of how faculty members are “socialized” into the University. As common in many socialization models, Rosch et al., lay out their model in stages. The first stage in the Rosch and Reich model is referred to as the pre-arrival stage. The pre-arrival stage focuses on the individual's predispositions prior to entering a new setting (p. 116). Here, Rosch and Reich focus mostly on the graduate student experience. Interestingly, Rosch and Reich (1996) find that the graduate student experience does not instill one's “role orientation”²² as many assume. The researchers write “role orientations were formulated as each individual weighed the role orientation espoused in graduate school against personal values” (p. 124).

²² Role orientation simply refers to how faculty prefer to spend their work time: primarily on teaching, primarily on research, or equally.

Rosch and Reich's second stage is called the encounter stage and addresses an "individual's preconceptions that are formed during recruitment and selection" (p.116). The interview process is the most important event during this stage, where "candidates select or attend to information during hiring process...using predispositions as a frame of reference, and preconceptions regarding the setting are formed" (p. 122). At this stage, interviewees develop what Rosch and Reich (1996) term a "preconception framework." Interviewees and new hires use this framework as a sort of baseline to set up personal and professional expectations regarding their work and their role within the organization. Often, however, these "preconception frameworks" are flawed, based on incomplete or inaccurate information. For example, Rosch and Reich (1996) point out that during interviews, organizations are likely to make only the most positive images and information available to prospective hires. In addition, because interviewees are not yet "faculty insiders," their own interpretations, mostly rooted in their own student experience, may be ill conceived (see p. 125).

The third stage is referred to as the adaptation stage and is built on the dynamic notion of cultural learning. Rosch and Reich (1996) find that new faculty members are often given extensive autonomy to make sense of their role and their work expectations. They note that informal and formal processes and events, such as departmental meetings (formal) or conflicts between colleagues (informal), serve as important sources of information for new faculty members as to what the culture, expectations, and faculty roles are supposed to be. Because of the professional freedom and relative independence characteristic of faculty work, Rosch and Reich (1996), along with Tierney and Rhoades (1994) suggest that it is common for faculty to misinterpret and

then be confused by organizational messaging, policies, and practices. To compensate, Rosch and Reich write that new faculty use an extensive amount of practical knowledge gained through their graduate student experience. For instance, faculty participants described how they modeled “teaching styles of their graduate school mentors; experimenting with teaching methods that had best met their learning needs...adopting attitudes they most admired and hoped to impart” (p. 126). With this, Rosch and Reich (1996) argue that the socialization process is very dynamic rather than uniform and uncontested. Thus, it is suggested that when faculty members use their graduate school experience to guide their work, especially when they are trained in an institution different from the one in which they become employed, they leave their own “imprint” on the organizational culture.

Finally, the fourth stage is referred to as the commitment stage. In this final stage, “values and norms of the local culture are assimilated by the new members” either through attachment or individuation. In the attachment process, faculty have learned about the roles, norms, and values that are expected of them. Then they work to cultivate and nurture such role development. In the case of individuation, faculty question organizationally defined roles and expectations, resulting in a “dynamic” exchange between faculty and organization. Rosch and Reich (1996) suggest that faculty strived to reconcile personal values, values they learned from their graduate school experience, and their “preconception framework” in order to shape and redefine their role.

This model allows one to develop an understanding of some key stages or experiences in a faculty member's career. Rosch and Reich (1996) describe them as

pre-arrival, encounter, adaptation, and commitment. Whatever labels one uses, Rosch and Reich's work points out the some significant ways that faculty members learn about the expectation of their work and how they negotiate those expectations. What is probably most valuable about this framework is the potential it shows for exploring organizational-actor relationships from a more dynamic perspective and what sources faculty use to help them get through. Moreover, theories of faculty socialization are not only useful for considering the entrée into faculty-hood, but also for considering how faculty deal with ongoing organizational circumstances. With this being said, this framework reminded me to explore how *all* faculty learned about the expectations of their work, how they began to learn about the transition and what, if any, specific set of experiences or values drive their interpretation of what it means to their work.

Although this theoretical framework sheds light on particular phases of faculty learning and socialization, faculty socialization, experience, and perspective can not be adequately studied inside an organizational vacuum. It is necessary to understand the larger setting in which faculty are situated. Thus, nesting Rosch and Reich (1996) work inside NI helps to connect the learning tools that faculty use to the larger higher education field.

While it is possible to nest micro level models inside NI, there still remains little micro level work available in the NI literature and most researchers who utilize NI tend to fall back to larger structural backdrops to explain actor behavior. Perhaps, this is because most studies are drawn from large data sets or organizational documentation and micro level inquiry requires labor intensive field work. Whatever the case, Powell and Colyvas (2008) urged NI theorists to move the micro level work forward. In their

article, they urged scholars to make use of Goffman and Garfinkel in the study of organizational phenomena. The theorists write:

Institutions are reproduced through the everyday activities of individuals. Members of organizations engage in daily practices, discover puzzles or anomalies in their work, problematize these questions and develop answers to them by theorizing them...participants ascribe meaning to these theories, and so doing develop and reproduce taken-for granted understanding...rather than perspectives that either highlight habitual replication or savvy change agents, we stress that most micro-motives are fairly mundane...aimed at interpretation, alignment and muddling through (p.277).

To this end, Powell and Colyvas (2008) suggest that researchers let go of both the “cultural dope” and “entrepreneurial actor” as explanations of change and focus their gaze on the powerful role that individuals play in everyday, mundane organizational life. There is, in fact, a small and growing body of literature that shows how actors can and do engage the structures and processes that give shape to their life in order to make sense of and “muddle through” (Burch, 2007; Gonzales et al., 2008; also consider Tyack and Cuban, 1995), yet as noted by Powell and Colyvas, this line of NI inquiry requires further work. It is hoped that in considering what NI has to offer for this study, I can extend the micro-foundations of institutional theory as Powell and Colyvas suggest.

Related to the lack of micro level work, NI fails to consider more specifically how power and power inequities affect *particular* types of individuals as they muddle through, make sense, and adopt or recreate behavior. This gap can only be remedied by connecting individual, experience, and sense-making processes to issues of power and conflict both inside and outside the field of higher education. To do this, it is necessary to get closer to the faculty position, to their perspectives and experiences in order to understand how faculty make sense of their role in today’s universities. Such

relationships and power inequities can be studied more carefully if one considers Bourdieu's body of work, especially his writing on intellectuals (Swartz, 1997). In fact, Powell and DiMaggio (1991) suggest that Bourdieu's work on fields, action, and habitus offers an interesting and plausible line of inquiry to take NIMF further. In the next section, I introduce Bourdieu's body of work and explain why.

3.3 The Influence of Pierre Bourdieu

Taking what is available from the NI literature to study the intersection between a university and its faculty means investigating how faculty make use of the institutional, organizational and the "everyday-ness" that is available to them and how they put those elements to use. NI is intended to present a dialectical perspective on all of these intersections. What NI does not do, however, is consider how differently situated individuals may view and negotiate this intersection differently. Furthermore, it fails to critically relate such sense-making and intersections back to environments outside of the given institutional field.

Bourdieu's theory of field, action and habitus, however, forces one to account for the ways in which differently situated individuals perceive and engage the same structures and phenomena in very different ways. Bourdieu insists that to explain social life, one must "do more than simply take what people do in their daily lives for granted, and [must do] so without losing sight of the wider patterns of social life" (Jenkins, 1992, p. 68).

It is useful to begin by explaining what Bourdieu means by wider patterns of social life. Bourdieu is highly aware of large scale political, economic, social, and cultural factors. In fact, according to Jenkins (1992) and evidenced by Bourdieu's early

work²³, Bourdieu once worked as a “blissful structuralist” (p. 17). Taking the political and/or economic situation to develop explanations for the entirety of social life, however, was not sufficient for Bourdieu. Of his dissatisfaction, he wrote:

It was only after a detour over terrain familiar to myself – on the one hand, life in the Béaran where I come from, and university life on the other – that I uncovered for myself the objective presuppositions of the structuralist approach; one of them being the privileged position accorded to the observer vis-à-vis the native population which, it is assumed, are ineluctably trapped within the unconscious...My intention was to bring *real-life actors back in* who had vanished...through being *considered as epiphenomena* of structures (Bourdieu in Honneth et al., 1986, p. 41, my emphasis).

Still, economic, political, and social patterns retain a central and significant place in Bourdieu’s work; to the extent that actors, their world view, and their actions emanate from structural arrangements. These wider patterns and arrangements are conceptualized as fields. Bourdieu suggests that there are various *fields*, and that they “are defined by the stakes which are at stake – cultural goods (life-style), housing, intellectual distinction (education), employment, land, power (politics), social class, prestige or whatever – and may be of differing degrees of specificity and concreteness” (p.84). In his own work, Bourdieu has given considerable attention to the field of education²⁴ and specifically to the university and academic life (Bourdieu, 1984; Dillabough, 2004; Swartz, 1997, p.219). Not only are the fields defined by the stakes which are at stake (defining what is a legitimate education, for example), but the definition for what a legitimate stake is set up in the field, itself.

²³ In his early work in Algeria, Bourdieu put forward striking structural arguments to explain the Algerian way of life.

²⁴ Some of Bourdieu’s most well known work relates to his theory of social reproduction where he argued that the French education system, and education systems in general, reproduced the hierarchical arrangement in society. He also, however, devoted much time to the field of higher education or academia and the symbolic violence that is character of that field.

Thus, a *field* is the arena in which individuals struggle – with whatever capital they have - for position, which gives them opportunity to define the stakes. Capital, in Bourdieu's theory, is a term used to describe resources that function as a sort of life currency²⁵. Defining the various forms of capital is quite strait forward. Economic capital generally refers to the income and wealth of an individual while social capital refers to one's circle of friends, family, and professional network. Cultural capital refers to the habits, skills, linguistic styles, that one acquires in relation to his/her economic position. With this being said, across all categories, capital varies and some forms are recognized as being more valuable, legitimate, or prestigious by those with the *power to rule* or with the power to validate; such ruling power is Bourdieu's symbolic capital. Of symbolic capital, Bourdieu writes "[it is] the power of *world-making* ... the power to make *groups*... The power to impose and to inculcate a *vision of divisions*, that is, it is the power to make visible and *explicit* social divisions that are *implicit*, [it] is political power par excellence" (Bourdieu cited in Allen, p.415).

Symbolic capital, then, is particularly valuable in that it means that some individuals have the "capacity to name and to categorize" what is useful, valuable, or otherwise legitimate. For instance, the disciplines in higher education have long validated the practice of scientific research, with its proclamation of removed subjectivity and objective truth making. This narrow conception of "truth" has pushed alternative voices, views, and approaches aside, resulting in deep divisions amongst social researchers as well as the marginalization of women, people of color and "others" who have opted out of the traditional scientific method (Bourdieu, 1988, p. xix; also see

²⁵ Some have written about the similarities between Bourdieu's "capital" framework and Weber's view on life chances.

Collins, 1986, 2000; Smith, 1987). Such is an example of a field struggle punctuated by deep power inequities that emanate from a history (e.g. racism, sexism and exclusion) and structural arrangements (e.g. economic structures and opportunities, scientific connection to economic and industrial development, and thus to elites (see Silva and Slaughter, 1984; access to education, etc.). Of such struggles, Swartz writes:

those in dominant positions [are pit] against those in subordinate positions ... the struggle for position in fields opposes those who are able to exercise some degree of monopoly of power over the definition and distribution of capital and others who attempt to usurp the advantages. In general, Bourdieu sees this opposition occurring between the *established agents* and the *new arrivals* in fields (p.124).

It is apparent that front and center to Bourdieu's analysis is conflict and power. If one takes the notion of a field and applies it to faculty as they are situated in the field of higher education, there are several relations of power and struggle which can be immediately identified.

The first angle one can take with Bourdieu's framework of course is the faculty-university intersection. This means looking, in a general way, at the sort of capital that faculty use not only to make sense of, but to get through the organization. To bring the "actors back in," as Bourdieu aimed, faculty perspectives, experiences, and lives must be studied – as they are nested within the university. This particular vantage point gets at one of the overarching issues in this study: the university declares a new mission, but this mission must be carried out by the faculty. Yet faculty members approach their work with a particular set of experiences, outlooks, and skills that may or may not be in alignment with the university's mission. How do faculty members react? What do faculty members make of the university's intentions to capture a more prestigious title? How

does this impact their work experience? And how do they negotiate this impending change?

How people engage in this process of sense-making and action is a central concern for Bourdieu and one that he seeks to answer with his concept of *habitus*. Habitus is how one acts, how s/he sees the world, and her place in it and in many ways it is built out of the capital that one has to work with. Furthermore, habitus provides a sort of sense about how the world operates and how one should operate in relation to that world. Allen (2007) defines habitus as:

the durable organization of one's body and its *deployment* in the world. It is found in our posture, and our way of walking, speaking, eating, and laughing; it is found in every way we use our body. Habitus is both a system whereby people organize their own behavior and a system through which people perceive and appreciate the behavior of others (p.416).

Habitus, the stocks of resources, knowledge, world view, that one uses to play the academic game is a concept intended to help explain action. One's habitus provides individuals with schemas, perhaps, for mobilizing, innovating, or reforming the boundaries of the field in which they are situated and in which they would like to gain acceptance or legitimacy. This is a critical point for Bourdieu who argues that habitus is more than a world-view, but that it is a manifestation of one's total history which affords a person agency in a field that is bound by social rules and structures. Clearly, this is the second angle that one can get at by using Bourdieu's work: accounting for one's personal biography and history and how that intersects with the field in terms of their work and world-view.

However, it is critical to stress that actors do not construct lines of action from their habitus in calculated ways, but instead that habitus functions as a sort of *practical*

logic for individuals. In the now-famous Chicago Workshop, Bourdieu discussed the intended purpose of the concept habitus:

...the main purpose of [habitus] is to break away with the intellectualist philosophy of action represented in particular by the theory of homo economicus as rational agent....It is to account for the actual logic of practice...*to have a logic without having logic as its principal* – I have put forth a theory of practice as the product of practical sense, of socially constituted “sense of the game”...I wanted initially to account for practice...by escaping both the objectivism of action understood as a mechanical reaction...and the subjectivism which portrays action as the deliberate pursuit of a conscious intention, the free project of a conscience positing its own ends and maximizing its utility through rational computation (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.120-1).

Thus, Bourdieu believes that one’s habitus offers a range of experience and knowledge that individuals draw from as they strategize to achieve legitimacy and position in their given field. Rather than being “the fate that some people read into it” (Bourdieu, 1992, p.133), habitus is an *open system of dispositions* that is constantly subjected to experiences, which makes habitus a system where learning and skill acquirement is possible. In other words, the formation of habitus is an on-going and interactive process (Bourdieu et al., 1992, p.126). As people live, interact, and observe, their habitus absorbs tacit lessons about social life, particularly in relation to the field in which they are located.

Habitus might best be conceptualized as a way in which actors can innovate, negotiate, or resist the conditions in which they are embedded. While the field structures the habitus by advancing lessons, norms, expectations, the “habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing one’s energy” (Bourdieu et al., 1992, p.127). The point at which an individual contributes to the constitution of a field is the point at which

individuals affect, even slightly the dynamics within that field. This can be understood by acknowledging that there are “conflicting interests between those who occupy institutional positions for conserving and reproducing the existing order in symbolic fields (i.e. academia) and those who contest that order by proposing new forms of symbolic capital” (as cited in Swartz, 1997, p.229). In some ways, this theorizing comes very close to Zucker’s (1991) NI ethnomethodological study, in which she shows that individuals can build up/maintain cultural institutions which impact and contradict larger organizational goals and directions.

In order to apply Bourdieu’s field-habitus framework, Jenkin’s suggests that three steps must be considered. He writes that “first the relationship of the field in question to the ‘field of power’ (politics) must be understood. The field of power is thus to be regarded as the dominant or preeminent field of any society; it is the source of the hierarchical power relations which structure all other fields” (p.86). In other words, to apply Bourdieu’s field concept to “higher education” requires a firm understanding of the relationship between ‘the field of power’ or the political/policy making field, society and the higher education field.

Secondly, in order to apply Bourdieu’s field concept, “one must construct a ‘social typology’ or map of the objective structure of the positions which make up the field, and the relationships between them in the competition for the field’s specific form of capital.” Taking Jenkin’s second suggestion requires that one understand how the field of higher education itself is structured and how universities in a field compete, and what sort of “stake” they are competing for. Here, there are several parallels one can draw between NI and Bourdieu’s theory. NI and Bourdieu both suggest that the field offers up

definitions or prescriptions for legitimacy and prestige; here, one can consider editorial and publishing boards, ranking groups, professional and disciplinary associations, and top ranking, already established organizations.

Finally, and this is the part, which is most applicable to getting at the university-faculty intersection, “the habituses of the agents within the field must be analyzed along with the trajectories or strategies which are produced in the interaction between habitus and the constraints and opportunities which are determined by the structure of the field.” This third criteria suggested by Jenkins is where one “bring[s] the actors” back in, as desired by Bourdieu. It is the level at which one is provoked to investigate how people act inside a given field while understanding that their actions are constrained by the field’s rules – a notion that reflects both the Marxian and Weberian influence on Bourdieu’s thinking.

Thus, using this field-habitus framework, it is evident that in faculty life, struggles abound. There are the discipline based struggles, the great epistemological debates that characterize social and educational departments and research (Bourdieu, 1984; 1988; 1997; Swartz, 1992; Erickson, 1986). However, probably most significant in the life of the faculty member is the struggle to attain the label of legitimacy for one’s own work. Of this, Bourdieu writes that “intellectual, artistic, or scientific stances...are strategies in a game where the stakes are the conquest of cultural legitimation or in other terms for the monopoly of the legitimate production, reproduction, and manipulation of symbolic goods and the correlative legitimating power” (as cited in Swartz, 1997, p.228).

This struggle, as depicted above, seems most relevant to a struggle between of tenured and non-tenured, tenure-track faculty. This is because as “new arrivals” to the field of higher education, tenure-track faculty members strive to be legitimized by the senior “established agents.” According to Swartz (1997), cultural and symbolic capital constitutes the stakes in the intellectual or academic field. Swartz writes:

intellectual fields are primarily arenas of struggle over who has the authority to define what are the legitimate forms of cultural production....Intellectuals stake out positions that are constituted oppositionally and reflect the unequal distribution of types of cultural and symbolic power involved in the struggle (p.226).

In the intellectual field, then, there are those who judge and those who are judged, the creators versus the curators of knowledge (see Swartz, p.226). When one faction of faculty is equipped with the power to judge the value and legitimacy of another’s work, the faculty who is judged becomes vulnerable and exposed. Consider for example, the position of the tenure-track faculty who writes “from the margins.” Not only is she subject to the politics of her tenured counterparts, but she becomes subject to *symbolic violence* in other ways. Of this, Bourdieu writes:

...one could go further and reintroduce into the model not only the political stance but also the works themselves, considered in their most visibly social properties, like their genre or their place of publication, in their topic as well as their form: thus, we see for instance, that the distribution of works according to their degree of conformity to academic norms corresponds to the distribution of their authors according to their possession of the specifically academic power (p. xviii).

However, Bourdieu encourages us to think more carefully about how nuanced the struggle can become. For instance, although tenured faculty might have a particular set of capital that is important inside a changing university (institutional know-how, networks, departmental and college level decision making), younger faculty might have

a form of capital that is more valuable to the field of higher education at large. Consider the findings from Bowen et al., (1986) and Schuster al., (2006) that both suggest that early career faculty seem to be more research oriented than their senior faculty peers. Power, the unequal distribution of power and the kinds of relationships that grow out of this inequity stand at the heart of Bourdieu's work and must be recognized.

Thus, while tenured and tenure-track faculty may be categorized as "the faculty," the kinds and the degree of power that each of these factions holds is strikingly unequal. While tenure-track faculty enter their faculty position with certain, although limited forms of capital (a degree, a body of knowledge, etc), at an organizational level, they lack well-developed social networks, understanding of the organizational culture, and they are subject to the rules, prerogatives, and disposition of tenured faculty. How a non-tenured faculty member of the faculty negotiates in the face of her senior, tenured counter part, according to Bourdieu has a great deal to do with her habitus (structural and organizational location, history, and experience).

Up until this point, habitus has been used to refer to the common sense assumption that people carry idiosyncratic, structurally and historically rooted stocks of knowledge and experience which they make use of as they go about navigating life. Mostly, it has been used to compare the differences in habitus that tenure and tenure-track faculty are likely to embody. However, habitus can and should be used as a much more powerful conceptual tool. The presentation that major conflict between faculty exists only or primarily on the basis of tenure status is too binary, particularly in light of Bourdieu's opposition to dualities. Thus, while uncovering the power inequities between faculty and university and amongst tenured and tenure-track faculty is important,

habitus also affords the opportunity to explore biography, history and experience in creative and flexible ways. For instance, previous research has shown the struggle for women and other minorities in academia, between different ideological and methodological camps, between older and younger academics (Bowen et al., 1986) and between teaching oriented and research oriented faculty (O'Meara, 2002) and between those who harbor different opinions regarding the scientific enterprise (Perorzoia, 2009).

Thus, Bourdieu's work is also helpful for considering what organizational change and sense-making might mean for others in academia, such as women, people of color, and/ or working-class academics. Bourdieu's own work on gender and habitus remained somewhat under-developed until late in his career; although, the Bourdieu-Wacquant interview (1992) suggests that gender was always an extraordinarily important concern for Bourdieu (p.134). Finally, in 2001, Bourdieu wrote explicitly about gender, habitus, and power in *Masculine Domination*, which he opens with the following quote:

being included, as a man or woman, [...] we have embodied the historical structures of the masculine order in the form of unconscious schemes of perception and appreciation (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 5).

In this book, Bourdieu deconstructs the "ahistorical" and "naturalized" dominant-dominated relationship between men and women. Bourdieu argues that the differences between men and women, although often attributed to biological conditions, are socially constructed differences built on myth and propelled through a symbolic violence exerted through critical "social institutions, such as the family, the church, the educational system and the state" (Bourdieu, 2001, p.34). Bourdieu's goal is to point out that the divisions between men and women are not natural, but instead they are divisions that serve social and economic institutions created by and held by men who seek to hold

onto their privileged position²⁶. For Bourdieu a critical understanding of social life demands the acknowledgement that the world and more specifically, “fields” have been categorized, named, and constructed according to the “male principle” (see Bourdieu, 2001, p.22-3).

The male principle, Bourdieu argues, pervades the speaking, doing, and thinking of society as it becomes *embodied domination*. “At the origin of culture understood as social order,” masculine domination anchors the human experience and view of the world. With regard to higher education, consider for example, the extent to which universities and colleges continue to operate by and exude male privilege (Goode and Bagilhole, 1998; Mason and Goulden, 2004; Park, 1995; Perna, 2001; Simpson and Cohen, 2004). For decades, higher education researchers have documented the “chilly climates” that women experience in higher education (Simpson and Cohen, 2004). Many of these studies have investigated the ways that the academy has “othered” women.

Gappa, Trice and Austin (2006) write about the need to rethink faculty work, lamenting that higher education, and academia, more specifically, is designed for an “ideal worker” (Gappa et al., 2006) that no longer exists. The ideal worker - a white middle-class male faculty member with a wife to manage the household affairs – no longer constitutes the majority of faculty, and yet, the structures, rules, and policies that govern faculty life are deeply inscribed with the ideal worker/masculine domination. In the context of change, such relations are especially important. The male principal

²⁶ Admittedly, this statement reflects a flavor of structural functionalism, but it is a functionalist theory held together only by the deep power inequities that Bourdieu sought to uncover, question, and critique. See Jenkins (1992) for a deeper discussion on the structural functionalist flavors that run throughout Bourdieu’s work.

dictates that women are predisposed to be better care takers; thus, women might be given or expected to deliver more service and/or teaching related work. At a moment, however, that the University is moving away from a teaching/service oriented mission, this might be troublesome for women.

Yet Bourdieu stresses how masculine domination operates at such an implicit level and argues that, in general, men and women are not actively, consciously working to uphold this dominant-dominated relationship. Instead, men's and women's participation is simply the way life is lived and that the violence associated with masculine domination, although real, is subtle and symbolic. In other words, masculine domination is the "way things are;" it is inscribed in the way that one views the world and her/his place in it. One's habitus, range of skills, schemes of perception are grounded in the wo/man dichotomy.

To further the attention that Bourdieu gives to one's historical and structural location in society and the habitus associated with this positionality requires a lens that is flexible and it must be a lens that allows one to see how multiple positions shape academic life, perspectives, and sense-making. Specifically, one must use a lens that accounts for the whole person. It is useful then to extend Bourdieu's work, especially the considerations provided in his work on gender, by fastening on some of the explicit tenets of critical race theory, especially Collin's (1986) work, in which she argues that one's multiple "statuses" or positions interlock and afford/dispose individuals to varied positions of power and sometimes marginality, at different intersections. Thus, Collins (1986) is also concerned the relational, like Bourdieu and she also believes that relations unfold at a very of intersections which can be studied. However, Collins (1986)

in a much more explicit fashion has written about how one can take agency from positions even when they are, by all objective measures, positions of marginality.

To this end, Collins suggests that the power to “self-define” is a critical form of agency and a possibility to articulate resistance. To this end, she writes that to define one’s self according to one’s own experiences, values, and motivations rather than to be defined is an act of resistance, “a direct, blatant insult delivered.” In terms of this study, it is important to understand, then, how faculty define themselves and how that plays into the ways that they construct their role in a changing university. Both Bourdieu and Collins ask that we remain mindful of where these definitions come from and how agency is built out of pre-existing categories taken, for example, from the field of higher education or the university in which faculty work – thus, pointing us back to the distribution of power in terms of who provides or how certain categories are provided as legitimate, plausible “roles.” However, Collins work seems to open up the possibility for counter stories or “counter” utilization of these pre-defined, plausible notions or roles – which of course, makes her work much more amenable to agency.

It is apparent, then, that Collins’ work parallels Bourdieu’s framework. However, Collins’ work seems to offer a more focused (or perhaps a less abstract?) lens for understanding the role that one’s *personal biography*, shaped as it is by one’s structural location, plays in terms of the organizational-individual intersection. In addition, Collins, more than Bourdieu, brings to light the power embedded in alternative ways of seeing and thinking. Collins leans on and advances DuBois’ double-consciousness to show how it affords opportunities for critical and creative resistance. While Bourdieu states that the habitus is an “open system” that allows one to absorb new lessons, skills, and

capital that can aide in one's mobilization, Collins finds strength in the lessons, skills, and capital that one learns by default of being who they are, as they are. To what extent such creativity and alternative kind of capital will be helpful for faculty striving to make sense of their new roles is unknown, but a question that begs exploring.

From a methodological stand-point, Collin's matrix of domination requires that one place personal experiences and perspectives at the heart of the analysis to show how one's multiple levels of experience and identity comes into play in everyday life; how personal biography functions as a lens through which faculty view the purposes of their work and how it provides a habitus for action, reaction, and engagement with the field of higher education, faculty colleagues and especially the university in which they work. Looking into faculty's personal, professional, and academic histories to better understand the forms of capital and privilege that they bring with them to the university for their professional life will help to situate faculty both inside and outside the field of higher education.

3.4 Why these frameworks?

The question must be asked: why have I selected these frameworks to help me think about and sketch out a plan for my study? The answer spans both academic and professional reasons. From an academic stand point, NI helps me nest the university and faculty members in a field; infusing NI with a shot of academic capitalism gives sharper character to this field setting and accounts for why most scholars believe that Universities are seeking research and prestige at an increased rate. Bourdieu and Collins force a critical look at processes of institutionalization, change, and agency inside this setting at an individual level.

On a personal level, however, the drawing out of my entire research study and my larger research agenda, at large, reflects my innate interest in understanding how Universities and faculty members intersect, and what these intersections can tell us about faculty work. To this end, it has always been my view, perhaps naively, that faculty members approach their work with a particular sense of hope for how their work will unfold, about the public purpose that their work has the potential to serve. Surely, this has much to do with the idea that “going to college” resembled the promise of a better life for me and to my family. I recall very clearly the importance that my parents gave to the educational endeavor and especially to the notion that their daughter would someday go to college and be able to make a better life because of it.

Thus, from the time I was very young, my vision of higher education centered around the promise of a public good intended to make all of our lives better. It was understood that whatever benefits I drew from my education, I would give back. These principles are central to how I think about higher education, they are embedded in my vision of what a University is intended to do. In Bourdieu’s language, this is part of my habitus and as a scholar, but more importantly, as a global citizen, I hope that I can carve out a space to do the kinds of work that I believe have the potential to make a contribution, whether this is offering my skills for service, mentoring younger students who come to higher education with hopes like my own, or asking difficult questions that force an opening up of status quo theories, perspectives, or understandings.

I have now spent several years in the education system. After graduating high school, I attended a small state university in northern New Mexico where teaching and service ran through the university’s blood. In fact, I never knew the complexities and

tensions within faculty work. My experience, however, at a larger university struggling to redefine its mission from a teaching dominant to a research dominant one has been revealing, perplexing, and to some extent alarming. My own observations and previous research show that the tensions embedded in this transition, especially at the faculty level, are profound, ubiquitous and always rooted in power and politics. Therefore, studying this problem is especially important to me because I believe that faculty work and the experience of faculty at work is indicative of the role that our universities play in the lives of students like me.

Whether South West's transition is "right or wrong" can easily slip into a sort of moralistic polemic, which I often heard over the last few years as I learned about SWU's transition. It should be made clear that stagnation in our universities is neither acceptable nor desirable, and I do not aim to make this sort of argument. Researchers in American universities have produced positive, groundbreaking solutions to critical, large scale social problems, and one would be a fool to deny this. However, as noted throughout the literature review, today's research endeavor is highly intertwined with market influences, prestige and rankings fever, and some argue that it has transformed higher education as a public good to an academic capitalistic learning regime (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2005). Thus, when universities break away from their teaching and service missions to embark on this sort of change, serious implications for the kind of work that faculty do and the kind of audiences that they are accountable to must be considered. The way that faculty approach and make sense of this situation will be the heart of university work for the next several decades. Thus, university change must be taken with precaution, reflection, and perhaps, not before some serious institutional soul

searching. It is my hope that my work informs this discussion, not only, but especially at South West.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1 An Interpretive Work

This study, in its ultimate form, is intended as a story about what organizational change looks like and means *in* the life and *to* the life of faculty members. The faculty members who responded to the open-ended survey questions, who participated in lengthy interviews, and who responded to follow up questions asked over email, phone, or in person, are the central instruments used to render this story. Thus, it is the “immediate and local meanings...from the actor’s point of view” (Erickson, 1986, p.119) that matter most in this story. Given these leanings, this study can be placed in the interpretive family of research approaches which means that there is a “central research interest in human meaning in social life” (p. 11).

My work is heavily influenced by a number of scholars who have written about the purpose of social research, the nature of knowledge and reality, and of course, methodology. Already I have mentioned Erickson (1986) by placing my study in the interpretive research family. As an interpretive work, I am most interested in understanding the meaning that faculty members ascribe to the change that they face as the university in which they work strives for a new kind of mission. This means the use of theory had to be tempered to avoid “fitting” my data to previous theoretical perspectives (Glaser et al., 1967) and allowing insights and understandings to emerge from the perspective of the study participants themselves.

Tempering and pacing my use of theory for this study prior to design, and especially, during analysis are methodologists like Glaser and Strauss (1967) who

advocate for researchers to build theory from their inquiries rather than revise or test someone else's original thinking, and yet, mine is not a grounded theory in the traditional sense. Literature reviews and theories did play an orienting role in the formation of this project, particularly in the conceptualization phase. However, the influence of Glaser and Strauss (1967) urged me to be patient during the data collection and analytical process, and ultimately, their writing kept me from being married to the theoretical lines that first helped me to think about this problem. Their writing allowed me to remain confident as surprises and unexpected patterns emerged from the data (see pp. 45-50). Only when the data collection process came to a close did patterns, ideas, and actions become clearer, stronger, or more numerous and it was at this point that I began to visit various theoretical lines to interrogate the data in a more purposeful, but not forceful way.

4.2 Epistemology and Mixed Methods Research

While this is an interpretive work, it draws from various data collection strategies. As a mixed methods study, it is critical to tend carefully to ontological, epistemological, and methodological issues in order to present a research that makes sense internally. It is true that some highly respected scholars are outright skeptical about the mixing of methodologies (see Erickson, 1986). Such critics argue that, at base, a researcher cannot approach a study from the divergent assumptions implicit to different data collection strategies.

Others, such as Creswell (2008) explain and advocate for mixed methodologies, even with interpretive work. Creswell (2008) writes that mixed method research “involves the use of both [qualitative and quantitative] approaches in tandem so that the

overall strength of a study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research [alone]" (p. 4). Mixed methods studies are often drawn from what Creswell refers to as a "pragmatic perspective." Pragmatists are beyond the classical ontological debate and "believe that an external world [exists] independent of the mind as well as [one that is] lodged in the mind" (p. 11). This means that researchers, of the pragmatic persuasion, situate individuals and the subjective meaning they give to their experience and views inside a larger, objective reality. The subjective meaning (the world inside one's mind) must be connected to the larger social realm; this is the interest of the pragmatic researcher.

As a pragmatic interpretive researcher, I pose a variety of questions intended to help me understand faculty work, sense-making, and organizational change. To contextualize the university, the faculty, and their working conditions, I use descriptive statistics collected via an on-line survey. For instance, I describe the professoriate by academic, professional, and personal background and I use the survey to explore faculty work time allocation and faculty expectations about their work.

The kinds of data mentioned above, again, are used primarily to contextualize the study, and to give some sense to the rich set of interview data and open-ended responses collected via the survey. For example, through several open ended questions on the survey, I asked faculty to explain if and how their work habits have changed, and if so, to explain why they have made these changes. I also asked faculty to describe personal opinions about the shifting orientation at South West and whether or not they had any general or specific concerns about the change as it relates to their own work. I asked faculty to specify if the aspirations of the University impact their ability to achieve

any of the missions or goals that they have for their work as professors and to elaborate either way.

The most important function of the survey data was to develop a better understanding of faculty perspectives and opinions prior to my entering the field and carrying out in-depth interviews. The survey data gave form to the interview questions and alerted me to potential lines of inquiry. The interviews as well as the open-ended survey data are certainly the heart of this analysis. It is through the interviews and other qualitative responses that I came to a better understanding of what faculty's work means to them at this moment in time. It is only through interviews that I could witness the emotion (Neumann, 2009) with which faculty members talk about their work. Only during the interviews, was I able to see faculty literally making sense of the University's changing aspirations, using one piece of "organizational messaging" (Gonzales and Pacheco, forthcoming) and then another to rationalize or sometimes legitimize their work, their role, or sometimes the shift, itself. In the next section, I describe my research design and the multiple data collection strategies and sources.

4.3 Research Design and Data Collection Strategies

This study was guided by a concurrent embedded data collection strategy (Creswell, 2008), which means that quantitative and qualitative forms of data were collected and analyzed simultaneously. However, the qualitative data sources get at the heart of this project, and thus receive priority (Creswell, 2008) in my analysis. In the following section, I describe the purpose of the on-line survey which was used to gather both quantitative and qualitative forms of data. Thereafter, I describe the interview process and document review processes.

4.3a On-Line Survey

To establish an understanding of the faculty members who work at South West University, an on-line survey was sent to all ladder rank tenured and tenure-track faculty members at the University. The survey was modeled after the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (NSOPF, hereafter) survey (version 1999 and 2004). The NSOPF was designed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and was first administered in 1984. Since then, it has been administered a number of times to thousands of faculty members across the U.S. Each time Carnegie has administered the survey, they have changed items and sequencing. The various instruments are usually referred to as “versions.” In general, all NSOPF versions contain questions intended to gauge faculty work time allocation, faculty job satisfaction, and faculty rewards.

For my study, I modified NSOPF versions 1999 and 2004 surveys by combining them, removing several items, and adding others (to see final survey, contact author). Because I revised the original NSOPF surveys extensively, I subjected my final survey instrument to a series of pilot testing (Schutt, 2004, p.241) to ensure instrument readability and validity. The piloting process is described below.

The pre-testing of my survey consisted of three specific stages. After designing an initial survey instrument, I asked a panel of experts to review and complete the survey and then to offer detailed feedback on the questions regarding sequence, word choice, and general readability. The panel of experts received the survey via e-mail just as the faculty participants would.²⁷ In total, my panel of experts included six individuals:

²⁷ One member on my panel completed the survey by paper and pencil.

two education researchers, one of which has several years experience in questionnaire design, a political scientist, who is very familiar with mixed methodology and survey research, a sociologist, with extensive mixed methods experience, a psychologist, and one fellow student colleague. The composition of my panel follows the suggestions offered by Peterson (2000).

I asked the panel participants to provide feedback or general reactions to the questions on spaces allotted in the on-line survey. When the panel of experts had completed the survey, I reviewed each expert's feedback and modified the survey where I felt the comments and suggestions were most appropriate.

At phase 2, I then reviewed each question with a professor of higher education (my mentor and dissertation advisor) to ensure readability and sequencing. He posed questions to me from the survey to ensure that they were clear and oriented towards the ultimate ends of my study: to understand faculty sense-making of South West's change.

Finally, for phase 3, I re-sent the survey to a student colleague who completed the survey on-line for final review. This final review was intended to ensure functionality and readability of the final instrument. No glitches were revealed in this final pilot phase. Following this final review, I sent all relevant materials to the Institutional Review Board at South West. Once I received approval from the Institutional Review Board at South West, the survey was sent out to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members at South West University via Survey Monkey, an on-line survey service. The final survey included five major sections and consisted of a mix of 37 close and open-ended questions.

Because the survey was delivered via Survey Monkey, it was imperative to obtain current e-mails for all potential faculty respondents. This contact information was

provided by the Information and Technology Offices at the University and supported by the Center for Institutional Evaluation, Research, and Planning. In total, the Information and Technology Office provided 440 e-mail addresses for tenure-line faculty members. The faculty participants came from six different colleges which include: Business, Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, Science, and a School of Health Science and Nursing.²⁸

I did not include professors with appointments, such as “lecturer;” “visiting professor;” or “adjunct” because they are not evaluated according to the Tenure and Promotion policy in the same ways that tenure-line faculty are evaluated. Thus, the university does not impose “work expectations” on these faculty in the same way that it does for tenured or tenure-track faculty who are subject to periodic peer review and judgment. I also excluded graduate students who serve as Teaching and/or Research assistants for similar reasons.

The surveys were launched at the very end of September and faculty were given three weeks to complete the survey (See Appendix A for Survey Invite). Reminders for non-respondents were set up at the launching of the survey. Those faculty members who failed to respond after one week received an e-mail reminder, and for those who had not completed the survey during the second week, a final e-mail reminder was sent two days before closing the survey. In hopes of retaining a larger sample size, the deadline for participation was extended by a few days. In total, 180 faculty members

²⁸ Although South West also has a College of Nursing, I have excluded these faculty from the sample because they are formally organized into two distinct tiers: clinical and research. This formal organization has obvious implications for the kind of work that each tier of faculty is expected to do.

out of 439²⁹ potential respondents answered the survey for a 41% response rate.

However, of these 180 respondents, a smaller portion completed the survey in its entirety for a final N of 140 or 32% rate. The survey include five major sections. These sections are described below.

The first section, Academic and Professional Background asked faculty to name the institution where they received their highest degree, faculty's primary discipline or field of study, any professional positions held outside academia. These questions bear out issues that other researchers have identified as important when studying faculty work and experience. Recall that Rosch et al., (1996) suggest that one's graduate experience can act as an important reference point for faculty members. I also asked faculty to indicate their discipline or primary field of study because in the literature there is evidence of deep cultural differences amongst disciplines (Becher, 1995; 1996; Clark, 1989).

The second section, Work at South West, asked faculty members to describe their experience at South West in very general terms. For example, faculty were asked how long they had been at the institution, if they were tenured at the institution, and if so, what year they were granted tenure. In this section, faculty members were also asked to describe their work load. For instance, faculty were asked how many sections per semester they taught in the 2008-2009 year, about how many students were in those sections, and what levels they typically teach (undergraduate vs. graduate). The questions in this section were intended to help me paint a contextual picture of faculty working conditions at South West University. This is an important step in studying

²⁹ One of the email addresses "bounced back" as undeliverable.

change as other researchers have shown that a lagging infrastructure are key barriers to successful change, and more specifically, to mission transformation in universities (Grbich, 1998; Meyer et al., 1977; Wright, 2004).

The third section on the survey, Scholarly Activity, asked faculty to describe the expectations of their work when they were hired at South West. In a follow up question, faculty were asked to describe their work time activity in the previous year (2008-2009) and then to comparatively note how they would most prefer to spend their work time activity amongst the areas of teaching, researching, service, and fund procurement (grant writing and administration). It was in this section that I asked faculty if their work habits had changed in the last few years and if so, to describe those changes in qualitative form. Faculty members were then asked whether or not the adjustments to their work habits were due to South West's aspirations to become a more research focused university.

In the fourth section, faculty members were asked to give their opinions on South West's transition. Here, faculty were explicitly asked if the expectations of their work have changed because of South West's desire to be a more research focused university. As a follow up, faculty were asked to discuss if South West's decision to be a more research focused university affects their ability to achieve any of the goals that they had hoped to achieve as a faculty members. If so, I asked faculty to explain how they manage their own goals and/or hopes for their work and the university's new mission. Posed as an open-ended question, faculty members were given the latitude to explain in their own words how their goals coincided, conflicted, or otherwise intersected with the University's aspirations. Faculty were then asked if they believed they would be

successful (earn tenure, promotion, etc) under the auspices of the University's changing mission. Finally, faculty members were given the opportunity to express any specific or general concerns regarding SWU's transition.

In the final section of the survey, faculty were asked to give some basic demographic data. For instance, faculty were asked to describe their age, their racial/ethnic background, their gender, and whether or not they were first generation college goers. These questions were intended to not only paint a more detailed picture about South West's faculty, but previous research (noted in Chapters 3 and 4) has shown that between and among such groups of faculty members, there are issues that need to be explored. For instance, female and other minority faculty members are often assigned to or asked to participate in more service related tasks (Baez, 2000; Park, 1995; Sotello Viernes Turner, 2002), and as a result, the other tenets of their work suffer or their experience becomes acutely stressful and burdensome.

The final question asked faculty if they would be willing to participate in an audio-recorded interview with me to discuss the survey questions more specifically. Out of the 140 participants who completed the entire survey, 66 indicated that they would be willing to meet with me to discuss the topic in more detail. Following a three and half week period, the survey was closed on November 1st, 2009.

To analyze faculty survey responses to the close-ended survey items³⁰, I transferred the raw data set from Survey Monkey into an Excel spread sheet. This spreadsheet was then transported into SPSS 15. Once the data set was imported into SPSS, I named and coded the data. For instance, question one asks faculty to "name

³⁰ For a copy of the final survey, please email the author.

the institution where [s/he] received [her/his] highest degree.” Faculty answers were coded by using the 2005 Carnegie Classification for Higher Education schema. Thus, if faculty indicated that they received their highest degree from University of Florida, I simply did a search for University of Florida and then coded the response accordingly. I also recoded data for question number three. For this question, I asked faculty to name their primary field of study or discipline. Answers were recoded to be fit into the traditional disciplines and fields, which include Business, Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, Sciences, and Other. Thus, for a faculty member who described his primary field of study as “teacher education,” his answer was then coded as Education. I then created a new variable based on faculty responses to question three in order to place each faculty member into one of Southwest’s colleges. Creating this new variable took an extensive amount of time because often faculty named a primary discipline of field of study that could signal placement in more than one college. In fact, to create this new variable, I used faculty responses for question three as well as South West’s on-line faculty directory. While I could have simply asked faculty members to identify what college they work in rather than create a new variable, I wanted to be sensitive to the fact that faculty members may not want to identify their specific college given the sensitive nature of this study, especially for tenure-track faculty members.

After the data was imported into SPSS and coded appropriately, I ran descriptive statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics, in general, include frequencies, modes, medians, and averages as well as range. For the purposes of this study, however, frequencies are most relevant. Cross-tabulations were run for a few variables. For

instance, I ran cross-tabulations to locate tenured and tenure track faculty by gender and college as I attempted to design a well-balanced interviewee sample.

I then began to review the open-ended responses to gain a general sense of the data (Creswell, 2008). I outlined some preliminary ideas and insights, which can be reviewed in Appendix J. I proceeded to “cut” the open-ended data by tenure status and gender to see if there were any general patterns of differences unique to these different groups, as the literatures indicate. I found no significant differences among men and women in the survey data, but field of study and tenure status both emerged as a potentially important angles to inspect. This preliminary analysis of the open-ended survey data aided in the development of interview questions as well as the development of my interview pool, which are discussed below.

4.3b Interviews

In-depth interviews were conducted with a sub-set of faculty survey respondents. Faculty who indicated a willingness to be interviewed (N=66) were selected on the basis of four criteria: tenure status, college, and gender. In a less strategic way, I attempted to interview an even balance of white and Latino faculty members since these two groups make up the vast majority of South West faculty and because as mentioned earlier, previous historical, theoretical, and empirical works have shown that gaps in work satisfaction and experience exist between and amongst certain groups of faculty, including white and minority faculty. Selecting interviewees on these criteria is based on the review of literature, but more importantly on important, interesting, or surprising lines of inquiry that emerged from the survey data analysis.

To draw participants from each of these groups, the pool of potential 66 interviewees was divided into 3 colleges (Education, Liberal Arts, and Science), gender (Female/Male) and tenure status (tenured/non-tenured). From each of these subgroups, participants were randomly selected from a list and then contacted for interviews. It is important to note, however, that the potential pool for interviewees across the subgroups was uneven. For example, many more women in Liberal Arts indicated a willingness to be interviewed than in any other college. In the College of Education, only one tenured woman indicated that she was willing to interview. In the College of Science, the number of willing participants was rather low, with only 9 faculty members indicating a willingness to be interviewed.

With these sampling considerations undertaken, I e-mailed faculty members (see Appendix for e-mail and letter invite) and asked them to participate in a follow-up interview. I began by e-mailing tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College of Education. Initially, I asked 10 faculty members from the College of Education to participate in an interview (4 tenured; 6 tenure-track and 6 men; 4 women). Of these potential interviewees, 9 agreed to be interviewed. Of these 9 interviewees, 5 were men and 4 were women while 3 were tenured and 6 were tenure-track. The interviews with the College of Education faculty members took place in late November to late December.

I then moved on to invite and interview tenured and tenure-track faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts. I began by inviting 17 faculty members from this college to be interviewed. I wound up interviewing 12 faculty members from this College. There

were 6 tenured and 6 tenure-track and 5 women and 7 men across sub-groups. These interviews took place from mid-December to mid-January.

Finally, in the College of Science, I invited 7 faculty members to be interviewed. These 7 faculty members were the only survey respondents from the College of Science who indicated that they would be willing to be interviewed. Of these 7 interviewees, 4 responded to the interview invite; 3 tenured and 1 tenure-track; 2 women and 2 men. These interviews began at the end of January and were concluded by mid-February. Interviewees are introduced in the chapter six.

All interviews were recorded. Most of the time, I used two machines to record the interview. However, at times, the room did not accommodate two machines (one of which was electrical) and so I used a mini-tape recorder in such cases. In general, the interviews took about one hour, but several took at least 1.5 hours and 2 took about 3-3.5 hours. Interviewees were most generous with their time and genuinely displayed an interest and strong support for the research project. Most, if not all, asked me about the final intentions of the project. Many encouraged me to share it with University administrators and several noted the need for such an important undertaking. I am grateful, still, for their support and time.

The interviews were conducted in a variety of places. Most professors wanted to meet in their offices although library studies, coffee shops, and my own office served as interview spots. Each interviewee was presented with 2 consent forms at the beginning of the interview. Interviewees kept one consent form that I had signed. At the bottom of the consent form, I asked interviewees to indicate whether or not they would like to receive a copy of their transcript, an executive summary of my analysis, and/or if they

would be interested in participating in “member’s check” at any time during the analytical period. Several faculty requested an executive summary and 8 said they would be willing to participate in a “member’s check” (Creswell, 2008).

The interview process was a dynamic, complex, labor and time intensive experience. As major ideas and patterns emerged from the data, I revised the questions that I used with the faculty interviewees. Stake (1995) warns that in “qualitative research projects, issues grow, emerge and die” (p. 21); he urges the researcher to be flexible and confident in this process and advocates for the “progressive focusing of questions” (p. 21). Thus, it was important to be patient with the study and to allow questions and issues to emerge from the data. By mid-point of my interviews, it became clear as to which questions were most relevant to South West faculty and which questions would allow me to tell this story of faculty roles and sense-making amid SWU’s transition (see appendices to review the evolution of my questioning guide).

Although each interview process was quite unique, there was a general framework consisting of 3 parts that I attempted to follow as we moved through questions. I always began by asking faculty to talk to me about their background. I asked them to share with me how they “ended up” in the professoriate and then asked them to offer a few key words about “what drives” their work. These questions were very broad, intended to open up the opportunity for exploration, interesting storytelling on the part of the participant, and for setting the tone of a comfortable dialogue rather than a formal, stiff interview (Spradley, 1996).

After asking the professor to self-reflect on his/her entrée to the field, the interviews became more specific. I asked them to explain in more specific terms what

they thought their work as a professor would be like before entering academia and then to give me a general comparison as to how it has unfolded. I asked the professor to describe how and why they ended up working at South West University and what they understood the expectations of their work to be when they arrived. I often asked them to talk in general terms about their teaching, research, and service experience at South West.

The third transition was mostly about the organizational movement at South West. Most of the time, I offered a cue such as "...and how did you learn about South West's aspirations (sometimes called goal or objective) to be a more research focused University? And what does [Tier One] mean to you?" The aim here was to uncover how faculty most often learned about the University's intentions to move up the academic ladder. In addition, however, I wanted faculty to self-define what "the transition to Tier One" means to them as individual faculty members and to the University, more generally. Faculty members were asked if they were excited about this movement, if they had any concerns, worries, or fears³¹ related to the shift. They were asked to give an opinion on the shift. For instance, I asked many faculty, "do you think this is a good thing?" or "do you agree with this shift?" Probes unique to their answers always followed. I then asked faculty how they fit themselves and their work into the University given the shift in focus. Throughout this third phase of questions, faculty did not require much provocation. They spoke freely and swiftly. It seemed that most faculty members

³¹ The questions regarding excitement, fear, and/or worries grew out of the interview process. Early on, faculty members talked about how this transition really makes them "worry;" others expressed sadness and one compared it to the process of "mourning" where one's work is no longer what the university is looking for. Another faculty member, at mid-point of the interviews, suggested that I ask faculty about the "fear of change." I am grateful for all of my interviewees' candidness and eagerness to help me. The implementation of these questions proved quite fruitful.

had a well-developed opinion about the transition or were anxious for the opportunity to explore their thoughts aloud. I concluded most interviews by posing a hypothetical question (Spradley, 1996) of some sort. Most often, I asked some faculty to describe what they would tell a potential faculty hire about the University and the role that they should expect to play at South West in order to be successful (earn tenure and promotion).

Before ending the interview, I always asked faculty members if they had any comments, questions, or suggestions to improve the project or my list of questions. A few faculty members suggested University documents for review. Out of 26 interviewees, more than 20 asked me what I intended to do with the results and if I planned to work with administration on these issues. Almost all faculty members asked if I was finding perspectives and experiences similar to their own. On these occasions, I shared with faculty some general, preliminary analytical points. For instance, I often shared with faculty members that the definition or understanding of “Tier One” was very divergent amongst faculty members, and that few individuals, actually referenced the state legislation that defines “Tier One” for South West.

As is customary in most data collection techniques carried out in the field, each interview was followed by a period of note taking and reflection. After each interview, I asked myself a set of questions (see appendix). These questions were intended to provoke vivid details about the setting in which the interview took place, the tone of the interview, and insights, surprises, or common ideas, sayings, or actions that the participant may have offered. I specifically asked myself “did I hear or see anything in this interview that reminded me of other interviews?” I also asked myself “were you

surprised by anything in this interviewee's conversation?" Note taking is not only important to capture small, ephemeral details that are difficult to reconstruct after such labor intensive and extended data collection periods, but note-taking is also a strategy that enhances the validity of interpretive work because they can be used as a source of triangulation (Creswell, 2008). For instance, researchers can go back to field notes to compare initial thoughts and insights to the analyses that emerge later on.

Moreover, the researcher makes a concerted effort to be reflexive about the interview experience, to set aside hunches, or judgments and to draw directly from what she has just learned from the interviewee during note taking. To this end, after interviews, I asked myself "How do my own views or background influence the sense that I am making of this interview experience? Did I find his/her assessments or view points difficult to understand or agree with? What personal judgments did I make? How might they narrow my vision in some way?" Setting aside this time to be reflexive forced me to account for my own biases and view of the world (Creswell, 2008).

Interviews were transcribed verbatim by me as well as a hired transcriber. This transcriber signed a confidentiality contract and transcribed 18 of the 26 interviews.³² The hired transcriber was provided with a brand-new USB on which she saved the transcribed documents. I met with the transcriber every other week to exchange tapes and to download new transcriptions into my computer as well as an additional, external hard drive at my home. All audio recordings remain in my home office. In the following section, I describe the analytical process employed for all qualitative forms data,

³² I am extremely grateful to the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence and the El Paso Center for Research on Educational Reform for awarding me monies that allowed me to hire the transcriber. Without these monies, this work would have taken many, many more months.

including open-ended comments from the survey, interview data, and organizational documents.

Because the amount of the data collected for this study is rather large, I used NVivo 8 to help me organize and store all open-ended or qualitative data. At first, I imported all data into one database. I did not organize the data according to any variables, but instead looked at the database from a more global perspective. At this point, my intention was to become more familiar with the data set as a whole (Creswell, 2008).

Then, in a new data base, I began to organize my data more systematically. For instance, I coded the responses for each open-ended survey question by tenure-status/gender. To do this, I imported open-ended survey data for a total of 5 questions and categorized each as a “case.” These cases were organized into domains according to tenure-status *and* gender. This resulted in 20 documents or cases being uploaded into NVivo, categorized as either: Tenure-Track Male; Tenure-Track Female; Tenured Male; Tenured Female.

I then imported each interview transcript (N=26) and organized them according to college, gender and tenure-status. One set of field notes per interview (N=26) was also uploaded into NVivo and categorized according to the same three variables. In total, I uploaded 72 documents (transcripts, field-notes, and survey cases).

As mentioned earlier, my analytical approach was highly influenced by Mills (1967) and Glaser and Strauss (1967) as well as Creswell (2008). Mills (1967) reminded me to move across complex levels of society and individual, which are typically studied in isolation, leaving us with an incomplete, and typically uncritical, understanding of

complex social matter. As Mills (1967) notes it is too easy to fail to connect one's "private troubles" to larger "public issues" when one studies and analyzes from a static position. Glaser and Strauss (1967) reminded me of the rich potential that exists for data that is not tightly wound to preconceived frameworks or theories. Their writing encouraged me to be creative and comfortable with the surprises that emerged from the data.

On the more practical end, Creswell (2008) lists a number of steps that qualitative researchers should take to make more reliable their analytical processes. The first step is to check all transcripts (which were transcribed verbatim) for any obvious mistakes. The second step outlined by Creswell is to ensure that the codes which are used to eventually bundle ideas, actions, inactions, emotions, and other issues into themes are well defined and that they do not "drift." Drift occurs when codes and themes are not well defined, and thus, the nuances and differences amongst data are lost. To ensure against drift, Creswell recommends that the qualitative researcher define codes as she constructs them. The final definitions for major themes and categories can be found in the Audit Trail in appendix.

My first hand at analysis took place in fall 2008 when I reviewed the open-ended survey comments to help me develop a list of interview questions. In this process, I looked across my open and close ended survey data to construct a list of issues and questions that seemed meaningful. For instance, in the survey, many faculty noted that they have made changes to their work time allocation in the last few years. About 2/3 of those respondents indicated SWU's transition was a factor in the changes in their behavior. Thus, this is an example, of some of the issues and questions that I later

asked about in the interviews. This initial coding session was really intended to help me figure out what I needed to ask before entering the field.

My second coding session took place in the latter part of 2008. By this time, I had completed many of my interviews. Thus, I looked most primarily at my interview data to identify common or surprising actions, expressions, and/or perspectives. I also looked for insights, categories or actions that seemed to align with the literature on organizational change and faculty work. I defined these categories by first describing with my own words what the code meant. I worked to set limits on the meaning of each code to draw distinctions between those that might be closely related. To further define each code, I proceeded to pull quotes or key words from the respondent's comments and/or transcripts. I then returned to the survey data to check for links or commonalities that would allow me to triangulate the emerging insights.

A third round of data analysis began as I uploaded my data into NVivo 8 in January 2010. This was the first time I coded my data in NVivo 8. This third coding process resulted in almost one-hundred coded ideas, each of which was defined by key words, phrases, and actions taken from interview, survey, or field note data sources. I coded by looking again for frequency of ideas, expressions, or actions, patterns of surprising or interesting comments, that either confirmed or disconfirmed what previous scholars have had to say about faculty life, organizational change, or higher education, in general. I also looked back at the previous categories and insights from my first two initial coding sessions to see if they still "held." If they did, I began to add additional evidence or notes for them. If not, I typed these ideas and insights on another word

document where I have outlined a number of future research questions and topics for further discussion.

After this “free coding” phase, which lasted about one month, I re-read a “clean” or un-coded version of my data in February 2010. At this point, I began to think about the various lines that could be drawn from my data. In other words, like in most cases, where the data set is large and deals with complex phenomena involving multiple levels –in this case, faculty members, their university, and the field of higher education – several stories emerge from the data. One story dealt more directly with the ways in which South West University had gone about this organizational change process. Several themes emerged from the data that pointed to a poorly, rather undemocratic, and top-down approach to change.

Yet, the questions that first inspired my study were intended to respond to questions regarding the intersection of faculty and university. To help me return to these issues, I began to interrogate the data more carefully and purposefully. Because, ultimately, I was concerned about faculty sense-making, interpretation, and action taking, I consulted the work of Karl Weick (2009) who outlines an analytical strategy for researchers who wish to study sense-making in complex social and organizational settings. Weick’s outline of sense-making is not a theory, but a step-by-step process in which he describes how he and colleagues have studied sense-making by individuals who work in hurried “impermanent” organizations.

With much affinity to early phenomenology (Berger et al, 1967), Weick suggests that the researcher must first bracket his or her own assumptions and then look at the ways in which the actors being studied draw information from multiple sources. Sources

might include personal, professional experience, knowledge, formal and informal conversations, mundane interactions, and identity. He describes how an actor is consistently receiving/drawing streams of information from multiple sources, which implies a chaotic environment for actors. Weick notes that actors must organize these streams of information to make sense of situations, conflicts, and surprising situations.

Weick notes that, ultimately, the actor decides what courses of action are plausible and sensible after organizing information. Weick (2009) presses that sense-making is not a rational, calculated process, but one that emerges through dynamic exchange. He also notes that it is best understood through reflective retrospection. Using Weick's outline provided a sharper and very practical approach to looking at my data again.

First, I asked myself to describe the environment in which faculty members carried out their work. It was important to paint this picture in that I found that the discourse used by leaders to describe the change included multiple messages, ambiguous understandings, and "open-ended" language. These messages seemed to play an important part of faculty sense-making in two distinct ways – either faculty listened closely to the messages and sought to carry out those messages or faculty rebuked, laughed at, or actively sought to undermine the organizational messages.

I asked, given South West's aspirations and the flux which faculty members are embedded, what are faculty's interpretations of South West's change? How do they understand it? How do they define it? In most of the interviews, I purposely asked this or some sort of similar question. In others, faculty described what it means to them without being asked the question. Such comments were extremely helpful, as they gave form to

how faculty members have made sense-of what this change means to them and to their work.

As I began to understand the interpretations and definitions that faculty have ascribed to this transitional process, I also began to see the kinds of information that they were using to make sense. In other words, I learned about the sources of information that faculty used to make sense. Based on such sense-making, faculty made decisions about their work and employed them to make a space for themselves and their work.

Then, finally, I looked across all data sources (both coded and un-coded) to understand the kinds of actions that faculty members are taking to navigate SWU's transition. Here, I sought to understand how do faculty members go about their work in light of this transition? How are they reacting to this transition? These questions helped me understand the kinds of roles that faculty members are (re)constructing in light of SWU's proposed transition.

4.3c Document Sources

Creswell (2008) notes that multiple forms of data strengthen the validity of qualitative work as the various sources can be used to “check” other forms. Thus, in addition to survey and interview data, I also collected a number of university documents.³³ These documents allowed me to develop a more historical perspective on the evolution of South West as a university and also to understand at a technical level how the discussion of change was first instigated and what it means to faculty members at South West – at least from an organizational stand point. These documents ranged

³³ These documents are not provided in the appendices in the interest of protecting the University.

from University newspaper clippings, to Presidential Convocation speeches, to job postings that emphasized the University's plans to climb the ladder. I also used some field notes that I took during University meetings over the last few years in which "Tier One" was discussed.

In addition, I reviewed the legislation, as adopted and approved by voters in the State of Texas, which define the benchmarks for Universities, like SWU, who aim to attain a research focused status and access "Tier One" monies. In addition to the legislation, I reviewed interviews offered by the sponsoring legislators where they aimed to explain and justify the bill.

Some of the most important documents that I reviewed included an evaluative report generated by an external advisory group. This advisory group visited the South West campus as well as other "emerging Tier One" campuses in the state of Texas in 2004. The group completed a university wide assessment and then proceeded to provide recommendations to the University and the University system. The University as well as the larger system each offered a response to the evaluative report. These documents were critical to establishing a clearer sense of the strengths and constraints unique to South West's "Tier One" journey.

Interestingly, faculty alluded to one or many of these documents or other pieces of the official university discourse as they described this change (especially, the evaluative report). The interpretations they drew from such data sources often diverged – from the official University position as well as from one another. Many of the documents that I reviewed are used to describe the setting, South West, in the next chapter.

4.4 Validity of the Study

Although this is a mixed method study, the analysis is foregrounded in the qualitative data. Thus, as a predominantly qualitative work, this study is not validated or checked for reliability in the same way that quantitative studies are. However, I have followed Creswell's (2008) suggestion for presenting as transparent and dependable a qualitative study as possible. In short, I have attempted to provide as much information as possible to help others study this matter and to help them understand the limitations of my own work, which include the extremely important influence of context in a study like this. To this end, I have also provided an audit trail to demonstrate the specific pieces of evidence that were used to help me determine and delimit my major analytical themes and categories (see appendix).

As has been noted throughout this chapter, several steps were taken following Creswell's (2008) advice to secure the validity of this study. These steps included my checking of all transcripts to ensure against major mistakes or errors prior to coding. When the coding process commenced in fall 2009, I described each code that I constructed with my own words and then proceeded to delimit the code, taking care to make distinctions between similar and/or related phenomena. I consistently looked across all data sources: survey data, interview data, field notes, and documentary sources to triangulate the ideas, actions, and arguments that I derived from each. For example, in spring 2010, I developed a code that I called "resistance." This code was derived from my two of my interview transcripts; however, when I looked at the survey data, I realized that resistance *might* include active and intentional behaviors intended to undermine organizational goals, but that it more often consisted of passive or inactive

behaviors that are not necessarily intended to undermine organizational goals, but which are *not at all* intended to contribute to the achievement of SWU's goals. Thus, I revised my definition and coded the ranging forms of resistance as "acquiescence." Again, refer to the audit trail in the appendix to review the pieces of evidence and definitions used for each theme and category.

Finally, following Creswell's (2008) advice, I conducted a member's check with some of the individuals (N=4) who were willing to speak with me about my emerging analysis. The member's check consisted of me either calling or e-mailing the willing participants to ask them for comments on my analysis. Member's check participants were also asked to provide any feedback, such as potential suggestions or recommendations.

CHAPTER 5

THE SETTING

5.1 South West University's Saga

In this chapter, I describe the historical social and political context at South West University. In many ways, it is an attempt to capture and document South West University's "organizational saga" (Clark, 1972) to help readers understand where this study unfolded. According to Clark, organizational sagas are the stories that bring people together around a central university purpose and character. Yet, a saga is not just a story about "who we are" and "what we do"; it is a story built out of belief, emotional investment, and it is a story that produces what Clark refers to as "durable normative bonds" (Clark, 1972, pp. 178-179) around the organization's identity.

To what degree Clark's (1972) original conceptualization of an organizational saga still holds in today's social world is questionable. Faculty members, both senior and junior, often turn outward, rather than inward, to find purpose and collegiality amongst a circle of discipline based, national or international peers (Becher, 1995; Bowen et al., 1986; Leslie, 2002; Rhoades et al., 2004; Zemsky, et al., 2005). This turning outward has resulted in the weakening of faculty governance (Zemsky, et al., 2005) and their concern (as well as knowledge) about what is going on at their employing University (Tuchman, 2009). Therefore, the investment that faculty have in their University's purpose and "saga" is likely to be less than what it may have been in the past. In fact, some University presidents have commented that the university is more like a hold-over than a place that faculty truly invest in and become intimate with (see Duderstadt, 2001).

Furthermore, Clark's (1972) organizational saga, with its strong Durkheimian roots, is also tested by the post-modern turn. Kezar (2001), an expert in leadership and organizational change, calls on organizational leaders, participants, and other stakeholders to search out the multiple meanings that might be derived from an "organizational saga." Drawing explicitly from post-modernism, Kezar (2001) pushes leaders and scholars to understand that individuals may see and hear the saga, but they do so from their own vantage point, with a unique epistemology that is filtered by one's personal, historical, political, and other experiences. Thus, university sagas, like universal truths, may not hold people together in quite the way that Clark (1972) originally wrote about.

Heeding Kezar's caution, then, "organizational saga" can still afford scholars some currency because it is the "official" story that a University often puts forward for itself. Sagas can be drawn together by reviewing historical and contemporary documents, in which the University mission has been expressed, debated, and tinkered with. Dialogue from top administrators, symbolic expressions or what Gonzales and Pacheco (forthcoming) refer to as "open-ended slogans" help to color the official or public story of a University. My own position is that a saga, even if it does not inspire the durable and universal bonds that Clark wrote about, can provide constituents with a sense of who the organization claims to be and in general, what its claimed purpose is.

With this being said, it is important to offer a look into South West University – to understand its saga, as it has evolved over its one-hundred year history. After all, faculty members work inside universities; thus, universities are bound to give some expression to the ways in which faculty come to know, understand, and carry out their

work. It is the university that grants tenure and promotion and so it is the university that can secure the future of faculty members by finding value in their work. The kinds of work that faculty members do and that faculty members are rewarded for reflect the values, priorities, and missions - the saga - of Universities (Fairweather, 1996; Melguizo et al., 2007). Thus, understanding the organizational saga is central to understanding the work experiences of faculty members.

South West University, located in a southwestern state, originally opened its doors around 1910. The school was intended to prepare local professionals to work in a engineering and geology industry. Located in an isolated spot in the southwest, the school was the first and only higher education provider in the region for a few years. When South West leaders refused to respond to calls by state officials and community leaders to expand its narrow curriculum to address the growing regional need for primary school teachers, a small city college was opened. This new college was dedicated to the preparation of teachers (a normal school) and would compete with South West for almost one decade (Pacheco, 1999, p. 144).

Eventually, the teacher's college folded and ultimately it was absorbed by South West University. It was at this time that South West finally accepted the call to expand its curriculum and serve as a regionally responsive university by providing training for a wider sort of professionals who could serve in the region. By the late 1930's, student enrollment had grown to 600 with many, if not most, students enrolling in the teacher education program (p. 149). Still today, the College of Education at South West is a major producer of students at South West and an extraordinarily important producer of

teachers for the entire region. It is estimated that more than 80% of local school teachers are educated at South West.

To a great extent, South West's early hesitation to serve as a teacher preparation program subsided. By the late 1960's, "one-third of all degrees awarded by the university were bachelor of science degrees in education" (Pacheco, 1999, p. 151). The prestigious National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education recognized South West's good work in teacher education. In the mid-1990's, professors and researchers earned multi-million dollar grants, established cross-cutting and innovative partnerships with many local school districts. At that time, faculty members were thoroughly encouraged by the President to engage in cross-campus collaboration and in school-based research. Nurturing close ties to the region, and especially to the schools, became the foundation of South West University's saga over the last forty or so years. To this end, De Los Santos, Jr. (1991) writes that South West became "increasingly attuned to opportunities for developing educational programs, research, and service activities related to its unique location and clientele" (p. 207).

Thus, in its relative isolation, South West University was assigned and accepted the charge of a regional university. For example, in its 1985 strategic plan, South West defined its "primary mission as meeting the needs of the metropolitan area it serves through instruction, research, and public service" (p. 217). De Los Santos (1991) points out that the precise ordering of these university functions was very purposeful because South West leaders wanted to "emphasize commitment to creating educational opportunities rather than erecting educational barriers for students whose talents and motivations enabled them to meet the rigorous standards characteristic of university

degree programs” (p. 217). Not only did South West University take as its charge to serve the region by offering opportunities that the regional Hispanic population had historically had limited access to (on a local and national level), but it committed itself to address institutionally racist policies and practices.

In the late 1980's, South West joined two other border sitting universities in the state, all of whom were defended by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund in a suit that charged that the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board was inequitably funding border institutions. Most border situated universities in the state tend to serve large Mexican American or Mexican National students, and, therefore, MALDEF charged that THECB was causing unfair chances and unequal opportunities to the Mexican American population. Specifically, the lawsuit alleged that the Higher Education Coordinating Board failed to provide equal opportunities to minorities when they denied, repeatedly, the university's request for new degree programs, especially graduate and doctoral level programs. Eventually, the suit was settled out of court, and the affected universities, including South West University, were given an additional stream of funding to ameliorate the disparate funding gap for border-sitting, Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI's).

Providing access to an education has never been conceived as sufficient. Throughout the President's 20+ year tenure at South West, the saga and its details have become more focused. The President, along with other top leaders, have aimed to provide access to a kind of undergraduate education that is bolstered by strong faculty-student relationships, faculty mentoring, hands-on advising from faculty, and undergraduate exposure to laboratory and research experience. In fact, in the spring of

2008, the President announced to Deans, Chairs, and faculty that “undergraduate advising” needed to be tended to as a top faculty priority (Gonzales et al., 2009). Undergirding this approach to undergraduate education and South West’s student-centered mission based on the work of Laura Rendón was affirmed.

In short, Laura Rendón’s (2004) work rejects the mainstream approach that is predominantly used for understanding student success and university-student relationships. Mainstream approaches, such as Tinto’s (1993) student departure model, use personal and/or cultural traits to explain student’s vulnerability for risk of departure. Perhaps without meaning to, these traditional approaches have created hierarchical schemas for understanding or classifying personal and/or cultural values and traits. In general, middle-class, Anglo practices are deemed “best” at yielding successful higher education students. On the other hand, students that come from “non-traditional” “non-middle class” backgrounds are typically conceived as lacking the appropriate culture. To this end, mainstream models suggest that non-traditional students can only succeed in higher education if they disconnect from their personal backgrounds, cultural practices, and familial as well as friendly ties. These mainstream models ignore racist and classist ideologies and practices that are embedded in many of the country’s core institutions, including higher education.

Rendón’s work advances the perspective that higher education institutions have the ability and the responsibility to invest in systematic out reach to students who enter the institution from marginalized positions. Rather than “assimilate” or depart from their cultural histories and personal biographies, Rendón suggests that it is possible to tap into the assets that students bring to the institution. From epistemologies, to

experiences, to the tacit cultural knowledge and ways of life, universities can and should, according to Rendón, incorporate such assets to make the university setting more relevant and welcoming for students that come from non-traditional backgrounds.

Rendón's work has frequently been cited by the President in key university speeches, such as the 2006 University Convocation. In that speech, the President noted:

...we have adopted "validation" as an underlying theme of our Student Success initiative. Inspired by the work of Laura Rendón and our own extensive experience, we understand that for first-generation students such as those served by [South West], engagement is an important, but not sufficient....These students' success also appears to be heavily contingent on our individual and collective validation of them and their potential to succeed. Such validation comes in many different forms — our time, our advice, a friendly greeting — and it comes from many different sources on the campus. We are all important players, no matter where we work or what our professional responsibilities may be...

Putting the principles of validation to practice, South West used Rendon's (1994) validation theory to guide a recent self-study and accreditation process. Furthermore, when the President discusses what most people have identified as South West's problematic graduation rate, s/he points out that well over 50% of South West's students are first-generation students who successfully manage to juggle work, family and school. The President and Provost suggest that the prolonged graduation rates are not symptomatic of a problematic student body or of ineffective institutional outreach, but instead, that they reflect the larger structural issues, like poverty, lack of educational background in the family, and border-oriented challenges, that SWU students have to deal with. The Provost, specifically, notes that South West students should actually be recognized and applauded for their tenacity (Faculty Orientation field notes, August 2009). Thus, the President and other top administrators turn the problematic graduation

rates on their head to showcase the tenacity and resilience of SWU students.

Validating, understanding students and their histories is a major part of South West's saga. Taking into account that students juggle multiple, complex roles is something that faculty have been asked to be cognizant of over and over again (Faculty Orientation field notes, Presidential Speech 2007).

Thus, validation is something that the President has asked University community members, including faculty, to *believe* in and to *engage* in. In a 2007 speech the President spoke about the role of the professor at South West. S/he said:

We have to recruit faculty members who understand from the very beginning what our expectations are about...it's very important that [South West] faculty think about that...We care about young people...who come to use with their dreams and aspirations...we have a responsibility to provide them with the best possible opportunity to succeed...we try real hard to have [this as a] consistent message [to prospective faculty].

In fact, at the 2009 New Faculty Orientation, the Provost spent time developing these ideas for an audience of new faculty members through a lively presentation (field notes, August 2009).

To this end, the South West University Vision statement notes "the South West Community – faculty, students, staff and administrators – commits itself to the two ideals of *excellence and access*." Strange bedfellows are excellence and access when it comes to U.S. higher education, and yet South West has insisted over the last few decades that they are not only achievable, but compatible and complimentary. While many question the compatibility of South West's "excellence and access" mission, (Rincones et al., 2005), this pair of unexpected ideals have become, along with commitment to local schools and organizations, the heart of South West's saga. Access is furnished by the relatively open admissions of the university, numerous student

success programs, including learning communities, entering student programs, middle-years programming, and progressive financing options that the university has created for its students. The validation framework furthers access by providing sound support systems, including faculty and staff that are “tuned into” the context of their student’s daily lives. Again, recall that in 2008, the President issued a mandate to all Deans, in which s/he ordered that tenure-line faculty members be involved in the undergraduate advising process for SWU students. Excellence, on the other hand, has largely meant the provision of hands-on, undergraduate education, research opportunities for undergraduates (especially in engineering, which has been renowned for its practices), and the expectation that faculty be engaged with students.

The pursuit of excellence, however, has come to new heights in recent years, particularly in light of South West’s aspirations to become a more research focused or “Tier One” university.³⁴ “Tier One” is a term used mostly, if not exclusively in Texas, as it has been defined by the Texas legislature and the Coordinating Board. Nonetheless, “Tier One” is often loosely equated with Carnegie’s “Doctoral University/Very High Research Activity” classification (Interview field notes, November – February 2009; participant observation). In this study, “Tier One” is meant to signal the concept as it has been defined by state and local stakeholders, and which has been further “localized” by the University administration through many speeches and slogans as will be made apparent later in this chapter and in chapter six.

³⁴ “Tier One” is language that has been adopted and used to describe what are generally considered Carnegie’s doctoral research universities with very high activity. See the 2005 Carnegie Classification schema at <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php>. Tier One and research focused or primarily research institution are used interchangeable throughout the dissertation.

By state standards, a “Tier One” University is expected to have a strong research mission executed by high quality faculty and other research professionals, sizeable amounts of externally funded research projects, university-industry partnerships, and a solid institutional reputation as judged by its peers and ranking systems, such as the U.S. World News Report (Personal field-notes, 2009). Policy makers and higher education leaders in the state agree that “Tier One” is loosely defined, but all note that the single most important indicator to be used in planning for or measuring “Tier One” is that a University should have at least \$100 million dollars in research expenditures per year. This most important criterion comes from recently passed state legislation known as House Bill 51. This piece of legislation, further discussed below, unleashes resources for South West as well as other “emerging Tier One” universities who wish to advance their “Tier One” aspirations.

The achievement of “Tier One” research status, this new brand of excellence, South West leaders argue, does not challenge or undercut the university’s commitment to access, student validation, or undergraduate education as some might assume. Instead, University leaders suggest that the move towards “Tier One” is an attempt to offer its students access to the kind of superior educational experience afforded by other elite research universities. In other words, “Tier One” is an opportunity to offer the best kind of education to the students that South West has committed itself to serving.

In the next section, the idea of “Tier One” and South West’s evolving aspirations to achieve this status are further described. It will become clear that “Tier One” is a transition instigated by many factors and players including state policy makers, University system leaders, powerful business leaders, as well as South West

University's own leadership. Following the discussion of how and why South West University became engaged in this pursuit of "Tier One" status, remaking its organizational saga, I describe the current context of South West today, with close attention being paid to structural or other changes that the university has made to facilitate the transition.

5.2 Changing a Saga: SWU's Tier One Aspirations

The transition from a regional teaching focused university to a "Tier One" or research focused institution can be traced to the very late 1980's, but not until the mid-2000's, did "Tier One" become a widely known, publicized university goal. While there has always been some level of research activity at South West as well as some level of externally funded research, it has been in isolated areas. Generally, research productivity has been concentrated in areas including K-16 action research, biological sciences, geological sciences, engineering, and psychology (Institutional Research Task Force Report, 2004). In the late 1980's, South West began to dabble more seriously in research, particularly externally funded research and in the mid-1990's, several multi-million dollar grants were awarded to innovative education researchers who sought to build strong K-16 partnerships based on teacher and principal professional development, school or field based research, and K-16 curriculum alignment. Since the 1990's, social science researchers have done increasingly well in the obtainment of external research funds.

Nonetheless, as late as 2004, South West was still largely considered a doctoral granting university that focused most primarily on teaching for the preparation of professionals for the region. Thus, although scholarship has long been expected from

South West faculty members, it is common knowledge that in the 1980's and still in the 1990's, one could earn tenure with a strong teaching and service record; this is true no more (New Faculty Orientation College Level Meeting field notes, August 2009).

In the 2000's, conversations about research and the need to increase research productivity, particularly the kind that generates revenue via grants and contracts began to circulate on South West campus. For example, in a speech that focused on the state's dwindling support, the President highlighted the importance of alternative revenue sources. Research grants, the President pointed out, filled fiscal gaps left behind by the state. The need to produce research, particularly research attached to grants, emerged as a significant theme in Presidential speeches in the mid-2000's as the President took time to recognize faculty members who secured large grants. In 2006, the President mentioned the success of a few faculty members who had successfully secured grants. However, in 2007, 2008, and 2009 the President recognized multiple faculty members who had successfully secured grants during the previous year. Time was spent not only on describing the grants, but also on framing the important role of grant monies for South West's future.

During the 2009 University Convocation, the President made clear that South West's organizational saga was in a state of revision. S/he stressed the important role that research productivity, particularly externally funded research, will play in South West's future. While notions of access and excellence lingered, these South West traditions were cast in a new "Tier One" light. The President noted that becoming a "Tier One" university:

...not only means that [South West] will do more externally funded research, develop more doctoral programs, award more doctoral degrees,

and gain the national stature associated with that level of activity. It also means that [South West] *undergraduate students will have access to an enriched campus environment that will provide them with the skills and confidence to compete with graduates of prestigious universities across the U.S. and internationally*, and that the degrees earned by all [South West] alumni will continue to increase in value. El Paso and the surrounding region will also benefit from our transformation, as [South West] becomes an even more effective catalyst for technology transfer, commercialization, business start-ups and overall economic development (italics my emphasis).

While South West's "Tier One" aspirations have been and continue to be nurtured by internal leaders, more recently, there has been a great impetus from the state of Texas. In early 2000, a rumbling began in the capitol; the rumbling dealt with the need to increase the research activity and output of the state's universities. Government officials, policy makers, and influential industry leaders argue that an increase in the number of "Tier One" research institutions will bring with it an improved economy, a more creative and innovative citizenry (improved human capital), and an entrepreneurial spirit that other major research university and their hubs have experienced (i.e., Silicon Valley, Research Triangle, and Harvard-MIT complex). These factors, they believe and some research shows, contribute to a more vibrant, modern, and to some extent healthier lifestyle.³⁵

Responding to the state's rumblings, the University System,³⁶ of which South West is a part of, commissioned the External Advisory Group³⁷ (EAG) to complete an independent study and determine which of its institutions harbored the most "Tier One"

³⁵ Although more limited, there is another perspective which argues that research universities do not always have a positive spill-over effect. See Feldman's (2003; 2004) work on the difficulties of measuring and establishing precisely how universities contribute to local economic growth.

³⁶ A pseudonym.

³⁷ A pseudonym.

potential.³⁸ When the EAG completed its multi-campus review in 2004, it determined that South West University was within twenty years or so of achieving “Tier One.”³⁹

South West quickly went to work on the recommendations highlighted in the EAG report. For instance, the EAG advisors suggested that South West University create an infrastructure for grant writing and grant administration. In recent months, South West has striven to improve grant administration and evaluation processes. The EAG advisors also suggested that South West exploit their already well established research programs, which circulate around engineering, biomedical studies, geology, K-16 partnerships, psychology, and international business. These programs have a unique slant in that most if them employ a border perspective and study the fastest growing population in the U.S. (Hispanics). The EAG recommended that South West continue to build on these foundations.

In addition, the EAG noted that the faculty would need to begin to frame their research agendas as national or international ones, rather than border or locally focused ones (p. 59). Connected to this recommendation, the EAG also noted that South West faculty must do a better job of disseminating their work to national and international audiences. To this end, in 2008, the South West President and Provost brought together a cross-section of faculty members from Colleges of Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Sciences to highlight what research was taking place at South West. The goal was to encourage faculty collaboration, but also to stress to

³⁸ The University System has seven institutions. The EAG studied four of these campuses.

³⁹ Four universities which are part of the University system were studied by the same advisory group. The advisory group believed that all universities would need 10 years+ in order to achieve “Tier One” status although most aspired to meet the Tier One goal within a 10 year time frame.

faculty members the importance of disseminating their work to wider, national audiences (Personal field notes, April 2008).

To meet the \$100 million dollar “Tier One” benchmark by 2015 (South West’s time line), the EAG figured that South West would need to hire approximately 300 new faculty members throughout the 2004-2014 decade. Each new faculty member, the EAG explained would have to yield about \$230,000.00 in external research monies annually in order to achieve the \$100 million dollar bench mark. The EAG cautioned against hiring at such a quick pace (about 30 new members per year) and suggested a slower, more economical approach to faculty hiring. At the 2009 New Faculty Orientation, however, at least 30 new faculty members were in attendance (field notes, August 2009).

In addition, to the report that the EAG prepared for each university, the EAG prepared a broader, more general report for the University System. In this report, the EAG makes many specific as well as generic sorts of recommendations. The general report notes that “institutions that desire to elevate its research stature must foster a research culture on its campus” (p. 6). Most of the institutions studied, including South West, were noted as having a shortage of research active faculty. The EAG group also pointed out that “high student enrollment” often poses challenges for Universities who seek the heightened prestige and status associated with “Tier One.” The EAG writers note “...high student-faculty ratios and heavy teaching loads [are] frowned on by ranking organizations and students alike, and the latter poses a significant barrier to research productivity” (p. 6). The EAG authors continue to note that campus leaders are just now realizing the difficulties imposed by an already large and still expanding student body.

The EAG team concluded “excessive enrollment, especially with low admission standards, can become a losing proposition, wasteful of resources, and expensive to students and parents” (p. 6). This last note by the EAG presents major obstacles to South West, with its deeply engrained commitment to serving the students from the local region, most who arrive at the University with poor preparation and no higher education background, through the relatively open access process. The open access mission of the University, an integral component of the South West’s “excellence and access” saga, is tested by the EAG recommendations.

Highly interested in the creation of more research productive institutions, Texas legislators followed the EAG report as well as each university’s respective response. In 2008, the state Senate Higher Education Subcommittee held meetings to discuss the “Tier One” situation. Presidents from each of the emerging “Tier One” institutions were invited to speak their thoughts on the issue. At that hearing, the President of one of the Universities noted, “it is important to increase the number of “Tier Ones” because our [state] economic vitality absolutely depends on centers of creativity and entrepreneurship” (President Barr’s Testimony, unpaginated). President Barr⁴⁰ continued to add that the “United States must be able to compete with China and that contest should not be based on which country has the lowest wages. We want to compete based on who has the best ideas,” (President Barr’s Testimony, unpaginated). The best ideas, Barr suggests, are generated, supported, and developed inside research universities.

⁴⁰ A pseudonym.

When the President of South West addressed the Subcommittee, ideas regarding local, regional and statewide development were again reinforced. The President emphasized actions that South West had taken or was about to take with regard to economic development and planning. “South West has worked closely with business and civic leaders to identify areas of research investment that are strategically aligned with economic development in the region” (SWU President’s Testimonial Record, 2008, unpaginated), the President noted. Later on, the President added “South West’s capacity to foster economic development is increasingly recognized by regional business and civic leaders as a key to the region’s future, and this recognition in turn generates increased private sector support for the university” (SWU’s President’s Testimonial Record, 2008, unpaginated).

The President finally spoke to the issue of undergraduate education and students in relation to South West’s “Tier One” aspirations. Here, the President mobilized pieces of South West’s excellence and access saga:

...South West’s accelerating development as a Tier-One institution has created unparalleled opportunities for its graduate and undergraduate students...a majority of whom are from the [local] region, Hispanic, low-income, and the first in their families to attend college. South West has made a strong commitment to create access for this regional population that has been historically underserved...but access alone is not sufficient. South West students have every right to expect access to the highest quality educational programs delivered by faculty who compete successfully with their peers at research universities across the United States... (Testimonial Record, 2008, unpaginated).

Throughout 2008, legislators and higher education leaders grappled with what kinds of policies and investments would be necessary to support Universities as they strive for “Tier One.” Finally, during the biennium meeting of the legislature in 2009, legislators crafted HB 51. This piece of legislation creates a National Research Fund of

\$500 million dollars by unfreezing already existent higher education monies. Voters approved this measure, largely known as “Proposition 4” on November 4, 2009. The details of the legislation are as follows:

1) Create Research University Development Fund (RUDF) to provide funding to eligible emerging research universities for the support and maintenance of educational and general activities that promote increased research capacity; 2) Create Texas Research Incentive program provide matching grants based on the amount of donations from private sources; 3) Create the National Research University Benchmark Fund (NRUBF), which would provide funding incentives based on a point system to reward universities that met critical benchmarks toward achieving national prominence as major research universities.

“Tier One” has obviously been kicked into gear by external players, such as state law makers and other leaders, but the President, along with other University leaders, began to lay groundwork for “Tier One” a number of years ago. This change process began quietly, but the dialogue has become more consistent, louder, and stronger over the last few years. For example, at the most recent “State of the University Address,” the President made a case for South West’s transition to “Tier One.”

The President began by noting the “distinct profile” of South West University and the University’s history in challenging mainstream notions of what a higher education institution should do and how it should function. The President said:

We sought to achieve both access and excellence despite the insistence of skeptics that there had to be a trade-off between these two goals...We are at our best when we are who we are, doing what we do in our own way, rather than trying to imitate others. We clearly aren’t Harvard on the border, nor should we ever aspire to be that. We are no longer the small mining school of our origins, *no longer the self-deprecating regional institution into which we evolved* (my emphasis).

The President acknowledged South West’s saga - its deep commitment to teaching, access, excellence, and student validation and cast them in the new,

emerging “Tier One” light. “Our primary challenge is to be confident in creating a new model to transform [South West] into a Tier One University by leveraging our authentic strengths...doing Tier One the [South West] way.” The President, I argue, is attempting to “localize” the concept of “Tier One” in order to guide SWU’s transition.

Ultimately, though, to be “Tier One” by the state’s standards and to qualify for the additional fiscal support that HB 51 authorized requires at least a few things: increased research productivity supported by external funding sources, high quality faculty, and at least 200 doctoral graduates per year. At first glance, these requirements imply that South West must morph into the public research university model that higher education is familiar with, where teaching often gets outsourced to graduate students and/or adjuncts and where faculty are rewarded disproportionately for their research and fund raising abilities, encouraged to build partnerships with business and industry rather than to spend their time on instruction and institutional or community service. However, the President rebukes this image. Instead, a set of new mantras have been developed over the last year. One often hears the President or Provost say “South West wants to *be – not be like!*” (Personal field notes, August 2009) Thus, not only is South West adjusting its mission to be more research focused, but it is striving to create a different kind of “Tier One” University. At the 2009 Convocation, the President said:

As we...compete to become one of the next “Tier One” universities, we know that there will be a temptation to adopt tried and true models from other institutions that are already in this category. I think we all know from our experience...that the pathway to [South West’s] success is not achieved by emulating models that aren’t well aligned with who we are and whom we serve....We must attain the expected level of research and graduate program excellence while at the same time never losing sight of our commitment to undergraduate student access and success....Although there will surely be skeptics, and those who will

identify us as underdogs, we know that we can become a truly successful “Tier One” university only by doing it our way.

The President and other leaders have made it clear. South West is on the move to “Tier One.” This means more research is expected of faculty members and that fundraising has become a core responsibility of faculty members (New Faculty Orientation field notes, August, 2009). My survey and interview data showed that the emphasis on research and grant writing has, in fact, become more prominent in recent years. At the same time, the discourse on faculty responsibilities for teaching remains great.

There is other evidence of the transition. Faculty members at South West have seen several, structural changes in recent months. For instance, college wide and/or discipline specific writing groups have been formed. Faculty members, especially those on the tenure-track, are encouraged to attend such meetings in order to refine their writing and to encourage faculty collaboration. Since at least 2007, the Provost has held monthly meetings intended to support tenure-track faculty and help them understand that the standards for tenure have indeed changed (Interview filed notes, August 2009).

Also, in 2008, the President and Provost sponsored a University wide research conference where administrators and guest speakers prodded South West faculty to share research interests and expertise with one another. Many faculty responded by noting that no infrastructure existed to help them do so. Thus, South West built an on-line research data base to catalogue the research expertise of every one of its faculty members. Faculty members are encouraged to visit the site and learn what colleagues are doing and to think about possible collaborative opportunities. Another important goal of the research conference was to encourage faculty to disseminate their research to wider audiences. Two renowned guest speakers were brought in to stress to SWU

faculty the potential that exists for some of their research agendas. Research centers, a symbol of research universities, have also emerged over the last few years at South West.

Despite these numerous changes, South West's infrastructure continues to lag in many ways (Institutional Faculty Survey Results, 2009). Teaching loads, generally, remain high. In the College of Education, Business, and Liberal Arts, a 3-3 teaching load is common. Other colleges typically assign faculty a 2-2 load or sometimes a 2-3 teaching load. Enrollment continues to rise, along with class sizes, even at the graduate level. In addition, it appears that faculty members are still expected to do extensive amounts of academic advising and the use of graduate students as instructors is still not accepted in many departments or colleges.

In the next chapter, I present my data. I have divided the chapter into two sections. The first section is derived mostly from survey data in which I describe South West faculty, their working habits, and whether or not South West's "Tier One" aspirations have led faculty to make changes to their work habits. The second major section, however, is composed mostly from qualitative data sources (interview, open-ended survey data, and field notes). Threaded through the presentation of my data is my analysis and discussion. I close the dissertation in Chapter 7 where I elaborate on some of my findings and situate this work in the larger scholarship on higher education, faculty work and roles, and organizational change.

CHAPTER 6

DATA ANALYSIS

6.1 Survey Data

A total of 439⁴¹ tenured and tenure-track faculty members received a survey via Survey Monkey in late September 2009. Out of 439 potential respondents, 179 faculty members responded for a response rate of 41%. However, several faculty members failed to complete the survey; the majority of those who failed to complete the survey stopped at the point that a series of open-ended questions were presented. Thus, of the 179 initial respondents, 140 actually completed the survey in its entirety for a final response rate of 32%.

In order to establish a sense of how representative my sample is, I compare my data set to the University's most current faculty count, which was last updated in the fall of 2008 in Table 1 below. This table displays data taken from university records for South West's tenure-line faculty. Next to the university data, I compare my own survey population to show how representative my sample is.

Table 1 Southwest 2008 Tenure-Line Faculty & Survey Respondent Profile

All Southwest Faculty by College	Total	Respondents by College	Total	Representativeness by College
Business	43	Business	13	(30%)
Education	53	Education	37	(70%)
Engineering	79	Engineering	19	(24%)
Health Sci.	35	Health Sci.	15	(43%)
Liberal Arts	179	Liberal Arts	64	(36%)
Science	103	Science	31	(30%)

*The College of Health Sciences and Nursing have been combined. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

⁴¹ Although there were 440 faculty members at South West when I launched my survey, one survey immediately "bounced back" to me because the email information was incorrect. Thus, only 439 faculty members received the initial invite.

By college, my faculty sample is fairly representative of Southwest University. While the College of Liberal Arts generated the greatest number of respondents (64); as a whole, the College of Education was best represented in the sample.

6.1a Academic and Professional Background

To better understand who the South West faculty is, the survey included many questions related to faculty background. For instance, faculty were asked to identify their tenure status, whether or not they had been tenured at South West, and if so, what year they were granted tenure at the University. Tenured faculty members responded at a much higher rate than tenure-track faculty members as they made up about 56% of the respondent pool. Of the tenured faculty members who participated in my survey, more than 50% were granted tenure by South West. This means that faculty who were awarded tenure by South West are likely to have a sense about what faculty in the past had to achieve in order to be successful. Therefore, tenured faculty are likely to be able to offer a comparative view as to what today's faculty members are expected to do. In fact, out of the 84 tenured faculty who responded to this question, 25 (30%) indicated that they do not believe (10) or are unsure (15) if they will continue to be successful in their professional life in light of South West's move to achieve a more research focused mission. In some of the open-ended sections throughout the survey, tenured faculty often commented that they do not believe they will be able to achieve promotion because of the changed expectations. For example, one tenured male professor wrote:

I don't think I will be promoted beyond the associate professor as one faculty member tried to get promoted last year and was denied. I thought she would have been promoted, but when I saw her not get promoted I had serious doubts that I would ever make that promotion. (Survey Comment, 2009).

While others did not have such serious self-doubt, they did express a deep amount of skepticism regarding their ability to succeed because of the lagging infrastructure and resources that South West has made available to faculty. For instance, one tenure-track professor wrote:

Not sure that [South West's] resources are aligned with its mission to become more research oriented – it may affect me in that I am expected to do things with very few resources (Survey Comment, 2009).

Forty-five percent of respondents in my study represented the newest “academic generation” (Schuster et al., 2006), which means that they completed their doctoral degrees sometime in the last decade (2000-2010) while about 28% indicated that they completed their doctoral programs and entered academia in the 1990’s. Thus, the faculty sample can be largely characterized as “Early Career” faculty. Another 17% indicated that they entered academia in the 1980’s while 10% noted that they entered the professoriate in the 1970’s. The year that faculty members enter academia has been shown as an important factor to consider because the “new academic generation” tends to be much more research oriented, having experienced a research focused preparation (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006).

Along the same line of thinking, it is important to understand where faculty members received their graduate education. Of the 179 faculty respondents, the vast majority (69.8%) received their highest degree from a university that is identified as “Research University with very high activity” (RU/VH). Twenty-four percent (24%) of faculty members received their highest degree from a “Research University with high research activity” (RU/H). The RU/H category is how Southwest is currently identified. Only 1.1% of faculty members at Southwest come from “Doctoral Research

Universities” (DRU). In fact, many of the interviewees commented on the fact that new hires seem to be coming from major national research or “Tier One” universities – at least more so than in the past. Exiting from these major research universities, especially those from the newest cohorts, most scholars might predict that the SWU faculty possess the strong research orientation that Schuster et al., (2006) describe in their work.

In terms of personal background, previous research has shown how important gender is to exploring the faculty experience. Male faculty members constituted the largest respondent group at about 61% while women made up the other 39%. This is rather representative of South West as a University, which as of 2008, consisted of a male faculty population of 58% and a female faculty population of about 42%.

Along the same lines of thinking, Turner (2000) and Baez (2000) have both written about the additional service expectations that fall on faculty of color.⁴² Thus, inquiring about faculty member gender and ethnicity is an attempt to account for what other scholars have found to be significant factors when studying faculty work and their prospects for success. It is sensible to assume that at times of change; tensions between work load assignments may become heightened. In other words, as South West attempts to gain Tier One status, the distribution of service and teaching oriented assignments may present a potentially volatile situation, where tenure-track faculty seek relief from these duties in order to secure their future, while on the other hand, tenured

⁴² It is important to note that Turner (2002) Baez (2000) take a different approach to discussing the fact that minorities are often assigned or participate in more service opportunities. While both critique universities for perpetuating the marginalization of minority faculty by their failure to build and administer a more fair work distribution process, Turner stops there. Baez, on the other hand, conceptualizes service as an opportunity for “critical agency” for minority faculty, and an opportunity to revise and reshape the system that oppresses minorities at a number of levels in a number of areas.

faculty members are the ones who have major decision-making powers at the department and college level.

When it comes to race and ethnicity, most faculty in my sample identified as Caucasian/Anglo (56%) while Latina/os followed at a distant second (36%). On this criterion, Latina/o faculty members are somewhat overrepresented in my survey and interview sample because the entire South West faculty consists of 56% White faculty and 30% of Latina/o faculty members. It is important to note that a large group of faculty failed to report a racial or ethnic background. Faculty from other racial and ethnic backgrounds such as Asian Americans or Blacks make up a very small portion of the South West professoriate, coming in at 5% and 2%, respectively. My own survey sample consisted of only 1 Black professor's response and 6 responses from Asian American faculty. Because of the faculty demographics at South West and the survey sample, I elected to conduct interviews with only White and Latina/o faculty.

By considering tenure status and gender simultaneously, a clearer picture of the sample can be painted. However, because the University does not report figures that combine tenure-status, racial/ethnic background, and gender, there is no way to determine to what extent my survey sample reflects University faculty demographics.

Table 2 Survey Sample by Tenure-Status, Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Faculty Descriptors	N
Tenured Caucasian Male Faculty	40 (22.3%)
Tenure-Track Caucasian Male Faculty	8 (4.4%)
Tenured Caucasian Female Faculty	14 (7.7%)
Tenure-Track Caucasian Female Faculty	17 (9.5%)
Tenured Latino Male Faculty	17 (9.5%)
Tenure-Track Latino Male Faculty	14 (7.7%)
Tenured Latina Faculty	5 (2.7%)
Tenure-Track Latina Faculty	15 (8.3%)
Total	130 (72.2%)*

*Percentages do not total 100% as all groups are not accounted for in this table.

It is important to note the disparities in tenured and tenure-track faculty members in terms of gender and race. The smallest group of faculty members, when considered along the lines of tenure, gender, and racial/ethnic background, is by far tenured Latina faculty members. On the other hand, the largest group of faculty consists of tenured, white males

6.1b South West Faculty Work Context

Faculty members were asked to indicate how many courses they taught during the most recent academic year (2008-9). Forty percent of the South West faculty member respondents noted that they taught 2 courses in the fall of 2008 while 43% indicated that they taught 2 courses in the Spring of 2009. This is surprising because only a few years ago (2007-8), most faculty taught a 3-3 course load (Gonzales et al., 2008). According to the literature, reduction in course loads often signals a University's commitment to research (Fairweather, 1996). Twenty-two percent of faculty members report that they taught three courses in the fall of 2008 and the spring of 2009. Of those faculty members who taught three-courses, most were located in the College of Education and Liberal Arts.

The majority of faculty (38%) reported that the undergraduate classes that they teach usually have 50 or fewer students. On the other hand 28% of faculty reported that undergraduate class sizes range from 50-100. Regarding graduate education, most faculty members (40%) report that these class sizes are no larger than 20 per class while 15% report that their graduate classes usually have between 20 and 30 students. Eighteen percent of faculty report that the graduate classes they teach usually have more than 30 students.

Asking questions about faculty work load, particularly work load as it is distributed from the University are important considerations as faculty members go about making sense of the role that they are expected to play at South West. Large teaching loads (above a 2-2) and large classes, especially at the graduate level, are signs not of a “Tier One” Research University, but of a teaching focused University. Moreover, when faculty members were asked if they have a teaching, research or any other kind of graduate assistant to help them with their work, the vast majority (38%) indicated that they do not. Eighteen percent noted that they “always” have an assistant(s) while 24% indicated that they do have an assistant more times than not. Five percent noted that they do not require an assistant to carry out their work. Nonetheless, Research/Tier One Universities typically provide student assistants to faculty members so that they can help facilitate the research and teaching efforts of faculty members.

6.1c Role Orientation

In the next section of the survey, faculty members were asked to respond to questions about their work. More specifically, these questions were intended to

compare the expectations of their work versus their actual work experience at South West. These questions are common in research on faculty work; in fact, similar questions have been part of the Carnegie surveys since 1969 (Finkelstein, 2001). While most research reveals gaps between faculty expectations, preferences, and actual time and energy allocation, little work has been done to understand how faculty navigate between these gaps.

In my own survey, faculty members were asked to describe their “role orientation” (Schuster et al., 2006) by describing how they would most prefer to spend their time and energy. Then, in two follow up questions, faculty were asked to describe work time allocation in two additional ways: expected and actual. When it comes to how faculty at South West expected to divide their time across the major tenets of faculty work (teaching, research, service, and fund-raising), as a whole, faculty reported that they believed they would divide their time fairly equally across teaching and research. See Table 3 below for details.

Table 3 Faculty Members’ Expected, Actual and Preferred Work Time Allocation

Activity	Expected	Actual	Preferred
Teaching	38%	43%	39%
Research	40%	28%	39%
Service	15%	15%	10%
Fundraising (obtaining resources from grants, external contracts, and other sources)	9%	8%	8%

When the responses to these three questions are disaggregated by tenure status, the analysis remains fairly similar. For example, tenured faculty members, who typically entered the organization in a time period spanning the mid 1970’s to the early 2000’s, expected to spend 40%, 37%, 16% and 9% on teaching, research, service, and fund-raising, respectively whereas tenure-track faculty members, most of whom entered

the organization around the early to mid-2000's, expected to spend 39%, 41%, 13% and 9% on the same activities.

The entry-stage expectations signal to the idea that, perhaps, many, if not most, faculty members understood South West University to be a University where teaching and researching are equally valued or that SWU still operates first and foremost as a teaching-focused University. Such a division of time certainly does not speak to the expectations that one might have upon entering a major national research or "Tier One" university. To this end, one faculty member, during her interview commented, on how different South West's working realities are from major research institutions'. She said:

I'm doing reference checking, talking about job candidates and some folks I've been talking to are from some research institutions ...[their workload at] USC is 70-30-10, you know or 80-10-10! Like research, teaching and service is just, it's not, it's not really possible when you're a faculty member and you're looking at your calendar...I think, especially people who got hired like 4 or 5 years ago, I mean I knew coming in about this talk about transition and said 'okay, I'll adjust.' But people who got hired just a few years [before me] to be a teacher, I'm sure they are probably a little disappointed because maybe they would have taken a job somewhere else (Interview Dr. Baines, 2009).

Dr. Baines' comment is significant for a number of reasons. First of all, her conversations with colleagues at already established research universities remind her of the distance that South West has to travel before achieving conditions that would allow South West faculty to compete with faculty researchers at these universities.

In addition, Dr. Baines points that just a few years ago, faculty members that came to South West might have very well believed that they were going to work at what seemed to be a teaching focused university. How such faculty members negotiate such a dramatic turn of events is a central concern, of course, for this project. How they make sense of their work and their place at South West in the realization that their work would

ultimately be guided by a different set of rules is critical to this discussion and a topic I return to later in the chapter by using interview data.

With regard to *actual* time allocation, tenured faculty members report spending 43% of their time on teaching while tenure-track faculty members spend about 44% of their time on teaching. Tenure-track faculty members spend a little more time on research (31%) versus tenured faculty who spend about 27% of their time. This is an important finding. One might assume that tenure-track faculty need, and perhaps prefer to spend much more time on research efforts since it is they who will be subject to the changing standards. However, throughout the survey comments and the interviews, it became apparent that faculty members struggle with their research agendas due to lagging infrastructure and support systems at SWU.

Interestingly, with regard to preferred time allocation, tenured and tenure-track faculty differ just slightly. While tenured faculty would prefer to spend about 41% of their time on teaching, tenure-track faculty report preferring to spend about 37% of their time on teaching. On the other hand, tenured faculty report that they prefer to spend 38% of their time on research while tenure-track faculty prefer to spend 40% on research. Such balanced work time allocation, again, reflects the possibility mentioned above in Dr. Baines' interview. South West, in many ways, perhaps, still communicates and presents itself as a teaching focused university where research is surely important, but not the driving factor in faculty success. These insights, all drawn from close-ended questions where faculty estimated how they expected, actually do and, most prefer to spend their time demonstrate that the change process at South West has not simply fallen in place. Faculty work loads and faculty work time allocation do not resemble, in any case, the

work time allocation of faculty who work at major research universities. Instead, there seems to be a negotiation of some sort: faculty members appear to be working through the organizational reality as well as their own orientations. How faculty members negotiate, however, is best explored with more qualitative forms of data, which are further discussed below.⁴³

Finally, there were items that sought to explore if and how faculty members have made changes to their work over the last few years. When faculty were asked if they had made changes to their work time allocation over the last few years, 55% reported that they had made changes to their work time allocation while 17% reported that they had “somewhat” made changes to their work time allocation. Of 86 who indicated changes, 52 described changes that involve less time for teaching and service, and more time for research and grant-writing. Faculty members were then asked if the changes they have made were/are related to South West’s aspirations. In general, most faculty members (55%) who have made changes report that South West’s aspirations have some bearing on these changes. About 28% claim that the transition is definitely a factor while 27% report that it is “somewhat” of a factor. However, another 43% report that South West’s research focused mission aspirations are “not at all a factor” in the changes that they have made.

Taken together, the faculty members who responded to my survey are fairly representative of the South West faculty. The survey data show that, as a whole, they

⁴³ it is important to note the problematic nature of gauging faculty role orientation and even time allocation with the tripartite measure used in this and most other studies. Colbeck (2002) has written about the possibilities for understanding and studying work as an integrative whole rather than as deconstructed parts. She, as well as Neumann (2009) have found that some faculty members are able to draw simultaneously from their research, teaching, and service activities to make their work a complementary and integrative whole rather than a set of subtractive ones.

are carrying out their work as if South West University is to remain a teaching focused university where research is valued, but not to the detriment of teaching. Perhaps, their work time allocation is tied to what seems to be the lagging infrastructure at South West; their realization that the South West context does not reflect the context of already established research universities. Whatever the case, faculty must interpret their immediate work realities and they must strive to make sense of it in order to figure out what it is that they are expected to do at South West. These sorts of questions are best addressed, of course, with qualitative data. Open-ended survey responses as well as interview data are woven together in the next section to understand how faculty members are managing to make sense and construct a role within this changing university.

6.2 Sense Making Sources

The analysis of qualitative data, which includes open-ended survey responses, interview transcripts, interview notes, and almost two years of field notes, resulted in a number of major insights, which I grouped categorically and then thematically. Taken together, the close and open-ended survey data is particularly helpful in painting a picture of faculty work load and working conditions at SWU. I believe both can be taken as indicators about the kind of university that SWU is in actual practice. The interviews, on the other hand, helped me to get at how faculty members are “making sense” of this transition, and more importantly, how they are carrying out their work inside this changing university. From the data, it became apparent that faculty members make sense of South West’s transition by drawing from at least two major sources. These two

sources include the institutional field of higher education and the immediate organizational culture. These two sense-making sources are defined below.

6.2a Institutional Field as a Sense Making Source

The institutional field offers up the most widely known and used prescription for SWU faculty in terms of what it means to be a professor at a “Tier One”⁴⁴ University - even though the state of Texas and University officials claim to have authored the “Tier One” concept and its benchmarks. Defined, the institutional field is where cultural standards of legitimacy are structured and maintained by various sectoral stakeholders, like universities, colleges, editorial/publishing boards, ranking systems (ranging from the commercialized U.S. News World Ranking to Carnegie’s Institutional Classification system), (inter)national professional and other kinds of discipline associations as well as faculty members, themselves. As New Institutionalism (Bastedo, 2009; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Powell and DiMaggio, 1991; Sauder et al., 2007; Scott, 1983) predicts, the field provides powerful reference points for SWU faculty members as they turn to other universities, with an already established “Tier One” or research focused status to understand what it is that faculty at “Tier One” universities do. To this end, faculty also referenced ranking institutions, grant funders, and publishing outlets to understand what they are/might be expected to do as SWU strives for this new status. Very often, they use their own experiences at “Tier One” universities, where they studied as students,

⁴⁴ When I first began interviews, I tried to refrain from using the Tier One language because of its ambiguous and loose conceptualization. Instead, I tried to use language like “South West’s transition,” “change,” or “aspirations to be more research focused.” However, it became apparent that faculty members, themselves, were more acquainted with or comfortable with the “Tier One” language. This is probably due to a number of reasons: the pervasive “Tier One” discourse which can be found in Presidential speeches, press releases, and university related items. Also, as noted later on, in the field of higher education, “tiers” are usually referenced to categorize universities. For instance, someone might say “oh, Harvard, that is a top tier school” or “well, it’s not a tier one school, but it is near top.”

and sometimes, where they worked as professors to understand what South West's "Tier One" aspirations are all about.

Some concrete examples of the ideas, ideals, and practices that faculty members borrow from the institutional field and then bring to bear on their understanding of "Tier One" include: 1) the notion that teaching will not be rewarded and is not an institutional priority; 2) that scholarship and the production of scholarship trumps every other tenet of faculty work; 3) that service is risky, undervalued work, particularly for tenure-track faculty members; 4) that selectivity in the admissions process is key; 5) that one needs to be concerned with the prestige of a publication outlet, not just with producing scholarship; 6) that grant writing and procurement of external funds through a variety of measures is of rising import; 7) that student-faculty relations, especially at the undergraduate level will be distant, particularly because graduate students will be expected to tend to undergraduate instruction; 8) that graduate education matters more than undergraduate; 9) that locally defined and practice oriented kinds of scholarship will be given less value in the reward system for faculty members; 10) that one's research productivity must outpace/excel over the research agenda of others who already work at "Tier Ones."

When faculty use these ideas, ideals, practices borrowed from the field, it means that they believe that South West's "Tier One" aspirations are an attempt to achieve the form and functioning of already established major research universities, such as the Berkley's, Michigan's, Harvard's, Stanford's⁴⁵, and other elite places. I call this the "institutional model" throughout the rest of the dissertation. In very practical terms, when

⁴⁵ These specific institutions and others were referred to repeatedly by faculty members in their interviews as they sought to explain what SWU aspires to do, what the transition specifically means to them, etc.

faculty think about and talk about SWU's "Tier One" transition using the institutional field, they associate SWU's move to "Tier One" as an attempt to become a highly selective university that focuses on the production of scholarship and research at the expense of teaching and student mentoring. Moreover, faculty members who use this model also believe that SWU is interested in capturing national and international attention by rewarding the faculty members who write in the most elite outlets and capture the largest audiences; this national and international renown, they believe comes at the expense (for better or worse) of examining local, practical problems and writing for a more local audience. In fact, one tenured faculty member in the survey captured this perspective perfectly when he said "my concern is that only the publications in peer-reviewed journals will be valued at the time of tenure consideration, and I believe this is unfair and seriously diminishes the role of the academic scholar to effect social change." Another faculty member wrote "I fear that we will begin to not be able to serve the area schools and teaching ways they need because we will be too busy doing 'Tier One' research." Many also believed that the move to "Tier One" was connected to the need for the University to raise money.

That most faculty members have interpreted South West's transition as an attempt to emulate dominant institutional model is probably not a surprise to most institutional theorists. One of the major tenets of institutional theory is the belief that organizations and members mimic organizational behaviors by those who are already considered prestigious. To this end, institutional theorists have argued over the years that many kinds of organizations, ranging from art museums (Powell, 1991) to educational organizations (Rowan, 1982) to higher education organizations (Morphew,

2009; Rusch et al., 2007; Sauder et al., 2007) tend to look and function more and more similarly as they seek survival in their institutional field. Yet these claims of isomorphism that have become central to the new institutionalism are rarely interrogated. The process of institutionalization or the borrowing of institutional ideas to make sense of one's practice or one's organizational situation have rarely been inspected up close (see Zucker, 1991 and Powell and Colyvas, (2008) for two exceptions).

This is because most institutional theorists do not or have not forced a closer examination of cases of alleged isomorphism – particularly at the ground level. Hence, the mixture of methods in my study bring us closer to the actual lived experience of faculty members and their perspective and show that had my study been limited to document review and quantitative figures, a case of isomorphism would have seemed a sensible explanation for what is going on at SWU. Recall that quantitative data suggested that faculty members are complying with institutionally defined notions of “Tier One” and thus, allocating more time to their research and grant writing efforts while de-emphasizing teaching and student mentoring. However, although most faculty members understand South West's move to be a move toward the dominant institutional model (an instance of isomorphism), the interview data show that faculty members inside the university bring this interpretation to bear in very different ways when it comes to their own work. An interpretation drawn from institutional sources, in other words, does not necessarily lead to conformity.

Nonetheless, the fact that faculty members across the board (21/26 faculty interviewees) interpret South West “Tier One” transition as an attempt to adopt the ideas and practices of the dominant field model is quite shocking in light of the

President's long-fought and strident attempts to reform or deter such notions (as outlined in chapter five). For instance, in year 2009, the President began a convocation speech by telling the story of a young Latino professional, also a South West alumnus, who landed a great job at the Wall Street Journal. S/he told of how the young Latino was intimidated by his colleagues' very prestigious educational backgrounds, and as a result, he began to "emulate them in a variety of ways." Until, one day, the President continued, his editor pulled him aside and told him that he was valued for his personal, professional and cultural vantage point, rather than for his ability to imitate others from more traditional backgrounds. The President then exclaimed:

This lesson is also one that has to be learned and re-learned by South West as a higher education institution with a distinct profile. We are at our best when we are who we are, doing what we do in our own way, rather than trying to imitate others. We clearly aren't Harvard on the Border, nor should we ever aspire to be that. We are no longer the small mining school of our origins, no longer the self-deprecating regional institution into which we evolved – (Presidential Convocation Speech, 2009)

Despite the President's attempt to inspire - at least officially – the creation of a different kind of "Tier One" model, where in true South West fashion, access and excellence remain core ideals, and where regional service, teaching, and student validation are to remain at the heart of faculty work while research productivity, grant writing and other forms of fund raising simultaneously and unproblematically increase and improve, most faculty members do not have faith that South West can or even should attempt to build a new model. In fact, for some faculty members, the idea of building a new and different kind of "Tier One" model *does not even register*. However, let me stress; faculty members are not naïve. Faculty acknowledge that South West has a long way to go before it captures the prestige and reputation of any major national

research university, but doing so, imitating and capturing that sort of reputation is surely what defines SWU's "Tier One" aspirations for most faculty members.

6.2b Organizational Culture as a Sense Making Source

On the other hand, some faculty members use the organizational culture and discourses that are available to make sense of what their role at SWU will and should be. Because culture is such a complex and all encompassing term, I have done my best to narrow and define what I mean by organizational culture. In this study, organizational culture refers to the ideas, ideals, and practices that are carefully constructed, thoughtfully teased out, and often used to secure support, to incite pride and devotion amongst stakeholders at SWU, especially in the form of administrative discourses and organizational history. In this regard, the organizational saga laid out in chapter 5 is quite important for those who primarily use organizational culture to make sense of SWU's transition.

Yet organizational culture does not just pour from the top; it is reproduced by members of the organization as they use normative, already embedded ideas, ideals, and practices to guide their work. Therefore, some faculty members, particularly those who have been at the University for a lengthy time and/or who have some sort of investment in the organizational culture and discourse use it because they have had a hand in structuring it and so it is structured onto them, giving them viable courses of action for fitting into the transition. In other words, for some faculty members, the organizational culture, perhaps more than the institutional field provides an outline of what the possibilities are for a professor who works at a "Tier One" aspirant SWU.

When faculty members use organizational culture and discourses to make sense of the transition, they suggest that South West aims to build a *new kind* of “Tier One” model the “South West Way.” Five of the twenty-six interviewees in my interview pool were convinced that South West should, could, and intends to build what I call a “new kind of Tier One” model⁴⁶ or “Tier One the SWU Way!” as one slogan⁴⁷ put it. These faculty members discussed the creation of a University where access, excellence, teaching, and research along with local and regional service will be equally valued and executed without a problem.

Within my interview sample, I spoke with a few faculty members that are or were contributing architects of the “Tier One the SWU Way” plan and who spoke eloquently and persuasively about the transition as an opportunity to fulfill SWU’s long-held mission of providing the “best” kind of access. In the words of one professor/previous top administrator:

...access and excellence are indissolubly linked....I mean its kind of hard to be against either...This is why I am here and this is why it is important - in a deeply, historically underserved community, if you don’t drive your access institution to the highest level of excellence you are shortchanging on the access level itself because you’re not really providing access you’re providing some kind of *‘okay, good enough for you all now; this will be fine for you all level of excellence.’* you have to drive for excellence or you would be shortchanging the very students you set out to serve – (Interview Transcript, 2009).

In essence, faculty members who tend to see SWU’s “Tier One” aspirations as an attempt to build a new model see it as a continuation of SWU’s unique commitment to

⁴⁶ A few others thought it sounded admirable and exciting, but doubted the plausibility of such approaches.

⁴⁷ Other slogans include: Some of these slogans include “Tier One the [South West] Way!”; “We are going to be, not be like!” and the most recent one includes “South West aspires to be the next major, national research university with a 21st century demographic (a dominant Mexican American demographic)!”

access and excellence – just taken to a new level. Typically, for these faculty members, teaching and scholarship are thought of as complimentary. Furthermore, they believe that one's research agenda should be defined by local needs and then translated for national and international audiences. Probably most intriguing is the idea that SWU will not adopt more rigorous admissions standards or raise tuition (thereby shutting out large portions of the local, working class population) and that faculty will continue to “validate” undergraduate students, as has always been prescribed by the President. Amongst survey responses, I was unable to find any clear, additional evidence that other faculty members buy into the possibility of building a new “Tier One” model and within my interviewee pool, the majority of faculty members often criticized and laughed at the idea.

Thus far, I have outlined the two major sources of sense-making. It must be stressed; however, that drawing from institutional field and/or organizational culture does not mean conformity. Although some faculty members seek to import the institutional field, the majority of faculty members sought to negate a role some where between institutional field and local organizational culture. Sometimes faculty members juxtapose organizational and institutional culture to justify the negation of their role or to explain why the work profile that they have constructed is legitimate at SWU. To this end, I argue that faculty sense-making is not simply about faculty figuring out what this transition is about and how to cope with it, but it is about faculty members who are *striving to create a legitimate space* for themselves and their work – an endeavor which most faculty hold closely to their heart. Like the faculty members that Anna Neumann (2009) has interviewed in her work, the faculty members in my own interviews also

conceive of their work as a labor of love (Neumann, 2009) – outgrowths of their love for learning and teaching, for discovering and sharing, personal endeavors to mentor others who share backgrounds similar to their own, to raise aspiring, critical thinking and well-equipped practitioners, professionals and scholars for the local region and sometimes for the world. Thus, as faculty members spoke about this endeavor called work and especially when they described if and how their work “fits” into SWU, given the current context of change, it became apparent that professors were constructing a space for themselves amid this quite ambiguous environment of change. They aimed for their work, and thus their role, to seem not only plausible, but legitimate and viable.

6.3 Constructing Roles, Making Spaces

Ultimately, I see that faculty are constructing roles and carrying out their work under the pre-text of three overarching themes. These three overarching themes describe what kind of role and actions faculty members are taking in light of SWU's proposed transition from a primarily teaching focused to a research dominant or “Tier One” mission. These themes include: faculty who **Operationalize**; faculty who **Negotiate**; and faculty who **Acquiesce**. As overarching themes, they are meant to signal the dominant response or action taken by faculty members, and thus the role that they are playing in this transition.

For instance, **Operationalizers** take action in ways that they believe will contribute to SWU's successful transition. They “own” the transition and are excited as well as determined to make it happen. However, as will be shown, Operationalizing can look different based on one's interpretation of SWU's “Tier One” aspirations.

Negotiators, in general, take account of SWU's desire to achieve a new and different kind of status, and yet as a whole, they are quite skeptical about SWU's commitment to achieving "Tier One" -as they know it- or they are still unsure about where SWU is going. In the latter case, faculty members often juxtapose their own experience at already established "Tier One's" and then compare them to their experiences at SWU and "negotiate" a space and a role for themselves somewhere in-between. In other words, negotiating is about trade-offs, and it is about faculty members taking agency over their work and their role at South West in small, practical, but still powerful ways.

Finally, **Acquiescing** signals to acceptance, resistance, and sometimes the reconstruction of one's role. All of these acquiescent acts, I argue, are grounded in a quiet sort of power as faculty members take agency over their role and either work to re-insert themselves as viable and legitimate members of the University (not necessarily the field) or actively resist the transition all together by not changing work habits at all.

The rest of this chapter is laid out in sub-sections. In the first sub-section, I introduce the **Operationalizers** (N=11/26) and make a concerted effort to explain how Operationalizers, as a group may be working towards the achievement of SWU's "Tier One" aspirations, but when one comes closer, it becomes apparent that Operationalizers are using two different models to guide their sense-making, and thus, the interpretations and roles they construct are actually quite different and imply significant implications for SWU's transition.

The second sub-section is dedicated to the **Negotiators** (N=9/26). Amongst the Negotiators, actions (the way that they negotiate) are quite similar. What is interesting

and what I spend time discussing in this chapter is what they are negotiating and how negotiations are conditioned very much by one's habitus.

Finally, the third section is where I introduce and discuss the **Acquiescent** (N=6/26). In this section, I show how acquiescence can take different forms, but how it is consistently rooted in a sort of quiet power. I spend time here, also, suggesting that Acquiescent faculty members reassert a sort of role that has for a long time been valuable at SWU; the Acquiescent, to a certain extent, seek to reassert the legitimacy of this role that has been structured onto them via their long term career at SWU. I question whether or not SWU could (should) do more to ensure that these faculty members have a legitimate space during and after this time of transition.

In each sub-section, I introduce the faculty members in each group. I describe their backgrounds and what attracted them to academia, in general, and to South West, more specifically. I explore what they believed South West was about and why they believed they fit into the University early on. After introducing faculty members in each sub-section, I attempt to outline precisely what sorts of ideas, ideals, and practices (and from where they pull these ideas) faculty use as they interpret South West's "Tier One" aspirations. This approach is intended to contextualize and juxtapose the institutional and organizational cultures that faculty use for their sense-making. I also highlight how faculty members use either organizational or institutional culture more predominantly. I show how their sense-making is inextricably linked to the roles that they construct and how the entire process is often, though, tacitly filtered by the whole of one's lived experiences.

Ultimately, I theorize that, given the current structure of the field of higher education, and the larger socio-political and economic environment in which South West's transition to "Tier One" takes place, there are certain sense-making processes, and thus, roles that are likely to win more recognition and value. There are, then, critical implications for certain groups of faculty and kinds of faculty work that beg consideration especially if one is concerned about the ultimate purposes of universities, and more specifically, of university professors. Such implications are explored more fully in chapter 7.

Before moving forward, it is important to point out that although I describe faculty as "groups," this is only on the basis that they have made similar interpretations of the "Tier One" transition, and thus, adopt similar stances and strategies with regard to the transition. In no case, did I find faculty reaching out to make sense of this transition with others - with the exception of formally organized meetings, in which faculty members became recipients of confusing and often contradictory messages offered by the University Provost, President, College Deans and/or senior colleagues. One of the most interesting, disturbing trends in the data was the deep sense of isolation amongst faculty members and their disconnection from colleagues. This is an implication taken up in chapter 7 where I also move on to provide a discussion of my findings and highlight both theoretical and practical implications.

6.3a The Operationalizers

"I came to [South West] to do research. I've dedicated my whole life to research." – (Faculty Survey Comment, 2009)

I refer to the first group as Operationalizers. This group of 11 faculty members works and constructs roles that they believe contribute to South West's "Tier One"

aspirations. Thus, they seek to “operationalize” SWU’s Tier One aspirations.

Overwhelmingly, Operationalizers describe themselves as research-oriented faculty and one professor went as far as to clarify that “I want my [students] to see that I am not a teacher, that I am a [social scientist].” Operationalizers understand that the production of scholarship, grant-writing and the procurement of external dollars are all important aspects of capturing a “Tier One” status. Six explicitly spoke about writing grants. A few mentioned that they attempt to write grants in order to “buy out” some of their teaching time – a relatively new phenomenon at SWU. As a whole this group looks to wider, national, international or disciplinary based groups to “measure” how well they are doing. A few mentioned that they use rankings associations as a way to gauge their progress to “Tier One.” They are also concerned with writing in elite outlets and impacting wide, national, or international audiences. Frequently, Operationalizers note that they were “hired to help South West achieve Tier One” and they are excited about such prospects. Of the Operationalizers who have been at SWU for an extended period of time (at least five years), they described South West’s aspirations as finally matching their own orientation to work. Table 4 below details some basic information about the Operationalizers.

Table 4 Operationalizers’ Background Information

T-Status	College	Minimum, Maximum and Mean Yrs @ SWU
8 Tenured	3 Education	~1 Min.
3 Tenure-Track	4 Liberal Arts	30+ Max.
TT	Education	Mean = 12 years
T	4 Science	-

Dr. Lucero is a tenure-track faculty member. He works in the College of Education and has been at South West for about five years. Dr. Lucero, interestingly, grew up in the local region in a middle class family. The son of a professional, Dr.

Lucero was the second generation to attend college. It was during his masters program that he developed an interest in the scholarship of pedagogy. Like the majority of faculty at South West, Dr. Lucero, received his doctoral training at a major research university.

Dr. Lucero described what a “tremendous influence” his mentor had on him. “My mentor...encouraged me to pursue this [academia]....culturally; he was a tremendous influence on me. So, [research] is just something that I still have a desire to do.” When asked to describe what attracted him to the professoriate, he explained “I wanted to go the academic route and I wanted to identify as a researcher. I wanted to build an identity of a researcher....I had a really big interest in how people learn...” In his survey response, Dr. Lucero indicated that he believed that South West was the perfect place to situate himself as an emerging researcher. As of 2009, Dr. Lucero had been at South West for five years. Of coming to South West, he wrote “I wanted to have the opportunity to focus on research.” During the interview, I asked him to expand on this comment about his coming to South West.

.... [I saw] from the college and the university that this is the direction that we are going in – you know, ‘Tier One.’ So, there was a lot of discussion of reduced loads, of funding for graduate students, a lot of discussion about expanding the field experience program...in which case I knew I could do some research...And I knew that [South West] was emerging as a ‘Tier One;’ so, that was a big incentive because other places that I had interviewed – when I had those interviews, it seemed like they were looking for someone more qualified to teach and they were looking for someone to take on those teaching responsibilities to release faculty that they had there to do the research. So, that is why I turned them down... (Interview Transcript, 2009)

Dr. Lucero went on to admit that he is grappling with his identity as a researcher. Taking a regrettable tone, Dr. Lucero told me the following:

Leslie: So, would you say that you identify primarily as a researcher?

Dr. Lucero: Umm. That is a hard question because I don't think that I am quite there yet. At this point in time, I see myself more as a teacher.

Leslie: And is that okay with you?

Dr. Lucero: Not really. No. I want to pursue that desire, that notion that I had as a doctoral student....But I think at this particular point in time, most of my emphasis has been on teaching. That was not because of decisions that I made, but really because of infrastructure, uh, certain things that I am asked to do. You know we mentioned before you turned the tape on, that I have three courses, three preps! That is a lot of service to students. The balance tips in that direction. I mean...I guess with that kind of demand in the job (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Lucero had a clear sense of his career before entering the professoriate. As an undergraduate and master's student, he discovered a passion for scholarship on the teaching and learning. In his graduate program, this love for scholarship and research was solidified as he worked with a renowned researcher and his mentor. Above all, Dr. Lucero prizes the research endeavor. He saw South West as the perfect place to begin his research oriented career, but today he strives to reconcile his vision with the reality of work at South West.

Dr. Rivera, a tenured faculty member in the College of Education, described his attraction to South West as we met in a local coffee shop. He has been at the University for nearly 10 years. Dr. Rivera grew up in another country in what he described as a poor, working class family. He told me that he spent much time as a young adult trying to understand poverty and the causes of poverty. Before entering the professoriate, he told me that he had thought about making a life of religious practice. Ultimately, though, Dr. Rivera concluded that "as a university professor, I would have more opportunity to spread the word and transform the world..." He described his work as driven by a core mission: expanding and maximizing his contribution through social justice research,

especially around matters of race and equality. For example, he described his work with the following statement:

I consider myself as an activist educator. I think - I have no respect and no value for faculty who do research for private interests or for self promotion only. I think their research is important as long as we are looking at the public interest, that our research has an effect on people and that our research sheds some light on - brings some insight on the body of knowledge...Hopefully, you know the research will be a way of transforming reality and transforming our communities, our society. And I don't consider myself only a local researcher, I am a nationalist and I am also an internationalist (Interview Transcript, 2009).

A graduate of a prestigious research university, Dr. Rivera always aimed to work at a major research university. In fact, when asked, in the survey, to express his opinion on South West's transition to Tier One, he responded "I have been looking for that my whole life here." For Dr. Rivera, South West represented an opportunity to do important social justice work, both inside and outside the classroom. Probably most importantly, however, he believed that South West provided an international stage that would allow him to have a wide and ranging impact via his work. Although Dr. Rivera does not identify primarily as a researcher, like Lucero; he does stress how important it was and it is to produce scholarship that has a national and international impact.

Dr. Romero, also an Operationalizer, is a tenured faculty member in the College of Science. At the time of our interview, Dr. Romero had been at SWU between 5-10 years. Dr. Romero grew up in another country in a working class family. Explaining that he was held up at a conference due to poor weather conditions, Dr. Romero multi-tasked throughout our entire interview. Answering phone calls, sending out power points to colleagues, and responding to e-mails, Dr. Romero told me how his innate curiosity for learning, especially with regard to science fueled his desire to become a faculty

member, but more specifically to become a researcher. Of this life-long love for learning science, he noted “I was like very curious about science, you know, when I was a kid. I used to have, used to buy this - it was like...a collection series called ‘The Scientist’.” Trained at one of the most elite universities in his home country, Dr. Romero has always prized research above and beyond the teaching tenet of faculty work. In fact, although his course load is typically a 1-2 (sometimes a 1-1), he would prefer to “teach less.” He began his career as a faculty member in his home country and then decided to relocate to the U.S. and specifically to South West in order to conduct research. When asked to explain how he decided to make this move, particularly to South West University, he said:

The U.S. is still the center - still the center for research in the world and so I start looking for places. [I started] looking for positions and I was in a meeting and a professor from [South West] saw my presentation and, was very excited about my work. And at the same time [South West] was, you know, was starting this move [towards Tier One]. And they were hiring professionals, you know, hiring new professors for areas of my work [and] my research program (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Like Dr. Lucero, Dr. Romero came to South West, in hopes of starting up a strong research career. Since arriving, he has earned tenure and is very involved in grant writing. He takes pride in the success he has had in obtaining grant funding for his own research and for the University.

Dr. Ortiz is a tenured faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Ortiz is a nationally renowned faculty member who has been at SWU for a little over 10 years. From the general area, Dr. Ortiz grew up in a working class family and was the first to attend college. He returned to the area after his studies at an elite university. When asked to describe what attracted him and keeps him at South West University. He

frankly clarified:

I love living here. I love [this city]. I love living on the border and that's one of the reasons, one of the reasons that I wanted to keep teaching here. It is not because of [South West University]! But because of where it's located it's located - on the border. I want to live on the border. I want to write about the border. I want this...this is it for me. So...you know the University of Iowa is not on the border. Stanford University is not on the border. You know, um, University of Chicago, none of those places is on the border. They're not where I want to live, ah particularly, um, so you know so I have to make choices and some of those choices are personal. [South West] shouldn't take credit for that. I didn't stay here because of [South West]. You know, it has nothing, my decision to stay here has nothing to do with this university nothing at all, and that's just the truth! (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Ortiz, a graduate of one of the most elite Universities in the U.S., came to the South West campus in order to facilitate what has been a phenomenally successful career. When asked about his view on teaching and research, he explained that research can and should be a tool for teaching. Specifically, he suggested that one must be current in his field in order to teach young people. Clearly, however, Dr. Ortiz remains at South West in order to carry out his scholarship in a setting that he enjoys and wants to write about.

Dr. Smith is fairly new to South West University. Just recently, he finished his doctoral work in one of the nation's premier universities and joined the South West faculty as a non-tenured, tenure-track professor in the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Smith is the son of two professionals and grew up in a solid, middle class family. He said coming to SWU was a practical decision since there was a shortage of jobs when he entered the market. He also noted in the survey, however, that the transition to "Tier One" "encourages my own priorities which are researching and writing to a wider audience" (Survey response, 2009).

Dr. Pena is a tenured faculty member who works in the College of Science. Dr. Pena also grew up in another country in a working class family. She could recall clearly how her love for learning and for science, in general, set her on the path to a research career. More specifically, however, Dr. Pena told me that she was motivated to look more carefully at her area of research when a loved one passed on from a disease that she now studies. Dr. Pena identifies first and foremost as a scientist, but does not mind the teaching. In fact, she talked about being surprised by the joy she gets from teaching. She has also been successful in obtaining grants for the University to support her own research.

Dr. Arguello is fairly new professor to SWU, but he is not completely new to SW as a University. As a local resident of the area, he obtained his undergraduate education at SWU. Now, a tenure-track professor in the College of Education, he is quite excited about capitalizing and contributing to SWU's "Tier One" aspirations. Dr. Arguello discusses his desire to be a professor in very clear terms. He described in the survey and during out interview how the professoriate allows him to position himself to be a leader and a scholar that will impact the attainment and experience of higher education for minorities, especially for aspiring Latinos. When asked what drew him specifically to SWU, he noted:

What I appreciate about [SWU] –is that it is unapologetic about advancing Hispanic education - and so much more than my previous institution...The other thing that attracted me was that, you know, SWU, from the time I have been here anyway has been pretty clear about increasing its research focus and that is evident in the teaching load (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Arguello compared his experience at his former University to his experience at SWU. At his former University, he often taught a three-three load and prepared

numerous new courses during his first few years. Such conditions were not amenable to producing scholarship, which is what Dr. Arguello most enjoys. Since arriving at SWU, though, Dr. Arguello believes that he is in a place that really wants to focus on research, given his two-two teaching load and other support systems that he has been afforded, such as small grant opportunities and research assistance.

Dr. Jackson is a tenured professor in Liberal Arts, educated at two of the country's most elite universities. He described growing up in an upper middle class family as the son of two professionals. He has been at South West for more than 20 years and admits that he "ended up" at South West because it offered him a position when he entered the job market. For a while, he served in a high ranking administrative position at the university where he oversaw the development of curriculum/programming and was quite involved in the earliest discussions of "Tier One." He says that prior to obtaining his position at South West, "I didn't think about teaching actually....I had really gotten into it from the research side." To this end, Dr. Jackson remarked about the very traditional orientation of his own doctoral program where "[his] time at [Elite] University was a very research oriented kind of program..." that had prepared him for a similar kind of career.

Dr. Marks is a tenured faculty member in the College of Science. Dr. Marks had been at SWU for more than 20 years. She grew up in a solid middle class home with two parents who were also professionals. Although her parents may not have aspired for her to enter the professoriate, they were always supportive of her interests in academics and science. Like Dr. Jackson, Dr. Marks has also served in an

administrative capacity for a number of years and talked about the sort of longitudinal insight she has regarding SWU's aspirations.

Dr. Marks entered the professoriate based on her desire to do research, her affinity for the subject matter, and her desire to have a flexible career that would allow her to raise a family. South West was attractive because she liked the region and felt that it was a place where she could do interesting things with her research agenda. When asked to talk about whether or not any ideas or goals inspire or drive her work as a professor, Dr. Marks began by noting that, initially, her interest in research was primary. However, she eventually learned to enjoy teaching, and she talked at length about developing her instructional capacities to become a "more effective teacher."

Dr. Matthews gave a particularly provocative interview. As a native of the South West region, Dr. Matthews has been at the University in faculty role for multiple decades. A tenured faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts, Dr. Matthews was well-versed in SWU's history and could speak about the transition to "Tier One" in quite detailed fashion. Dr. Matthews noted:

You are speaking of a person that sort of transcends historical periods because when I started here it was [previous name College] and so the whole research component was not stressed and so what happened was that actually in 1967, I believe was the year that they transitioned to the University. Then there was a change and the department started recruiting PhD's from all around and these PhD's came from 'Tier One's,' you know. We hired people from Harvard, from Princeton, from wherever, and they came with this idea about research... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

As the university began to bring in more research oriented faculty with Ph.D.s, she decided to leave to obtain a Ph.D. of her own – like several of her male colleagues had done. She told me about her experience as the sole woman in the department as a newly minted Ph.D. who was *not* put on the tenure-line like her returned male

colleagues. Eventually, a tenure-line opened up and Dr. Matthews was finally given a tenure-line position. Dr. Matthews talked mostly about her work as a teacher. However, she has had a fairly successful writing career and sees the teaching and researching as compatible.

Dr. Samuels has been at South West for less than 10 years and spent the large majority of his time as a high ranking administrator. In fact, at the time of our interview, he was still serving South West in predominantly an administrative capacity. I interviewed him to gain insight into the thinking behind “Tier One.” In many ways, Dr. Samuels was at the forefront of the “Tier One” conversation, especially with regard to how the transition and its implications were to be communicated to faculty at South West. Dr. Samuels, as a faculty member, prior to assuming his administrative position, won an excellence in teaching award and throughout the interview; it became apparent, how important the teaching function of the university really is to him. His comments suggest that often research and teaching function as subtractive tenets of faculty work. Referring back to his own experience as a professor, he said “I mean...the production of instructional time...that was competing with getting my dissertation research done and I knew I had to do well...” I do not use Dr. Samuels’s interview data extensively since at the time of the interview he did not have figure out what “Tier One” meant to teaching, researching, and service work.

Below, I discuss how Operationalizers have made sense of SWU’s transition and then how they have taken action in light of this transition. In this section, I seek to show how faculty member’s habituses serve as a sort of lens for both the sense that they have made and for the strategies and actions that they employ. Furthermore, I show

how these constructed actions seem practical and second nature to the faculty members – yet they are all actions connected to and underwritten by power relations that structure the field of higher education and also power relations that are at play within South Western University. I show how these different sense-making and action taking processes help me to distinguish two sub-groups of Operationalizers: the cosmopolitans and the local-cosmopolitans.

The Operationalizers can be divided into two sub-sets upon the basis of the definition that they have assigned to South West's transition, and perhaps more importantly, because of the kinds of roles that they are playing in this transition. Although they are all categorized as Operationalizers, it is important to point out that these two groups are in fact, Operationalizing SWU's "Tier One" aspirations in very different ways towards quite distinct and divergent ends. These differences are anchored in different kinds of power and capital that faculty members have access to.

The first sub-set of Operationalizers includes six faculty members: Drs. Romero, Smith, Lucero, Pena, Rivera, and Ortiz. I refer to this group as the **Cosmopolitan Operationalizers**. I call them cosmopolitan (Gouldner, 1957; 1958) to describe the sort of habitus that they embody and that they deployed as they spoke to me about their lives and roles as faculty members. Specifically, Gouldner (1957; 1958) wrote about two different roles that tend to develop in complex organizations and referred to these roles as that of the "local" and that of the "cosmopolitan." The differences are noted below:

...the cosmopolitan is characterized as being low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skill, and likely to use an outer reference group orientation; the second, the local, was characterized as being high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation (Gouldner, 1957; 1958).

Using the above definition, Cosmopolitan Operationalizers tend to lean heavily towards research and aim to appeal to wide external reference groups. In his 1958 work, Gouldner worked to better define the local-cosmopolitan construct and took academia as the field of study. He used factors like publication record, community engagement, and student-faculty contact hours to flush out what might be expected of a cosmopolitan versus a local scholar. In the end, the cosmopolitan professor represented what others describe when they talk about a research oriented scholar who is highly interested, oriented, and engaged in research and who references external groups rather than local organizational constituents while the local looked a lot like what scholars tend to describe when they discuss a more teaching oriented scholar who is focused on local matters, work with students, and applied knowledge.⁴⁸ No research, at least that I am aware of has tended to the sociological origins or the basis of what makes or shapes a cosmopolitan versus a local orientation. This research attends or at least begins to attend to this very important question through the use of Bourdieu's body of work.

Thus, returning to Bourdieu's concept of habitus, it is important to account for how one's habitus comes to be shaped as a cosmopolitan versus a local scholar. Here, some of the commonalities amongst the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers include their gender (most are men), that they tend to be fairly new to SWU and that all have come from very elite Universities; these are important factors to keep in mind as other

⁴⁸ In many ways, it seems that this discourse on cosmopolitan-local is a continuation of the long running debate regarding pure and practical or applied research and scholarship. At the cosmopolitan-local level, however, this debate can be said to have manifested at the most micro level with the most micro manners and habits.

research often suggests that men tend to be more research oriented (Schuster et al., 2006) and also that one's graduate training experience is an important factor in shaping one's orientation to the professoriate (Rosch and Reich, 1996).

However, what is also critical with the concept of habitus is to look across one's whole lived experience. Dr. Romero recalls being exposed at a very early age to science and remembers purchasing small science kits at newsstands as a child. Dr. Lucero was exposed to teaching and learning early on, as the son of a professional educator, and he grew to love scholarship on pedagogy. Dr. Pena told me of losing her loved one to a disease that she wants to learn more about and hopefully find a cure through her research contributions. Also, four of the six Cosmopolitans are international or have international backgrounds, and thus are connected to larger networks and knowledge communities than the local one or even the national one.

As for the other sub-set of Operationalizers, I refer to them as **local-Cosmopolitans**.⁴⁹ This group is composed of 5 tenured faculty members with extensive experience at the University (mostly as professors, but one as a student and a native of the area) and includes: Drs. Jackson, Marks, Matthews, Arguello, and Samuels. Four of the five are tenured while the tenure-track professor is an Associate Professor, Dr. Arguello, with more than 7 years of professorly experience behind him in a University very similar to SWU and also with deep roots to SWU community, as he grew up in the

⁴⁹ In 2008, Rhoades and students wrote about the need to interrogate the local-cosmopolitan dichotomy. This argument was useful and inspired some of my own thinking about how to characterize the distinct subgroups that fell under one theme. However, I also think that Rhoades et al., (2008) discussion can be expanded and made more multi-dimensional. Here, when I refer to local-Cosmopolitan Operationalizers, I do not use the phrase the same way that Rhoades et al., (2008) does, but I attempt to show the powerful intersect between organization and professor, particularly with the organization as a structuring agent. I use Rhoades et al., (2008) conception of Local-Cosmopolitan later when I discuss the Negotiators who tend to be tied to the local community/historical mission of SWU in more personal ways.

area. Three have been at the University for more than 20 years while another has been at the University for almost 6 years. This group has worked at SWU for an average of 19 years. Out of the five, 4 have served in central administrative posts for prolonged periods of time while employed by SWU. During their time spent as administrators, these Local-Cosmopolitans became involved in the early planning/thinking stages behind SWU's transition. In fact, one of the professors referred to himself as one of the "architects of the 'Tier One' plan." This insider perspective translates into a sort of power and privilege that no other group of faculty members could talk about or use in their work or as they attempted to make sense of SWU's transition.

I call them local-Cosmopolitans for several reasons, but most importantly I theorize that they are Cosmopolitans that have been localized through their long term relationship to the University, but probably more importantly because of the investment that they have made to the organization. Similar to the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers, they describe themselves most primarily as researchers, but dissimilar to the Cosmopolitans, they view their instructional work and their research work as closely jointed. Only the tenure-track professor, Dr. Arguello, discussed how he protects his scholarly time from his teaching time, which he believes is sensible given his non-secured status. Thus, local-Cosmopolitans look at their work differently than the Cosmopolitans in terms of their teaching and research responsibilities; however, the distinction between the Cosmos and the local-Cosmopolitans is deeper than this.

Local-Cosmopolitans have no objection to SWU's strides toward "Tier One;" however, it is a very unique version of "Tier One" that they are working towards. Specifically, the local-Cosmopolitans move quite fluidly between institutional and

organizational culture to help them define this transition at SWU. Earlier, I discussed the President's attempt to convince the faculty and other stakeholders that SWU wants to build a new kind of "Tier One" – where access, excellence, scholarship, teaching, and student validation are equally valued and celebrated. Local-Cosmopolitan Operationalizers are the *only* group of faculty members that believe SWU can (or should) build a new model. Other groups of faculty, yet to be introduced but including the other sub-set of Operationalizers call such aspirations "pie in the sky," bologna" or flat-out "lies." Others often acknowledged how exciting it would be to build a new "Tier One" model, but worry that SWU does not have the capacity to move forward with such a bold vision and that, ultimately, the transition will fall "on the backs of the tenure-track faculty" (Faculty Survey Comment, 2009).

Again, it is my task to theorize how this sub-set of faculty members came to be local-Cosmopolitans and to show how their habituses – their range of experiences – set up such a disposition. In other words, what can be said about this group that ties them together? Most staggering is the number of years that they have spent at the University. Thus, although, Dr. Jackson admitted that "he got into the professoriate for the research side of it;" today, he admits that he enjoys teaching and that teaching freshmen is "energizing." Like Dr. Marks, who entered academia to do research she enjoyed, Dr. Jackson has learned to "enjoy" teaching. Not only has time spent at SWU structured a habitus that allows these local-Cosmopolitans to look at their work as more integrative and complimentary, but, they, more than the Cosmopolitans spoke about the importance of making a local impact and specifically of serving the regional population through open access admissions and by designing research that is based on the

University's local context. This is an extremely important point. Local-Cosmopolitan Operationalizers contextualize the move to "Tier One;" they account for the balance and the care that has been given to protect SWU's open-admissions, the regional and public mission of SWU as the only public four-year University for a quickly growing and large population, and the criticality of SWU as a teaching University that prepares local professionals.

Thus, I argue that local-Cosmopolitans move from the institutional field to the organizational culture to define what SWU's transition means, but the organizational culture is much more predominant in their sense-making and action taking. Interestingly, the mixing of organizational and institutional culture is not even apparent to them, they spoke about SWU's aspirations to build a new kind of model as unproblematic, exciting, and they simply could not understand why others critique the transition at all.

Below I present data on sense-making and action taking for the Cosmopolitans and then the local-Cosmopolitans. I attempt to juxtapose these two sub-sets of faculty members to one another and show how even within one group of faculty members who set out to "Operationalize" the university's aspirations (which are also their own aspirations), very different ideas and actions are at play. I believe, however, that only one set of ideas or actions will be deemed useful and legitimate as the University progresses on its "Tier One" journey, and again, it is useful to remember here, that the University is not located in a vacuum, but in a field of higher education where prescriptions for legitimacy and prestige are quite sturdy. With this in mind, I turn to the data.

6.3b Cosmopolitan Operationalizers in Action

When asked to explain what South West's transition means to him and his work,

Dr. Romero, a tenured Scientist said:

Well, 'Tier One' is, is, you know, in simple terms, I think [it] is the top schools, top universities in the country, like Harvard, Yale, you know, and here in Texas we have ah Texas A&M we have ah UT Dallas, Austin...but top schools where not only teaching is very, uh, how do you say [*sic*]? [Teaching] has reached [*sic*] you know very high levels, but also especially, I'll say research [*sic*]. So you have to have a certain level, certain level funding, of research, and ah a number of publications and ah, and that but, you know, [that] makes the difference between let's say Harvard, Yale, you know. [South West] is not a Tier One University; you know...I think, [South West] is in the intermediate stage. I think we have increased a lot our, our, our funding ah portfolio, but we still have long way to go, I think (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Clearly, Dr. Romero sees South West's transition to "Tier One" as an attempt by SWU to adopt the form and functioning of what I call the institutional model. Not only does he use Harvard as a reference point, but he places South West's current position in the context of already established elite research universities. Dr. Romero's definition of the situation is not uncommon. In fact, the vast majority of faculty members indicated that they believe SWU aspires to be a University like Berkley, Harvard, UT Austin among others. For instance, in the survey one faculty member noted "I don't want to be in a place that wants to be like Austin." Another faculty member commented:

We need to start thinking like a 'Tier One' institution where the infrastructure is in place...let's not kid ourselves - In order to be able to play within the Major League, we should be able to have the required support and talent to sustain it. A new wave of leadership who is in tune with new century is badly needed. *We cannot be a teaching institution and a Tier One. We cannot move to Tier One in an open-access format for all students.* I am all for access of minority students, however, we can run into the problem of a spiral down curriculum and quality of training (Tenured Male Survey Respondent, 2009).

This faculty member's comment synthesizes some of the main issues and understandings that Cosmopolitans have about SWU's transition. For instance, they believe that to achieve to "Tier One," the University must and will at some point need to let go of open-access while also building a better infrastructure in terms of organizational leadership, graduate education, and also grant support staff. Turning to the institutional field, rather than to the local organizational culture to define "Tier One" has major implications for the kind of faculty roles that professors construct during this time of change. Absent from the Cosmopolitan's understanding of SWU's transition is the compelling need to serve as an open-access, regional university that the President and others, including their Local-Cosmopolitan counter-parts, press upon.

Dr. Rivera, a Cosmopolitan, who refers to himself as an "internationalist and an activist educator" completely turns the local organizational discourse on its head to define "Tier One." When asked what he thinks about the notion that South West can do "Tier One its own way," Dr. Rivera critiqued:

I have a problem with that because there is no such a thing as our own 'Tier One.' It's a national concept, you know, that universities apply. By that 'Tier One' means *one* thing to the whole nation and people understand the concept of 'Tier One' as reduced course load to everybody [*sic*] and uh [fewer] number of students in the classroom. Uh, it's a national concept, you know. You can't reduce it to a local concept because if one of our professors leaves - they needed to go to another university, then you know, what are we to have? What we have across the nation should be the same, so that faculty [we] have aren't left behind when other universities demand other criteria (Interview Transcript, 2009)

Dr. Rivera went on to explain that the College of Education, where he works, recently lost two good scholars because they went to schools where they would be treated like "Tier One" faculty. Also frustrated with the idea that South West leaders

suggest that SWU can build a new “Tier One” model, Dr. Ortiz, a cosmopolitan, stressed:

It really frustrates me because we can’t have it both ways. We simply can’t pretend, you know. Um, not to criticize the President...but sometimes she talks out of both sides of her mouth. You can’t, you know be Miss Populist while ‘Tier One’ is not populist. Ok, that’s just the truth, so there... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Institutional interpretations are based on more than references and comparisons that faculty make between South West and already established “Tier Ones.” Probably more importantly, faculty’s interpretations are grounded in what they believe to be a de-emphasis of the very activities that once defined South West as a regional, teaching university. For instance, one faculty member stated:

...a rabid focus on \$\$\$, external grants, will hurt university mission [regarding] service and quality education...many of our students need extra attention to succeed. There won’t be time for this attention if rewards are focused not on teaching but on some other activity...it’s a shame...helping students was why I was most attracted to [South West]. (Faculty Survey Comment, 2009).

The faculty member quoted above believes that South West’s aspirations represent a change in priorities, and thus, he does not foresee South West’s transition to be an extension of its more historical ideals and practices or an attempt to remake the “Tier One” model.

Other data support the suggestion that faculty members believe that South West’s priorities have shifted, and thus, that the “Tier One” transition is not about maintaining teaching and service at the heart of faculty work. For instance, recall that when faculty were asked if they had made changes to their work profile due to South West’s aspirations to be a more research focused university, the vast majority said yes. Then, when they were asked to describe the changes that they have made, an

overwhelming majority suggested that they spend more time on research and fundraising efforts than just a few years ago. For example, one male tenure-track professor noted “I have divested myself of nearly all service and advising duties and have been trying to refocus my efforts into research and to a somewhat lesser extent teaching.”

Although the university may not have intended for their faculty to interpret South West’s transition as a move towards the dominant institutional “Tier One” model, it is clear that many have arrived at this conclusion, nonetheless. This is particularly true amongst the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers for whom the dominant institutional model aligns nicely with their own orientations and hopes for their work. Thus, unlike other faculty groups who seek to negotiate, ignore, or resist the “Tier One” transition, Cosmopolitan Operationalizers seek to make this transition successful. How they seek to operationalize the “Tier One” transition is described below with data.

Consider the case of Dr. Romero. As Dr. Romero spoke about his work, the conversation was filled with ideas and practices nested in the institutional field, not South West’s organizational culture. He spoke about his affinity for research and explained that although his current teaching load is either a 1-2 or sometimes a 1–1, he would like to teach less. In order to teach less, he is currently pursuing grants in order to “buy out” some of his time. After sharing about the learning curve which he had to overcome in terms of learning the American grant writing system, he proudly admitted:

I can’t complain. I was, you know, I [have been] very successful in obtaining [grants], you know, getting funded. We got funded into the first and the second year, I applied, and I got two grants, two major grants. One of them was – it was the first time that this kind of grant was written

and submitted from [South West] and was funded. So, [it was a] great, great thing, you know, a great accomplishment. So but, you know, to have funding is something that you cannot stop. You have to be continuously, continuously writing, submitting proposals and, and [it] is getting tougher every year. You know, so that's I think that's the toughest thing is laying the foundation (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Romero spoke about his work as a faculty member who works in a “Tier One” University. He acknowledges, however, that there are a number of changes that have to happen in order for South West to achieve “Tier One” status. He noted:

Many things have to change... [We] have to start changing how, the way we accept students, you know, undergrad students. We need to set a higher bar for the students we accept; we have great students, but ten times you know, we have students that they, they couldn't be in a Tier One. You know, and I understand, you know, the situation [here] is a completely different situation from the rest of the country...you know, we deal with the population, which is most of the students have to work outside campus in order to survive....that's something that we don't find much in 'Tier One' universities like, you know, if you go to UC Berkley or Harvard, Yale or Duke, you know most of the students, they are well off. You know, they, family maintain them they don't have the pressure to work... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Again, in many ways his suggestions directly undermine the localized notion of “Tier One” as he mobilizes references to Harvard and Berkeley and points out that South West must change its ways to be on par with such universities. That Dr. Romero believes the University needs to “raise” or change its process for admitting students is sensible, particularly since he is referencing the larger field of higher education to understand what a “Tier One” looks like and how it functions.⁵⁰ Dr. Romero does not advocate a more stringent acceptance process because he aims to keep certain groups of students out of the university. He is not a mean or elitist professor; he has simply

⁵⁰ For instance, on average, the majority (46%) of South West students' score between a 18-23 while (42%) score at between a 12-17 on the ACT. At the most prestigious Ivy League schools, ACT scores for the middle 50% of admitted students were no lower than 28.

applied the logic of the field - the logic that he embodies - to understand what South West needs to do in order to attain “Tier One” status. Yet, without a critical eye, Dr. Romero simply accepts and hopefully awaits the day that SWU makes the changes that will allow him to carry out his research – even if such changes mean the dismantling of an open-access admissions process for a historically marginalized population that SWU has long served. This is a critical finding that SWU administrators need to consider as they engineer this change; the fact that professors flatly reject the notion that SWU can be “Tier One” and remain an open-admissions University signals a distinct philosophical difference regarding the role and purposes of SWU.

In another way, Dr. Romero expects and is waiting the day that South West can better facilitate the work he is putting into the achievement of “Tier One.” When I asked Dr. Romero “Is this transition to ‘Tier One’ something you favor, something you agree with? Do you have worries?” He responded:

I think that nobody disagrees with [Tier One], but I think everybody - I think most people here agree with you know, with this move towards ‘Tier One’ status, [but] the infrastructure we need to get there - there are many things that we have to change. There has been a lot of change in the last [few] years I’ve been here. You know, this grant I got you know, [a few years ago], this was the first one here – well, in the college. Nobody knew how to, knew how to deal with that grant so had to go through several bureaucratic processes, you know. I felt like a guinea pig, you know, in many aspects, you know. I had to open the, you know, ah how do you say the, the (gateway? - suggested by Leslie). You know, so the main things that have to change - is [we have] to become more dynamic [in grant administration]. Since I arrived here it has changed a lot but it needs to go, still needs to change more in order to arrive at the point that [we] can be comparable to top tier one universities (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Romero went on to explain that South West needs a more dynamic grant writing administration system as well as a learned grant writing support staff. The emphasis that Dr. Romero places on grants and the centrality of grant writing to his

work supports Musselin (2007) and Gonzales et al., (2009) claims that grant writing is becoming a normalized and institutionalized part of faculty work. Slaughter et al., (19007; 2004) extensive body of work shows that grant writing is particularly prevalent at major research universities. Dr. Romero, then, operationalizes his role as faculty member as if he is already working at a “Tier One” University. Dr. Romero deeply loves his research; he will do what it takes to support his labs, and he expects, like any other “Tier One” professor expects, for his university to do the same.

Dr. Smith is also a Cosmopolitan Operationalizer, yet he dismisses the idea that student demographics present a challenge to South West’s successful “Tier One” transition. However, Dr. Smith is identified as a cosmopolitan because, in a different way, Dr. Smith undermines local organizational culture. He notes:

You know, I hear people saying, ‘we can’t be a ‘Tier One’ because of the students. We need to work with our students.’ And I kind of laugh because the students don’t really matter! We won’t be working with them that much; the graduate students will! (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Smith sees himself in a South West where graduate students will take over the bulk of responsibility for undergraduate education, and where he can focus on his writing as well as mentoring doctoral students. Undergraduate students, as he says will not impact his own productivity and, thus, “don’t matter.” Dr. Smith and Dr. Romero turn to the field to understand the form and functioning of “Tier One” Universities, especially with regard to students and student-faculty relations.

When I asked Dr. Smith to talk about how the transition has impacted his work, he simply explained, that it had not impacted him at all. He, like some of the other Operationalizers, simply explained “I just act as if I am already working at a ‘Tier One’ University.....” While Dr. Smith does not mind teaching, he prefers his research work

and thinks of his teaching as somewhat marginal. When I interviewed Dr. Smith, he made clear that SWU was the only offer he had upon entering the very dry market. However, he noted that he keeps apace with current openings in his field via an on-line website. In fact, when he learned that I was on the job market, Dr. Smith kindly shared “a secret.” He cleared his computer screen and jumped to one of his “Internet Favorites” where he pulled up a wiki for available academic positions. He admitted that he reviews the openings periodically. Dr. Smith showed me how to locate the job listings in my own field, but advised me that there was “not much activity.” It became evident that South West was no more than a holding ground for Dr. Smith, which is in itself a cosmopolitan tendency.

Dr. Rivera agrees that “students” are not a legitimate reason for not pursuing “Tier One” status. He believes those that make such claims are racist. In fact, Rivera believes that the South West students deserve a “Tier One” education. He said “I look at the “Tier One” universities and my students should not have less than students in other top universities. They should learn what they are learning at top universities” (Interview Transcript, 2009). Intrigued by his comments, which seemed to suggest that he supports “Tier One” for the benefit of his students because he believes that “Tier One” will afford them a better learning and educational experience, I asked him to further elaborate on how students will benefit. This was a new perspective since most faculty members seemed to think that the undergraduate education experience might suffer because of SWU’s “Tier One” aspirations. Dr. Rivera said:

I think that ‘Tier One’ brings prestige to us....I think ‘Tier One’ will bring more resources, more prestige more attention to what we are doing here, we deserve it and I want to work for a ‘Tier One’ institution...to make it a

place of excellence where we can advance scholarly work. (Interview Transcript, 2009)

At first, Dr. Rivera describes how South West students will experience a better learning experience if South West can achieve a “Tier One status.” However, when pressed to elaborate, it appears that students will benefit more from the prestige associated with a degree granted from a “Tier One” than from their actual learning experience while faculty will benefit from the opportunity to advance scholarly work. At the end of the interview, Dr. Rivera, himself, called into question the benefits to be derived by South West students; this is captured in the displayed dialogue below. Dr. Rivera asked me, “Leslie, what interested you in this research? Why are you doing it?” I frankly responded:

Leslie: When I entered the doctoral program, well, I began to hear about ‘Tier One’ and I began to wonder about that. You know, I began to wonder about what happens if [South West] does not provide clarity and infrastructure – [like what] you talked about -teaching loads, assistants, etc- then what happens to the student-faculty interaction, the student experience...what gives? And so, I wanted to talk to the faculty to see how they are seeing this ‘Tier One’ [transition] and how they are managing...

Dr. Rivera: Oh, yes that is interesting, an interesting idea. You are right top universities are very cut throat – students are like (Dr. Rivera makes a funny face, looking and pointing his thumbs downwards) – you know, like we [South West] care for the students too much, you know and you know we cater to the students. [University Name], [University Name] and others don’t do that – we pamper them....

Dr. Rivera’s comments are strife with contradiction. On the one hand, he believes that South West University should become “Tier One” because South West students deserve what he considers to be the best kind of education – a “Tier One” education on par with that of any top tier system. This statement reflects some of the local organizational culture and discourse: all students, especially SWU students, deserve

the “best” education, which only a major research university can provide. On the other hand, he admits that top universities are “very cut throat” and that students seem to occupy a space somewhere at the bottom of a totem pole. Whether “Tier One” represents the best kind of access to the best kind of education, Dr. Rivera looks forward to the day when South West, as a “Tier One” institution, will bring him and his students the prestige they deserve.

He, more than other Operationalizers tends to use the organizational discourse and culture – a culture that asserts that access is not sufficient, but access to excellence must be the case. What is important to point out about Dr. Rivera is the length of time he has been at the University (about 10 years) and also his personal experiences working with impoverished communities with little access to education, disadvantaged social groups, and particularly his work on race and equity. This slew of personal experiences has surely structured his habitus, helped him to see the world and higher education, specifically, in a certain way. Moreover, after almost 10 years, it is acceptable to theorize that he has had a hand in structuring the organizational culture that is now structured onto his habitus and that this lengthy experience at SWU helps/necessitates how he defines SWU “Tier One” aspirations as an attempt to create an open access “Tier One” institution that would provide direct benefits to the local population.

Yet, Dr. Rivera is classified as a Cosmopolitan Operationalizer because of other actions and comments. For example, he flatly rejects the notion that South West can or should aim to create a new “Tier One” model on the basis that it will not allow him or his students to be as competitive as possible on the market – a very cosmopolitan

disposition. He explains that at the kind of “Tier One” that he hopes to achieve, students will not be “coddled” the way that they currently are at South West, which means that faculty will be given the time they need to do their research and get their “ideas out there.” He is a Cosmopolitan Operationalizer because he very much looks forward to the day when South West, like other “Tier Ones, “will allow him to focus on his research and scholarship in order to reach the widest of audiences.” Dr. Rivera’s goals to reach as wide an audience as possible were summed up as he explained why he came to South West.

...I applied for several other universities and when I applied here, there was a professor, a dean here by the name of Max Gallegos⁵¹ and I told him, ‘you know, I do social justice work and work with [certain theorist] and I told him that I don’t need a job because I already had a job. And I told him that *I wanted to expand and maximize my contribution*. And I told him please don’t hire me unless you know my contribution will be valued, that [SWU] will value what I do.’ And they hired me and he said, ‘oh yeah, we need social justice here’...So, since I came over here [to South West], *I see great opportunity to work with other countries with Mexico and uh to travel extensively to other countries and presenting what I do...* (Interview Transcript, 2009).

The want to reach wider audiences is emblematic of faculty who work at major research universities, and in fact, quite opposite of Gouldner’s local (1957; Baker & Zey-Ferrel, 1984). Fairweather (2002) notes that research visibility earns institutions stature and Melguizo and Strober (2007) calculated that research visibility functions as a sort of prestige, which faculty are rewarded for. Dr. Smith’s and Rivera’s hopes to reach such wide audiences fit well amongst conceptions of faculty legitimacy drawn from the institutional field and which signal a cosmopolitan, outward looking habitus.

⁵¹ A pseudonym.

For others, like Dr. Ortiz, the hopes to impact a wide audience have been a long-lived reality. He is a highly successful creative scholar with world-wide connections. When I asked Dr. Ortiz to talk to me about the “Tier One” transition, he very directly said:

We have a conflict in the mission...we have to reconcile that. You cannot - and this is just the truth - be an open admissions university and be “Tier One” - that’s not going to fly. Open-admissions means that we have - that we’ll take students, and I’m not knocking it - that we take students that may or may not be fully prepared in certain areas and we take them anyway. And then we hopefully bring them up to speed by offering remedial courses....When you do that, it means you’re in a teaching university... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

It is clear that Dr. Ortiz draws his understanding of SWU’s transition from the institutional field. As he explained, SWU simply needs to make a decision about what it wants to do: be a teaching or a research university. However, in very cosmopolitan fashion, he declared that either way, it will not impact how he carries out his work. This is because Dr. Ortiz teaches only upper level juniors and seniors. Thus, as he put it, Dr. Ortiz does not have “to deal with the non-majors, the people that are at the very beginning” and whom, he notes, often need a lot of support. Dr. Ortiz told me that at one point he volunteered to teach a cross-listed course for undergraduates. He flatly stated that he would “never do that again.” Talking about his experience in this particular undergraduate section, Dr. Ortiz said that he found the situation problematic and stressful. He estimated that 1/3 of the students were barely literate. Thus, Dr. Ortiz takes actions grounded in his cosmopolitan sensibilities. He now uses his power (capital) as a tenured faculty member to “opt out” of cross-listed courses. He surrounds himself with already prepared, serious majors in their upper level years.

Finally, Dr. Ortiz notes that he relies on SWU for very little. He said “I stayed [in the region] because I wanted to stay here. I have published [several] books and I’m not bragging, its just that I’m very successful in my field, very successful and the university gets that for free. I’m not compensated; they don’t give me any of those things [course releases, travel monies] ...” Later on, Dr. Ortiz told me that in all his years at the university, he asked for travel monies only once. Otherwise, he looks to his field where he is supported with both cultural and fiscal forms of legitimacy for his scholarly endeavors.

Perhaps, Dr. Lucero presents the most interesting case regarding the cosmopolitan operationalizaiton of “Tier One.” When I asked Dr. Lucero, a male tenure-track faculty member in education, to explain what the transition means to him and to his work at South West, he stumbled and almost began with a justification for his perspective:

Well, ‘Tier One’ is essentially what most of us – as junior faculty – we all graduated from ‘Tier One’ institutions – we have people here from Iowa, from Madison, other people from UT Austin, we have other people from Texas A&M, so the way we see ‘Tier One’ is basically based on our own training. And the majority of the training that I received from [my] ‘Tier One’ was to work at a ‘Tier One’ institution and I think that the expectation was, especially when I was first hired, this is the road to ‘Tier One!’ This is where we are going.... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Then Dr. Lucero specified his role more definitively: “My role is to write grants, do research, and to publish in top tier journals...” It is critical to highlight many points from Dr. Lucero’s comments. When asked to discuss the transition to “Tier One,” it was clear that Dr. Lucero drew his understanding from the institutional field as he compared the notion of “Tier One” to his and others’ experience at already established “Tier One” universities. He then stresses that his role is grant writing, scholarship and publication.

No where does he mention teaching, although he has been asked to teach a heavy load every semester since arriving. Although Dr. Lucero understood that teaching was part of his work as a professor, he expected that it would constitute a much smaller portion of his work.

I asked Dr. Lucero to talk about his own definition of “Tier One” and how he reconciled that with some of the other language put forward by University leaders, particularly related to the idea that South West can do “Tier One the South West Way.” Dr. Lucero responded:

...in the President’s speech to the college at our retreat, she said ‘you know we want to look at ourselves and compare ourselves to other ‘Tier One’ universities and see what makes them work.’ But then later on, she said, ‘but we don’t want to be like them.’ (At this point, Dr. Lucero makes a funny face). How do you do that? (Dr. Lucero raises his hands to either side). Um, in a way it is kind of like she said that we are going to redefine ‘Tier One,’ but I don’t see how that is possible. When from a national level [others] hear ‘Tier One,’ they are going to envision x, y, and z. When UT or UNM look at us or other places look at us, they are going to say how are you a ‘Tier One’ institution? Um, I still haven’t...Um, I don’t see. You know you have a certain lattice that kind of creates a support, creates a framework for something and if you want to kind of build on that structure and make it bigger or something you realize that *there are certain joints, certain things that have to give way*, that you have to dismantle to build in that place because if you try to do anything – the stress, the strain something is going to give (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Lucero’s comments reflect what Cosmopolitan Operationalizers see and think about when they hear about South West’s aspirations to become a “Tier One” institution. Rather than reference or make use of the organizational culture and discourse that the President and other leaders put forward to guide the transition, they reference wider national audiences and meanings while questioning and even ridiculing the localized notion of “Tier One.” As is evident with Dr. Lucero, he wants to be considered a legitimate and a viable scholar in the field, not just at South West. He

strives to create this legitimate space for himself the best way he knows: by following the norms and the expectations set up in the institutional field where professors focus on “grants, do[ing] research, and to publish[ing] in top tier journals...” This is the kind of role that he attempts to construct for himself on a daily basis, but as noted earlier, his heavy teaching load makes it difficult. Thus, Dr. Lucero struggles to enact his role as researcher. From his perspective, the university has failed to facilitate what he believes he needs to assure success in a “Tier One” University. During his interview, Dr. Lucero shared the disappointment that he has experienced over the last few years. He noted that the reduced teaching loads which were promised to him when he was hired have not been delivered, nor has the collaboration of grant writing at the department level or college level been facilitated by anyone, as was promised. Of these let downs, Dr.

Lucero said:

I am kind of disappointed about how discussions about reduced course loads have kind of stalled. We want more focus on the research end of it, but they are still demanding the same on the other two things [teaching and service]...In terms of teaching class sizes, they are now going to be getting bigger...[Also], I was told that graduate students would be around and that is another thing that hasn't happened....You know as far as writing grants in collaboration, that is something that we have not been given time to do, so um those are the two main things that have been pulled away or that have not come to fruition. (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Given Dr. Lucero's serious commitment to and aspirations to be a researcher, I pursued these comments to understand how he copes with such disappointments. Particularly, I was interested to know about any formal or informal supports – even emotional ones – offered by his colleagues or the college on a larger scale to deal with such disappointments and struggle.

Leslie: I mean, I know in some departments, it is common practice for the senior faculty to do the grant writing to support the younger faculty and

provide [monies for] graduate students, or you know that the senior faculty take on the heavier course loads. Are there any discussions of that happening for you guys – on behalf of you [tenure-track faculty]?

Dr. Lucero: Not that I know of. As a matter of fact, for my third year review, it seemed like more was being pushed toward the junior faculty in terms of responsibilities. Some of the comments that I got and this was something that I talked to my former chair about at the time (laughs) and she gave me a certain perspective. One of the comments was directed towards service - several of the comments said that I 'needed to do a lot more committee work.' But the rationale as you say – going to a 'Tier One' institution [status] – is that senior faculty should be the ones doing the service work not the junior faculty because they need more time for research. And there were several comments on [my review] from senior faculty - the tenure committee is made up tenured faculty - several of those comments were about me not doing enough committee work and at the time I was already sitting on two committees...(Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Lucero quickly learned that operating like a 'Tier One' faculty member is risky at the organizational level, particularly from his senior colleagues. The ideas and practices that are defined as legitimate in the field perhaps do not carry the same cache at South West University for tenure-track faculty members. Yet he sees himself, his work, and "Tier One" through a lens built out of his experiences as a student who had the leisure to study as an undergraduate without the distraction of work or other commitments, as a student who was able to realize his love for research and scholarship. Then, when he attended an elite state research university, he was able to build on that initial love. He was mentored to be a researcher and he very desperately wants to live out that role as a researcher. In many ways, he has to figure out how to do that without the support of his university and his colleagues.

Dr. Lucero's situation is particularly informative, given his status as a tenure-track Operationalizer. In the survey, another tenure-track faculty member in the College of Business hinted at a similar situation. He wrote, "In my department, there is a move into

more research. You can tell that some faculty members do not even talk to me as a new faculty [member] since they may perceive me as a 'different' person. So old ones versus new ones...I do not like that."

Also, Dr. Ortiz shared a story with very similar dimensions as Dr. Lucero's. As mentioned earlier, Dr. Ortiz has always tended to a reference group much wider than the local one at SWU. He has been renowned since early on in his career. In fact, early on, he was awarded a highly prestigious honor by a national association in his discipline. However, at the department level, he was not offered congratulations or even recognized at all. At a time when the University was just beginning to tinker with its mission, about fifteen years ago, the tenured faculty members in Dr. Ortiz' department never praised Dr. Ortiz for his national prestige, and he believes that he was isolated because of his success.

For the most part, though, the other Cosmopolitans, all tenured faculty members, did not report having any trouble or experiencing difficulties due to the role that they have constructed for themselves. This may be due to the fact that Dr. Romero and Dr. Pena arrived at the University with several years experience as faculty members/researchers elsewhere and both have been able to bring in large sums of money via grant writing. As scientists, fund raising is particularly important, and the literature indicates that the disciplines are quite important to understanding faculty work and the evaluation of faculty work. Thus, coming from, embodying, and using a cosmopolitan sort of habitus that gives shape to a "researcher role" might be more acceptable in the sciences. Still, at a place like SWU, where the potential for tapping into talent of a seriously underrepresented population in terms of science careers, one

would think that teaching and mentoring students would be an especially important priority.

With regard to Dr. Rivera, who works in the College of Education, he looks at his work responsibilities as complimentary. Thus, he is not likely to have ever excluded teaching from his role as a faculty member as does Dr. Lucero, Dr. Romero, or even Dr. Smith. In other words, for this latter group of scholars, teaching is marginal or it is what they *have to do* in order to carry out their research agendas. While such dispositions might be acceptable in already established “Tier One” Universities, it is not yet acceptable at SWU.

The idea that embodying and using cosmopolitan habitus has implications for different groups of faculty members is a critical insight when it comes to understanding and dealing with organizational change in higher education, particularly change that impacts faculty work and roles so closely. Although some Operationalizers attempted to put to use the cosmopolitan capital, knowledge, and skills that they picked up in the field of higher education, they found that they were not as useful in an organization that has a deep local culture of its own, particularly when they are to be judged by the “curators” (Bourdieu, 1994) of this local culture. This is an incredibly important point as it illuminates that the faculty’s capital/skill carries different weight when it is deployed and when it is used to construct their role in different settings (discipline, organization, field, etc.); this insight takes one beyond the superficial, functional analysis which suggests that the younger, cosmopolitan faculty members that SWU is hiring will be successful because they know how to help the university achieve its goals.

My analysis shows that there are many intersections and relations to be considered here. By looking across faculty members, it is clear to see that they are drawing very different interpretations of the SWU transition and that they are drawing out very different kinds of roles (as will be evident in the next sections). By considering the university-faculty intersection, it is clear to see that cosmopolitan tenure-track faculty and even tenured faculty to a certain extent are not well-supported by the university. Some believe that they have been flat-out misled, such as Dr. Lucero about what the university wants to achieve.

To this end, Cosmopolitan Operationalizers find themselves taking an inordinate amount of responsibility to secure their role as researchers. For instance, the same faculty member who commented on the divisions between the old and new within the Business College wrote:

There is a lot of hope for me and pressure to publish. I like doing research, but I am an assistant professor. There are no senior faculty members that are exceptionally published. There is no support for me. I feel I am by myself....I miss an environment when people talk about research during lunch, people debate new trends in the field, and co-author." (Survey Respondent, 2009).

Another faculty respondent, who seemed quite research active also described how the University failed to provide the necessary support for her in terms of grant writing, which is a major component of SWU's "Tier One" journey. She explained:

I have made several attempt to establish long term research commitments on government lands or with government agencies, and institutional support has been lacking when it could have helped the most (Survey Respondent, 2009).

Rather than look to the organization to support them with their work, the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers seem to have accepted the fact that until the University

makes changes so that it can attain the kind of “Tier One” status that *they* aim for, they must and will assume more responsibility. Yet looking outwards for support, like Dr. Ortiz does or expecting little from their University reinforces the gap between faculty member and University.

For instance, Dr. Romero’s and other’s stories about the lagging grant infrastructure demonstrates how faculty members assume responsibilities that SWU fails to address. Yet complaints about grant infrastructure are not new; my own research shows them dating back to at least 2007 when I first began to look at this problem. Thus, Dr. Romero and other like minded faculty take on inordinate amounts of responsibility for their grant research, writing and administration. Already Cosmopolitan, the increased sense of responsibility for their work and their success furthers the distance between faculty and University and faculty members find it easier or more sensible to ignore or reject local organizational culture, which emphasizes SWU’s dedication to the region and to teaching.

As a result of this increased sense of responsibility for achieving “Tier One,” Cosmopolitan Operationalizers discussed working long hours. In fact, Dr. Pena noted “I like my research very much. I find the time to do whatever is necessary to keep it going. I sleep very little.” In addition, when asked if the transition at SWU had caused them to change their work habits, one faculty member responded “trying to obtain more external grants to support students and their research. My working hours per week are almost 80-90.”

Cosmopolitan Operationalizers, then, expect and receive very little from their university. In clear ways, the university abuses its positionality as it takes the hopes and

orientations of these cosmopolitan researchers for granted. Moreover, besides, the fact that the university projects an abusive power on its faculty by failing to provide them with the support and resources needed to insure their careers as researchers who want to move the university to “Tier One,” there is also a sense that the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers must approach their work carefully and perhaps that they must temper their cosmopolitan disposition in certain instances. To this end, the Cosmopolitan Operationalization of “Tier One” remains a gamble as the case of Dr. Lucero highlights. In the section below, I show how local-Cosmopolitans define SWU’s efforts to achieve “Tier One,” how they take action, and what kind of roles, then, they carve out for themselves amid this transition.

6.3c local-Cosmos⁵² in Action

The local-Cosmos are actually Cosmopolitans that have been localized via their long term relationship with the university. Specifically, they are a group of 5 tenured faculty members who have made a significant investment of personal and professional energies into the university. However, of the 5, 4 have held high-powered and critical positions that involved “Tier One” planning. To this end, this group of faculty has a sort of insider’s privilege and power, and thus, moves comfortably between the institutional field and local organizational culture – both in terms of their explanation of Tier One and also the actions they take inside this transition.

Embodying and evoking such unique perspectives was Dr. Jackson. In fact, his perspective on South West’s transition was quite unique, and one that I had not heard in over 30 interviews that I have conducted over the last few years (26 in this project plus

⁵² For readability, I will use local-Cosmos.

8 for a pilot study where I examined similar questions). Dr. Jackson, a tenured and high-powered faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts, with more than a decade worth of administrative experience began by flatly rejecting the notion that South West's primary focus has ever been teaching. He noted "My department has always laid heavy emphasis on research...when I came here (in the 1980's); I was told 'do the basic job in the classroom and focus entirely on your research. That's how you get tenure.' And that still, frankly, is basically true – in most departments." Intrigued by Dr. Jackson's comments, which I had not heard until this interview, I asked him to elaborate.

Leslie: You know, that is interesting because some – Well, I have heard...

Dr. Jackson: [Interjecting] In other words, there is a rhetorical level that operates more widely at the University and I think that in general faculty members are very committed and creative and concerned teachers, BUT the truth of the matter is that in most departments, the promotion and advancement comes through research (Interview Transcript, 2009).

As he continued to elaborate on what I saw as a very unique perspective, he said, as if in relief, "I think for many of us, [the Tier One conversation] simply fits strait into what we thought we were doing in the first place."

Trained at two of the country's most elite institutions and considering himself first and foremost as a researcher, Dr. Jackson seems to embody a cosmopolitan habitus. Nonetheless, he is able, and I will show, that he expertly and comfortably mobilizes organizational culture and discourse to define South West's "Tier One" transition to explain what South West's transition is about. I theorize that his ability and willingness to mobilize and tout South West's unique take on the transition is inextricably intertwined with his position, power, and personal investment in the design of SWU's proposed "Tier One our Own Way" model.

For example, when asked to define the “Tier one” transition, Dr. Jackson moved between the institutional and organizational culture and then fused together ideas, ideals, and practices from both.

Leslie: What do you make of um, one of the things that I am really interested in - that has really come into play recently is you know this phrase: ‘We are going to be a ‘Tier One,’ but we are going to be a ‘Tier One the SWU way’...

Dr. Jackson: [Interjecting, again]. Yeah, again, I understand. I have a particular view on things because of course I was an administrator for ten years and I was [a top leader]...and my whole focus was on this ‘Tier One’ agenda...As long as [the President has been here], this is how we have looked at things - that the way for us to make our place in terms of research is to capitalize on our advantages which means not copying other state research universities, but moving in a new direction that allows us to emerge as a research university while at the same time maintaining our identity and our distinctive character and so forth. (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Jackson’s response is quite informative. First of all, he acknowledges that he has a “particular” view of the transition; I suggest this is not just a particular view, but a view that signals his privilege and power as an insider. This view gives Dr. Jackson a much more lucid understanding of what SWU means when it says that it aims to do “Tier One” its own way.

Because his explanation of the local “Tier One” idea still seemed quite abstract, I asked if he had seen any resistance to the “Tier One” transition, Dr. Jackson suggested that the resistance is not to “Tier One,” but to the strategy that the University has pursued – specifically, the notion that SWU can do “Tier One” its own way. He went on to explain that the transition may seem confusing because people/researchers have not learned what it means to be a researcher at a place like SWU. Instead, he notes that they have been trained “in a vanilla way. So, it is natural that their career trajectories

follow that route and it is kind of hard to get them to shift gears..." What Dr. Jackson calls "vanilla training" is equivalent to the training that takes place in the "institutional model" of research universities where soon-to-be faculty members see faculty members who outsource most teaching to graduate students, who prefer their research to their teaching responsibilities, and where one's research is an outgrowth of pure interest rather than linked to local problems or contexts. To this end, Dr. Jackson said that "Tier One the SWU way" is about capitalizing on the "point where research and opportunities can intersect with our strengths, with our human resources. And you know lots of times we have not been able to do things that make sense because we don't have the people that can do that." Thus, from Dr. Jackson's suggestions, it would seem that "Tier One" is about becoming a research university, but one where the faculty members' research agendas are grounded in the local context in local matters and where they are engaged teachers and mentors. Dr. Jackson continued to clarify what "vanilla" in terms of what faculty expect of their University. He said "obviously, as a Tier One institution, they [already established Tier One's], may have greater resources to help people [faculty] get in the game. You know, what we have got to do, of course, is fly by the seat of our pants..."

The need to be creative or to "fly by the seat of our pants," as Dr. Jackson calls it, emerged as an important idea throughout the analysis. Being creative is often code word for "we don't have resources to support you, but we expect you to get it done nonetheless!" Those who "Operationalize" and also those who push for "Tier One," like the local-Cosmopolitans and the university administrators, often evoke a discourse of creativity. In fact, the entire idea of building a new kind of "Tier One" model is framed by

a need for creativity and innovation. To this end, the most cosmopolitan Operationalizers take on inordinate amounts of responsibility often talked about a need to be creative with their time, energy and resources. On the other hand, others, mostly tenure-track faculty members, questioned this call for creativity. One professor, Dr. Estrada, introduced in the next section, commented on a speech given by one of SWU's top leaders and said:

So [this administrator] was saying, 'I know it's going to be challenging for us to become a 'Tier One' institution because we have challenges at this university that may be are not present at other universities, but what we have to do is be creative about meeting those challenges!' So, I thought that was interesting because it's like we have to be creative? Whatever that means...it's just like you know, you can do it because here we are creative! Go do it... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Estrada makes a good point. What does it mean to be creative, to fly by the seat of one's pants? For a tenure-track faculty member without job security, it seems much too risky to "be creative;" acting within familiar boundaries and falling back on what seems sensible seems a much better strategy.

Dr. Jackson, however, offers an example of creativity and posed it is as a strategy emblematic of the "SWU Tier One" model. He told me about a series of interventions that he is implementing, with the support of a grant, in his survey courses to improve the academic performance of his students. He hopes and is looking for a partner to help him translate this work and data into some sort of "scholarly publications." Thus, he uses local commitments to open access, undergraduate education to achieve cosmopolitan ends. This is quite creative and also quite brave. For most discipline based faculty, engaging in educational and applied research is risky and to be avoided at all costs (Gonzales and Rincones, 2009; Hora et al., 2008), especially for those

without tenure. Yet Dr. Jackson has the confidence to move between organizational and institutional culture to define the transition and to also enact his role as a local-cosmopolitan.

Near the end of our interview, I asked him to talk about an idea that I had heard from others in my sample, which was that in order to become “Tier One,” SWU would need to raise admissions standards and accept better qualified students. To this, Dr. Jackson balked. He said:

Oh, I am totally unsympathetic to that response. Right? But, um first of all, we could transform this university overnight if we wanted to right? I mean we could just raise the admissions standards, downsize the undergraduate program right, and have a different kind of university but that would be a wrong headed approach... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Jackson seemed unaware or unwilling to admit that several faculty members actually do use these “wrongheaded” ideas to guide their sense-making and their work, especially the other Operationalizers. He pressed forward to argue that it is quite possible to have an open admissions university and a “Tier One” University at the same time; faculty members simply “need to be creative.”

At the end of this very same dialogue, Dr. Jackson noted, “I would be misrepresenting though if they said tomorrow, ‘you know [Dr. Jackson], we just got this huge grant...all you have to do for the next five years is research!’ I mean I would be happy as a clam! I mean I would not be begging to be back in the classroom.”

Why would a person of Dr. Jackson’s stature, then, couch his research orientation, his cosmopolitan sense of scholarly life, in a local-Cosmopolitan disposition? Clearly, he prefers the research tenet of his work. As a long-term faculty member, and a highly successful administrator, with a direct hand in designing the “Tier One the SWU way”

notion, he has a stake in its legitimacy and its success. At one point, he said “being one of the architects of SWU’s agenda...I don’t have much sympathy for the doubters and I don’t pay attention to people’s thoughts about it. Um, so I am maybe not the best person to talk to – you know, I do hear people saying these things about the expectations, this and that and so forth, but it seems kind of exaggerated to me.” Dr. Jackson has the privilege and the power to ignore others. His frustration with others’ lack of understanding is grounded in his own world view, his own practical logic about what SWU is doing and why it makes sense.

Dr. Marks, a tenured professor in the Sciences, definitely entered the professoriate to carry out a research agenda. When she began to work at South West, she understood that it was a University in transition. She spoke about how her preparation at another “Tier One” institution helped her see the transition. She noted:

At that time [when I was hired], the University was trying to transition and I went to a university - for my doctorate – that was a ‘Tier One,’ so I had worked in that kind of environment. And I could see even back then that South West was trying to move towards a research base, so for me that that felt like a comfortable setting because I wanted to do research (Interview Transcript, 2010).

When I asked Dr. Marks to define what “Tier One” means, she offered the following:

You know, how much money is being brought into the University, that’s one measure. Another measure is how well your faculty are known in terms of publications, members of national panels, editorships, things like that. How well our students are being placed into academic positions...it’s a reputation kind of thing (Interview Transcript, 2010).

At first, Dr. Mark’s sense-making might seem strictly cosmopolitan in nature. Her definition of “Tier One” is certainly grounded in the institutional field. Furthermore, as we interviewed, she spoke about her inclination for research, her struggle with teaching,

and her keen awareness of what other researchers are doing in her area, particularly at the more elite universities and departments.

By definition, these sorts of habits all fall under a cosmopolitan orientation. However, in our interview, she also discussed her real interest and desire to work at place where she could contribute to the community. She felt that, given South West's relative isolation and first generation college student population, the opportunity to "give back" seemed great, and thus, she believes in the possibility that SWU can and should build a new kind of "Tier One" University. When asked to talk about SWU's transition and what it means to do "Tier One" the SWU way, Dr. Marks said this:

You know, well, I think you have to do a careful balancing act and I think that, that there's sort of a model that people have of this - this is the way to go to 'Tier One,' but that isn't necessarily the only model. O.K. - and so there can be more than one way to get there... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Marks continued to use many key lines and discourses that are part of SWU's organizational culture, thus signaling her local orientation, but she is also highly aware of the expectations set up in the institutional field about how a "Tier One" should function and how it should look. For instance, when talking about the tension between the "Tier One" aspirations and open-access, she conceded that this is a difficult issue, given the growing enrollment and class size at SWU. She described how the growing class sizes are becoming more and more difficult to handle and how she often worries that the "younger faculty" might leave for a research university where class sizes are not so large, teaching expectations so high, and resources so tight, particularly in terms of laboratory and scientific equipment. However, she insists that it is not only possible, but

necessary to build a new “Tier One” model. As evidence, Dr. Marks uses her own department. She said:

I think our department is probably one of those that you’d say was closest to ‘Tier One’ and um that’s becoming more apparent as we’ve been getting, for instance, information from some of the schools that we call our peers. And really the productivity in the faculty, in terms of grant money coming in, in terms of publications, is on par with a number of ‘Tier One’ schools. *What’s different* is we have a bigger teaching load and we’re carrying a lot of our students - for better or worse - and I think that is something that our faculty is sort of grappling with - especially at the master’s level. We want to ensure that our undergraduates can come into a master’s level program. For many of them, [a masters] is a professional degree; it is very difficult just with a bachelor’s degree to get a reasonable job in [our field]...So, I think, I think we really need to keep that pipeline going and as much as, you know, we would love to see more and more doctoral students, we can’t let our master’s programs die away... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

From Dr. Marks’ comment, there are a number of significant issues to be pointed out. First of all, she notes that her department is one that demonstrates that it is possible to be an accessible, on par “Tier One” program. She also points out the significance of professional degrees for the local community and notes that this is probably more of a significant contribution than the preparation of academics, since most people intend to go into professional practice rather than pursue a Ph.D.

However, she also notes that it is only possible to maintain such accessibility and regional relevance because the faculty members teach more than faculty members at other “Tier Ones.” According to Dr. Marks, the faculty members have shown that they can produce grants, scholarship, and teaching excellence all simultaneously – even while carrying many students who are poorly prepared to enter the University. Yet Dr. Marks also worries about the sustainability of such work loads. As the interview came to a close, she noted:

...it's not easy for the younger faculty to leave right now. Maybe we are at an advantage because the financial crisis is so bad elsewhere, but say the economy picks up again, and things get better; there are a lot of our faculty - there are going to be people out there trying to recruit them away even within the state so that, that's always been a worry (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Marks admits that what SWU is aiming to achieve translates into an incredible amount of work for her colleagues, especially those at the junior level. She has hopes, however, which are anchored in her local disposition that other professors, will like her, remain at SWU because of a commitment to the community good. With a look of hope, she notes "I think the faculty that come here [to South West University], have come for some of the same reasons I have, that they see that they can make a significant contribution. That, ah, that there is this community involvement that they want to be a part of..."

When it comes to the actual role and the agency that Dr. Marks takes on her work, she admits that 'Tier One' "won't change much for me." This means that she will continue to work as a researcher who uses teaching as an opportunity to improve her research. However, what was interesting was Dr. Marks' advocacy on behalf of other faculty members who are less research-oriented, which I believe is an attempt to secure the local mission at SWU. For instance, she said:

When I was chair, I used to tell my dean all the time, 'there is no one in this department that is goofing off. If they are not contributing through research and publication, they're doing a great job in the teaching and they're bringing new students in and they're mentoring these students.' There's lots of things that also count as well as just, just the research dollars and the publications and, I think we all feel stretched thin and I just really hope some of our people don't, you know, burn out.' (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Although Dr. Marks, herself, prefers the research end of work, she sees a place for teaching, and advocates that faculty be rewarded for excellence in teaching. She sees the strain that her junior colleagues face, and although she feels it herself, she is a tenured professor. Also a local-Cosmopolitan, she plays her role out quite differently than Dr. Jackson who becomes decidedly frustrated with anyone who questions or critiques the transition. In some ways, Dr. Marks' does the "emotional work" (Hoschild, 1983) that Dr. Jackson disengages from. She cares for her junior colleagues, empathizes with the strain that they are under, and is also sensitive to the fact that people have lives away from the university. To this end, she spoke about her own commitments as a wife and mother during our interview. This is not all that surprising; women employ (and are expected to employ) emotional labor more often than men. Dr. Mark's case is a situation where it is possible to see where the local, the cosmopolitan, and perhaps other more personal roles, such as mother and caretaker, intersect to structure and dispose one to constructing a certain kind of role.

Dr. Matthews, a tenured faculty member with many decades of experience at SWU, is categorized as a local-Cosmopolitan for a number of reasons. In some regards, she is the most cosmopolitan and the most local of all the faculty in this category. With regard to her local orientation, this may be due to the fact that Dr. Matthews has spent multiple decades at the University and is also a native of the area.

When I asked Dr. Matthews to talk to me about "Tier One" and what it means to her, she said, "well, it is sort of fulfillment of our prompts, you know, we're in sort of isolated area but we've always had a kind of excellence." She went on to tell me about her son who attended SWU as well as a few of the top-notch universities in the U.S.;

her son felt that SWU provided as good, if not a better, educational experience than those already established “Tier One” universities. As a local, Dr. Matthews was obviously very deeply committed to promoting SWU. However, she is worried that SWU might be losing its edge. Of this she said:

I think SWU deserves to be ‘Tier One.’ Now, I am a little concerned; I think we have high end – I think we do have the faculty and the facilities and the desire and everything...my concern is a little bit about the numbers game...I think there is a lot of students we are letting in - now, the rationale for that is that we, you know, our students are not well served and so we need to give them the opportunity. And the thing is, though, we’re giving them the opportunity and they come in and they can’t make it....Unfortunately, what happens there is that when you see semester after semester of poorly prepared students, it ends up lowering expectations....That’s my fear - that’s my fear; we’re letting too many people, ah, shall we say pass?....This whole idea of equality, equality of opportunity, but when it comes to higher education, you have to merit that, you know. They’ve got the tail wagging the dog...So what are we going to do; we’re going to give everyone a college degree? ... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

In the comment above, it is clear that some of Dr. Matthews world-views are not in alignment with SWU; specifically her belief that SWU should be more stringent in its admissions process.

However, Dr. Matthews spoke about admissions carefully – unwilling to compromise her commitment to South West’s “Tier One” plans. Like Dr. Jackson and Dr. Marks, she admits that because of her administrative experience, she has known about the transition for quite some time. With regard to SWU building its own model, she excitedly claimed:

Well, [Tier One our way] means - signals to me that we are not going to be a rubber stamp...some of these other [Tier One] schools are sort of coasting on their reputations from before, you know, and they’re not all that marvelous. So yeah, I think we need to understand who we are and do who we are, you know the very best...[And] who we are is we’re a frontier university and the thing about a frontier is, is that’s the purpose of

going to a frontier – is not doing things the way [they] were done back, you know...whenever I was recruiting people, when I was chair...I would always tell them, 'we are a frontier university, when you go to the frontier, you know, you can map out your destiny, you know....We need to not pattern ourselves on, we need to go into areas that we can excel at, you know, we have plenty of great faculty around here who can do it...(Interview Transcript, 2009).

Clearly, Dr. Matthews' position and privilege as a tenured, long time faculty member allows her to pick and choose from the institutional field and from the organizational culture as she defines "Tier One." It is interesting that in some ways Dr. Matthews defines "Tier One" so uniquely, picking up, especially, on the organization's commitment to contextualize one's research. This is evident when she says "we need to understand who we are and do, do who we are." At the same time, she flatly –even passionately- rejects the open-access mission. Looking into Dr. Matthews' experience might illuminate how this outlook is one structured by her experiences. As we spoke during the interview, Dr. Matthews spoke multiple times and at length about the "gender discrimination" that she faced as a young female faculty member in a department filled with men. At one point, she suggested that "a little discrimination does not hurt you; it can actually make you tough – we make students suffer when we coddle them, with using victimhood reasoning." Access, then, to higher education, like her own access to the professoriate, is not a right, it is a privilege and it is not something that should be easily given, as her own access to the professoriate was not easy. With regard to the role that Dr. Matthews seeks to play in the "Tier One" transition, she laughed and said:

Well, you're talking to the wrong person. Not only am I tenured, but I've been here a hundred and six years, you know...I don't have to look for people to publish my work, people come to me and ask me to write, so I am in a different situation than, but I really do feel for these people who, you know, have to balance all of that, that's tough (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Thus, Dr. Matthews will continue to work as a teacher-researcher and won't be changing any work habits due to SWU "Tier One" aspirations. Because of her position, she has been able to create many courses that compliment her own research interests, which tend to fall around "frontier" sort of issues. I identify her as a Local-Cosmopolitan Operationalizer for concrete reasons. First of all, Dr. Matthews does not resist the transition nor does she seek to negotiate it in any way. In many ways, she adopts the rhetoric and discourses of the University, but her own experiences and world view lead her to reframe these local discourses with ideas and practices borrowed from the institutional field (such as the notion that SWU can create a new model, but it should still be model with tighter access). Nonetheless, at the end of the day, Dr. Matthews does not see how or why she may need to change any of her own work habits to contribute to this transition. Clearly, this is an assertion of power very similar to the one that Dr. Jackson asserts in his unwillingness to consider why some faculty may struggle with this transition.

In this first section, I have introduced 11 faculty members who I call the "Operationalizers." I call them "Operationalizers" because, despite their divergent understandings of what "Tier One" means, they believe in the transition and they want to contribute to its successful completion. This, in itself, distinguishes this group from other groups of faculty members that will be introduced in the remainder of the chapter.

The Operationalizers' aspirations to contribute to "Tier One" spur these faculty members to take action. The kinds of action that faculty members take and the roles that they construct reflect their understanding of SWU's "Tier One" transition. This sense-making process is also, more importantly, I theorize, filtered, and thus, structured

by one's history, personal biography, and view of the world or habitus (Bourdieu, 1988). Habitus, sense-making and action taking, then, are linked. Yet, this is not a narrow, mechanistic process. Faculty do not consciously sit and think about what "Tier One" really means and then take action. Instead, they hear the organizational discourse and they see the changes occurring around them, and then those things are filtered, pressed into a shape and form that is recognizable, where they know how to fit.

Using Gouldner's work on locals and cosmopolitans to describe habitus more precisely, I theorize that Operationalizers embody and deploy a habitus that is cosmopolitan or a mixture of local and cosmopolitan. This is an important extension of the original concept by Gouldner, which I elaborate on throughout this chapter.

Cosmopolitans tend to pull ideas and ideals from the larger institutional field more often. They entered the professoriate to be researchers and scholars. They see SWU's aspirations to achieve "Tier One" as an attempt to catch the form and functioning of already established "Tier Ones" like the ones that they graduated from or aspired to work at in the first place. They see their role as researchers, grant writers, and experts while teaching remains on the margins. These skills and knowledge carry a sort of taken-for-granted cache, particularly at the field level, but there have been instances where such skills and dispositions render trouble at the local level (Dr. Lucero's case).

On the other hand, those with a local-Cosmopolitan habitus are comfortable pulling from institutional and organizational culture simultaneously. They have the power of tenure, a long history behind them at SWU and they have all been involved in administration at SWU. Of five, four are tenured faculty members who see "Tier One" very differently from the Cosmopolitans as they believe that it is SWU's intention to build

a new kind of research model – one where teaching, research, access, and excellence will be equally prized. As tenured faculty members, they admit that they really do not plan to change any of their work habits due to “Tier One.”

In the next section, I introduce the Negotiators. The Negotiators are a group of 9 faculty members, all of whom are tenure-track. Their cases are especially informative as they are the scholars who will carry forth the University for the next several decades, should they find success at SWU.

6.3d The Negotiators

“I would not cut down on the amount of time I spend writing grants, I would still do that. But, I would cut down on the committee work” - Dr. Aaron

The Negotiators are a group of 9 tenure-track faculty members. Of the nine, six are women and three are men. Of the nine, six mentioned that they were particularly attracted to South West because they wanted to work with Latina/o students from working class backgrounds. Of these six, four faculty members are themselves from a Latina/o background. Of the nine Negotiators, only two believed that the transition might be an attempt to build a new kind of “Tier One” model. Still, these two faculty members wonder if it really is possible to build a new model. The other seven faculty Negotiators define “Tier One” by looking to the institutional field to understand what it is that a “Tier One” does and how its faculty members engage their work. They come from the Colleges of Education and Liberal Arts. In general, they arrived at the University in hopes of carrying out a “balanced” career, where teaching and research would be equally valued.

As a group, the Negotiators are a savvy, critical, and thoughtful group of faculty members. Unlike the Operationalizers, Negotiators take a critical, and sometimes harsh,

stance against the University because they believe it has positioned them in a highly ambiguous context without providing the support they expect and deserve in order to carry out their work like professors who work in “Tier Ones”. Also, unlike the Operationalizers, the Negotiators are ready and willing to ask and confront difficult questions about this transition. Whereas the Operationalizers, especially the Cosmopolitans, acknowledge and want SWU to change its open-admissions process, they are unwilling to really wrestle with the implications of such changes, even when I prompted them to expand on this. For instance, when I pressed Dr. Romero to talk about the idea that students in the area often look to SWU as their “access institution,” and if admissions are made more stringent to facilitate “Tier One,” local people might face an access problem, Dr. Romero said:

I think that will be a problem that needs to be solved. I don’t know how, how they’re going to deal with that because our student pool is not going to change, but you know...in five or ten years from now, [the student pool] will change cause people from other parts of the country, even from abroad, they will start coming to SWU (Interview Transcript, 2010).

Thus, rather than confront the problem, Dr. Romero leaves it for someone else to grapple with and looks forward to the day that SWU will be able to attract a more prestigious (although, not necessarily regional) population. Quite the opposite, the Negotiators critically assess to what extent it is possible for South West to remain a teaching oriented, open-access University in light of the “Tier One” aspiration. Out of nine of the Negotiators, eight clearly stated support for the open-admissions policy at SWU.

The Negotiators struggled throughout their interviews; they grappled with what seems to be the passing of South West’s regional responsiveness, teaching focused

mission, yet they also found ways to negotiate the impending transition. Because while Negotiators are highly skeptical about SWU's commitment or knowledge about how to achieve "Tier One," they do understand that there is some movement at the university. The Negotiators seek to find a space for themselves by negotiating a space for themselves inside the transition. Negotiating often consists of "holding back" and this can be based in a sort of practical sensibility. For example, holding back is when those with a more cosmopolitan disposition "hold back" some of their skills, talents, or energies because they do not have the support they believe the university should provide to make this "Tier One" transition as manageable as possible. Negotiating also, however, can consist of a "holding back" when faculty use a more locally disposed habitus to shape what they will and will not give up in terms of who they are as professors.

Some specific examples of negotiation include one's insistence on writing for local newspapers and outlets, one's attempt to keep her work very local and also very applicable to local problems, one's agreement to produce and be engaged more in her scholarship than in previous years, but not to become overly concerned with the kinds of outlets that she is publishing in. Another example includes writing grants to satisfy one of the tenets of "Tier One" even if grant writing is something they never wanted to do. Others work to produce more scholarship, but refuse to grant write. Unlike Operationalizers, Negotiators would never speak or act against access, teaching, and the importance of local service/impact. Negotiators come at this transition from a critical (and sometimes) hopeful perspective and it is with such critical lenses that they are able to question and thus negotiate a role for themselves at SWU. Some important details

about the Negotiators are presented in Table 6 below. In the next section, I introduce the Negotiators.

Table 6 Details on Negotiators

T-Status	College	Min. Max & Mean Yrs @ SWU	Gender
9 T-T	4 Education	Min ~1	6 F
-	5 Liberal Arts	Max ~5-7	3 M
-	-	Mean = 3.9	-

Dr. Muñoz is a tenure-track faculty member in the College of Education, trained at one of the best public universities and will go up for tenure within the next few years. As a first-generation college student who grew up in the area and received some of her education from SWU, she identifies with and is very devout to South West's teaching mission. In fact, while completing her doctoral work, Dr. Muñoz always hoped to come back to SWU to teach. Of this she says:

...I always thought that I was going to come back to [South West]. I was a student here....One of things I really liked when I was a student was the closeness that faculty and students developed – [the] close working relationships, I think, to me made a difference...I could see that they genuinely took an interest in my intellectual growth, and so I really liked that and I felt that, you know [South West] is you know populated by students like myself that really could benefit from faculty who were committed to them as first-generation students (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Muñoz' personal and academic experience grounded the expectations that she had for her work. She envisioned herself carrying out the work of a teacher and mentor. She notes that when she arrived at South West, she thought of her work as "teaching focused." She says, "When I came here I only thought about the side of me as a teacher, as a mentor and never as a scholar... I always...thought of myself... as a teacher..." Besides her clear commitment to teaching, Dr. Muñoz also acknowledges and appreciates the criticality of open-admissions for the local population. As a woman of color, a person from a working class background, and someone who was "not tracked

for college,” Dr. Muñoz greatly benefitted from South West’s attention to access, student validation and her instructors deep personal investment in her growth.

Dr. Estrada is also a tenure-track faculty member in the College of Education. Like Dr. Muñoz, she grew up in the area in a working class family, but unlike Dr. Muñoz, Dr. Estrada went away for her education. In fact, Dr. Estrada attended two of the premier research universities in the U.S. A string of personal circumstances resulted in Dr. Estrada’s return to the area. At one point, Dr. Estrada had decided that academia might not be the right place for her. She explained:

Dr. Estrada: I went to a very traditional program where you did like, you know, [pure research in field] and became a professor and had your research agenda. So, I think that was the assumption [that I would be a professor], but then probably about the middle of my graduate career, I started rethinking whether I wanted to take that immediate step. So, I didn’t go directly into a faculty position and decided I wanted to have more kind of applied research experiences....

Leslie: What was it that kind of made you rethink it or kind of pause and made you think of doing more applied work? What made you pause and think about that?

Dr. Estrada: Um...I think there were several things and one of them was just - I think I felt that the rigor of doing research.... [It] was a very high pressure environment to be in and combined with being on the tenure track? I was starting to question ‘did I really want that?’.... and I started to feel also like with my own dissertation research that it was so specialized and so focused....it was somewhat removed from like everyday experiences. I mean, I think I could see it had direct applications but - but - I felt like something was missing... (Interview Transcript, 2010).

The opportunity to conduct applied research materialized and Dr. Estrada spent a few years engaged in grant-supported action research as an independent scholar. Eventually, a tenure-track position in the College of Education opened up and Dr. Estrada met the requirements. Encouraged to apply by some of her colleagues at South West, Dr. Estrada submitted an application. I asked her to describe what she thought

the expectations of the job entailed when she was first hired. She explained “I understood that an ideal candidate for this position would have a developed research agenda.” In this regard, Dr. Estrada was confident. She was experienced in creating research projects and had extensive grant writing experience which she could use to support her research. However, she also explained that she knew how important teaching was to the University. The stress placed on teaching made her believe that at SWU, she could establish a more balanced career than the one’s she had witnessed while in graduate school.

Dr. Reyes is a tenure-track faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts. The daughter of migrants, Dr. Reyes was the first to attend college in her family. An energetic and very much socially justice oriented faculty member, Dr. Reyes outlined the reasons why she entered academia:

Service and leadership - For me service and leadership go hand in hand and when I got hired here, I said ‘Look, I do applied work and I knew I was going to do applied work. How will all that research help our people here? My people are here. My family is here. This is my community, my country, and my legacy is here [in the region] (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Clearly, Dr. Reyes was attracted to the professoriate for the venues that it provides agents of change. She described herself as the “service professor” on campus because she works so closely with the campus’ civic affairs office for each of her classes. Being at SWU was an opportunity to focus on her teaching, but she is just as passionate about her research. Dr. Reyes sees them as inextricably linked and ensures that she is also able to accomplish service through her applied work. Thus, SWU was a good fit for Dr. Reyes because she wanted to be in a place where her applied work would be accepted and valued.

Dr. Aaron is also categorized as a negotiator; her case is extremely insightful because Dr. Aaron was one of many faculty members denied promotion in recent years. However, if given the chance to stay, Dr. Aaron would like to stay at SWU. Dr. Aaron came to South West in the mid 2000's. When asked what she thought about South West as she pursued a position at the University, she said that she thought of it as "more of a teaching University." Then, Dr. Aaron went on to elaborate:

YES! Right, because the website had emphasized access, you know, teaching and access and graduates who were the first in their family to graduate. You know, that was the whole mantra, and you know there [was] a difference after I was hired here! (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Aaron says that if given the chance to stay, she would. The first in her family to graduate, she like the majority of the Negotiators, is highly committed to the open-admissions policy of the University. She believes that SWU must continue to work with local organizations, especially schools, and teachers, and fulfill its mission as a regional University.

Dr. Baines, a tenure-track faculty member works in the College of Liberal Arts. Dr. Baines "accidentally" became a professor, but explains that the work fits well because she loves research, writing, and teaching. When asked if there are any core values and ideas that drive her work, Dr. Baines said:

I mean, like all faculty probably – I love higher education. I think everyone deserves to have a higher education. I want everyone; I mean everyone in the world to go to college....I would love for everyone to get college degrees. I also think that I probably like a lot of professors, look at the world and say 'how can we contribute?' I don't think I would be a good doctor. I didn't end up being a dancer (laughter) which I wanted to be when I was little. So, I think I'm a good at this job.... I mean I think I can do a good job and maybe this is the place in the world [where] I can contribute something meaningful (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Like most of the Negotiators, except Dr. Lamar, who is introduced later, Dr.

Baines believes that teaching and research are compatible or at least that they can be used in ways that enhance the other. Coming to SWU was an opportunity to capitalize on both of her strengths: teaching and research.

Dr. Valdez is a male faculty member who works in the College of Liberal Arts. He has been at South West for less than five years and is a tenure-track faculty member. Like all of the Negotiators, he believed that South West presented an opportunity to equally balance teaching and researching. When asked if there is anything that drove him to be a professor and if there is anything that currently drives his work, Dr. Valdez said the following:

...well, certainly curiosity....I would not claim to be a great researcher - not yet - but I'm very interested in research and I'm very interested in how research in my field really is tied into teaching and knowledge learning and knowledge acquisition and not just you know to a skill level....So, in some senses, my interest in research is always linked back to teaching because even though I'm at a research one university or a *research one wanna-be university*, where research is supposed to be more important than teaching *I will never, I will never adhere to that [idea]* because I just think teaching is much more important than research (Interview Transcript, 2009).

More than access, Dr. Valdez is highly committed to the teaching mission of the university. When asked to explain his resistance to adhere to the notion that research trumps teaching, Dr. Valdez explained that he “comes [from a background of] tutoring, that’s really a teaching sort of...that’s my first interest in education. It’s not intellectual curiosity about the subject.” Dr. Valdez’ commitment to instruction is bolstered by his commitment to practical or what he called productive knowledge that can be tied into one’s practice. To this end, Valdez, like Reyes, believed that SWU was a place where applied or practical knowledge would be valued.

Dr. Simon is a tenure-track professor in the College of Education. During our interview, he told me about the deep sense of commitment that he has to the local community. The son of parents who have always been engaged in local social and political affairs, Dr. Simon, is well aware of the *de facto* and *de jure* injustices that the Mexican American community around SWU has suffered through the years. After a very successful career in educational administration, Dr. Simon was able to do what he truly loves: teach. As a native of the region and a graduate of SWU, Dr. Simon always hoped to return to SWU to teach. As a professor, he seeks to develop socially aware and critical thinking leaders.

I asked Dr. Simon to tell me “how he saw his role, what he thought his work would look like before entering the professoriate.” To this, he said “I probably saw myself being more of a teacher.” Dr. Simon elaborated and explained that at one point when he was an administrator, he had the opportunity to work as an adjunct.

I loved it. It was just like I would leave the office and get this overwhelming sense of peace, you know going to the university. I have just always loved it. And when you do adjunct work, you don't have the research pressure. So I guess my first love has always been teaching (Interview Transcript, 2009).

In addition to his love of teaching, he spoke at length about his devotion to the local community. He said “when I left the schools, I had options available to me including in higher education and in the schools, and you know again, though, my heart is at SWU.” Dr. Simon returned to SWU to be a professor in the early 2000's and will be up for tenure soon.

Dr. Lamar is a tenure-track faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts, but is also highly involved in the College of Education. She came to the university about five-

ten years ago, but spent much time doing research prior to entering academia. Having grown up in an academic family, Dr. Lamar always thought that academia might be an appropriate place for her. However, after completing her doctoral work, she worked as an independent researcher and activist in a variety of settings. Dr. Lamar decided to enter the professoriate at SWU because she wanted to teach. Of her work, Dr. Lamar said:

I really feel that [my field] is about making a better world...I do feel like a lot of social problems are perpetuated by people not speaking about the cause of these problems and people having an [un]clear idea of how society works...The stuff I do on education...its all about making schools more equitable, less hostile places....I think teaching, especially teaching future teachers - it's a place where I really feel you can have an impact... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Because Dr. Lamar had a successful career in scholarship even before entering the professoriate, I asked her to talk about the teaching and research venues of her work.

Leslie: I was going to ask you to, you know, to look at the different ways we have to communicate what we know, our message [as scholars], and so far, [do you think] your teaching, for you, is the best way?

Dr. Lamar: Definitely teaching and writing, but especially teaching.

Dr. Lamar clearly loves and is passionate about teaching. It is important to point out that Dr. Lamar sees teaching and research as mostly subtractive in nature. Thus, for her, SWU presented an opportunity to focus on her teaching, and to work with students that have historically been underserved. Of this she said:

I'm really happier I ended up here [rather than a Tier One University she interviewed at]...I really like the bicultural community. I like it that it is a working class community and the university; it's not so separated [sic] from low income people. I love that [SWU] serves a population that a lot of universities won't and it provides opportunities to people who would not have access to college if they weren't here. I think the mission of [SWU] is

very important and very much in line with my own priorities (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Garcia is a tenure track professor in the College of Liberal Arts. The son of a professional, Dr. Garcia is a second generation college student. He spoke about the powerful influence that his father and grandfather had on him in terms of pursuing a higher education. "You know, they always instilled in us growing up...how important it was to pursue a higher education, particularly in the Chicano era, you know...you had to set an example for others, for the next generation."

Pursuing a position at SWU was Dr. Garcia's attempt to ensure that he could continue to inspire and set an example for other Latina/o students, as their teacher, mentor, and as a scholar. He also notes that SWU seemed like a place where his work could serve a clear and practical purpose. When asked to describe what "drives his work," Dr. Garcia said this:

...every academic thinks their research and teaching is important, you know, but to me, you know, I feel that my teaching and research really does have sort of national and international implications. I just love the idea of being able to convey knowledge that I've gained over the years to my students and knowing that they are going to go on and that they are going to have some sort of impact... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Garcia sees his teaching and research as complimentary endeavors, like most of the other Negotiators.

In the next section, I demonstrate how the Negotiators have made sense of this change by looking to the field. However, just because they look to the field does not mean that they seek to import the ideas, ideals, and practices of the field into their practice. Instead, Negotiators often use their experience and knowledge of the field to highlight why SWU is not ready or should think more carefully about the implications of

seeking and achieving “Tier One.” This group, more than any other, seeks to challenge South West’s aspirations by comparing their experiences at already established “Tier Ones” to their experience at South West. For instance, although Operationalizers note that South West’s infrastructure is problematic, the Operationalizers have both the savvy *and* the want to contribute to the making of South West into a “Tier One” university. Thus, they take on an inordinate amount of responsibility for the transition.

In comparison, the Negotiators are unwilling to completely sacrifice their commitments to teaching and service. They are also unwilling to take responsibility for what they believe to be the university’s ambiguous and poorly designed “Tier One” strategy. Furthermore, a few faculty members mentioned their unwillingness to further sacrifice their personal and family lives to keep pace with the heightening demands of the university – which they believe are issued without support. Thus, they negotiate - with savvy and stocks of capital and knowledge, with a habitus that grounds them and acts as their lens for the world - what they are willing to give up or let go of and what they are not. Ultimately, they construct both a role and a space for self by strategizing, using skills they picked up in the field, and tempering those by their own personal commitments and world views.

6.3e Local-Cosmopolitan Negotiators in Action

Earlier I used and extended Gouldner’s concepts local and cosmopolitan to tie together sense making, action, and habitus. Whereas the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers introduced in the last section were very representative of Gouldner’s original Cosmopolitan, the other set of Operationalizers, the local-Cosmos, represented a sort of hybrid. They drew together ideas, ideals, and practices from both the institution

and the organization. Their ability to creatively construct a role for self by using these two sources simultaneously, I argue, is grounded in their position and power as tenured faculty members with long histories at the university. Still, these local-Cosmo Operationalizers overwhelmingly positioned themselves as researchers – there was an outright rejection that teaching was the primary function or the most enjoyable part of their work. Thus, I argue that they are Cosmopolitans that have been localized; their local disposition has been structured onto them because they have spent so much time at SWU, as a faculty member, as an administrator, and as a decision maker. They truly have a stake in the realization of SWU's "Tier One our Way" logic, as most had a hand in its design.

However, here, in this section, I argue that the Negotiators are also a sort of hybrid – a different version of the Local-Cosmopolitan. Negotiators seem to have a more personal connection to SWU and to the access and teaching mission, and thus, their local habitus are structured not by a professional long-term relationship with SWU, but by a deeper, personal connection/insight with the students and their roots in the region or an area with similar history and conditions.

Theorizing that it is time to forge a new, more nuanced and multi-dimensional understanding of locals and cosmopolitans is Rhoades et al., (2008). Taking a critical perspective, Rhoades et al., interrogates the local-cosmopolitan dichotomy and what it means for academia, and higher education in general. Rhoades et al., begins by noting that the academic profession is clearly structured along what he and his students/co-authors view as this problematic dichotomy. They write:

...a central norm [for academics] is that of mobility in a national market. To be an academic means to be oriented to national norms and reference

groups more than to local ones. That is central to the shift from a parochially oriented system of liberal arts colleges to nationally oriented system of research universities. Such norms are also central to stratification among institutions – devaluing institutions that are oriented and recruit locally –and within professions- privileging those who circulate nationally over those who stay local. And they help us understand the distance between the Research University and their local communities (p. 211).

Rhoades, with the help of his students, outlines how this dichotomy privileges the cosmopolitan at the expense of locals – many of whom, he and his colleagues suggest, tend to come from working class, minority backgrounds and who aim to give back to their local communities through their professional expertise.⁵³

Rhoades is compelled to reformulate this dichotomy because he is an active witness to his students who, themselves, challenge the dichotomy in their daily lives and experiences. Rhoades' students, all professionals with advanced credentials, tell him that they are “writing different scripts about what it means to be a professional [in higher education] (p. 211). Their goal, they argue, is to serve as local-cosmopolitans – to be connected to their wider professional communities, but anchored in their communities. In rewriting these scripts and challenging what it means to be an accomplished and legitimate higher education professional, Rhoades notes that his students have helped him rethink the dominant model. Specifically, Rhoades writes that his students, all of whom are working class Latina/os, provide him with insight as to what “social groups are served by [the dominant] model and what groups are badly served by it” (p. 212). One of the implications that Rhoades and his students present regarding the dominance

⁵³ Also see González and Padilla's (2008) collection of essays and Baez (2000) work on service as critical agency.

of cosmopolitans in academia is how cosmopolitans typically lack a sense of real commitment to the communities that their Universities are intended to serve. They write:

If locals are seen as stuck in one place, never benefitting from new experiences, can not cosmopolitans be viewed as being unanchored, drifting from one place to another and investing less in any one place than in their career...if locals are cast as parochial and narrow-minded, cannot cosmopolitans be characterized as carpet bagging opportunists who have little understanding of or appreciation for the local organization and community's culture? (p. 218).

Rhoades et al., (2008) characterization and challenge to Gouldner's helpful, but limited concepts of local and cosmopolitan is much needed. The Negotiators in my study, to varying degrees, represent Rhoades et al., (2008) local-cosmopolitans. This unique disposition – their habitus – structures their understandings not only in a technical sense, about what “Tier One” means, but perhaps more importantly, what their role as professors are at SWU, and in higher education, in general, are really about. I argue that their disposition allows them to see the movement at South West through a more critical lens. This is distinct from the Local-Cosmo Operationalizers who are actually cosmopolitans that have been localized, and who draw from both institution and organization from a position of power and prestige, rather than criticality, like the Negotiators.

Here, it is helpful to again think about the multiple intersections that give shape to one's habitus. To do this, I draw from critical race theory, rooted in thinking by W.E.B. Du Bois, Dorothy Smith, and Patricia Hill Collins, and more recently, Tara J. Yosso and Dolores Delgado Bernal. All of these writers seek to raise consciousness of the subtle and implicit marginalization of people of color (and people, in general); some more than others, seek to show how multiple personal factors intersect (Collins, 1986;1990; 2000)

to give one a certain epistemology, and thus, a unique view of the world. This epistemology that is formulated by one's personal biography and experiences is very similar to Bourdieu's (1998) habitus. Like Bourdieu, Collins also suggests that epistemology (world-view) and agency are tightly wound together. In keeping with my earlier writing, though, I will use habitus rather than epistemology, but I do want to note that epistemology is more explicitly intended to signal to a view, a form of knowledge whereas habitus is an embodied view or disposition, built out of knowledge and capital, that afford one actions, skills, and strategies.

Like Du Bois who wrote about "double consciousness" (Appelrouth et al, 2008, p. 288), Collins (1986) who writes about black feminist thought, and Delgado-Bernal (2008) who writes about *la trenza*, the Negotiators, coming from various places and intersections on the margins, all have a sharp view that compels them to interrogate the transition at SWU. Of the Negotiators, 6 are women, 7 are first generation college students, 5 are Latina/o, and 6 come from working class families. Six consider themselves natives of the area while three of them have lived in the region since they were children. They all have witnessed first-hand the important role that SWU has served in the region. For instance, Dr. Estrada recalls how her father was able to pick up an occasional educational credit to build his résumé, and how SWU's doors were always open to him, allowing him to improve his credentials and ultimately, the life he made for his family. Dr. Simon has witnessed, time and again, how Mexican American/border populations have been disenfranchised by the state of Texas and educational institutions, more generally. He has fought this marginalization through his administrative practices and through legal channels where he testified at state hearings.

Dr. Lamar, a serious scholar committed to social justice work throughout the Latin Americas and on the border, has gained much insight into the workings of communities and educational institutions through her activism, her field research, and her in-depth relationships with border communities, and these experiences help her situate SWU's transition through a more critical lens.

More than all other faculty types, the Negotiators described their work and their experience inside a transitioning South West as strategic. Their strategizing is rooted in their criticality of the University's transition, which they describe as an incredibly unclear, ambiguous, risky process. It is important to stress though that strategizing should not be interpreted as faculty members sitting at their kitchen table concocting deliberate plans of resistance.

Instead, recall that habitus provides a disposition for practical action, a practical logic that people use to make sense and take action (agency) over their given situation. Habitus is bound up in the experiences and positionality of the individual; within this bounded nature, though faculty members can and do have strategies at their disposal. Bourdieu (1988; 1993) insists that the appearance and sensibility of these strategies is practical and tacit while their *deployment*, however, can be strategic (Bourdieu, 1993).

The habitus and strategies taken up by the Negotiators are so unique from the other groups mainly because of their criticality. More than any other group, the Negotiators use their experiences, ideas, and practices, gained from the field to justify their deep skepticism and lack of belief in South West's "Tier One" aspirations. They also use their experiences from the field, at SWU, and their deeper local connections to SWU, the students, and the area to assess the benefits and risks involved in the

proposed transition. Negotiators describe – in very matter of fact ways – the reasons that South West is not on its way to “Tier One” and sometimes what they fear in a transition to “Tier One.” In some ways, their deep skepticism and sometimes their fears about what “Tier One” signifies, underlines the ways in which they negotiate their work.

For instance, when I asked Dr. Baines to describe for me what South West’s transition is about, she turned to the institutional field and specifically to her own experiences as a professor and student at Research Universities and said:

[if we go Tier One]...there’s going to have to some awful decisions made. A lot of people are going to be left behind. ‘Tier One’ does not bring everyone along. We’re going to stop admitting some undergrads when their scores are not high enough. We’re going to fire most of our adjuncts. This has to happen if we are going to ‘Tier One’ because it will be a *doctoral based* university and a *research based university* (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Baines then notes that the “Tier One” discourse is not unique to South West, and that she has heard it before. Therefore, she does not take it too seriously. After looking to the field to define what “Tier One” means, she turned directly to SWU’s organizational culture (ideas, ideals, and practices) and juxtaposes the two. She points out that in her former University, when internal grants became available; she was penalized if she tried to explain how the grant funded research could be tied into her teaching. At SWU, however, she is expected to demonstrate how her research “is going to impact the classroom. It was the opposite at [former university]. If I mentioned the classroom in a grant proposal, I wasn’t going to get that [internal] grant, so here the talk is ‘Tier One,’ but everything is still oriented to teaching.”

Dr. Baines, however, is okay with this. She notes that when she came to SWU, she did not “come expecting it to be a high research university.” Given her deep

skepticism, I asked Dr. Baines how she would describe her contributions to SWU, and more specifically, how she places her work inside the University. Of this she gave several examples of the way she is negotiating a role for herself amid the ambiguous context. She began, first, by explaining what the working realities are at a “real Tier One.”

In my mind, the money comes first and when my teaching load is a 2-2 with 50 students in each class and when I have two research assistants, then we will get to ‘Tier One.’ I hear the same talk, the same ambition [at other universities and] that’s great. I mean in some ways, the [talk] doesn’t have a lot of meaning because they don’t really mean ‘Tier One,’ they mean more research, more grants. ‘Tier One’ is a specific status in which you are one of the few research producing institutions in this country and in the world. To get there, you would need to add zeros at the end of the budget (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Until Dr. Baines sees more zeros at the budget and relief from her heavy teaching responsibilities, she negotiates what she will and will not give to the University. As someone who equally “loves” her teaching and research, she is unwilling to compromise her teaching. She notes that should the push for change continue, SWU will need to be honest. “Faculty members are going to spend less time with undergraduates. Doctoral students are going to take on that burden and so [SWU] has to invest in them.” Dr. Baines insists that until graduate students receive full support to be strong teachers (training programs, workshops, financial support, etc); she would not feel comfortable and would not allow graduate students to take over her undergraduate courses. She says, “If I am not going to interact with them [undergraduates] anymore or much less, the doctoral candidates need to be trained really well. So, if ‘Tier One’ comes, I’m not completely against it, I just want to do it right. We have to allocate money [to support graduate students] to help faculty with our work.”

Ultimately, though, Dr. Baines does not believe that SWU wants to or can achieve “Tier One.” She completely turns the local “Tier One the SWU way” logic on its head when she explains what “Tier One the SWU way means”:

... [that] we’re not going to be ‘Tier One!’.... ‘Tier One’ the [South West] way means that we will never be an institution where most of the full professors don’t even talk to students. No! I mean *that’s* ‘Tier One’ when you look at, I mean, you look at Columbia right - where the famous professors you go to study with, you won’t probably even meet or maybe you get to take upper level classes with that person but you mostly interact with their teaching assistant. Will [South West] ever be like that? No. And unfortunately, it will never be at the level where [faculty are] producing a book every other year. You need to pretty much not talk to students to do that and so the mission of [South West] - that the students are really nurtured - probably won’t, won’t allow us to go ‘Tier One’ in a way that it is always done and the most way people would think is ‘Tier One.’ I mean could we think of ourselves as ‘Tier One’ by getting more grants and producing more research? Maybe; will anyone see us as ‘Tier One’? Probably not (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Several important insights can be gleaned from Dr. Baines’ comment. First of all, she demonstrates the power of the institutional field as she insists that the field is the only place from which legitimacy can be rendered. The institutional field, then, holds the symbolic capital - the power to name.

In light of her criticism and skepticism, Dr. Baines works to find a space for herself where she can remain a fairly balanced teacher and researcher. She admits, “I mean for me [the Tier One discourse] doesn’t change my strategy a lot....I mean it’s not the strategy that I would have if I were at a ‘Tier One.’ At a ‘Tier One,’ I would probably be looking aggressively for writing teams, so that instead of getting one or two good journal articles, I would be shooting for three, you know.” Thus, Dr. Baines negotiates rather than operationalizes; she is unwilling to assume the extra responsibility or even the stress that Operationalizers assume as they work to remake SWU into a “Tier One”

university. Unlike others, she is unwilling to work on the weekends and maintains a pretty typical work week schedule (7:30 to 6).

By patching together experiences and ideas drawn from the field with experiences and knowledge regarding South West's organizational culture, Baines determines that "Tier One" is not really what South West wants or aims to achieve – at least not a form of "Tier One" that will be recognized by others. Still, there is some sense that Dr. Baines accounts for South West's aspirations. She acknowledges that this move is primarily about faculty producing more research, scholarship, and grant money, and she is willing to produce more scholarship and to write grants. However, as she notes, she will not do so until she has a teaching load that allows her to work more efficiently and teaching assistants that support her in her teaching and research efforts. Dr. Baines clearly sees the move towards "Tier One" – if it is in fact a move – as a move away from teaching and the sort of student focused mission and culture that South West has long cultivated. Until she sees evidence that demonstrate that SWU is in fact serious about the transition, Dr. Baines notes that the "Tier One" discourse "doesn't really change [her] strategy" and the current organizational culture, with its heavy emphasis on teaching and student nurturing will guide her work. This is acceptable to Dr. Baines who came to South West not expecting to work at a "Tier One University." Dr. Baines has the savvy to negotiate what she calls a "shallow" "Tier One" discourse and meanwhile to negotiate her role. She draws from her experience, and thus, her habitus to make sense of South West's claims for transition. She holds accountable, as do the other Negotiators, South West University for failing to provide the support that faculty need, for failing also, to be honest with its constituents about what a move to "Tier One" really would mean for

undergraduate education.

Dr. Baines is not the only one who negotiates the meaning as well as a place inside South West's transition by turning to previous experience in the field at prestigious already established "Tier Ones." In fact, she is not the only person who has been at another University that aims to achieve a "Tier One" status via an increased focus on research. Dr. Valdez, a tenure-track faculty member, who works in the College of Liberal Arts, has also heard this kind of conversation in another University. When asked to describe what South West's transition means to him, he, like other faculty, also returned to his experience at already established "Tier One's." He described light teaching loads, support systems for faculty research and teaching, including a strong graduate education system, and sabbatical time. He also noted that such universities usually have strong fiscal backing in terms of their endowments, but what was most significant about Dr. Valdez' definition of "Tier One" was how he depicted the role of teaching in faculty work. He noted:

Look at your Big Ten universities, they're great research universities...but not necessarily great at teaching... you know, and I went to one of them. I am not saying that they neglect teaching necessarily, but it's different. There's more online teaching...you don't necessarily have the professors till' your junior or senior year and some of those professors are just more interested in their research... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Like Dr. Baines and the other Negotiators, Dr. Valdez came to South West because he believed it was a place where he could balance teaching and researching. He was also particularly interested in creating professional and technical writing classes for local professionals. In fact, during the interview he described how he devoted his entire first year to creating a certificate program for working professionals. As someone who believes passionately in the power of education for its practical implications and

applications, he was committed to providing a program for local professionals that would be useful. It was during his fourth semester at the University that he realized that the program was not going to materialize, and at the same time, the push for research and “Tier One” status grew especially strong. At that point, Dr. Valdez let go of the certificate program and began to re-strategize, which he says has caused him some misgivings.

As someone who is committed first and foremost to teaching and particularly towards teaching that has direct and practical applications, Dr. Valdez finds himself in a position that he characterizes as filled with “trade-offs.” Of his recent work profile, he says:

there are trade-offs...there is this trade off because I feel like I'm shifting attention away from teaching and service oriented things that I'm frankly very interested in doing and I'm hoping to turn attention away from [that] to, you know, concentrate more on other various research projects...maybe there is a balance that I haven't quite figured out yet...but even this past semester, I feel that my teaching suffered... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

This shift away from teaching and service clearly impacted Dr. Valdez on a personal level. Dr. Valdez explained to me that he believed he was being asked to reform his role as a teaching and service oriented professor who values professional and technical education to that of a researching professor who values abstract knowledge. He, however, with the help of his chair, has negotiated a new perspective on his role inside this transition. He says that, for now, he is “strategically reorienting” his work rather than reforming his role as a whole. Still, the negotiation, a play on semantics, really, does not sit well with Dr. Valdez. As of now, one of the largest trade-offs that Dr. Valdez has made is to post-pone his certificate program and spend more time on research oriented projects. As for his teaching, he believes it has suffered, but

says that he is working continually to find a balance between teaching and research, rather than let go of teaching completely. He notes that no one explicitly, of course, asks a faculty member to “let go” of teaching, but given the demands of “Tier One” and the lagging infrastructure, there is only so much time. His service work (such as the creation and launching of the new certificate program and other commitments to discipline based groups) suffers, but they are activities that Dr. Valdez believes he can return to after tenure. Dr. Valdez’ case is important. Early in his interview, he noted how he would never “adhere” to the notion that research is more important than teaching. However, as he talked about his work, it was clear to see that Dr. Valdez had, in fact, adhered not only to the notion, but to the practice of prioritizing research over teaching. What is insightful here is the power that SWU, through the mechanism of tenure, has over its faculty members. On the one hand, SWU hired Dr. Valdez to teach and develop practical oriented programming; mid-stream, SWU announces its desire to reach “Tier One” status. At first, Dr. Valdez is shocked and now he struggles to bring some sort of balance that would allow him to function in a way that he can feel at home with himself.⁵⁴

Dr. Aaron came to South West in the mid 2000’s. When asked what she thought about South West as she pursued a position at the University and whether or not she thought of it as “more of a teaching University,” Aaron responded:

YES! Right, because the website had emphasized access, you know, teaching and access and graduates who were the first in their family to graduate, you know that was the whole mantra... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

⁵⁴ Bourdieu has written about how habitus is a home unto itself.

Dr. Aaron, however, found out, that in fact, SWU is no longer a teaching institution. Recently, the professor was denied tenure. According to Dr. Aaron, there was a time that faculty members were rewarded and encouraged to serve students in the ways that she did. She believes that those days have come to an end. Inevitably, she takes her own case as proof that South West's student-centered days have come to a close. She said:

...the implications [of Tier One] are that I was not given tenure. And this is strait from a [top administrator's] mouth. It was because I did not have enough publications in 'Tier One' journals, but I [said] I had done the gold standard for grant writing and program building. And s/he said, 'well, your work would be excellent for a lesser institution – one that is really interested in teaching.'" (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Nonetheless, Dr. Aaron says that if given the chance to stay, she would make the following kinds of changes to "how she carries out her work:"

I have a couple of articles that I want to finish and if I were to be able to stay, there are some things that I would like to write about and I would make sure to do that....I would not cut down on the amount of time I spend writing grants, I would still do that. But, I would cut down on the committee work... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Aaron's interpretation of South West's mission has radically changed over the last year and thus, how she would choose to conduct her work has changed. Rather than spend inordinate amounts of time on service, which was a major part of her work before, she would focus on publication and grant writing. Asked to comment about the negotiation she would make by "cut[ting] back" on service, Dr. Aaron responded:

Leslie: In terms of work with the community, what do you

Aaron: (Interjected) – it doesn't count.

Leslie: Oh, do you think it will just become non-existent? Like not happen?

Aaron: Well, I brought that up to [top administrator], and s/he said, 'well you have got to be thinking of your doctoral students.' And I said, 'Okay, I see weaving the doctoral students into the things we do, but we are the only game in town! And we have...school districts and we have to be working together!' And – s/he doesn't value that. And that is extremely important and you know if we are going to do any kinds of real change – and hopefully, we are helping make changes happen in [city], in the schools, there has to be a very thoughtful relationship (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Although willing to compromise the time she spends on service, teaching is one area that Dr. Aaron would *not* compromise. I interviewed Dr. Aaron in 2007 for another project. At this time, she spoke to me at length about her work as a professor. She pointed out that most professional and graduate students at South West tend to work full time, that they have complex personal demands to balance (care-giving demands, work, and financial stressors) and that just getting on to campus can be a struggle. During that interview, I asked Dr. Aaron how she addresses such challenges with her students. She offered a range of answers such as moving her classes to a later start time in the evening (6:00 versus 5:00) to allow students to get something to eat, find parking and get settled into class. She is also very keen on using technology (in many formats) to ensure round-the-clock accessibility to students. At one point, Dr. Aaron arranged for her class to be taught at a totally different location so that students would not have to drive so far to reach campus, especially since most were coming from their professional day jobs, which were spread across the city. She is unwilling to negotiate or compromise what her work as an instructor is about at SWU or the fact that she strives to serve the students in the region in ways that reflect their lives. Dr. Aaron's commitment to providing an educational experience that is grounded in the reality of her students' lives structures the kinds of negotiations that she is willing to make. The

unwillingness to “decontextualize” one’s work, especially one’s instructional role, was common amongst the female Negotiators at SWU and is a research line that must be further explored. Dr. Aaron’s unwillingness to “decontextualize” is perhaps, anchored in her own experiences as a single mother, who worked her way through school, eventually earning a doctorate when her children were grown.

Ultimately, Dr. Aaron is a good example of the casualties associated with organizational change. In fact, many faculty members that I interviewed actually referred to Dr. Aaron’s situation as an example of how unclear the transition is. Dr. Aaron had provided exemplary service, worked with faculty members in the college to improve their pedagogy in a number of ways, wrote a number of grants, ten of which were funded during her time at SWU. As a tenure-track faculty member, she used a skill set that many believe to be central to the transition (grant writing/fund procurement), yet she was unable to assert and claim the space as “grant writer – program builder” as a legitimate one. This is an interesting situation because one of the Acquiescent, to be introduced in the next section, does just that. However, his tenured status gives him the ability and the symbolic power to do so. Dr. Aaron and Dr. Valdez, together, also show the tenet of faculty work that may be likely to suffer the most as universities strive to achieve more research focused missions: service.

While it seems that service might be the component of faculty work that Negotiators most often compromise, what was especially compelling was their refusal to “de-contextualize” their work and where their work unfolds – an awareness grounded in a deep localism, perhaps. For instance, when Dr. Estrada, who began her work at SWU as an independent grant-funded scholar at SWU, moved into the ranks of the

faculty, she explained that she took her responsibilities as an instructor very seriously. As a native of the area, she has first-hand knowledge of the purposes that SWU has served for the community. Therefore, Dr. Estrada reflexively interrogates what it means if SWU makes this transition:

The President talks a lot about [South West] serving the needs of the community and kind of having being [*sic*] an accessible institution for the community that is around it....I've heard her in talks you know discuss, how in the past the demographics of the university were much different from the demographics of the borderland, and how, now that has changed and she sees that as a positive thing. There are things that maybe the university needs to focus on that might not be compatible with the goal of becoming a big major research institution. I feel like those goals deal generally with kind of students who, like my dad, came to [South West] for a few years. I think he was between jobs and he has an Associate Degree and he had always wanted to get a Bachelor's Degree, and so one time when I think he was between jobs, he started coming back to school. I know other people who have kind of done similar things you know gone back to [South West] after many years and [South West] has doors open to those students, and I don't think those doors are quite as open at Stanford and Michigan and other places...(Interview Transcript, 2009).

As for SWU's desire to build a new "Tier One" model, Dr. Estrada notes that it is a nice idea, but as a tenure-track faculty member, she would prefer to have a clearer understanding of what this means. Bringing to light the power relations that govern this transition and her vulnerability in it, she says:

[The idea of a new model] is so abstract. I mean what does being creative mean and what does 'Tier One the SWU way' mean? I mean if a model doesn't exist, we have nothing to follow. I don't know ... [even] the Founding Fathers when they were writing the Constitution, they like modeled somewhat after France. I mean there - I don't know. It just feels you're embarking on a mission where you don't have a model... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Estrada is highly skeptical about what the local discourse regarding "Tier One the SWU" means. For her, "Tier One" is represented by the sum of her experiences in already established major research universities. Even if a new model is possible, Dr.

Estrada sees that she will be expected to build this new model and as a tenure-track faculty member, she is ambivalent about this process. Thus, she negotiates a role and a space for herself that makes sense in light of who she is and what she knows about SWU.

Bringing savvy and skills learned while she was a graduate student at elite universities, she notes that she is willing to contribute to SWU's efforts in some ways. For instance, her experience as a research associate (during and after her graduate work) afforded her the opportunity to learn much about grant writing and administration. At one point, Dr. Estrada reviewed proposals for a highly prestigious foundation and so she is quite familiar with the grant review process and believes that this can help her to help SWU's "Tier One" efforts. Thus, Dr. Estrada is willing to support SWU's efforts by writing grants. To a certain extent, she is willing to invest more time into her research and scholarship efforts, but she believes that this increased time investment comes at the cost of her teaching. In her survey response, Dr. Estrada wrote "Given [South West's] current direction, I feel compelled to deemphasize teaching and put more into scholarship."

At the time of the interview, I asked Dr. Estrada to elaborate on this comment and to talk about her work in the context of SWU's change. It became clear that Dr. Estrada's de-emphasis on teaching is quite limited, although it feels significant to her. She spoke about spending less time on grading papers and offering fewer comments on papers. She spoke about being more cautious with her office hours and about the tighter boundaries that she has erected when it comes to communication with her students.

However, Dr. Estrada's connection to the local community and her empathy with the student body disposes her to think and to situate her students' lives contextually – rather than to assume that SWU students have lives like the students that she went to school with during her graduate studies. Thus, she finds ways to teach and to serve the student body at South West in ways that reflect her understanding of their lives. Of this, she notes:

...in terms of teaching...as a professor, as an instructor, I feel like I have to be sensitive to the needs of the students that we have. Most are full time graduate students that are balancing career and family which I think is more often the case here than at places like Stanford and Michigan. We don't have, you know, inexhaustible resources to support [graduate students so that they can avoid full-time work]. So, I mean given those aspects of the student body, I feel like it's important to take those things into consideration. Even in developing my syllabus and the kinds of assignments and the kinds of expectations....I don't want that to sound like I have low expectations for students, but I feel like I need to have reasonable expectations because in graduate school; when I was in graduate school my advisor could call me up any time of the day or night and I would be accessible. You know, I didn't have kids and I didn't have another job. I don't, I do not feel that those would be reasonable expectations to have for the, you know, the students that I have. Um, so there are just different expectations or the expectations based on the *realities of life and work* (Interview Transcript, 2010, my emphasis).

Dr. Estrada's historical ties to the region, her own identity as a first-generation Latina student, her father's stopping in and out of school impact how she constructs her role as a professor at SWU. Although she is quite capable of drawing together all her cosmopolitan experiences, knowledge, and skills picked up at the prestigious, already established "Tier Ones," her local habitus provides a certain view of the world and more specifically of the role that SWU plays for regional communities with a long history of marginalization. As Dr. Estrada talked about the tensions that she consistently

negotiates, she asked “what do we sacrifice by getting there...you know, what are the potential consequences?”

To this end, Dr. Estrada’s deployment of cosmopolitan capital is tempered by her local habitus. Her inclination to negotiate rather than jump in and operationalize a “Tier One” mission is buffered by her ties to the region, to her witnessing what a South West University can do for people like her father who stopped in and out of the University, working his way through school around the demands of an inflexible work schedule and family responsibilities. Thus, Dr. Estrada worries, like Dr. Muñoz and Dr. Reyes below, about the regional mission of the University. She wondered where local students – many of whom are bound to the region – would be able to obtain a higher education, especially if they do not have the kind of preparation that will be necessary to gain admissions to a “Tier One.”

In many ways, Dr. Muñoz discussed the transition and her role in it similar to Dr. Estrada. Also raised in the immediate area and the first in her family to graduate from college, Dr. Muñoz has been a tenure-track professor in the College of Education for the past four years. After receiving her bachelor’s and master’s degree from SWU, Dr. Muñoz felt that returning to SWU was an opportunity to give to students what had been given to her. During our interview and other exchanges, she has shared about her experience as an immigrant to the U.S. and the fact that she had not been “tracked for college.” She noted how her SWU professors helped and really invested time and energy in “my intellectual growth.” When asked to define the transition to “Tier One,” Dr. Muñoz noted that it is about the “production of knowledge” and then said “that’s still so fuzzy!” To a certain extent, Dr. Muñoz was unable to provide me with a clear definition

of “Tier One.” Certainly, she understands that it is about producing more scholarship, more research, getting involved in grant writing, but she is still quite unsure about where SWU wants to go. Of SWU’s plans to forge a new model of “Tier One,” where access, teaching, scholarship and excellence will all be equally valued, Dr. Muñoz notes:

...that sounds pretty courageous, but I don’t, we can’t have, I don’t think that is going to happen. I think that is mostly motivational talk...you know, we need to say, this is what we want to be and then we’re going to make tough decisions that need to be made if we want to go that particular direction (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Although Dr. Muñoz is quite skeptical about the direction of the University, she knows and accounts for the fact that the University is, in fact, making changes that have impacted its teaching dominant focus. A beneficiary of the teaching mission that SWU long espoused, she wondered aloud “has anyone asked those questions? No one has asked us [the faculty].” Dr. Muñoz, then, unsure about what it is that the University really wants to achieve negotiates what she will and what she will not do. After going through her third year review, Dr. Muñoz was more certain than ever that the University does in fact want to push towards a more research oriented focus; it was at this point that she took action and drew boundaries around her time, particularly related to teaching. Of this, we shared the following exchange:

Leslie: Do you feel like in some ways you had to leave that, that aspiration, you know that teacher part of you?

Dr. Muñoz: No, I’m I mean it just meant that I had to not completely kind of completely takeover but because it’s really easy to do. I mean we have so many students...I mean I love teaching and there is a lot to learn and get carried away with. I feel like I want to be loyal to the things I believe are important, but I also have to be strategic if I want to stay here. If they allow me to stay here, allow me to stay and do the one thing I like to do, which is teaching and also do my research. I mean, I enjoy both, but not getting tenure I will not be able to do any of those things here (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Thus, Dr. Muñoz has configured a set of criteria and which guide her negotiation. She said “I will teach large classes, whatever you want to give me, but they will have to be the courses that I have been teaching because I won’t do [new courses]. I mean it’s just not reasonable.” When I asked if Dr. Muñoz if she is involved in any “grant writing” and if she thought that grant writing and procurement of funds is an important part of the “Tier One” transition, she told me: “I heard a lot of people worry about [grant] writing. I never did to be frank. To me what was important was to write from my research efforts and get [it] into publication.”

Finally, Dr. Muñoz asserted that despite the whims of the University, she knows who she is as a scholar:

I can only be the kind of scholar I can be. I will just work with that....I am just who I am. I will do my best work, send it out, whoever wants to publish it and I’m hoping that will be sufficient. I’m not going to kill myself over [outlet prestige]. I am not going to sweat on that... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Muñoz’s account is filled with negotiation. Dr. Muñoz’s experience at a top-notch University and the hands-on mentoring that she received from a prolific scholar are important sources of information and capital that she uses as she negotiates a position for herself. Her personal, local connection and ties to SWU as a former student who benefitted greatly from the hands on approach from SWU’s instructors gives shape to her passion for teaching and mentoring. Dr. Muñoz is a local who has the cosmopolitan skills and savvy she needs to negotiate.

In other interactions with Dr. Muñoz, I have learned that she is deeply committed to the provision of equal rights in terms of education.⁵⁵ Her father, who I learned about when I interviewed her for another research project, taught her about social justice and what it means to be a “good, decent citizen of the world “(Interview Transcript, 2006). What Dr. Muñoz spoke about is often referred to in Latina/o families as a person who is *bien educado*: a form of education untied to status, degrees, pedigree or prestige, definitely removed from the marketization and entrepreneurial elements that cloud education, and moreso higher education, today, which encourage some scholars to look at outlets and prestige versus the sheer opportunity to share an important message or capitalize on a teachable moment. Dr. Muñoz’ experiences as a student/faculty of color and her social justice upbringing do not allow her to get caught up in the measures of education or academic life that are antithetical to what she learned from her father and her family over years.

Also unmoved by prestige or status, as defined by the institutional field, is Dr. Simon, a tenure-track faculty member in the College of Education who grew up in the area. From an early age, as a function of his family’s social justice work, Dr. Simon was exposed to notions of fairness, equality, and justice. In some ways, Dr. Simon is one of the most local of faculty members. When I asked how he “came to teach at [SWU], he responded “Well, I mean this is my hometown....This is home for me....My heart is here.” To this end, Dr. Simon tended to rely heavily on local organizational culture and discourses to talk about his work and the transition. Although worried, he is hopeful that SWU’s transition is, in fact, about providing the best of educational (and other)

⁵⁵ I was invited by Dr. Muñoz to sit on an Affirmative Action Committee in an organization in which we both participate.

opportunities to the local population. He explained "I hope it is about meeting high research standards within the context of our community – hopefully, research geared towards helping our community and not just academic exercises to get another citation on your résumé." Despite Dr. Simon's hopeful outlook, he is still skeptical and worried about the implications of "Tier One."

We [the College] always have a retreat at the beginning of the year and one of the themes of the college retreat was 'moving away from being a teaching University to being a 'Tier One University.' I mean those words send a powerful message. I mean let's not move away from our teaching mission. I mean, let's add to it (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Simon's local personal and professional connections to the community that surrounds SWU give shape to his world-view. As a long time leader of local schools, he witnessed how SWU serves a critical purpose and he wants to carry out that purpose through his work; thus, he works to create a space for his work through several negotiations. Like Dr. Muñoz, he admits that to a certain extent, he has to compromise because tenure is the key he needs to continue his work as a professor.

Thus, Dr. Simon accounts for the fact that SWU wants its professors to produce more scholarship. Therefore, he joined a team of researchers and took an opportunity to be included on a project that allowed him to produce several publications over the last few years. Dr. Simon admits that joining this writing team was strategic. He realized that he would have access to a large data set and would be able to publish many papers from the collaboration. Yet, by joining the team, he has had to set aside his social justice research agenda. He notes "I haven't written to my agenda as much as I have wanted to."

Still, Dr. Simon, like Dr. Muñoz does not get “caught up” in the prestige of the outlets. In fact, Dr. Simon talked to me about the importance of writing for local outlets, including state newsletters or even the local newspaper. He described a short column that he had recently written for the local newspaper. He admits “I mean I knew for a fact that this column would not mean anything for my tenure because [top administrator] has made it clear, ‘we are going to look at peer reviewed journals and upper tier journals.’ But the issue I wrote about, I feel strongly about.” Dr. Simon, wanting to earn that “key” (tenure) which will allow him to continue to teach, negotiates what he will and will not do. He will not stop being a committed teacher who responds to his 40+ students every day via a hybrid course; he will not allow the prestige of an “outlet” determine whether or not he writes what he thinks or feels about an important educational issue, particularly when it impacts the local community. He will, on the other hand, produce scholarship that will allow him to stay at SWU even if it is not directly reflective of his social justice agenda.

A Latina tenure-track faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts, Dr. Reyes entered the professoriate to engage and develop students to be leaders. Coming to SWU was an opportunity to develop students through her applied research. More than any other faculty member that I spoke with, Dr. Reyes represents the “complete faculty member,” (Fairweather, 2002) a person who is able to integrate teaching, research, and service in a seamless fashion. When asked to explain what SWU’s transition means to her, she responded:

‘Tier One’ means - it’s like [we] are expected to do more research and to bring in more money. And when I was interviewed, they were like ‘do you know how to write grants?’ I do know how to write grants and we’ve gotten funded. So I’ve brought in [hundreds of thousands] for our project.... ‘Tier

One' means we're going to be research based, but there's a conflict because this community is very poor working class and our schools are not preparing their students to be high-ended researchers...Most need a degree to get a better paying job (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Obviously, Dr. Reyes' definition of "Tier One" is drawn from the institutional field.

She believes that there is an obvious and unavoidable conflict between the reality of community needs and a "Tier One" research orientation. Nonetheless, a superstar in any feat she attempts, Dr. Reyes is working hard to ensure that she continues to succeed amid SWU's proposed transition. When asked how the transition impacts her, she admits that it is taxing on her and on her family life. In the survey, she noted that the mounting expectations at SWU are overwhelming. She noted "the goal to bring in more money, to become a better researcher, while still having a heavy course load seems unrealistic and inhumane."

Dr. Reyes negotiates the transition to "Tier One" in very sensible and strategic ways. First of all, she works to merge her teaching, her research, and her service in very practical ways. Before assuming any assignment, she asks herself if it will be possible to publish out of that given activity. She reflects and asks if participation in a particular activity might connect to her teaching. Like the Operationalizers, Dr. Reyes assumes a large amount of responsibility for her success. She does not, however, identify as a researcher first and foremost. In fact, she says her strength lies in the teaching aspect of her work. Unwilling to compromise her teaching, she says she sacrifices other things, like her exercise and to a certain extent her family life. She noted "this semester I couldn't exercise because my class got bumped [to a different time]. I had students - yeah - I can't tell them 'I'm sorry I've got to exercise. I can't see you' - when they're melting down and they need to talk to someone." She talked about her

inability to disengage from her students, like other professors who, she told me, simply close their door. She said, "I really love teaching...I came to make a commitment."

In some ways, Dr. Reyes might seem more of a conformist than a negotiator. In fact, I contemplated placing her amongst the Operationalizers. It does not seem like she is attempting to negotiate with the University. She is not holding anything back the way Dr. Baines or Dr. Muñoz hold back. She admits that her family life suffers, and that on a personal level, she feels constantly overwhelmed. Nonetheless, Dr. Reyes is a Negotiator because she is troubled by and critiques the prospect of SWU raising admissions to the point that local students would not have access. Mostly, however, Dr. Reyes is a negotiator because she is unwilling to compromise the practical or applied nature of her work, and aims to build leaders for the region through her applied field research/teaching/work. She believes in the value and the role of applied work, especially at SWU where individuals often look to higher education for its potential to build up practical, professional, and perhaps, even vocational oriented skill sets in order to support themselves or their families. Therefore, Dr. Reyes works to connect the components of her work to ensure that she satisfies not only the organizational demands related to "Tier One," but also her own expectations of herself as a teacher dedicated to the development of local leaders with practical and theoretical knowledge.

Dr. Garcia, a tenure-track professor in the College of Liberal Arts grew up amid the Chicano movement. His parents, particularly his father and grandfather encouraged him to seek a degree as a way of serving as a role model for others, especially other Chicanos. Of his desire to fulfill this role and work at a place like SWU, he says:

You know, [professors] dream. When we think of you know top, top universities around the country and say 'Oh, I'd love to teach there!' But

you know in realistic terms I was thinking, 'Well, what do I really want to do with my career in terms of academics? Yes, I want to publish and research, of course, and I want to be a leader in my, in my field but in terms of my teaching, you know...I really want to teach in a Hispanic Serving Institute (HSI) for one reason and one reason only.' As I was an undergraduate and then eventually, of course, as a graduate student - [this is] for a very good reason - in any class, I ever took, I was, I was the only Chicano in the in the group. Sometimes I was the only person of color in the room as well, you know, it wasn't like there were a lot of African Americans...even Asian Americans to a large extent, you know, so for me I was thinking, you know I would like to go to an [University Name], [University Name], or a SWU...(Interview transcript, 2009).

Today, he finds himself working at SWU, an institution where the opportunity to serve as a role model to Mexican American and/or Mexican National students abounds. To this end, Dr. Garcia spoke about teaching with pride and bragged about the abilities of his students at SWU. Dr. Garcia named and described the successes of a number of his students and beamed with pride as he talked to me about their bright futures.

Interested to see how Dr. Garcia viewed the transition to "Tier One" and how it might impact his ability to teach and mentor students so closely, I asked him to describe what "Tier One" means to him. Dr. Garcia was one of the few Negotiators within the group who believed – with few reservations - that it is possible to create a new kind of "Tier One" model. Of this he said:

So, I was actually aware of [SWU's Tier One aspirations] before I came and applied for this position. I said yes, this is exciting, this is exciting to, to be coming to potentially to a university that wants to move on to sort of the next level, in terms of its research status, right? And become a, a national, potentially a national research university and to me that really seems exciting (Interview transcript, 2009).

He spoke about the potential to create a research university where teaching and scholarship are equally valued, not only by the university itself, but by the professors. Dr. Garcia, a graduate of a prestigious public university, talked about his experience as

an undergraduate, where he was able to take classes with some of the best known thinkers in his field. Thus, his experience helped him to believe that, indeed, South West University could hold onto both teaching and research as equally prized and valued activities.

However, despite Dr. Garcia's excited and hopeful outlook when it comes to SWU's future as a "Tier One," Dr. Garcia is clearly negotiating his way through this change. In other words, rather than Operationalize without critique, he spoke about the need to produce more research and fund-raising in an environment that lacked critical support systems. He, like all the other Negotiators, finds it incredibly difficult to produce more research, scholarship, grant writing, and teaching excellence without any support systems or capacity amongst the senior scholars in his department. This is an important critique also offered by Dr. Muñoz, Dr. Estrada, and others in the survey. Tenure-track faculty often report feeling that their senior colleagues do not have the experience or knowledge to help them navigate the "Tier One" transition. This complaint is one that can be linked to Dr. Lucero's experience, where he was critiqued by his senior colleagues for lack of service (despite his service on two major committees).

Thus, although Dr. Garcia believes in the potential of "Tier One," he is unwilling to absorb any more responsibilities for the accomplishment of this institutional goal than he already has and so he negotiates what he will and will not do. At the time of the interview, Dr. Garcia noted that when he was hired at SWU, he thought his work would consist of about 50% teaching and 50% researching, with light administrative work. He looked forward to such a work load because he views teaching and scholarship as complimentary and believed he could contribute to SWU with such a work profile.

However, the year unraveled and Dr. Garcia found himself in a position where he was asked to take on more and more administrative responsibilities in addition to an unusually heavy teaching load (up to 3 graduate courses per semester). As a tenure-track professor, he sees such work loads as problematic because it has left him no time for research and scholarship. Although he did not indicate in his interview, in his survey he admits “I have divested myself of nearly all service and advising duties and have been trying to refocus my efforts into research and to a somewhat lesser extent teaching.” Later on in the interview, Dr. Garcia described a few things that “scare” him about the transition to “Tier One.”

There's two things...you know, we do have a very significant teaching mission. I've never been a part of an institution that doesn't have a sabbatical in terms of faculty development - sabbatical process for research. [A sabbatical process], I think, is something that the administration and the deans really need to address because there is no way that faculty can advance their personal and the institutional research agendas if they don't get significant time. And that concerns me....There [is] the need for, for time.... Now, the other thing that concerns me, too, is I don't feel that and again this may just be my case...We need grant writing support very, very badly because if we're teaching and trying to advance our own personal research agenda, going out and getting the large grants takes time and it takes experienced qualified individuals. And if you put that on top of the faculty as well [the other] responsibilities... (Interview transcript, 2009).

Several things are important here. Primarily, Dr. Garcia realizes and points out the gap in power between tenured and tenure-track faculty, between those with the power to make work load assignments and those who must consistently negotiate, learn how to integrate the tenets of their work, or learn how to say no to work load assignments, which can be a political risk for un-tenured faculty. Like Dr. Muñoz, Dr. Garcia is attempting to be clearer about what kinds of courses he will and will not be teaching over the next academic year. There is, however, always the potential for latent

power and politics involved when tenure-track faculty members make these kinds of assertions. Secondly, Dr. Garcia moves between field and organization to make sense of what his role might look like at a “Tier One” and the kinds of supports he needs to make it work. Until he has the sort of supports that other already established “Tier Ones” have in place (reduced teaching loads, sabbatical processes, a learned grant writing staff, etc), he, like Dr. Baines and Dr. Muñoz will not give any more to the University.

The Negotiators are not necessarily opposed to “Tier One,” but they do seek to hold the university accountable for the heightened demands that it is placing on its faculty, especially Drs. Baines and Garcia. This is an interesting finding. All of the tenure-track faculty members embody the dispositions and the practical skill sets that are needed to take SWU to the next level (cosmopolitan skills, knowledge, capital, etc...). This gives them, as tenure-track faculty, a surprising sort of power which they use to bargain or negotiate with the University what they will and what they will not do, what they need in order to produce more scholarship, grants, and other forms of “excellence” to catapult SWU.

At times their negotiation is grounded in very practical and sensible needs. For example, the Negotiators signal their unwillingness to further compromise their health (emotional, mental, and physical) and their inability to sustain such unrealistic and inhumane workloads in light of SWU’s weak infrastructure. On the one hand, Dr. Baines admits that she is not writing as aggressively or seeking as many top tier journals as she might be in a “real Tier One.” Dr. Munoz and Dr. Garcia are both asserting the kinds

of classes and the number of classes that they are willing to teach in light of the transition.

Other times, negotiation is anchored in more personal and biographical elements of who these professors are as people - as female professors who are unwilling to “de”-contextualize their working relationship with students, and thus, who strive to create learning environments and opportunities that reflect the realities of their students’ lives, such as Dr. Estrada and Dr. Aaron. In the case of Dr. Simon, negotiation is anchored in his exposure to the injustice and inequities along the border as a long time previous school administrator. In Dr. Muñoz’ case, her commitment to practicing the noble notion of *bien educado* and refusing to undermine her scholarship by sending it to only the most prestigious outlets is grounded in the lessons that she learned from family over the years. Therefore, if there is something important that must be said; Dr. Muñoz makes sure that it is said. “Tier One” does not deter her from this.

As noted earlier, in both practical and personal ways, the Negotiators resemble what Rhoades et al. (2008) wrote about in their piece on local-cosmopolitans. They are academics grounded not in one dimensional worlds of discipline or field, or even academia, but in multiple settings that have shaped their lives. Their purposes in academia, thus, are multi dimensional, grounded in the local context and yet enabled by their cosmopolitan experiences and skill sets. These Negotiators are working from the “pockets of power” (Gonzales, forthcoming) that they hold and their positionality allows them, forces them to ask questions that others do not see, do not seek, or do not find of concern.

6.3f The Acquiescent

... My contribution will continue to be, which is something they want to expand is the online [teaching]...and I know the program so well, I probably could help our other faculty or new faculty coming on, so I think that would be my biggest contribution. – Dr. Martinez, Female Tenured

The Acquiescent represent a group of six tenured faculty members who arrived at South West some years ago. Although some admit that they began their work at South West because it was the “only place that offered [them] a job,” they unanimously agree that they were attracted to the place and that they remained at SWU because of their deep seated commitment to access and their affinity for teaching. Across this group of six faculty members are a range of subtle differences in perspectives and reactions to “Tier One.” Yet, there is a deep sense of worry and skepticism which bounds this group together. Also binding this group is their attempt to insert themselves into the university as still legitimate, viable scholars and contributors. Even the two most resistant faculty members assert that there are ways in which they can and will still make a contribution not necessarily to SWU, but to the educational endeavors for the local region. Below, I introduce each member of this group and then highlight the kinds of action or inaction they have taken with regard to constructing a space and role for themselves as SWU moves on to a new mission and different purpose.

Table 7 Details for the Acquiescent

T-Status	College	Min., Max. Mean Yrs @ SWU
6 Tenured	2 Education	Min. ~ 2
-	3 LARTS	Max ~ 25
-	1 Science	Mean = 14 years at SWU

Dr. Martinez is a tenured faculty member and has worked at South West for almost two decades. Originally from the city where South West resides, Dr. Martinez was anxious to return home when the opportunity presented itself. When asked to

describe what attracted her to the professoriate, Dr. Martinez reflected “I’ve always wanted – I love teaching at all levels, and um, my whole point was to work at a university to be able to teach teachers.” Of returning to South West, Dr. Martinez explained that as a former student at South West, she was always impressed with her experience and that she believed her return to SWU would allow her to have a “balanced” career as a faculty member. Dr. Martinez noted:

At the time [I was hired], it was very balanced. It’s not balanced anymore, but back then it was balanced in the requirements. In addition to teaching and serving students in the teaching realm, you also needed to write for scholarship. And I understood that because in doing research, you also gain perspective on how to teach teachers better and you gain an understanding of what’s out there and what are the best practices and so forth. So, my end of it was then and still is [now] writing for the improvement of teaching, the improvement of the knowledge base that my students have ... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Clearly, Dr. Martinez was attracted to the teaching aspect of faculty work. Her love for teaching is grounded in a practical orientation, which is sensible given that her central focus has been working with school teachers her entire career. Research, for Dr. Martinez, is a tool and an exercise for improving her teaching. Widespread notoriety or publications in top journals are not of interest to Dr. Martinez, but a paper that can be helpful to her students is. In many ways, Dr. Martinez is a prime example of Gouldner’s (1957) local.

Dr. Walker is also a tenured faculty member at South West University. He has taught at the University for almost two decades and enjoys teaching more than any other activity although he does enjoy grant writing and has been quite successful earning money for the University through his efforts. His work, like Dr. Martinez’s, is also grounded in practicality and although he has “learned to like research,” he views his

research as a tool to improve his teaching, which he hopes, in turn, improves the schooling experience for disadvantaged students. Dr. Walker is so dedicated to the improvement of schooling for disadvantaged children that he has conducted research for local and other school districts despite the fact that they would not allow him to publish any research out of the work. When asked to describe what attracted him to the professoriate, Dr. Walker noted that when he entered his doctoral program, he always thought that he would return to “practice,” but while engaged in his dissertation research, he realized what an impact he could make by helping districts better understand how to implement culturally sound and competent practices. He decided to pursue academia in order to teach teachers and school administrators about what he had learned. As for coming to South West, he admits that initially, he took the position because the University offered him a job at a time when there were few openings. However, he explains:

I really liked South West. I mean the students here are just phenomenal and just so respectful and so I really liked that. Um, but when I first came here there was not *nearly* the push do the research. I mean I have always done some. I mean I have written grants while I have been here but it was always more focused on, I thought, on teaching and uh, so even though I continued to publish, I mean I have not published the way people should be if they are going to “Tier One” (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Walker, like Dr. Martinez, enjoys the teaching tenet most, and viewed it as the central aim of the University. For both, research has always been important, but it is viewed largely as a tool for improving what they are able to offer their students as teachers.

It is important to point out that the two faculty members mentioned thus far are located in the College of Education. Of the Negotiators mentioned earlier, five of nine

came from the College of Education. That faculty from the College of Education and its faculty might struggle with the transition to a “Tier One” research focused mission is not surprising as the education field has traditionally been recognized as a professional and or practice oriented discipline (most do not refer to it as a discipline at all). According to Frost et al., (2003), this means that faculty in schools of education are often assumed (and often do) to spend more of their time on teaching than on research in order to prepare professionals. This has resulted in the marginalization of schools of education within universities (Frost et al., 2003) because “within the academy, scholars value inquiry that is abstract, pure, or interesting for its own sake, sometimes assigning less status to work that has ‘immediate, practical utility’ (Bok, 1986 as cited in Frost et al., 2003, p. 122).”

Thus, the “capital” and the disposition that education professors have to work with is likely to be substantively different than some of their discipline based peers and geared towards practice and teaching rather than research and publishing for a broader, external audience. For example, one tenured, education professor from the survey noted “I enjoy training new generations of counselors. Therefore, my primary goal was to teach, not do research. Research is a part of it, but never my primary goal.” That education faculty seem to be oriented towards teaching for locally defined concerns and precise problem-solving and that they are amongst the Negotiators and the Acquiescent points to the import of one’s academic history, how that shapes the development of capital, and the constitution of habitus for faculty members. This is a line of inquiry that will be further explored in future research projects. However, it is informative to point out that on the one hand, the pair of Acquiescent described above have the symbolic capital

of tenure, and thus they are exempt from some of the risk and repercussions that tenure-track faculty face. On the other hand, this pair of tenured Acquiescent, with their more local, practical orientation, faces the prospect of being relegated to the margins in a South West that seeks to establish itself as “Tier One.” Their relegation may be even further agitated by their position inside a College of Education and the embedded prejudice against schools of education.

Dr. Medina is a tenured faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts who notes that one of the main attractions to South West was the opportunity to “pay it forward” by working with Latino students in the ways that his own professors had worked with him. Although Dr. Medina has had a fairly successful researching career, he particularly enjoys working with students and when asked hypothetically, if his College were to create a teaching/clinical faculty and a research faculty to address both teaching and researching, he said that he would most like to sit on the teaching faculty.

Dr. Chavez is a high energy, tenured faculty member in the College of Liberal Arts. She was at the University for just about one year when she started to hear about South West’s aspirations to achieve a “Tier One” status. For Dr. Chavez, this was particularly bad news. Part of what attracted her to South West University was its deep commitment to teaching and serving first generation Latino students, like herself. She believes that it is difficult to be a teaching *and* research driven University.

Dr. Chavez framed her story, and specifically her entrance to the professoriate, with her experience as a first-generation Latina student. She especially recalled the powerful influence of her mentors. When asked to talk about what attracted her to the

professoriate and more specifically if she had any mission or values that helped drive her as a faculty member, she had this to say:

Leslie: ...you know sometimes in the scholarship, you'll see faculty members who talk about having some sort of value or driving mission about why they chose their work. Do you have that? Can you explain that?

Dr. Chavez: Yes, I think I do. I think that in many ways because I consider myself lucky because I found not only [Alex]⁵⁶ who took the time to teach me all of this but because...almost everybody in the department who would see me working so hard and everything else. They also took an interest. And it's kind of like payback. I would like to be able to say, 'hey, I gave students or I gave them the opportunity, the benefit of the doubt. I hope I'm not too snooty with them, that I can let them know that, 'I've been there' and I try to do that. I think, as much as I can. I didn't come from the Harvard family, etc., so I can understand how incredibly difficult the whole system is. It's like truly a different world if you haven't...if you and your family haven't been through the whole college experience. Moving into an academic setting is really changing your life (Interview Transcript, 2009).

It is important to point out that although Dr. Chavez describes herself as a teaching and student centered professor, she has had a successful research career. She enjoys research and she does not see teaching and researching as exclusionary tenets of faculty work, but says that one must decide where one will primarily focus. She enjoys working with and teaching students above all else and finds her purpose there.

Dr. Stevens is a native of the southwestern U.S. To a certain extent, he considers South West University and the local area his home. A tenured professor in Liberal Arts, Dr. Stevens described himself as an "accidental academic." When I asked Dr. Stevens to talk about his work, especially if there is a part of faculty work that he is most attracted to, he spoke about the enjoyment he experiences in teaching and mentoring students. He said that mentoring is his real "claim to fame." Dr. Stevens elaborated to

⁵⁶ A pseudonym.

show that he has mentored undergraduates and master's students who have gone on to achieve a number of exciting and prestigious things in their lives. He named a number of his students and talked about co-authoring with students and pushing his students to achieve higher standards.

In addition to mentoring, Dr. Stevens says that his work as a faculty member "represents my background as a public servant." As a public service employee for many years, and one who has always been committed to studying and shedding light on the marginalization of women, people of color, and disabled groups, in general, he sees many intersections in his work as a researcher, mentor, and servant to the local community.

When asked specifically to explain what attracted him to South West, Dr. Stevens noted that he was initially hired to help design a Master's level program for public professionals to improve or build their skills to advance in their work settings. At the time that he was hired (2004), Dr. Stevens understood that his role at South West was "lots and lots of teaching" along with the normal expectations of publishing and mentoring at a master's level program." He notes how he really liked [those] expectations because they "were definitely clear...and I knew what I needed to do the first, second and third years." Today, he admits that tenure-track faculty face much higher and far less clear standards.

Dr. Jerry is a tenured faculty member in the College of Science. He has worked at South West for more than twenty years. Although not originally from South West's regional area, he considers it home since he began to do research and teach in the

southwest and U.S.-Mexican border region more than three decades ago. When asked what attracted him to South West, he says:

Well, I love this region. I love it – and I love being – this is probably gonna sound funny coming from a big ole *gringo*, but I love being by Mexico. I love the Mexican people. I love the culture. I love the Hispanic culture; the way...I love the desert. I always wanted to work in the desert and about [South West University], I loved and this is true here [in my] department, I love that the undergraduates are the top priority. I love that (Interview Transcript, 2010).

As Dr. Jerry spoke about his work and particularly his work on the U.S.-Mexico border, one could see pure delight. Working with students, particularly undergraduates and “getting someone turned on to science,” he explained, is the driving passion for his work. It is important to point out that Dr. Jerry does not believe that teaching and researching are separate entities, but instead he sees them as inextricably connected and informative. When it comes to working with undergraduates, then, he is not only talking about his work with them in classroom settings, but also in the field, in the labs, in all sorts of venues.

The Acquiescent, as a group of faculty members, see the University’s transition to “Tier One” as an attempt for South West to replicate the form and functioning of a major national research university. While there is deep concern for the teaching and regional missions that the University has come to serve, they are called the Acquiescent because they have accepted that the University has moved onto a different phase of its being (Kezar, 2001). For instance, Dr. Walker said of the transition “I guess it’s just the next step.”

In response, the Acquiescent faculty members attempt to establish a space for self by reconstructing a legitimate role – a way that they can contribute, perhaps not to

SWU, but to the teaching and access mission of the University, as it is something that they deeply believe in. On this note, it is critical to call attention to the way that the Acquiescent fall back on the organizational culture at South West – one that they have structured and one that has been structured onto them, giving them this unique habitus. Just as the Operationalizers' habitus is shaped by the field which disposes them to grant writing savvy, the knowledge and the know-how to negotiate lower teaching loads, their ability and *willingness* to rely on graduate students to complete their instructional duties, and their ability and tendency to prioritize their research over all other tenets of their work, the Acquiescent use the skills, capital and knowledge that they have gained during their tenure at South West. Their habitus includes the ability and the desire to teach, to enjoy teaching as the primary function of one's work, the ability and want to create research projects by addressing very local and practical problems, their familiarity with and agreement with South West's student validation approach, and ultimately, their view of South West as a University that serves the regional population by providing access and undergraduate education.

The Acquiescent, then, embody characteristics similar to Gouldner's local, but perhaps their commitment is not so much to the organization, but to the ideas that the organization has upheld for so long, and also to the community that SWU serves, specifically the student body. However, the Acquiescent, like other faculty members, must carry out their work in the field of higher education, not just the locale. This is even truer, given the fact that that "Tier One" seems to signal a more national, outward looking orientation. Thus, it is important to think about what it means to be a Local in academia. To do this, I turn again to Bourdieu's work on habitus, action, and field. In the

field of academia, it is clear that “Tier One” is defined by prestige, status, and selectivity, a focus on research over teaching, and the import of discipline or nationally defined research agendas than locally practical ones. For the Acquiescent, however, as they make sense of the change and their role in it, these sorts of habits/practices do not emerge as practical or even sensible lines of action. In fact, such habits or practices seem antithetical to their work and who they are as professors.

Thus, despite the fact that the Acquiescent have been somewhat research active, their research is oriented not towards wide international or national bodies, but to their most local constituents: their students and the local community. They take problems that are of local significance and they attempt to bring some resolve to those problems. While that work often can and does translate into publications, whether a publication can be produced from such work does not determine whether or not faculty participate in an important local project. Moreover, the kinds of publications that are yielded from this kind of work tend to be less prestigious by institutional field standards. For instance, a few of the Acquiescent faculty members talked about writing for state or regional newsletters, local schools, and/or action/policy briefs; none of these kinds of outlets are peer reviewed or prestigious outlets. By using the culture that they learned from the organization and that they helped to build, they situate themselves as marginal faculty members and there seems to be a certain degree of acceptance amongst them. The Acquiescent realize that their work is not likely to result in further promotions at the University. In fact, the Acquiescent admit that they are not going to apply for further promotion or that they are going to retire soon.

However, even from this marginal position, the Acquiescent evoke a quiet power. As mentioned above, these faculty members have the symbolic power of tenure, the ability to name a new kind of role for self and also the very important responsibility of judging the work of their colleagues. Thus, although they have stepped aside, I theorize that their activities and sometimes their inactions contribute to the persistence of mini or micro level institutions that can impact the larger trajectory of the University.

In other words, on a daily basis, the Acquiescent construct and reconstruct their role and their space, creating a habit, a practice that is visible, and which others are likely to draw from in their own sense-making – in this way, the Acquiescent faculty subtly exert power. This suggests that micro-level inquiries have much to add to the NI perspective on organizational change as we can learn from these mini or micro level institutions and whether or not they impact the larger organization (see Zucker, 1991).

Consistently, the roles that the Acquiescent construct resemble attempts to insert and maintain the validity of South West's "local orientation" as it transitions into what they fear to be a very different kind of university with. I discuss the Local Acquiescents' actions below to show that their commitments to teaching, mentoring, and ensuring that the students that they work with have a chance to succeed is at the heart of their work, but also at the heart of who they are as people.

6.3g Local Acquiescent in (In) Action

The Acquiescent, like all faculty members, face a complex set of circumstances which they have to make sense of. Although they are a group with relatively little at stake (all are tenured), they still grapple with South West's transition and how to ensure that they remain viable and legitimate contributors. Thus, rather than flatly ignore the

expectations of the University, the Acquiescent take into account the transition and then figure out where they might fit. Like all faculty, the Acquiescent find themselves using the sources, knowledge, and capital that is most apparent, available, and natural to them in order to make sense of and navigate this transition. For the Acquiescent, this means falling back on the skills, capital, and knowledge that can be drawn out of South West's organizational culture, which has been structured onto their own habitus.

Yet while the Acquiescent consistently draw from the organizational culture, to construct their role, they, like most faculty pull down ideas and definitions from the field to help them define "Tier One." What this means is that the actions they take are often clearly at odds with the institutionally notions of what "Tier One" means. For example, all of the Acquiescent worry that open admissions will no longer exist if SWU transitions to "Tier One." Dr. Medina, who was attracted to South West for its large Latina/o population noted that the open-admissions process is most definitely going to have to be revised if South West hopes to attain "Tier One" status. Another faculty survey respondent noted "the school's new goals seem nearly opposite of those for which we've been striving for years...to serve the general student population of the region." That faculty members frequently identify the open-access mission of South West as problematic to the "Tier One" trajectory should not be surprising. The model of "Tier One" that most faculty members, including the Acquiescent, are using as their reference point (the Harvard's and the Berkeley's, for instance) have a rigid admissions process whereas more than 95% of those who apply to South West are accepted.

The Acquiescent also believe that teaching will no longer be valued at SWU when the transition is complete, particularly undergraduate teaching. Others in the

survey agree. One male tenure-track professor flatly commented “I fear that we will neglect teaching of competent but not exceptional students.” In addition, one tenure-track female said that she recently made changes to her work time allocation by being “more focused with my time, spend[ing] less time on things that do not contribute to success in research and grant writing.” Another survey respondent noted:

I try to spend less time on campus and more time working on my own research and writing. I find that the best way to do that is to leave my office, which when I am here is usually filled with students who stop by (Survey Response, 2009).

While it is true that any tenure-track faculty member has to protect his or her time in order to construct a work profile that can earn her tenure, South West faculty members seem to be pushing aside the work that most believe used to matter most at South West University. For the “Acquiescent,” this means that they must confront the idea that their work is no longer the work that the University most prizes.

In believing that the core of their work is no longer the core of the University’s work, the Acquiescent then figure out how and where they still fit. They must not only construct a space for self and work, but they must work to make that space and that work legitimate. To do this, they turn away from the field - the source that they have used to understand what “Tier One” is about and they turn inwards, much like Gouldner’s “local” might. They turn to their students, the local community, and to themselves in order to find legitimacy and validity for their work. They acquiesce and step aside, concluding that validation of their own work is likely to come from inside their classrooms, the immediate region and community, and perhaps a limited circle of peers. They concede that it is likely that legitimacy will no longer be granted by the University

administrators who have led this transitional process, and certainly not from external groups.

Despite the fact that their work years are limited (most are within a few years of retirement), all of the Acquiescent still very much want to contribute to the educational endeavor for the regional population (not necessarily the University) in whatever way that they can, and they are especially moved to contribute in ways that they believe uphold the teaching and access mission of the University. In the survey, for instance, when Dr. Martinez was asked to explain how she manages her own personal goals for her work and the University's new aspirations, she noted "I will continue to have teaching students as my number one goal. I am close to retirement and am not interested in South West's goals for 'Tier One' status because it often undermines the mission of [my field] as a teaching program."

On one hand, Dr. Martinez comments signal that she realizes the value of her work is receding as South West makes this "Tier One" transition, but she will continue to work in that vein because she believes that it is work that must get done. In her interview, I asked Dr. Martinez if and how she and her work contribute to South West's successful transition and she discussed how her teaching load now includes a rather labor intensive class where she works closely with pre-service teachers and in-service teachers to improve their scholarly writing. She continued:

...I'm sure they're probably gonna [sic] want me to write more than - but I can't. My contribution will continue to be, which is something they want to expand is the online [teaching]...and I know the program so well, I probably could help our other faculty or new faculty coming on, so I think that would be my biggest contribution right now...just to continue to teaching [sic] and um I really don't think that I'm going to be that much of an asset in terms of going towards 'Tier One' other than just maintaining

the status quo or maybe even it's not even status quo just continuing on and on ...(Interview Transcript, 2010).

Dr. Martinez notes that “they” would probably prefer if she produced more writing, but at this point in the career, she is unwilling to do so. She can, however, with confidence contribute and to a certain extent satisfy organizational demands by teaching other teachers what she has learned and assuming a larger on-line instructional presence. This is her contribution, and thus, the role that she has constructed for herself.

Throughout Dr. Walker’s interview, he spoke about the transition as extremely stressful. He noted that there are an abundance of mixed messages, but ultimately, he construes the transition to “Tier One” to be about South West capturing an elite research university function and reputation. When asked specifically what South West’s “Tier One” transition is about, he said the following:

Dr. Walker: Well, much more scholarly production – um doing the research, um kind of I think of ‘Tier One’ universities where you have doctoral programs and you have doctoral students helping you write articles and collect data...Um, but that’s kind of how I envision it – a lot more scholarly production and kind of becoming leaders in the nation on particular topical areas that somebody would say – oh this person is at [South West] – that is kind of what I envision – ‘Tier One.’ Its just, its just...its really hard for me to envision what its going to be like at [South West] because I don’t think people are willing to let go of things that may need to be let go of. I hate to see them let go... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Leslie: Do you think one of the things that people think might need to let go of is undergraduate education? Do you feel that you or other people feel that? That teaching needs to be let go, I mean do you see [that] amongst the tenure-track folks?

Dr. Walker: Um, yeah, I see, I see that there is less time. I see there is less energy put into teaching to make it really quality teaching, not just going through chapters in the book and learning and lecturing over the chapters of the book and not activities and writing assignments and things

like that...um because I just don't think people have time (Interview Transcript, 2009).

In a later part of the conversation, Dr. Walker admits that because he is tenured, the transition does not impact him the way that it impacts the tenure-track faculty, but because of his commitment to teaching, to his colleagues, and to the general well-being of the department, he works to find ways to contribute. Dr. Walker, who has had considerable success with grant-writing while at South West, believes that grant writing is one way that he can contribute to South West's journey. Of this he said:

Like I have one [grant] going out this year because I want to get funded again – so yeah, I think that could be very much a be [a contribution] because part of “Tier One” is get a research grant and it helps the university move toward “Tier One,” but then also getting grants that support graduate students while they are going through getting their graduate degree is also a responsibility for “Tier Ones” So, yeah... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

As we spoke, Dr. Walker continually uncovered examples of how he contributes to South West during this time of transition.

Yeah, I mean, I probably don't have to do that [write more papers] because I have tenure. And I probably am not going to, uh, I don't know. Because I have tenure, I probably have less pressure than non-tenured, but I write a lot with...we have a faculty member who is not tenured, and we [my colleague and I] write with him a lot. That helps him/her. That helps me. And, uh, the nice thing is I have more data than I have written. So I can share that with him/her and s/he can get articles out. And I can get articles out of the data we have collected, and so and then the other thing is: I just really feel like we should set an example. You know for faculty, for new faculty who are coming in and they are not getting tenured, you know. I don't think I should be sitting here doing nothing – if research is an expectation for them, then it should be an expectation for me. I mean I am sure that I am not going at it as hard as new faculty for fear of not getting tenured. I do feel a sense of responsibility (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Initially, Dr. Walker acknowledges the power he holds as a tenured faculty member: the ability to say no to the heightened tenure requirements. However, Dr.

Walker has constructed a new role for himself: grant writer and facilitator. He understands that his ability to carve out such a unique space is supported by his tenured status and that not all faculty members have the privilege or confidence to do this. However, Dr. Walker does not want to be a non-contributing member of South West, and although he admits that he is not going to publish at a “Tier One” level, Dr. Walker is going to contribute by writing with and providing a junior tenure-track faculty member access to his data so that he can be successful.

In addition, Dr. Walker sees himself playing other important roles in the transition. He went on to describe a situation where a tenure-track faculty member was saddled with additional service commitments by tenured departmental colleagues. Of this, he said:

I raised a real concern and I said, ‘s/he cannot be, we cannot be saddling him/her with this area because s/he has got to keep up the momentum for writing.’ And everyone said, ‘well, s/he has come up for three year review right now and s/he looks good.’ And I said, ‘yeah but s/he has two more years to look good and two more years, and its getting harder and harder to [get] tenure, so I don’t want him/her committing to that service area. I mean s/he’s already got 3 classes to teach!’ So, yeah, teaching 3 classes and then trying to keep up with research and then to add service to that... (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Walker’s contribution circulates around a willingness to facilitate a more equitable work experience for tenure-track junior faculty. However, turning to Bourdieu (1993), one can see how Dr. Walker’s seemingly passive, acquiescent stepping aside and his new role as a “facilitator” is in fact a struggle to remain in view as a legitimate member of the South West University, if not necessarily in the field of higher education. Of this Bourdieu (1993) writes:

The ageing of authors, works, or schools is something quite different from the product of a mechanical slippage into the past. It is the continuous

creation of the battle between those who have made their names and are *struggling to stay in view* and those who cannot make their own names without relegating to the past the established figures, whose interests lies in freezing over the movement of time, fixing the present state of the field over. On one side are the dominant figures, who want *continuity, identity, reproduction*; on the other, the newcomers who seek discontinuity, rupture, difference revolution. To make one's name means to make one's mark, achieving recognition of one's difference from another, means creating a new position, beyond the position presently occupied...(p. 106, my emphasis).

Bourdieu points out that there is always a struggle, especially between the young and the old, to either maintain or establish legitimate practices. The Acquiescent, with their tenure, have the sort of power and confidence that allows them to create a new position, but this seems much less likely amongst faculty who are on the tenure-track.

As I interviewed Dr. Walker, it became apparent that he constructed a new role by taking on additional service and by facilitating a smoother experience for his tenure-track colleagues. In the survey data, it was also evident that other senior faculty have assumed additional service responsibilities, such as writing grants to support their junior colleagues in the department and/or acting as a very conscientious mentor for younger faculty. For instance, one male, full professor noted: "I find that I need to nurture more junior faculty, and they face a series of contradictions between (a) teaching load; (b) research; and (c) widespread shortage of resources."

Dr. Medina's interview was filled with a sense of acquiescence. In fact, at times, he spoke as if he were no longer an integral member of the university or even of his department. He explained that when a university adopts a "Tier One" agenda, it usually results in "a stronger focus on research and diminished role for teaching students;" he believes that this has a tremendous impact on departmental culture. In his department, where there has been a history of factions, the "Tier One" transition seems to have

irritated these old divisions. When the recorder was off, he spoke to me in detail about the “auditing culture” (Power, 2003) that has been introduced by a new department chair where faculty members work is now judged on a most rigorous point system. Power (2003) uses the notion of an “audit culture” to describe the heavy influences of both markets and science across a variety of social spheres, including organizations. That Dr. Medina referenced the heightened attention to “accounting” one’s work so narrowly and tightly signals to a number of critical issues relevant to faculty work. First and foremost, when forced to account so narrowly, prescriptions for prestige become tighter, and faculty members are likely to draw definitions or measures for prestige for their accounting system, not from local culture or history, but from distant, already institutionalized structures. Similar to the imposition of snap-shot measures that are used to validate entire schools at the K-12 level, faculty members are forced to use tightly, but socially constructed notions of what counts as prestigious – and thus legitimate - forms of faculty work. The loss, then, of one’s ability to self-define and then make a case as to why certain kinds of work are legitimate (teaching or writing for local or state level outlets, for instance) are lost upon the construction and implementation of such tight auditing systems. This means that faculty members are not governing themselves at a local level, but that they are governed by an accountability that may manifest at a department level, but which is most definitely rooted in the ideology of markets and science: two spheres which prescribe and dictate how quality can be understood and measured in contemporary society.

Reflecting on his role in the transition, he noted “the new faculty members are actually experiencing something much more dramatic and difficult for tenure and

promotion than what I faced.” Thus, Dr. Medina admits that the advice “[he] can provide is limited.” Ultimately, Dr. Medina admits that as a result of this transition, “I work more often from home.”⁵⁷ Thus, Dr. Medina has very much stepped aside to allow others to conduct the business of the department. His concerns revolve around what he is good at. In fact, in his survey, when asked how he manages between the university’s aspirations and the hopes and goals he had for his own career, he simply wrote “I know what I am good at and so I do that.” What Dr. Medina feels he is “good” at was clarified in the interview when he said that if South West adopted a two-tier faculty (one tier for research, one tier for teaching), he would prefer to sit on the teaching faculty.

Teaching, Dr. Medina believes, is the way in which he can contribute to South West, and furthermore, it is the venue of his work where he is best able to “pay it forward.” Dr. Medina has interpreted South West’s transition as a move to adopt forms and functions very similar to already established major research universities: tighter admission standards⁵⁸, much more emphasis on research and publication than on teaching, particularly in terms of the tenure and promotion process. While Dr. Medina sees a space for himself in terms of his teaching contribution and his commitment to working with students, his interview suggests that it will be a temporary space. He noted that he is only a few years away from retirement and is not interested in disrupting or

⁵⁷ Gayle Tuchman (2009) also writes about how Wannabe University’s attempt to move up in status agitated or brought new conflicts into view amongst departments – even in departments without a history of conflict. Tuchman argues that the emergence of departmental conflicts is connected to a rise in the “managerialism” perspective in higher education, which strips faculty members of their power over departmental, curricular, and other areas that have traditionally been under the purview of the faculty. This is yet another venue of research that needs to be further addressed as Universities move to capture more prestige and status.

⁵⁸ For instance, on average, the majority (46%) of South West students’ score between a 18-23 while (42%) score at between a 12-17 on the ACT. At the most prestigious Ivy League schools, ACT scores for the middle 50% of admitted students were no lower than 28.

resisting the change. The University, but more specifically, his department, he believes has “passed [me] by.” As a first generation college graduate and a Latino faculty member who wanted to work with other Latinos, like himself, his world view is structured in a way that disposes him to create this sort of role. In many ways, he is like Dr. Muñoz or Dr. Estrada who want to ensure that their work remains relevant and accessible to the local population of Latina/o students.

Again, although the University President went through great pains to avoid the transition at South West being interpreted as an attempt to capture the form and functioning of an elite university, such as Harvard or even UT Austin, the Acquiescent (as well as most other faculty) define it as such. While some of the Acquiescent seem to be stepping aside or attempting to reconstruct new roles and spaces for themselves, others do not attempt to contribute at all to the transition. When asked to describe what the transition at South West means to her, Dr. Chavez responded:

I think for me ‘Tier One’ would signify a lot of money coming in for research, a lot of output regarding books and journal articles and more than just the usual...The whole idea of ‘Tier One,’ I think is very disconnected. At least from the way I’ve seen it defined in other places in the way I view it from the social sciences. When you have ‘Tier One,’ usually what you have is a lot of money coming as criteria for what defines a ‘Tier One.’ And the social sciences, or any of the liberal arts for that matter, seldom classify in the big bucks category, right? What we can do a study for \$15,000; that doesn’t even buy Petri dishes for chemistry so I don’t see my research at all contributing to that ‘Tier One.’ I see [me and my work] being affected by it, negatively affected (Interview Transcript, 2009).

In later parts of our conversation, Dr. Chavez went on to compare current undergraduate education at South West to the undergraduate experience at places like Harvard, Berkley, or other “Tier One kinds of places.” Dr. Chavez’s ideas about what

“Tier One “means are drawn from the field, particularly what she has learned from her experience at already established major research universities, other aspiring universities like South West, and from reading news in the higher education field (such as the Chronicle).

When asked about the possibility that South West might be able to build a new kind of “Tier One” model, where teaching and open access stays at the top of the University’s priorities, she critiqued:

As soon as you say you’re going into “Tier One,” those are definitions that are imposed on a university by an outside organization....when you say “Tier One” the “South West way,” who are you kidding? If we’re doing it for the money then the ones that are holding the money are the ones that get to define it. And either you’re doing it or you’re not (Interview Transcript, 2009).

As noted above, Dr. Chavez is categorized as an Acquiescent, yet she is not as interested in attempting to “reconstruct” her role like Dr. Walker or even Dr. Martinez. Instead, she notes: “I’m just proceeding as I always do. I do what I have to do...” It is important to stress that Dr. Chavez’s opposition to South West’s transition is not rooted in stubbornness or laziness. In many ways, she sees herself, a social scientist, becoming irrelevant to a university that is most concerned with faculty who can bring in money. However, more importantly, Dr. Chavez views the university’s aspirations as a threat to the provision of a quality undergraduate education. She believes that “Tier One” will yield negative consequences for the local student body in many ways. To this end, she notes:

Again, a lot of people who came [to SWU] came here with the whole President’s speech of ‘we are dedicated to the students and we value research and expect you to do both. And most of us like both, but we don’t want to become only research and I don’t want – I want to divide my time probably half, if possible. I don’t want to ever have to focus so much on

the research and lock my door on students if they need me or tell them not to email me so much (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Chavez' hopes for her own work, the commitment that she has to serving first generation college students is grounded in her own experience and success as a first generation Latina college student. She is unwilling to disengage from working with and focusing on the success of her students. True to this disposition, as I entered Dr. Chavez's office the day of the interview, a young unsuspecting girl strolled by. Dr. Chavez shot out of her chair and the conversation went something like this:

Dr. Chavez: Lucia,⁵⁹ what happened with your paper? Did you read my comments? You need to do x, y, and z.

Lucia: I know. Thank you. Do you still want me to do them? I don't know how to do that.

Dr. Chavez: Well come by after this. Maybe in an hour and I will show you. I will walk you through this. You need to know how to do this, Lucia. Ayyy, the paper was good, but you need to work on these issues [x, y, z]...Come by in an hour or so? I will wait for you! (Field notes, 2009).

At this point, the girl, obviously Dr. Chavez' student, only had room to confirm the appointment, in which Dr. Chavez would walk her through a number of exercises to improve her final term paper. Explaining her approach to her work, Dr. Chavez recalled her own experiences as an undergraduate student "again, I remember my panic. I would just stand there - that first paper that they asked me for...I would just stand there in front of the shelves and think 'oh my god, how I am going to read all these books?'"

Dr. Chavez' reaching out to students is common amongst academics who are first generation college students that become academics. This is particularly well documented amongst Latina/o faculty members, who see student success and support

⁵⁹ A pseudonym.

as an inextricable component of their work – something that they cannot simply disengage from and something that Dr. Reyes, Estrada and Simon all spoke about. To this end, Dr. Chavez resists and asserts who she is and what kind of scholar she is – despite the whims of the University. Dr. Chavez’s tenured position allows her to resist, to ask questions and make sharp critiques that others are not willing (or able?) to make.

Dr. Stevens, a first generation college student who grew up in a working class family, calls himself an “accidental academic” and notes that his strength has always been in the teaching and mentoring of students. Nonetheless, he is a tenured faculty member who sees that most faculty members at South West have based their “careers on teaching” and a transition in South West’s mission “poses challenges to faculty who have not been engaged in scholarship as of late.”

When Dr. Stevens was asked to explain how he understands South West’s transition, he mentioned increased scholarship production, the need to hire faculty members from already established research universities, the importance of graduate students and graduate education – all measures noted by others. However, what was particularly intriguing about Dr. Stevens’ interpretation of “Tier One” was how the change has been engineered in a very top-down fashion. Of this he said:

There’s a saying in minority, but more importantly, in disability communities that goes something like the following ‘not for us, without us.’ So the notion, like you know, its representative – that’s great – but it has to be representative and participatory. So, my point being that in order to become a ‘Tier One University,’ you should have [the support of] faculty members (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Stevens’ comments point to an underlying theme that lingered throughout the analysis. Specifically, the Acquiescent as well as the Negotiators talked about the change as if it has been “thrown” onto them. In other words, they noted that they (nor

their colleagues) had been included in the “Tier One conversation.” To this end, they often described the sense that their work and their voice has been taken away from them. Some felt that they have even lost control over their work. For example, recall that Dr. Medina spoke about the “auditing culture” and Dr. Chavez said:

We don't go into academia because we're getting paid such mega bucks. So the one little satisfaction that we get very often is writing our own way, our own path. We want to have the flexibility within, obviously, given parameters not only to meet our goals, but to meet the university's goals. When all of that is shifted on you after you're already in the organization, it gets to be very frustrating because all of a sudden for you to be able to do the 'Tier One' thing, you can't do yours (Interview Transcript, 2009).

The receding of faculty power over departmental, programmatic, and even one's research agenda is a consequence that other high education scholars attribute to the rise in managerial like behavior amongst higher education administrators and policy makers (Rhodes et al., 1997; Slaughter et al., 1996; 2004; Tuchman, 2009). This is a particularly relevant issue at SWU where it seems like administrators rather than faculty members have “pushed” the transition. In fact, survey responses revealed that some faculty members still had no idea that SWU was seeking “Tier One” status. One faculty member wrote “I have seen no concrete indication of [the transition to Tier One]”. Another asked “Is [SWU] going to adopt the posture of other major research universities?”

Dr. Stevens, like Dr. Chavez, does not believe that South West wants to, aims to, or can even build a new “Tier One” model. Also, like Dr. Chavez and several others, he believes that the university is doing a disservice by suggesting that it can become a “Tier One” university and maintain an open-admissions policy. Laughingly, he said:

That [Tier One the South West Way] is kind of a fallacy because to be 'Tier One,' you have to inform and follow national and international

standards and expectations of what 'Tier One' is. The difference between Triple A and us...it's like saying you want to be a pro-baseball teamer or pro-basketball teamer, you are really like the Albuquerque dudes, your triple A! (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Stevens, like Dr. Chavez, does not attempt to fit himself in. He remains unresponsive to the changes the university has announced. His resistance is not as active or willful as Dr. Chavez. While Dr. Chavez's resistance was framed by sharp critiques and concerted refutation of certain myths or half-truths, Dr. Stevens spent a lot of time laughing and sarcastically making fun of South West's local discourse. Again, amid laughter he said "I think there is a disconnect between 'Tier One' and totally honest with you- you with your tape recorder on... we really need to focus on our strengths!" South West's strengths, according to Dr. Stevens, consist of teaching and mentoring the immediate regional population, ensuring that research is applicable and helpful to the immediate area, and also ensuring that programs are relevant. What is important to note is that Dr. Stevens does believe that the University can achieve "Tier One," but that such hasty movement towards that goal is not healthy for faculty members or sound, in general. Because he noted that he does not and has not made major changes to his own work time habits, I asked what this transition means to new faculty members. Again, with a sense of humor, he responded:

They [new faculty] are going to [have to] want to work at church – it's a way to say, they have to worship at the altar of good teaching. They have to worship at the Center of God of Service – that's committee service, national, regional, and state wide associations and they have to worship at the evangelical house of community service and then [they're] going to go to the Dioceses of publishing and journals...(Interview Transcript, 2009).

Although quite funny throughout the interview, Dr. Stevens hit salient points throughout our conversation. He told me that he will continue to teach and mentor

students. He particularly likes mentoring and working with students as they prepare for their master's thesis. Like Dr. Chavez, he acknowledges his tenured position allows him to resist, carrying out his work like he always has. His experience as a teacher and researcher allows him to integrate his work duties more seamlessly than most new faculty members. His connections to his own mentors, his former students, and to the local community seem to help Dr. Stevens ground his work. As we ended the interview, he thanked me for the survey and for the interview and said "I always learn from students...that's the greatest incentive to do my work."

Similar to Dr. Stevens, Dr. Jerry also enjoys the relationships that he builds with students. As a tenured faculty member of the College of Science who has worked at South West for over two decades, Dr. Jerry believes that South West is risking its mission as it aspires to "Tier One" status. He began by plainly stating:

I am really worried. I am worried about the undergraduates. Because they say that they want us to bring in more money, to do more research, to graduate more Ph.D.'s and to publish papers – but where are the undergraduates there? Where do they fit into that? They don't! So I'm really worried about that (Interview Transcript, 2009).

As a follow up, I asked him, "So, Dr. Jerry, what will you do if you see that happening? Or what are you doing already?" To this, he responded, "I will make sure that the undergraduate programs are taken care of, that the students are still in the lab or in the field."

A prominent researcher in his department, Dr. Jerry is most concerned that the movement to "Tier One" is not only a move away from teaching, but also a move towards the market model. Of this he said, "the only people that will succeed are the ones that can bring in the money. And so I worry about us letting go of music or

English departments...I mean this place is starting to run like a business and we are university, we need to take care of each other.”

Similar to Dr. Chavez, Dr. Jerry believes that “Tier One” is not only about increasing scholarship, but that it is really about raising revenue for the university. As a result, work in the liberal arts, in the professional schools and undergraduate education, they believe, will be given less, if any, value. As evidence, Dr. Jerry gave an example of a grant that he and a junior colleague had recently written. The grant was intended to implement a science education/pedagogical intervention; at the time of the tenure and promotion review, the committee decided that it was “not going to count for much because it is an education proposal.” Then, Dr. Jerry pointed to another example where he witnessed another colleague’s work be insulted on the same basis. “Another guy I saw him go up for tenure and he had like a 1.5 million dollar grant in education and they were like ‘oh well, it does not count for as much because it is an education grant.’ I think that is ridiculous!” Again, for Dr. Jerry, the movement to “Tier One” translates into a loss of power for faculty members, particularly in terms of crafting a research agenda that matters not only to the science community, but to the faculty members themselves, and to the larger public good to which they want to contribute.

Like Dr. Chavez and Steven, Dr. Jerry feels that his work has been taken away from him. He noted that some of the joy that he gains from teaching is also at risk, and so Dr. Jerry plans to acquiesce in the most significant way possible. As the interview drew to a close, Dr. Jerry admitted that he plans to retire in the next few years. However, he said “But I am not gonna] stop working. I am going to stay teaching and

working with undergraduates if I can. I am going to take all the grant writing and administration out of my work.” Dr. Jerry concluded that “Tier One and the push” have taken some of the “fun out of my work.” Then, he reflected and questioned himself aloud in front of me:

I am tenured, and well, I just really have to show up for class...but I don't take advantage of that. You know why tenured professors keep doing what we do...Here we all are, busting our butt, I don't know why (Interview Transcript, 2009).

Dr. Jerry and I closed by talking about the emotional attachment (Neumann, 2009) that faculty members often develop to their work. He agreed that his work is an emotional endeavor, that he deeply loves working with students. He is just not sure that there is room for that in a “Tier One” aspirant University, and so he is going to step aside, retire, and attempt to return to the university as an instructor who can recapture the “fun” in his work.

Taken together, the Acquiescent are a group of faculty who identify first and foremost as teachers. Over their years at South West, they learned and were structured by the expectations, perhaps the reward system, and the institutionalized teaching focused culture at South West. In turn, they reinforced this culture. They learned lessons, picked up experiences, and their world and work views about the importance of regional service, teaching, and access were thereby strengthened; now they are embodied in their very dispositions. At times, this embodied organizational disposition intersects or is further reinforced by one's personal experiences, as a working class student, a first-generation student or an “accidental academic” who only succeeded through the higher education system because of the devotion that their own professors gave to them. This is especially the case for Dr. Chavez, Martinez, Medina, and Jerry.

Today, the Acquiescent use this habitus to help them legitimize their unique contributions, their reconstructed roles, or sometimes to justify their resistance, but they do so quietly.

Their quiet acquiescence should not be misinterpreted for conformity or even deference to the university. Their acquiescence is an assertion of agency in many ways. On the one hand, they accept the change, but on the other hand, they show that they are not ready or willing to produce more scholarship unless it is a direct benefit to their teaching. However, they will stay at South West University and they will contribute in ways that 1) reflect their personal orientations to their work (teaching, access, service) and 2) in ways that uphold the culture that they have structured and which has been structured on to them and which has afforded them the capital, knowledge, and view of the world that tells them SWU serves an incredibly important purpose as a regional, teaching focused University. Thus, their acquiescence is a subtle and quiet form of power, which not all faculty members have access to, but which they enact in plain view for others to see. Perhaps others will mimic these behaviors or mini-institutions as they about their own sense-making – a future research project might closely interrogate this very question.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Conclusion

This project began as a study intended to help me better understand how faculty members make sense of their work inside a changing university, especially a university aiming to make substantial changes to its mission in terms of what its driving purpose and function will be. Like all scholars, I had a unique starting point, a view of the world which I believe is important to understanding the methodology, design, and of course, the ultimate goals of this project.

I have always looked at educators, particularly my university professors, as incredibly important role models. Perhaps, naively, I believed that all professors enter academia for the same reasons I enter: to engage in research, teaching, and service that matters not only to me, but more importantly to others – to the public. My inspirations for wanting to investigate faculty roles and faculty work, I believe, are tied to my innate interest in faculty member's lives, but more specifically, in the idea of *what it means to be a professor*.

Now, as a scholar of higher education, I see the power, privilege, responsibility and pressures wrought in the faculty member role. Given the moment and environment that U.S. higher education finds itself in, I think it is ever more important that faculty members think carefully about what it means to be a professor in any of America's numerous, but all important public universities. At the same time, it is also necessary that higher education administrators, as formally authorized leaders of these *public* institutions, grapple with what it really means to steer an institution that is intended to

serve the public. In this concluding chapter, I discuss these ideas, but first, I summarize my findings in the immediate section below. Then I move on to discuss the theoretical and practical implications of my work and connect both kinds of implications to future research questions. The final section consists of critical closing thoughts. Here I discuss what I did not find in my data or ideas that emerged just weakly although I believe they are imperative to understanding and studying higher education and faculty work, especially in the context of mission or academic creep. The absence of these issues or points suggests a necessary, although bleak vantage point for what is going on in academia and higher education today.

7.1a Discussion

In this study, I have shown that faculty members at SWU are making sense of their University's proposed "Tier One" transition by drawing from two sources: the institutional field and/or the organizational culture. Turning to NI, I have shown the explicit, and what might even be called the hegemonic influence of the field of higher education, which includes organizations or entities such as 1) already established, elite research universities, like Stanford, Berkeley, Michigan and others; 2) the publication industry, particularly those outlets and editorials that garner the most prestige; 3) resource providers, such as grant funders or other research related funders; 4) disciplinarian associations as well as national and international professional groups. From the data, particularly the interviews and open-ended survey comments, I have outlined specific ideas, ideals and practices that faculty members borrow from the field to make sense of "Tier One" as well as the role of a professor inside a "Tier One" university. On the other hand, organizational culture and discourse are the second, although, much less used

source that faculty use to define the “Tier One” transition. Here, again, I was able to extract particular ideas, ideals, and practices that faculty members retrieve from the organizational culture and discourse to make sense of this organizational transition.

Overwhelmingly, faculty members look to the institutional field of higher education to understand what SWU’s “Tier One” aspirations are about and what these aspirations mean to faculty work. My analysis has shown that this intense reliance upon the field means that most faculty members bypass local organizational culture and discourses, including the creative slogans put forward by the SWU to communicate that “Tier One” is about bringing SWU’s access and excellence to new heights rather than adopting the elitist form and function of most already established major national research universities. Such sloganeering, I learned from a top leader as well as a few faculty who were involved in the early “Tier One” plans, was intended to convince faculty that “Tier One” does not/should not subtract from the historical import given to undergraduate education, the practice of open access, and/or the overarching regional approach to education that SWU has long prided itself on. Instead, SWU’s “Tier One” aspirations are suppose to about building a new kind of “Tier One” model, one where accessibility, solid undergraduate education, strong faculty-student relations, regionally grounded and practical research as well as scholarship and grant writing/fund raising will be equally valued. A few faculty members thought that such ideas were compelling or even admirable, but not realistic. In fact, the vast majority of faculty members in my study were highly skeptical of such ideas and flat-out rejected them. Others do not even acknowledge or dare to untangle what building a new model might mean.

Thus, I have made clear that faculty members make interpretations of South West's "Tier One" aspirations by drawing from two main sources, but it should be made clear that faculty members are not dopes, institutional heroes, or absolute prisoners of large university bureaucracies. While the institutional field, and sometimes the organizational culture provide faculty with important ideas, ideals, and practices to define "Tier One," they bring these definitions to bear in very different ways. So, although most faculty members believe that SWU wants to attain the form and function of elite research universities, they do not necessarily import the institutional model. Instead, they carry out work and construct a role that makes sense in light of the current organizational context, particularly as it relates to the infrastructure, but probably most importantly, they carry out their work in ways that seem most apparent, practical, and sensible to them, as professors with personal and professional histories that have provided to them a certain world view. To this end, what perhaps was most compelling and also most prominent as faculty made sense of their work in front of me was their tacit attempt to justify and legitimize why they were acting or (not acting) in the ways they described.

For these reasons, using Bourdieu's work on habitus, action and fields turned out to be quite helpful because it is a theoretical lens intended to help one understand the dialectical relationship between structure(s) and agency. The structures involved in faculty sense-making include the institutional field of higher education, the local organizational culture and context, including discourses, infrastructure, and the powerful mechanism of tenure, as well as wider social patterns that shape and anchor faculty members' lives. These structures anchor, but also open up and provide learning

opportunities for the individual (thus, the utilization of ideas and practices drawn from these different spaces). Lessons, then, are absorbed, becoming lenses for how one sees the world and her place in it.

Such lenses are best equated to Bourdieu's habitus. Recall that habitus, conceptualized as an open system where people can absorb new habits, skills, ideas, practices, and of course knowledge forces the researcher to see human beings as learning agents, capable of creative and also strategic behaviors. Yet, as its core, habitus is also a system, a view of the world, tacitly conditioned or shaped by these structural arrangements and one's position in relation to those structural arrangements. Thus, Bourdieu's theory of action is not intended to convey the notion that people act of complete free will, but instead that people act out of a habitus shaped by their personal history – always lived out in some sort of position and relationship to others, always lived out by people attempting to make some sort of space for themselves in the field that is most relevant to them: their work, their life style, etc.

Bourdieu suggests then that habitus helps people function and navigate through life in a very practical fashion. Human agency and sense-making is usually not heroic, calculated, or sharp, rational actions but can described as a sort of "practical logic" (Bourdieu, 1988). In fact, the data in this study show how faculty members take agency over their work and that agency rarely comes in the form of drama or heroism; it is in the mundane and practical ways that faculty members see and navigate their work world. Thus, as faculty look around, listen to the "Tier One" discourse, they account for the transition, lean on cultural standards that seem sensible and legitimate and all the while their habitus has tacitly structured and filtered standards and lines of action for them.

Bourdieu's theory of field, habitus, and action becomes even more helpful in light of the fact that faculty members seemed to be making a space for themselves amid SWU's context and that often they tried to convey to me the legitimacy and the appropriateness of their work habits and reactions to SWU's transition. To this end, Bourdieu characterizes social life as filled with constant and multi-dimensional struggles for legitimacy and position taking – making one's view point of the world relevant and valuable, particularly in the setting that is most relevant to one's viability.

In academia, such characterizations are particularly relevant as it is a field where individuals seek to establish their work as legitimate on a constant basis (for departmental colleagues, discipline peers, publishers, and so on). At times of change, when standards and norms seem to moving or less stable, the want to define oneself as legitimate is particularly acute as is the want to assert or maintain one's legitimacy rather than be left out of what the organization will become. Therefore, it is an attempt not only to hold up a mission that one has affective empathy for, but it is an attempt to preserve the structure that one now embodies, sees through, and lives out.

While one could use the phenomenological foundations of New Institutionalism to explain how faculty members rely upon these institutional and organizational ideas and practices to construct their role, Bourdieu's theory of action is much more oriented towards a power driven analysis, as he worked to connect the personal, to the cultural, and the structural (Swartz, 1997). The merging of New Institutionalism and Bourdieu's body of work allow me to show how sense-making is a process struck by power relations both inside the immediate organization, but also by relations that give structure to the larger field of higher education. Because this process of sense-making from the

outset is structured by field, organization, and sometimes larger social systems, power relations abound. Bourdieu's exceptional body of work especially helped me to think about the multidimensionality of these power relations.

Operationalizers, divided into the Cosmopolitans and the local-Cosmopolitans, I argued "operationalize" "Tier One" in quite distinct ways. While Cosmopolitans use ideas, ideals, and practices drawn directly from the field, without tinkering much with them, they position themselves as scholars that can easily depart, should the occasion arise. They operate like researchers, above all else, and find ways to contribute to the making of a "Tier One" university somewhere along the lines of a Berkeley, U.T. Austin, or Michigan. These faculty members use their disposition, their world view to guide their work and the construction of their role. To this end, they construct roles as cosmopolitan researchers, entrenched in their scholarship, concerned with their labs, and their grants, and mostly bothered by their students. They want to impact wide audiences, but wish the one at their university (their students) was just better prepared, more select, or perhaps that they had graduate students to tend to them. At the field level, they seem to be following all the "rules" that one needs to secure legitimacy. At the organizational level, there is some evidence, however, that such cosmopolitan Operationalizing might not be acceptable or may not have the same cache just yet. Consider, for instance, Dr. Lucero's case and also the comments from the business professor.

The local-Cosmopolitans, on the other hand, assert both power and privilege when they use their insider knowledge (capital) and understandings of what it means to try to do "Tier One the SWU" way. Their interviews, especially Dr. Jacksons and Dr. Marks, were good examples of what it might mean to build or enact a new version of "Tier

One.” However, these are professors with long histories and deep investments in the organization as well as its official discourses. The local-Cosmopolitans, all Cosmopolitans that have been localized, have the power of tenure to move comfortably between institutional field and organizational culture, to test new ideas, to conduct practical, action based research and then attempt to put it to some scholarly, cosmopolitan ends. They also have the power to assert the importance and the plausibility to build this new model, and to put to use the discourse of creativity and even meritocracy to justify the need for faculty members to simply work “harder” or be “more creative.”

The discourses of meritocracy and creativity were threaded throughout the interviews with the local-Cosmopolitans. These discourses can be understood as manifestations of the larger cultural and ideological principles that give shape to and support the deep seated free market and individualistic rhetoric that undergirds Western societies, especially the U.S. (Jepperson and Meyer, 2000). In some ways, the discourse of creativity and meritocracy are just different variations of the embedded American Dream ideology that permeates U.S. society. In short, this ideology releases “blame” or accountability from all structural - including organizational – systems, and assigns responsibility to the individual. This was evident as Dr. Jackson was simply unable and unsympathetic to what this transition might mean to others who are not “in the know,” who have anchored their entire scholarly careers on locally relevant and contextually grounded teaching, research, and mentorship and who have rarely looked to the field to understand what their work might otherwise look like.

The Negotiators, of course, present compelling, interesting, and quite surprising cases. They do not negate the change because they are simply defiant by nature, as faculty members are often depicted. Instead, some of the Negotiators are unwilling to give more to SWU than SWU is willing to give to them, particularly in terms of support systems and infrastructure. For instance, the data show that sometimes Negotiators hold back on some tenets of their work. Like Dr. Baines who says she won't shoot for top journals unless she has more support or Dr. Muñoz who says she is unwilling to teach new courses as the pressure (but not the support) for Tier One mounts.

Other Negotiators are unwilling, or perhaps more appropriately, *unable* to “de-contextualize” their work. For instance, with the savvy and experience to fulfill a “Tier One” research agenda at any University, Dr. Estrada finds herself negotiating what she will and will not do. Dr. Estrada's negotiations are anchored in her personal connection to the local area, her deep understanding of the community and the complex lives and challenges that SWU students face. Thus, she is unwilling to “de-contextualize” her understanding of her work at SWU. She has seen the real purpose that SWU serves as it takes students that other institutions might not take: students with full time work, more than one job, with familial responsibilities and often those with poor academic backgrounds. As a Local-Cosmopolitan, she seeks to serve the locale as she knows it, and so her classes are designed in sensible ways. She does not expect and will not ask her students to give up their personal and family commitments to find success in her class and ultimately, she is unwilling to take the role of disinterested, disconnected professor. Because other parts of their life and their experiences mediate, gave shape, and bring to surface alternative lines of action, the Negotiators find a place and a way to

ensure that they are responsive to local context and then they find ways to secure legitimacy through other tenets of their work. The Negotiators' critically interrogate what "Tier One" means and what it could mean for the regional student population and the larger regional community. Their criticality, often anchored in a juxtaposition of the purposes and nature of higher education at already established "Tier Ones" and SWU is an extremely important source of information that could help SWU steer through this transitional process with fewer casualties and a better understanding of what is at risk.

Finally, the Local Acquiescent represent an important component of SWU: they embody the teaching and regional purpose that the University has long asserted and prided itself on. It is not necessarily a loyalty to SWU, but to the mission that it has long espoused and which is now structured into the practices, world view, and habitus of the Local Acquiescent. In many ways, this group has the least and most at stake. Each of them has worked at the University, for close to 20 years, they are quite representative of Gouldner's (1957) locals. On the one hand, professionally, they are tenured faculty members who are within a few years retirement, but they are also people who are seeing the value of their work displaced at SWU.

To cope with this, they have, for the most part, stepped aside, allowing their junior colleagues to "take the lead" on this transition. However, in some instances, I argue that they have exerted a quiet form of power and reinserted themselves as faculty members with very specific roles to play inside this changing University. For instance, Dr. Walker, a tenured faculty member, has constructed a role for himself as a "facilitator." With his tenured position and power, he is able to do so. His local view of the world and

particularly of SWU compels him to defend SWU's teaching and regional mission, and thus his legitimacy as a faculty member.

They struggle for the most part, to insert themselves into the university, to claim or maintain a space of legitimacy for the work that was once viewed as highly legitimate to their peers, their leaders, and always, to themselves. The question must be begged: what happens when the Acquiescent retire? Will they take the vestiges of SWU's teaching and regional mission with them? Will there be any one left to assert the importance of teaching and public service and regional relevance inside SWU – in forms unadulterated by the institutional field or cosmopolitan orientations?

The same questions could be posed about the Negotiators. As tenure-track faculty members, they face a series of dilemmas. Will their negated roles will be sufficient for tenure? Will their peers see and understand why have negotiated in the ways that they have? Will someone understand and see legitimacy in Dr. Simon's local columns; how about in Dr. Muñoz' publications, even if they appear in less than stellar outlets? Will someone grant legitimacy to Dr. Garcia's and Dr. Valdez' investments in professional certificates intended to benefit local professionals? Facing multi-dimensional power relations, Local-Cosmopolitans must negotiate at various intersections: within their university and also in the field of higher education.

As of now, the outlook is bleak. As the data show, there is little room for alternative perspectives or ideas when it comes to understanding and defining what is legitimate, prestigious, or even just acceptable at "Tier Ones." What it means to be a legitimate faculty member in a "Tier One" University is entrenched in the minds and habits of faculty members, and it is not an understanding drawn together with institutional and

organizational culture; it is an understanding embodying the logic of the field, underwritten by prestige and power, the market and its discourses. The fact that most faculty members use the institutional field so predominantly in their sense-making shows the power imbued in the field itself and how it shapes the perspectives of all faculty members at SWU. While one can resist, negotiate, or undermine the transition, ultimately SWU must acknowledge that it has set out on a journey that cannot easily be restructured. To this end, SWU must confront for the changes that its faculty has already made to their work habits. SWU leaders must understand the deeper, cultural shift that is underway and it should most seriously contemplate if this is what they wanted when they set SWU on a new path.

7.2 Theoretical Implications

Given my analysis and the discussion above, I believe that there are several theoretical advances that can be drawn from this research and which I hope will help to further the study of faculty work, higher education, and especially faculty work in the context of mission creep. Here I outline what I believe to be the most salient theoretical contributions and implications of my work.

7.2a Using the Typology

The influence and faculty's reliance on the institutional field is concerning for multiple reasons. First of all, isomorphism or mission creep seems to threaten what many believe to be a core strength of the U.S. higher education system: institutional diversity. That there are various kinds of universities designed to fulfill unique purposes – whether it be to respond to a regional need for professional education, a need to generate new knowledge in the sciences for national or large scale purposes, or a need

to act as a comprehensive education provider to the broader public – the fact that American higher education has served all of these and additional purposes speaks to the democratic and pragmatic basis on which it was built. Many worry that mission creep threatens this strength.

It is important that scholars of higher education continue to look at the micro or interactional level to understand precisely the role that faculty members are playing inside such transitioning universities and whether or not, others are Operationalizing, Negotiating, or Acquiescing in the ways that I have described. Perhaps, using this framework, administrators can see the possibilities for various kinds of roles inside of changing universities, and also keep in mind the emotional attachment – the human element – that is embedded in one's scholarly life.

7.2b Professors as People: Habitus as a Flexible Lens

In the study, not only did I want to understand in a very practical way how faculty members make sense of SWU's aspirations to move from a teaching focused to a research focused or "Tier One" mission, but I aimed to understand from an in-depth perspective how scholars *as people*: people with histories and biographies, personal, academic, professional and otherwise bring sense to this transition and if and how that sense-making process is shaped by these experiences. Thus, while one can theorize about the organization and the future of faculty work at Universities engaged in this sort of change (as I have done from time to time in this work), it is also important to acknowledge and think about the personal side of faculty members and their lives to understand how it is impacted and how it impacts their work.

This is a complex process - incompatible with deterministic theories that are nested in absolute dichotomies. It requires a flexible lens, an epistemology and a methodology that is comfortable with looking at people as learning agents that can learn from the structures that also constrain them. For me, as mentioned earlier, the work of Pierre Bourdieu was particularly helpful. Also, though, drawing from Gouldner's (1957; 1958) work on locals and cosmopolitans brought to light new factors that may be important in terms of understanding people's sense-making process, particularly faculty. This is important because one of the critiques that Bourdieu's concept "habitus" often receives is related to its "openness," which some claim weakens its true explanatory power.

Local and cosmopolitan bring some precision to habitus. The nuanced understanding or theorizing about how one can be a hybrid is also helpful, especially this notion that one can become "localized," which I tried to make distinct from unidirectional or hot images of socialization. While local and cosmopolitan are two concepts that do not receive nearly as much attention in the literature as, perhaps, gender or even race or ethnicity, when it comes to studying faculty sense-making and work, I believe these two variables were fruitful and powerful explanations for what is going on with the SWU faculty. Whether one is a local or a cosmopolitan allows one to see and to understand what sort of power relations might be at play at an organizational level and of course at the field level for a particular faculty member. To be a local, as Rhoades et al., (2008) tells us in academia is to be at a disadvantage. To be hybrid, both Rhoades et al, (2008) and I, agree may offer certain advantages, but we wonder if higher education is ready to ponder, accept, and legitimize these new hybrids.

Locals, Cosmopolitans, and the hybrids I have introduced here are typological concepts that need and deserve further empirical testing. In the 1970's and 1980's, there was an attempt to refine Gouldner's (1957; 1958) original concepts, but most of this work was drawn from positivistic and quantitative thinking. I aim to and I hope that others are willing to do on the ground work, in-depth interviewing and field observations to bring some tightness to these concepts before moving forward.

A quick note, however, regarding the locals; there is something to be said of the local who maintains a sort of loyalty to her community, ensuring that research is relevant, applicable, and also that it is communicated to the leadership of the locale. Along these lines, a local can facilitate relationships between university and community by using her local and social capital. She can assure that academics approach regional or local matters with cultural sensitivities and awareness. She, also, is more likely to be able to highlight the local funds of knowledge and assets that that community has stored away; thus, preserving local knowledge, world-views, and practices. Being a local academic likely means that your own world view is somehow, even tacitly, informed by the world view, the needs, and the experiences of those in the community; are these not the kinds of approaches that a professor of a public serving institution should employ in her work?

7.2 Contributions to New Institutionalism

With NI (an organizational theory) as one of my major orienting frameworks, including or being mindful of the personal histories, habits, standpoints that faculty bring to their work, is an important advancement that is not too oft taken. Most organizational theories, including NI, is stiff with talk about structures and processes while human

beings are depicted as either “cultural dopes” or “institutional heroes” (Powell et al., 2008). However, organizational life, like social life, is built from the ground up through daily, mundane acts involving people’s general and tacit sense-making, organizing, strategizing, and action taking. My study provides at least three important advancements.

First of all, according to NI, organizations often adopt changes (isomorph) in order to maintain a legitimate position in their respective field. This often means that cultural mimicry is just as important as legal compliance or fiscal resources. NI also says that these isomorphic changes are more ceremonial, as organizational resources, local context, organizational culture, and basic organizational structures do not facilitate or allow for real change to take root. This is especially the case in large organizations with professionals who operate rather autonomously and whose products (student learning, for instance) are rather hard to measure. In many ways, this study confirms NI theorizing - that change is often ceremonial, attempts to obtain or maintain cultural legitimacy in the field, but that it is not at all linear or wholly adopted at the ground level.

What NI did was help me to see the structuring potential and power imbued in the institutional field as faculty referenced their peer (competitor) universities and departments, ranking organizations, prestige of outlets, and also funding sources. The cognitive categories and definitions were so prominent for most faculty as they made sense of “Tier One” that the localized discourse rarely entered their sense-making (other than to juxtapose or make fun of it).

The second contribution to NI, which I believe is important is the outline of specific ideas, ideals, and practices that faculty draw from by pulling down definitions and

assumptions offered up by the field. For instance, I argue that most faculty draw from the field, turn outward to understand “Tier One” and its implications. This often meant that faculty members believed teaching would no longer hold value, that undergraduate education would suffer, that one’s job was more about building prestige laden curriculum vitas than building relationships with their students.

This does not mean that already established universities with “Tier One” type of reputations or the field, in general, explicitly aim to offer up such definitions. Not one university would dare say that publications are more important than one’s investment in teaching or that undergraduate education is less important than graduate education. However, these sort of ideas and ideals are manifestations of micro-level practices that unfold in universities everyday, and which few are willing to interrogate. In many ways, these ideas, ideals, and practices are like the elephant in the room. Everyone knows that they are there, but no one really wants to talk about them. Showing the explicit ideas, ideals, and practices that faculty draw from the field in order to come up with a picture of what “Tier One” means for them and for their work, I believe, is an important advancement and contribution to the micro-foundations of NI. It arms higher education and other scholars with precise ideas with which to interrogate the field, other scholars, and of course, themselves.

Finally, my work also contributes to and hopefully re-arouses Lynne Zucker’s (1991) NI work on cultural persistence, which was originally published in 1977. The Local Acquiescent, I believe, are similar to the individuals who contribute to cultural persistence in Zucker’s work. I theorize that the Local Acquiescents, from their positions of power and tenured privilege, assert a sort of quiet power as they re-insert themselves

into the university. The work of the Local Acquiescents are important figures in SWU. As they create these new roles and spaces for themselves, as facilitators, as teachers, as a “committee person,” it is worthwhile to think about how their actions, built up and practiced every day may become mini-institutions for others to use and model. Some questions to ask in future research include: will these mini-institutions hold? If so, then what will be their impact on larger organizational trajectories? Is there a way that SWU can better integrate and recognize these important faculty contributions via policy and rewards structures?

7.3 Implications for Practice

Here I offer a few words about the practice, engineering, and launching of organizational change initiatives in higher education, particularly initiatives that are aimed at faculty roles and work.

Organizational change in higher education, like in any complex organization, where there are many internal sub-groups and communities is a difficult endeavor. From a structural perspective, an organization must make itself fluid enough to transport information in ways that are efficient and clear. There are strategies that SWU did not employ which may have alleviated some of the confusion and frustration that many faculty reported.

Dr. Jackson admitted that neither departmental and college level leadership was deeply involved in the “Tier One” planning or the dissemination of plans process. I ask, why not? Chairs are often looked to as “buffers” – protecting their faculty, but steering the department to ensure that it is in line with university goals. Why SWU did not take such steps is unknown. It is suggested that departments or colleges must be more

involved in change processes from the outset. For instance, college level/department level leaders might have held focus groups to solicit faculty ideas, worries, and understandings about “Tier One.” This information might have been “fed back” to other administrators at the top and across the university to inform policy and decision making processes.

A second simple step might have been to make information more concrete and accessible in tangible forms. As mentioned in chapter five, several universities are vying for “Tier One” status. Some of these other universities offer extremely detailed plans about the process on their websites. The presidents and top leaders of these other universities provide newsletters or updates on the website about the unfolding transition. Although, it seems quite patriarchal and hierarchical (that information seems to flow predominantly from the top), these other university leaders do make very accessible and very clear what their transition is about, how they will measure themselves, also how their faculty will be judged. These are informational sources that faculty members at SWU have never had and still do not have access to today.

Finally, in terms of steering this sort of change, university administrators and other leaders need to think more carefully about their faculty population. What are the current profiles of faculty members? How much scholarship are they producing? What are some concrete and attainable goals and how can they be set? What are the strengths of the professoriate and how can the university ensure a space for all of their scholars? For instance, a few faculty members were amenable to the notion that SWU develop a two-tiered faculty system: one line for faculty who focus more on teaching (clinical) and one where they focus more on research. This is not a radically new idea. Other

universities have developed similar approaches. The key, most faculty members, stressed was to ensure the equal treatment of both groups of faculty. That the university should develop systems or approach this change with more precaution is a point that I later return to: doesn't the university have a responsibility to ensure a space for scholars, particularly those that have given so much to it? And shouldn't the university's efforts go beyond the creation of snazzy slogans?

Consider this: tenured faculty members have created a career for themselves and this career is anchored very much in who they are as a teacher, an advocate, perhaps, and most simply put, as a person who has structured and been structured by their university. If change processes were understood and embarked upon as a more dynamic and *human* process; it might be possible to think about new possibilities for the habits, wisdom, and world-view of those faculty members that are often dismissed as lazy or stubborn faculty that simply take advantage of their tenured status.

7.3a Language and Power

Very much connected to how organizational change is conceptualized and engineered is the critical role that language and organizational discourse plays at times of change. Faculty members, across the board, have no clear sense what SWU means when it proposes to build a new "Tier One" model. In fact, faculty members do not really understand/know/acknowledge that "Tier One" is a specific status that has been designated by the state of Texas. In turn, survey responses and interview data clearly indicated that faculty members believe that "Tier One" is about SWU achieving the form and function of major research universities like Berkeley, UT Austin, Michigan, and

sometimes even Harvard or Stanford. Far from their mind is the notion that “Tier One” can be localized.

Still, SWU abuses its position and constructs “slogans” that are not only ambiguous, open-ended, and in the end quite meaningless. For instance, university leaders often talked about “Tier One” and the opportunity to build a new model and/or to do “Tier One the SWU way!” where both access and excellence, undergraduate and graduate education, teaching and research will remain equally valuable and legitimate university and faculty functions. “Sloganeering” (Gonzales et al., forthcoming), I argue, allows the organization to maneuver in tight situations, such as when it fails to provide the support its faculty needs or when “expiring organizational discourses” might be more helpful to motivate, incite pride or explain to faculty members and other stakeholders what their university is up to (also see Tuchman, 2009). In other words, at this time of change, when the university should be grappling with significant issues like access and regional purposes and how these issues will still fit inside a national, research or “Tier One” university - without increasing faculty numbers or support systems – the university instead puts forward creative, snazzy slogans that turn out to be quite empty.

The open-ended language of the organizational discourse used to describe SWU’s “Tier One” aspirations exhibits the sort of power relations and gaps that exist between the organization and its faculty. Smith (1990) points to text as an expression of the “ruling relations” that govern society. The University, led by administrators who aim to manage the University’s future, craft discourses, like “Tier One the SWU way” or “We are going to be, not be like!” to incite pride and motivation, yet as Dr. Jackson pointed out, such meaningless discourses can actually be turned into all sorts of “fearful” things.

While the “Tier One” plan just makes sense to this professor - a tenured, male professor with about twenty years experience at SWU, others called “Tier One” vague, “pie in the sky,” and noted that the loosely defined concept made them worry about what the university really intends as it sets forth on this “Tier One” journey. The importance of organizational discourse, communication and definition of concepts can not be stressed enough. The university must realize that the language that is used to convey such a dramatic transition must be clear and concise.

Plenty of information regarding the benchmarks for this new status or goal (or whatever) must be circulated and made applicable at the organizational level, especially in terms of what the benchmarks mean for tenure and promotion. Most definitely, creative organizational slogans should not be assumed to be enough to sway a faculty (or any other group) to adopt new world views and take up new lines of actions.

7.3b Organizational Responsibility

Earlier I mentioned that the university should ensure a space for all its scholars, particularly those who have given so much to the university, itself, like the Local Acquiescent. However, I believe this is something that the university should consider at a broader level. Guiding questions might include: what do our faculty members need here to be successful at these goals that we have set out or as we do what we need to in order to survive? What does the community that we are intended to serve need us to do so that we remain responsive? What is most helpful to our students and how can we ensure that we doing our best to educate them for their professions as well as for life? Can we honestly remain an open-access institution and reach a “Tier One” status although most faculty members do not believe such a feat is possible.

These are no easy questions. In 2009, the President made an interesting comment that was quite compelling to me. In a speech devoted to “Tier One,” the President explained that the university has made great strides in terms of creating a unique image – one where access and excellence are compatible, and to incite excitement about how the university might continue to move forward, s/he said “[we are] no longer the self-deprecating regional institution into which we evolved.” I recall how prominent those words were. Until that moment, I did not know that SWU was a self-deprecating institution at all. I also had not known that being a regional institution might cause one to be self-deprecating. Those words, however, were powerful, as were the words at one college level seminar where a dean said something to the effect “we are moving away from being a teaching institution.” Such language signals a change and one that has been engineered by SWU leaders.

Whether or not SWU aimed for them or not, there is evidence of some deep cultural shifts at SWU and it is time for SWU to take responsibility. My data showed that teaching and service as well as the larger historical and regional purpose are not prominent in some faculty member’s minds, particularly the Cosmopolitan Operationalizers. On the other hand, all of the Negotiators seem to striving for a way to preserve the regional, local mission while employing their cosmopolitan savvy towards what they believe to be SWU’s cosmopolitan goal. What happens when faculty members are drawing out such different kinds of roles for themselves? Is there, in fact, room for different kinds of works and roles in one university, and if so, will each receive equal validation and legitimacy? SWU faculty members do not seem to believe so as most are applying the logic of the field and dismissing the organizational slogans.

Most would argue that at one point a university must make decisions about what matters most, about who it will be and how it will function – such decisions, are of course, manifest in the tenure and promotion process, the granting of legitimacy for certain kinds of faculty work and roles. Many faculty members in my interview pool pointed out that the university has yet to make these sorts of decisions, but they surely would like to know where they stand although the case of Dr. Aaron may be indicative. The Negotiators attempted to interrogate “Tier One” and implications during the interview process. They are the only group of faculty members that I could see really wanted some answers, and in reality, wanted the university to be honest.

Again, a first step would be to provide explicit and committed plans for what the transition really means, rather than using creative slogans and open-ended concepts that allow the university to maneuver in difficult situations. A second step is for university leaders, especially deans and chairs, to work with faculty to create an outline where, together, faculty, chair, and dean, sketch out a faculty work load agreement as faculty are hired or as they proceed through promotion/review processes. Informally, I have heard about this process in other universities although I have never seen it applied directly. However, the faculty member and her chair come up with an agreement regarding the amount of time/effort that the faculty will allocate to the different tenets of her work. Typically, faculty members allocate the majority of time to either teaching and/or scholarship/research. Teaching load, course evaluations and syllabi are often used to gauge teaching while publications and journal prestige are used to gauge scholarly efforts. At tenure and promotion time, the promotion committee references this document to cross-check the faculty member's work activity. This is one strategy that

the university might employ to take care of its scholars. Another strategy, already mentioned, is the creation of a two-tiered faculty: one for teaching and one for research.

Also, though, taking responsibility not only pertains to university faculty, but also to the wider community. How will the university ensure that research that is grounded in local and practical purposes receive legitimacy? Dr. Jerry described how his own colleagues awarded fewer points to a grant because it was educational or action based research rather than pure research. However, action or practical based research is important for solving immediate and *often* local problems. These sorts of questions must be quelled out and integrated into policy measures. The development and implementation of such policies, however, demands faculty involvement and “buy in.”

Finally, the university claims that it is highly aware of its regional purposes. If this is the case, then the university must attend to the admissions issue. The majority of faculty members do not believe it is possible to attain “Tier One” without revising its admissions. This is not because faculty members lack faith that SWU students can succeed in a “Tier One” university; in fact, it less often has to do with the educational mission/function at all. It has more to do with the fact that most faculty members believe that undergraduate education will largely be ceded to the graduate students and that graduate education will become more important than the preparation of local practitioners or scholars. Also, skepticism also has to do with the sheer volume of students that open-access allows for. As evident in the data, prestige is a factor in “Tier One.” As noted by most ranking associations, measures of prestige include a university’s selectivity as well as its student-faculty ratio. Finally, a smaller segment of

faculty believe that SWU students need more than what faculty at a “Tier One” will be willing to give, particularly along the lines of SWU’s touted student validation approach.

These are the questions that SWU should be grappling with, but is not. These are the questions that will force accountability on SWU leaders, but they are questions that are mostly muted or uttered without conviction, which leads to me to my closing and final thoughts.

7.4 Concluding Thoughts

Some of the most interesting, but not totally surprising findings from my research were the absence of faculty governance, collective agency, and/or an outspoken chorus of faculty members demanding or at least asking what “Tier One” is really about. While faculty aired some suspicions to me and issued their critiques inside the confines of our interview, there was not any evidence of an attempt to question this transitional process from a more official, formal or collective platform, signaling the brokenness of faculty governance at SWU and I suspect in the larger field of higher education.

What I did find, however, were faculty members trying the best they know how to make sense of a complex initiative that has been strewn with slogans, but undergirded by little support – and, mostly, they were doing this by taking on an inordinate amount of responsibility, by adopting “creative” practices, by working harder, faster, more efficiently, and often by negotiating, and essentially putting themselves at risk. All of the sense-making and action taking, interestingly and unfortunately, seemed to unfold through quite lonely and isolated circumstances.

As I looked at my data, I saw an implicit and very deeply embedded ideology at work. I believe this embedded or should I say embodied ideology explains the absence

of collective sense-making – the inability or unwillingness to connect one’s “personal troubles to larger public issues” (Mills, 1959). Creativity, efficiency, responsibility, and isolation – all these are tenets, one could say, of neo-liberalism, which keep faculty busy at work. Neoliberalism is an ideology that forces the individual of modern society to take on an inordinate amount of responsibility for his or her failures or successes in spite of structural constraints and challenges. Projecting blame or success onto the isolated individual and promoting notions of competition, meritocracy and creativity, the neoliberal underpinnings of contemporary society, and thus, of higher education become normalized, accepted, and part of one’s habitus. “Greedy institutions” (Wright et al., 2004) are understood as acting rationally and acceptably while the larger, difficult and substantive questions like: why are we seeking “Tier One and what does that mean to undergraduate education; to the public that we are intended to serve? How are we going to ensure that we remain the access institution that this region needs, in tune to local knowledge, assets, challenges, and also its needs?” remain elusive (or quite muted) as people hurriedly attempt to make sense and secure a place for themselves somewhere inside this complex moving organization. Time for hard critical thinking, reflexive and reflective self-inquiry, and space for the critical “public scholar” that Mills (1959) once wrote about are viewed as luxuries, irrelevant to the contemporary university and the professoriate, as each of these institutions strives to make a place for itself inside the market of higher education.

Ultimately, I want SWU and other public institutions to wrestle with these hard questions and to subject its’ practices to an up-close examination. Is faculty work about researching and grant writing one’s way out of teaching, mentoring and working with

students? Is a university and faculty life about breaking through with new knowledge and critical ideas, only to circulate those in the most prestigious, esoteric outlets or is about sharing that knowledge and deconstructing those ideas in ways that can be applicable, practical and useful for our colleagues in the field, our neighbors, and our children? Is the professoriate about opting out of service only to find out that the university is no longer run by its professors and students, but by managers who approach the higher education endeavor as a business – always looking to advance themselves and their institution up the higher education/corporate ladder (Tuchman, 2009)? If we, as scholars, are unwilling to ask these questions, then who will and shouldn't we be asking these questions aloud to others, especially to university leaders?

As faculty members seek to make a place for their work at SWU, as they construct their roles, they are deciding what kind of faculty member they want to be and what kinds of students they want to work with, if they want to work with students at all. They are asserting the kind of work they want to do, and ultimately, they are asserting their views on higher education and their role as professors. These processes are not only professional decisions, but they are decisions that are deeply connected to larger endeavors.

It is my hope that there are many more Local-Cosmopolitans out there in academia – able to ask questions and to negotiate what they will and will not give up in terms of who they are as scholars, but perhaps more importantly allowing their lives to serve as lens for their work. Their critical positionality, as a local and a cosmopolitan, affords them a lens to see and understand what an important role SWU plays in the lives of students who may in some ways be like them. At SWU, the Local-

Cosmopolitans' unwillingness to "de-contextualize" SWU's transition and their work is a powerful, subtle form of agency that they take. Local Cosmopolitans, with their savvy negotiating skills, may just be what it takes to ensure higher education's promise to serve the public.

Unwilling to accept organizational change whole-sale, Local Cosmopolitan Negotiators carve out spaces for themselves; whether higher education is ready for this kind of a faculty member is unclear, but I argue that higher education desperately needs these kinds of faculty members "to recalibrate the overriding emphasis on cosmopolitan aspects of academic work" (Baez, 2000, p. 388) and to temper the organizational drift that is spreading throughout the field of higher education today. Hopefully, their questions will only become louder.

REFERENCES:

- Allan , K. (2007). *The social lens: an invitation to social and sociological theory*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Altbach, P. (1980). The crisis of the professoriate. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 448(1), 1-14.
- Altbach, P. (2001). The American model in comparative perspective. In Altbach, P. & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.), *In defense of higher education* (pp. 11-37) ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. (2005). Harsh realities: the professoriate faces a new century. In Altbach, P, Berdahl, R, & Gumport, P. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century - social, political, and economic challenge* (p. 287-314). ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P., Berdahl, R., & Gumport, P. (Eds.). (2005). *American higher education in the twenty-first century - social, political, and economic challenges*. (2nd ed.). ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- American Association Of University Professors. (n.d.). *Faculty to Do List*. Retrieved August 30, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/facutlydolist>
- Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: a political economy of urban educational reform*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Appelrouth, S., & Edles, L. (2008). *Classical and contemporary sociological theory - text and readings*. CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Archer, L. (2009). The neoliberal subjects? young/er academics construction of professional identity. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 23(3), 265-285.

- Arnone, M. (3). The wannabes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/section/Home/5>.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: conceptualizing critical agency in academy. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363-391.
- Baker, P. J., & Zey-Ferrel, M. (1984). Cal and cosmopolitan orientations of faculty: Implications for teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, 12(1), 82-106.
- Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2009). U.S. news & world report college rankings: model institutional effects on organizational reputation. *American Journal of Education*, 116, 163-181.
- Bastedo, M. N., & Gumport, P. J. (2003). Access to what? Mission differentiation in U.S. public higher education. *Higher Education*, 46, (341-359).
- Becher, T. (1995). The internalities of higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 30(4), 395-406.
- Berger, P., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. (1974). *The homeless mind - modernization and consciousness*. NY: Random House, Inc.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Random House Anchor Books.
- Birnbaum, R (1983). *Maintaining diversity in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Birnbaum, R., & Shushok, Jr., F. (2001). The "crisis" crisis in higher education: is that a wolf or pussy-cat in the door? In Altbach, P. & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.), *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 59-84). Baltimore, ML: John Hopkins University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1968). Outline of a sociological theory of art perception. In Appelrouth, K. & Edles, L. (Eds.), *Classical and contemporary sociological theory* (p. 699-709). CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). Social space and the genesis of groups. In Appelrouth, K. & Edles, L. (Eds.), *Classical and contemporary sociological theory*. (p. 699-710). CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homos Academicus*. CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J.D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L., & Farage, S. (1992). Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field. *Sociological Theory*, 12(1), 1-18.
- Bowen, H., & Schuster, J. (1986). *American professors - a national resource imperiled*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered - priorities of the professoriate*. NJ: Princeton Carnegie Foundation.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1991). Institutional origins and transformations: the case of American community colleges. In Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 337-360). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burch, P. (2007). Educational policy and practice from the perspective of institutional theory: crafting a wider lens. *Educational Researcher*, 36(2), 84-95.

- Bush, V. (1945, July). As we may think. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com>.
- Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement Of Teaching. (2001). <Http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/>. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>.
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333-349.
- Clark, B. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), 178-184.
- Clark, B. (1989). The academic life: small worlds, different worlds. *Educational Researcher*, 18(5), 4-8.
- Clark, B. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: the uniquenesses and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus*, 126(4), 21-42.
- Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: how faculty integrate teaching and research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 6(6), 179-214.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought in the matrix of domination*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: the sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33(6), 14-32.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. NY: Routledge.

- Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2008). Examining 'institutionalization': A critical theoretic perspective. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 673-701). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication.
- Crenshaw, K. (2002). The first decade: critical reflections, or 'a foot in the closing door'. In F. Valdes, J. McCristal Culp & A. Harris (Eds.), *Crossroads, directions and a new critical race* (pp. 9-31). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Davies, B., & Peterson, E. (2005). Neo-liberal discourse in the academy: the forestalling of (collective) resistance. *Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences*, 2(2), 77-98.
- De Los Santos, A. (1991). The history of South West University.
- Deephouse, D. L., & Suchman, M. (2008). Legitimacy in organizational institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 49-77). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Delgado-Bernal, D. (2009). *La trenza de identidades* - Weaving together my personal, professional, and communal identities. In Gonzalez, K. & Padilla, R. (Eds.), *Doing the public good - Latina/o scholars engage civic participation* (p. 135-148). VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Dillabough, J. (2004). Class, culture, and the predicaments of masculine domination: encountering Pierre Bourdieu. *British Journal of Sociology*, 25(4), 489-506.

- DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: U.S. art museums, 1920-1940. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 267-292). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1-38). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 63-82). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Dubois, W.E.B. (1903). The souls of black folk. In Appelrouth, K. & Edles, L. (Eds.), *Classical and contemporary sociological theory* (p. 290-305). CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Dubois, W.E.B. (1920). The souls of white folk. In Appelrouth, K. & Edles, L. (Eds.), *Classical and contemporary sociology* (p.305-309). CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Duderstadt, J. (12). *Preparing future faculty for universities*. Paper presented at the The American Association of Colleges and Universities. New Orleans, LA.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). Reaching for the brass ring: the U.S. news and world report rankings and competition. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 145-162.

- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In Wittrock, M. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). N.Y. : MacMillan .
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993a). Academic values and faculty rewards. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 145-162.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993b). Faculty reward structures: Toward institutional and professional homogenization. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(5), 603-622.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and the public trust. Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life..* MA: Allyn and Bacon .
- 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.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the value of rhetoric: trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 410-422.
- Fairweather, J. S., & Rhoads, R. A. (1995). Teaching and the faculty role: Enhancing the commitment to instruction in American colleges and universities. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17(2), 179-194.
- Feldman, M., & Desrochers, P. (2003). Research universities and local economic development: Lessons from the history of the John Hopkins University. *Industry and Innovation*, 10(1), 5-24.
- Feldman, M. P., & Desrochers, P. (2004). Truth for its own sake: academic culture and technology transfer at the John Hopkins University. *Minerva*, 42(2), 105-126.

- Finkelstein, M. (2001). Understanding the academic profession. In Altbach, P. & Gumport, P.J. (Eds.), *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 323-252). Baltimore, ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Flexner, A. (1968). *Universities: American, English, and German*. NY: Oxford Press.
- Freeland, R. (1986). The world transformed: a golden age for American universities: 1945-1970. In Goodschild, L. & Weschsler, H. (Eds.), *The history of higher education* (2nd ed., p.). MA: Pearson ASHE Reader Book Series. .
- Frost, S. H., & Jean, P. M. (2003). Bridging the disciplines: Interdisciplinary discourse and faculty scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 119-150.
- Gappa, J., Trice, A., & Austin, A. (2006). *Rethinking faculty work - higher education's strategic imperative*. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Garfinkel , H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: selected essays*. NY: Basic Books.
- Geiger, R. L. (2005). The ten generations of American higher education. In Altbach, P., Berdahl, R., & Gumport, P. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century - social, political, and economic challenge* (2nd ed., p. 38-70). ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Gladieux , M., King, J. E., & Corrigan, M. E. (2005). The federal government and higher education. In Altbach, P., Berdahl, R., & Gumport, P. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century - social, political, and economic challenge* (2nd ed., p. 163-197). ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

- Glassick, C., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: evaluation of the professoriate: An Ernest L. Boyer project of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching*. San Francisco , CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman , E. (1961). *Asylums: essay on the social situation of mental patients an other inmates*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Gonzales, L. D., & Pacheco, A. (forthcoming). The double-edged sword of organizational slogans.
- Gonzales, L. D., & Rincones, R. (2009). The role of faculty in global society. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 21(4), 382-406.
- Gonzales, L. D., & Rincones, R. (2010). Boundary crossers: legitimizing the work of interdisciplinary faculty members. *Under review at the Academic Exchange Quarterly*.
- Gonzales, L. D., & Rincones, R. (2010). University in transition: from the faculty seat. *Under review at the Journal of the Professoriate*.
- González, K., & Padilla, R. (2008). *Doing the public good: Latina/o scholars engage in civic participation*. VA: Stylus Publishing, Inc.
- Goode, J., & Bagihole, B. (1998). Gendering the management of change in higher education: a case study. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 5(3), 148-164.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(3), 281-306.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(4), 444-480.
- Grbich, C. (1998). The academic researcher: socialization in settings previously dominated by teaching. *Higher Education*, 36(1), 67-85.
- Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*. CA: Sage Publications.
- Gregorian, V. (2005). Six challenges to the American university. In Hersh, R. & Merrow, R. (Eds.), *Declining by degrees: higher education at risk* (pp. 77-96). NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Grimes, A. J., & Berger, P. (1970). Cosmopolitan-local: Evaluation of the construct. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(4), 407-416.
- Hammond, T. (2004). Herding cats in university hierarchies: formal structure and policy choice in research universities. In Ehrenberg, R. (Ed.), *Who is in charge at the modern university? Governing academia* (p. 91-138). NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haskins, C. H. (1957). *The rise of universities*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 507-542.

- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H.W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, 66(4), 507-542.
- Hearn, J. C. (2007). Sociological study of academic departments. In Gumpert, P. J. (Ed.), *Sociology of higher education: contributions and their contexts* (pp. 222-265). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Hinings, C. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (2008). Organizational institutionalism and sociology: A reflection. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 473-518). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling*. CA: University of California Press.
- Hora, M. T. (2008). *Factors influencing change initiatives to improve K-20 STEM education at California state university, Dominguez Hills*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison Retrieved July 2009 from http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/library/search?cancel_url=%2Findex.cfm%2Flibrary%2F&action=true&document_text=hora+matthew.
- Huckaby, F. (2008). Making use of Foucault in a study of specific parrhesiastic scholars. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 40(6), 770-788.
- Jacobs, J. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological forum*, 19(27), p. 3-27.
- Jaschik, S. (2009, September 14). Calculation that doesn't add up [Online forum comment]. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com>
- Jaschik, S. (2009, September 3). Hiding adjuncts from 'U.S. News' [Online forum comment]. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com>

- Jenkins, R. (1992). *Key sociologists: Pierre Bourdieu*. NY: Routledge.
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.) In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 143-163). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kanter, R. (1922). *The men and women of the corporation*. NY : Basic Books.
- Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kezar, A.J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change: recent research and conceptualizations*. CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Kirp, D. L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the bottom line*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Labaree, D. (2006, April). *Understanding the rise of American higher education: how complexity breeds autonomy*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved August 2009 from <http://www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree/selected-papers.html>.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17(4), 63-84.
- Leslie, D. (2002). Resolving the dispute: teaching is academe's core value. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 49-73.
- Leslie, D., & Johnson, G. P. (1974). The market model and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, XLV(1), .
- Levin, J S. (2007). *Nontraditional students and community colleges - the conflict of justice and neoliberalism*. NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Lincoln, Y. S. (2002). Resisting reform: tenure, productivity, and the public school crisis.

In Tierney, W. G. (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education - rethinking roles and rewards for the twenty-first century* (p. 59-78). NY: SUNY Press.

Lindholm, Jennifer Anne (2001). Establishing a "sense of space" within academic work environments: Faculty constructions of institutional fit and resulting implications for professional vitality. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, United States -- California. Retrieved July 5, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3035657).

Lindholm, J. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(1), 125-149.

Lindholm, J. (2004). Pathways to the professoriate: the role of self, others, and environment in shaping academic career aspirations. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, 75(6), 603-635.

Lohmann, S. (2004). Darwinian medicine for the university. In Ehrenberg, R. (Ed.), *Who is in charge at the modern university? Governing academia* (p.). NY: Cornell University Press.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1984). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*, 78, 734-749.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Organizations* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Mason, M. A. (22). Is tenure a trap for women? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>

- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Marriage and baby blues: redefining gender equity in the academy. *Annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 596, 89-103.
- Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the 'academic ratchet'. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65(1), 1-22.
- McCallum, D. (1856). Superintendent's report. In Shafritz, J., Ott, J.S., & Yang, J. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed.). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- McCormick, A. C., & Chun-Mei, Z. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change*, 37(5), 50-57.
- McGuinness, Jr. A. (2005). The states and higher education. In Altbach, P., Berdahl, R. O. Gumpert, P. J. (Ed.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century* (2nd ed., pp. 198-225). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Melguizo, T., & Strober, M. H. (2007). Faculty salaries and the maximization of prestige. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(6), 633-668.
- Mendoza, P. (2007). Academic capitalism and doctoral student socialization: A case study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(1), 71-96.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, 18(4), 560-568.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew effect in science, II: Cumulative advantage and the symbolism of intellectual property. *Isis*, 79(4), 606-623.

- Metcalfe, A., & Slaughter, S. (2007). The differential effects of academic capitalism on women in the academy. Retrieved on June 2009 at:
<http://www.uga.edu/ihe/pdfs/slaughter/academiccapitalismwomen.pdf>
- Meyer, H. D., & Rowan, B. (2006). *The new institutionalism in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Meyer, H. D., & Rowan, J (1977). Institutional organizations: formal structure and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Meyer, J. W., & Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The 'actors' of modern society: the cultural construction of social agency. *Sociological Theory*, 18(1), 100-120.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1991). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 41-62). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Milem, J., Berger, J., & Dey, E. (2000). Faculty time allocation: a study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (4), 454-474.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. NY : Oxford University Press.
- Morphew, C. (2003). A rose by any other game: which colleges became universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 207-223.
- Morphew, C. C. (2009). Conceptualizing change in the institutional diversity of U.S. colleges and universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3), 243-269.
- Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 456-471.

- Morphew, C., & Huisman, J. (2002). Using institutional theory to reframe research on academic drift. *Higher education in Europe*, 27(4), 491-506.
- Musselin, C. (2007). The transformation of academic work. Facts and analysis. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Retrieved December 2008 at: <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/ROP.Musselin.4.07.pdf>.
- Neumann, A. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282-310.
- Neumann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(1), 39-54.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 57-80.
- Pacheco, A. (2006, October). *Understanding the purposes of our work in the context of changing faculty culture*. Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association. Portland, Oregon.
- Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67(1), 46-84.
- Parsons, T. (1968). *The structure of social action*. NY: The Free Press.

- Perna, L. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 584-611.
- Perna, L. W. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 584-611.
- Perorazio, T. E. (15). *Deviance to what? Faculty perspectives on academic and commercial science*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association. San Diego, CA.
- Peterson, R. A. (2000). *Constructing effective questionnaires*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Philips, N., & Malhotra, N. (2008). Taking social construction seriously: Extending the discursive approach in institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 702-720). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The institutionalism in organizational analysis..* Chicago , IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 276-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Power, M. (2003). Auditing and the production of legitimacy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28(4), 379-394.

- Rendon, L. (1994). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19(1), 33-51.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the changes in junior faculty: Relationships among socialization, acculturation, and gender. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(6), 637-652.
- Rhoades, G. (2007). The study of the academic profession. In Gumpert, P. J. (Ed.), *Sociology of Education* (pp. 113-146). Baltimore, ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoades, G., Marquez Kiyama, J., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 209-235.
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (1997). Academic capitalism, managed professionals. *Social Text*, 51, 9-38.
- Riesman, D., & Jenks, C. (2002). *The academic revolution*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Rincones, R., & Rubio, R. (2005, April). *The musical chair game: a metaphor for tenure*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association. Montreal, CA.
- Ritzer, G., & Goodman, D. (2004). *Classical sociological theory* (4th ed.). MA: McGraw Hill.
- Rosch, T., & Reich, J. (1996). The enculturation of new faculty in higher education: a comparative investigation of three academic departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(1), 115-131.

- Rowan, B. (1982). Organizational structure and the institutional environment: the case of public schools. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27(2), 259-279.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Rusch, E. A., & Wilbur, C. (2007). Shaping institutional environments: the process of becoming legitimate. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(3), 301-318.
- Sauder, M. (2009). The discipline of rankings: tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 63-82.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: the restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, ML: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Schutt, R. K. (2004). *Investigating the social world: the process and practice of research*. (4 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Scott, R. W., & Meyer, J. W. (1983). The organization of societal sectors. In Meyer, J.W. & Scott, R.S. (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 129-153). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R. (1991). Unpacking institutional arguments. In Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 164-182). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of theory of organization. In Shafritz, J., Ott, J.S., & Jang, Y.S. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 125-134). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the Grass Roots*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism "old" and "new". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 270-277.
- Serow, R. (2000). Research and teaching at a research university. *Higher Education*, 40, 449-463.
- Serow, R. C. (2000). Research and teaching at a research university. *Higher Education*, 4 (40), 449-463.
- Shafritz, J., Ott, S. J., & Jang, Y. (2005). *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed.). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Silva, E. T., & Slaughter, S. (1984). *Serving power: the making of the academic social science expert*. CA: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Simpson, R., & Cohen, C. (2004). Dangerous work: the gendered nature of bullying. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 11(2). Retrieved July 2006 from doi:<http://dspace.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/3771/1/Gender%20work%20and%20organization2.pdf>.
- Slaughter, S. (1985). From serving students to serving the economy: changing expectations of faculty role performance. *Higher Education*, 14(1), 41-56.
- Slaughter, S., Archerd, C. J., & Campbell, T. (2004). Boundaries and quandaries: how professors negotiate market relations. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(1), 129-165.

- Slaughter , S., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Markets in higher education: students in the seventies, patents in the eighties, copyrights in the nineties. In Altbach, P, Berdahl, R. O., & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 486-516). Baltimore, ML: John Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, A. (1776). On the division of labor. In Shafritz, J., Ott, S.J., & Yang, J. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., p. 37-41). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Smith , D. (1990). *Texts, fact, and femininity - exploring the relations of ruling*. NY: Routledge .
- Sotello Viernes Turner, C. (2002). Women in academe: living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74-93.
- Sperber, M. (2005). How undergraduate education became college lite - and a personal apology. In Hersh, R. & Merrow, J. (Eds.), *Declining by degrees - higher education at risk* (p. 131-144). NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Stadtman, V. (1980). *Academic adaptations. Higher education prepares for the 1980s and 1990s*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers Inc.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 273-286.

- Taylor, F. (1916). The principles of scientific management. In Shafritz, J., Ott, J.S., & Yang, Y. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., p. 61-73). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W. G. (1987). Facts and constructs - defining reality in higher education organizations. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11(1), 61-73.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 29(1), 2-21.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Enhancing promotion, tenure, and beyond: faculty socialization as a cultural process*. (ED368321). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Digests.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (9). *Access without support is not opportunity*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2008/06/09/tinto>
- Torres, C., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspectives. *Higher Education*, 43(4), 429-455.
- Tuchman, G. (2009). *Wannabe U - inside the corporate university*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: a century of public school reform*. NY: Harvard Press.

- Veblen, T. (1918). *The higher learning in America: a memorandum on the conduct of universities*. NY: B.W. Huebesch.
- Veysey, L. (1965). *The emergence of the American University*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2007). Managing work and family on the tenure-track. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number 14491.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2009). Academic careers and children: lifelong commitments. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number:15780.
- Weber, M. (1922). Bureaucracy. In Shafritz, J. Ott, S.J., & Yang, J. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., p. 73-79). CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Weick, K. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 63(10), 673-676.
- Weick, K. (2009). *Making sense of the organization: the impermanent organization*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Publications.
- Wright, M., Assar, N., Kramer, L., Howery, C. B., McKinney, K., Glass, B., Atkinson, M. (2004). Greedy institutions: the importance of institutional context for teaching in higher education. *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 144-159.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.
- Zemsky, R., Wegner, G. R., & Massy, W. F. (2005). *Remaking the American university: market-smart and mission-centered*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Zucker, L. G. (1991). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. In Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. (pp. 83-107). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In Altbach, P., Berdahl, R.O., & Gumport, P.J. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political and economic challenges* (p.115-162). Baltimore, ML: John Hopkins University Press.

APPENDIX A

September 2009

Dear Professor XXXX:

I am conducting my dissertation research and would like to invite you to participate in a survey. In this survey, you will see that I am interested in learning more about faculty work and faculty opinions regarding organizational change.

The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes and includes mostly close-ended questions. However, there are a few open-ended questions.

If you choose to participate, you will be assigned a pseudonym. You can, thus, be assured of full confidentiality throughout the entire research and any dissemination process that follows.

I know that you are busy and I truly appreciate your time. I am hopeful that you will consent to participate in this survey by clicking the following link: <http://es.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx> .

If you have any questions, please contact me at 915.747.5771 or you can contact my advisor, Dr. Arturo Pacheco at 915.747.7712. Ms. Annabelle Casas can be contacted if you have any questions with regard to the IRB or confidentiality process. Please make reference to IRB No. 128749-3.

Sincerely,

Leslie D. Gonzales, Doctoral Candidate
Education Leadership and Foundations Department
915.747.5771

APPENDIX B

January 2010

Dr. XXXX
College of Science
South West University

Dear Dr. XXXX,

In mid-September, I sent you an invitation to participate in an on-line survey for my dissertation research. You kindly completed the survey and indicated that you would be willing to be interviewed at a later date regarding my research topic which is the faculty perspective on organizational change. I am very appreciative of the help you have provided and your willingness to be interviewed.

If possible, I would like to schedule our interview sometime before the end of the year. For your review, I have outlined a few details regarding the interview process below.

- Interviews can be scheduled at a place of our mutual convenience, but close to the university. We can meet at your office, at the library, or at a nearby coffee shop.
- I am willing and able to meet any day of the week.
- Interviews will take about 1 hour to 1.5 hours.
- Interviews will be audio recorded with a small digital recorder and another larger recorder to ensure high quality recordings.
- *You will be assigned a pseudonym.* In addition, all identifying details will be changed in the dissertation and other dissemination processes. Such identifying details include name and specific discipline. Thus, you will be identified primarily in terms of tenure status, and/or gender, and/or racial/ethnic background. Should you be the *only* individual in your college with a particular demographic background (i.e. the only tenure-track Latina woman in a college), then such identifying data will be excluded from the analysis/write-up to protect your anonymity.
- This study is voluntary and as such, you may withdraw from the interview process/study at any time.

Should you be interested, I will provide a copy of the interview transcript for your review.

If you should have any further questions, please feel free to call me at 915. 478.0522 or you can contact my dissertation advisor, Dr. Arturo Pacheco, at 915.747.7712.

Sincerely,

Leslie D. Gonzales, Doctoral Candidate

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

I, _____, agree to participate in the research efforts of Leslie D. Gonzales, IRB 128749-3. I understand that my interview will be tape and digitally recorded. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw from participation at any point.

I understand that the purpose of the research is to aid Leslie in the data collection process for her dissertation and that she is investigating the faculty perspective on change in higher education.

I understand that my name and information will be kept confidential because I will be assigned a code or pseudonym in any reports or documented/discussed findings. I will not be personally identifiable in any way through this research.

For further information, I know I can contact Leslie D. Gonzales at 915.747.5771 or her dissertation advisor, Dr. Arturo Pacheco at 915.747.7712.

Participant Name and Signature Date

Leslie D. Gonzales Date

Please check all that apply:

I wish to receive a hard-copy transcript of the interview today. ____

I wish to receive an executive summary of the analysis. ____

I wish to receive a hard-copy transcript of our interview today as well as an executive summary of the analysis. ____

I would like to participate in a member's check with you near the end of the data analysis process in the Spring of 2010. ____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE #1

Introduce self; Describe study by noting SWU's transition to be a more research focused (or Tier One university); Interested in learning more about this transition from the faculty perspective

1. Tell me a little about yourself.
2. Where did you go to school?
3. I have heard people talk about their entrance to the professoriate as totally unexpected and unplanned and others say, it was a natural progression, almost a "calling" if you will – what was your experience like?
4. Can you talk about what made you want to be a professor?
 - a. [Probe: Major influences, goals]
6. Were there any major influences like, your graduate student experience? Or a certain class or teacher?
5. So, what brought you to SWU?
 - a. [Probe: Were you recruited? Were you interested?]
6. How long have you been at SWU?
7. What did you know about the university?
 - a. [Probe: How do you like it now?]
8. Can you tell me about your arrival at SWU? How and what did you learn about the expectations of your work?
9. And now, what does a typical day look like for you?
10. With regard to your work as a faculty member, there is this notion of a tripartite (t,r,s) and some say that there is a fourth responsibility related to grant writing/administration, tell me about these work responsibilities. What is most important to you?
11. When you think of the teaching, research, and service, what are these things about? Teaching experience and philosophy, research philosophy and experience, and service experience and philosophy.
12. As you know I am interested in learning about SWU's transition (to Tier One), can you talk to me about this transition? What implications does it have for you? [Probe:

13. How did you learn about the transition (to Tier One)?

[Probe: Listen for people, events, & meetings].

14. What role are you expected to play in this transition (to Tier One)?

15. Tier One/Research focus resembles many things for many people; what does it mean to you? And your work?

16. Has the transition (to Tier One) required you to make changes as to how you spend your work time? [Probe: resistance, creativity, innovation].

17. Is this role different than the role that you wanted to play as a faculty member when you entered the academy?

[Probe: How?]

18. For some, the transition reflects a move away from SWU's traditional mission (teaching and service, access and excellence). Do you have any thoughts about that? Is that assumption misguided?

19. What are some of the challenges associated with this transition, for you as a faculty member? [Probe: infrastructure, work load assignment/ distribution, change of research focus/primary constituents].

20. When you think about your work as a faculty member, do you have any over arching goals that you want to achieve?

[Probe: Does SWU's aspiration to be Tier One change this? How do you manage both?].

21. Why do you think SWU wants to make this move?

22. What do you believe a professor, on the tenure-track, will have to do to be successful as SWU goes through this transition?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE #2

Introduce self; Describe study by noting SWU's transition to be a more research focused or Tier One university; Interested in learning more about this transition from the faculty perspective

1. Can you tell me a little about yourself.
2. [Probe: from where? New to TX?]
3. Can you tell me a little about your experience in your doctoral program? Was it research heavy?
4. I have heard people talk about their entrance to the professoriate as totally unexpected and unplanned and others say, it was a natural progression, almost a "calling" if you will – what was your experience like?
5. Can you talk about what made you want to be a professor?
[Probe: Major influences, goals; Were there any major influences like, your graduate student experience? a certain class or teacher?]
5. Before entering the professoriate, how did you conceptualize your future role as a faculty member?

Now, I want to move onto discuss your arrival at SWU.

6. How long have you been at SWU?
7. What attracted you to SWU?
[Probe: Were you recruited? Were you interested?]
8. What did you know about the university?
[Probe: How do you like it now?]
9. What kind of role did you expect to play at SWU – more research, more teaching, a balance? How did you learn about your role when you arrived? How about over the years?
10. What is your typical day like?
11. With regard to your work as a faculty member, there is an idea that there are 3 main duties: teaching, research, and service. Some say that there is a fourth responsibility

related to grant writing/administration. Can you tell me about these work responsibilities? Are you involved in all of these areas? What is most important to you?

12. As you know I am interested in learning about SWU's transition to Tier One, can you talk to me about this transition? How did you learn about the transition to Tier One?
[Probe: Listen for people, events, & meetings].

13. What implications does Tier One have for you and your work?

14. Tier One resembles many things for many people; what does it mean to you? And your work?

15. Has the transition to Tier One required you to make changes as to how you spend your work time? [Probe: resistance, creativity, innovation].

16. What role are you expected to play in this transition to Tier One?

17. Is the role that you are expected to play now different than the role that you wanted to play as a faculty member when you first began?
[Probe: How?]

18. How do you manage your work as a faculty member, especially as SWU goes through this transition? (strategies; efficiency, harder, faster, no boundaries; divesting)

19. Have you seen or experienced any tensions related to SWU's transition? (b/t teachers vs. researchers, sr. vs. jr., faculty vs. admin; liberal arts vs. sciences)?

20. For some, the transition to Tier One reflects a move away from SWU's traditional mission (teaching and service, access and excellence). Do you have any thoughts about that? Is that assumption misguided?

21. What are some of the challenges associated with this transition, for you as a faculty member? [Probe: infrastructure, work load assignment/distribution, change of research focus/primary constituents].

22. When you think about your work as a faculty member, do you have any over arching goals that you want to achieve? [Probe: Does SWU's aspiration to be Tier One change this? How do you manage both?] – [divest, complying, bullied, ignore, integrate]

23. Why do you think SWU wants to be a Tier One?

24. What do you believe a professor, on the tenure-track, will have to do to be successful as SWU goes through this transition?

APPENDIX E

(FINAL) Interview Questioning Route; Revised 1-6-10

About You

1. I would like to start by asking you to tell me a little bit about yourself.

I am especially interested in learning how you decided to become a professor.
How did you end up in academia?

Listen for/Probe: I have heard people talk about their entrance to the professoriate as totally unexpected and unplanned and others say, it was a natural progression, almost a “calling” if you will – what was your experience like?

2. A lot of people say that they enter the professoriate to accomplish particular goals or mission or that they are driven by a certain kind of value set. Is this the case for you? Can you talk about what made you want to be a professor?

3. Before entering academia, what did you think your work would be like? (I mean there is the teaching, the researching/scholarship – I mean what kind of professor did you think you would be?

About SWU

4. Can you talk to me about your arrival at SWU? How long have you been at SWU? What did you know about the university?
[Probe: How do you like it now?]

5. What attracted you to SWU?
[Probe: Were you recruited? Did you look at SWU on your own?]

6. When you were interviewing, what did you learn about the kind of role you would be expected to play at SWU? Work-time allocation?

7. How has your experience at SWU been so far – in terms of the work?

8. How about your role? What role do you think that the university wants you to play?

About Tier One/the change

9. As you know I am interested in learning about SWU's transition to Tier One. What do you know about Tier One? How did you learn about the transition to Tier One?
[Probe: Listen for people, events, & meetings].

10. What role are you expected to play in this transition to Tier One? What implications does it have for you and your work? Have you had to change how you carry out your work?

12. Does Tier One mean that you have a different kind of role as a faculty member?
[Probe: How?]

13. How do you feel about this?

14. Do you feel that the junior/senior faculty member, such as your self have a particular role in this transition? How about senior faculty? Anyone else?

15. How do you feel about Tier One? Is this something you support? Why?

16. Does anything about this transition worry you or concern you? How about even scare you?

17. I have heard this idea that SWU wants to do Tier One differently – The SWU Way or to be but not to be like – what do you make of this notion? And why do you think SWU insists on this idea?

18. For some, the transition to Tier One reflects a move away from SWU's traditional mission (teaching and service, access and excellence). Do you have any thoughts about that? Is that assumption misguided?

19. What are some of the challenges associated with this transition, for you as a faculty member?

20. Why do you think SWU wants to be a Tier One? Do you know if there has been any debate about Tier One amongst faculty?

21. What would you tell a tenure-track person, a junior person about SWU? I mean in terms of what kind of university this is, about the change, how they could be successful here...

APPENDIX F

Post-Interview Methods/Reflection Questions to Self

Where did the interview take place?

What did you see in the office/place?

What was the feel of the interview?

What was most surprising to you in the interview?

Did you hear anything that you expected to hear?

How does this faculty manage her/his role amid change?

Can you been able to identify any common patterns, ideas, expressions?

Did the interviewee say anything that reminds you of what others have said?

What new questions do you have after this interview?

What are the three main ideas, expressions, actions that are most important from this interview?

Do you agree or disagree with this professor? Why?

APPENDIX G

Audit Trail: Categories and Themes Explained

An audit trail is a document that researchers use in qualitative research to help clarify the research process. Specifically, it is intended to help condense the analytical categories, themes and other contextual information into smaller chunks to help audiences understand the researcher's thinking behind the research process; how and why certain categories were eventually integrated or bundled to form more substantive themes. Below, I show in condensed format specific examples, evidence, and quotes taken from interviews (N = 26) as well as survey data (N = 140) to define and delimit the major analytical categories and themes that emerged from my analysis of the data.

The analysis of the data resulted in three major themes. These themes represent the "roles" that faculty members are playing as SWU transitions from a primarily teaching focused, regional university to a research dominant or "Tier One" University. These themes include: **Operationalizing, Negotiating, and Acquiescence**. These major themes were built from both survey and interview data. In fact, although the data collection process began in fall of 2009, these themes were not formally "bundled" and "named" until mid-Spring 2010.

Below, I begin by showing what initial insights, ideas, common patterns emerged from the survey data. Beside/below each insight, I display a sample comment or example taken from the survey responses. I then show how these pieces of survey data fed, folded into, or were discarded from the rest of the analytical processes. On the final pages, I display specific quotes or examples drawn from both survey and interview data to exemplify my final analytical themes.

Emerging Themes/Categories/Patterns from Survey Comments
10/2009

What it means/how faculty are defining Tier One/Change:

Making sense with messages from SWU – Talking heads! – (access, frontier, building a new model!”

Referring to what other Universities/faculty do that are already what they think Tier One is, thinking or doing more in terms of scholarship, research, reallocating time away from teaching and service.

On a practical level, what it means to faculty work/changes/expectations:

Divesting – interesting comments

Managing time – so much talk about efficiency “work harder and faster”

Being bullied! – having to do more grant writing or learning about grant writing

What faculty think about this change/feelings:

Frustration and confusion – “blind leading blind” “no resources” – either practical or thinking wise; outdated leadership; leadership does not know what Tier One is; Senior faculty don’t know how to mentor us!

A lot of talk of creativity – I need to be more creative; we have to be more resourceful; I try to be more creative.

Excited about – “I wish this happened sooner!” I came here to do this. The University is finally catching up to me! (redeemed!?)

Deep skepticism and critique – unfortunate, missing our mandate – lots of people here talk about practical purpose of SWU vs. that of a research mission.

What it means to them as faculty members, how they see themselves inside this change:

Passed/passing me by

Redemption!/Finally, its about time!

Normal; expected

10/2009

The analysis of the open-ended data provides some important insights about faculty perspectives and experiences. The data also gives some indication about the various strategies that faculty adopt as they construct their work life on a daily basis in a changing university. Such data serves as important lines of inquiry that may be taken up as part of the interviews. The interview, which will be loosely guided by a set of questions, will be adjusted to reflect the themes or ideas that emerge from the open-ended data.

Some preliminary analysis of the open-ended data has resulted in the following “still emerging” themes:

- Divesting to adjust
- Efficiency, working harder and faster
- Work without boundaries
- Being “bullied” into certain activities
- Staying away from the university
- Deference to the university/field of higher education
- Skepticism about SWU’s “true” intent to transition
- Infrastructure issues
- Money vs. research/scholarship
- Divisions “old and new;” a university divided between liberal arts and the sciences; liberal arts left behind
- Undergraduate education versus graduate education
- Missing our mandate
- Love for one’s discipline, but not the university
- Service to community, service through application of research, service to Latina/os, Service through preparation of future generations....

10/30/2009

October/November 2009

Preliminary analysis of the open-ended data has resulted in the following “still emerging” themes. Below each “emerging theme,” I have provided a direct quote or an example from survey data.

Insight, Pattern, Theme	Quotes/Examples
Conforming or Responding to University (faculty are adjusting or conforming to perceived demands/expectations that come with transition)	“Divested myself of nearly all service and advising duties” to adjust; Efficiency, working harder and faster; Work without boundaries, 80-90 hour work week, working on weekends; Being “bullied” into certain activities, like grant writing; Staying away from the university to work, otherwise students distract; More fundraising, more writing; Prioritizing research/scholarship over everything else
Owning the Transition, Excited (suggest that faculty are excited about contributing to the transition/SWU finally caught up)	“I came here BECAUSE of SWU’s desire to focus on research” ; “that’s why I came to SWU” ; “I have always aspired to do “Tier One” research. I think it is great that the University is recognizing research.” ; been at SWU for awhile, it’s about time it recognizes my research
Want to comply but want to take care of teaching also (faculty write about how they are aware of the transition, but also how they do not want to “let go” of teaching or other aspects of their work)	Enjoy research and teaching – maybe equally, strive for a balance; believe a balance is important to self and to SWU; “Although I am more focused on research, teaching still matters to me and I enjoy working with students”; “My main concern is whether or not we will really be given the teaching release time to the research that is expected of us – I love research, I love teaching – but there are only so many hours in a day.”; “I do less undergrad teaching which I also feel is important.”
Resisting the Transition (faculty write about how they actually resist the transition or they critique it to show why they don’t think the transition is good idea)	-Ignore University; Critique the transition; “pie in the sky” “missing out mandate” Transition means that the service to community, service through applied research, service to students, service to Latina/o population will not be valued; “My discipline and my commitment are inimical to that objective”; ... “it’s a shame – helping students was why I was most attracted to SWU.”
Worries or Concerns related to transition (faculty describe risks involved in the transition; some of their answers are indications of how they define the transition)	Money vs. research/scholarship; Divisions “old and new,” a university divided between liberal arts and the sciences; liberal arts left behind; Undergraduate education versus graduate education; “I believe we are missing our mandate. It should be more applied and focused on getting people ready for work.” “My perception is that each year faculty expectations rise with regard to the tenure process”; “something has to give;”
Doubt, Skepticism, Critiques (faculty write about why they doubt or are very skeptical about the university’s)	-S Skepticism about SWU’s “true” intent to transition; “pie in the sky,” “I have not seen any concrete indication of the assertion.” “I don’t believe SWU really desires to be a more research focused university.”;

transition, why they think it won't or should not happen; philosophical and practical issues are mentioned)	<p>"the system does not seem to promote research";</p> <p>"There is more pressure for research production with the support for such work"; "SWU's focus seems out of touch with its financial reality. Additionally, most folks' interpretations of "research focus" seem to be outdated (e.g., they think a "Research 1" scholar could get tenure with 10 mediocre journal articles. Not true..."</p> <p>"Research 1 status is much more costly than folks around here seem to realize..."</p>
<p>Commitment to research, but not necessarily to SWU</p> <p>(joined academia to research; faculty seem to want to research, but not for SWU, for self)</p>	<p>"My own work has always taken priority and I believe that it is the only way to keep on top of the field, engage the field, and contribute to teaching."; "No overarching goals, I did it because I was interested in my field."; "I wanted to find answers that are important to me and people in my field"; "I love my field beyond belief."</p>
<p>Commitment to students, teaching, community, regional mission (joined academia for personal commitments; social justice)</p>	<p>"helping students achieve is why many (most?) of us are here. We risk a lot with Carnegie 1 focus"; "I have always wanted to impact the way students teach. That is my one mission and goal." "Want to be a teacher who makes a difference"; "try to help young people: students."</p>

This is a very rough outline of what I am seeing in the data.

SPRING 2010

As I ask myself, how have faculty defined this transition, it is apparent that faculty members are drawing from two specific sources to help them make sense of the transition: 1) what NI theorists would call the **institutional field or the field of higher education** and 2) the **immediate or local organizational culture**. Below, I have defined each of these sources. I have also provided examples from both the survey and the interview data that show when and how faculty members borrow from either or just one of these sources.

Sources of Sense-Making for Faculty Members

Institutional, external field	Faculty compare their experience at universities like Harvard, Berkeley, UT Austin, Michigan, and other already established research universities to explain what the transition means or to explain what changes they have made and why; they also refer to publishing/editorial boards in terms of prestige, they refer to ranking institutions, and often to what their peers are doing in X university.
Organizational culture	Faculty members use some of the discourse and “slogans” to explain the change. At first, the image of “talking heads” came to my mind when I heard faculty mobilize the slogans over and over again to explain what the transition is about through their use of organizational culture.

After making sense or defining the transition, faculty members “take action,” figure out how they fit inside this transition. My analysis rendered three major themes that represent the kind of action and thus the kind of role/space that faculty are making for themselves at this time of change. These themes include: **Operationalizing, Negotiating, and Acquiescence**. Below, I highlight specific quotes and examples for each theme. I moved back and forth from my survey and interview data to check the other source. Data was used to construct each theme and both kinds of data are provided below.

What does it mean to **OPERATIONALIZE**?

When faculty **OPERATIONALIZE**, they contribute in ways that they believe will contribute to SWU's successful transition. Recall, however, that Operationalizing can look different depending on the interpretation that faculty have made of the transition. Faculty who use or prescribe to the institutional model typically operationalize by doing the following: prioritizing scholarship, fitting in research at whatever cost (emotional, physical, life), fund raising, seeking to buy out teaching time via fund raising, and divesting one's self from teaching, service, or other faculty affairs in order to ensure that they succeed as researchers. This group of faculty members, I argue, embodies a "**cosmopolitan habitus**" which means that they are outwards looking and that they rely on the institutional field (Bourdieu, 1988; Gouldner, 1958; Rowan et al., 1977) to help them define and make sense of SWU's transition, to construct a role that they believe the field deems as legitimate and prestigious.

A few of the Operationalizers, however, particularly those with a long history at SWU carry what I call a "**local-cosmo**" habitus, which means that they often mix or draw from both field/institutional level ideas, ideals, practices, and norms as well as organizational culture (ideas, ideals, practices, and norms) as they operationalize SWU's Tier One transition. By making sense of the transition by using both institutional and organizational culture, these faculty members believe that it is possible to build a new Tier One model, where access, excellence, regional mission and national renown can be facilitated simultaneously. Thus, they Operationalize Tier One, but they operationalize in a very distinct way; their privilege and power (tenure) allow them to creatively and confidently think about and encourage a new model of Tier One. For example, Operationalizing Tier One amongst this group of faculty members includes a tenured LARTS professor who is engaged in education action research to improve undergraduate education and who is looking for a partner to work with and transform his work into scholarship. Another concrete example is one tenured Science professor's insistence on working in the schools, having undergraduates deeply involved in her research, and telling tenure-track faculty members to make sure their work is somehow connected to the local community. Most of these faculty members have been at the University for a very long time (almost 20 and 20+ years), and though they all began as "cosmos," the local habitus has been structured on to them. Thus, feel confident "mixing" what others believe to be two contradictory models. At this point, they are very much connected to the local region/population and hope to build a new model of Tier One, (thus mixing the field and organizational level ideas) in order to fit their work in and uphold the regional/access mission of the University.

Faculty Member	Operationalizing (includes survey data under conformity or owning the transition)
Romero – C	Experienced fund-raiser, grant writer who continues to write grants, tries to buy out teaching time, looks at fund raising as a necessary to supporting his work; would like to teach less, concerned with production of knowledge, but not necessarily with teaching, pretends to be working at a national research university.
Smith - C	Researcher who hopes that Tier One will allow him to focus more on scholarship, believes it will allow him to use graduate students to work with undergrads; wants to write to a wider audience and publish as much as possible, pretends to be working at a national research university.
Lucero – C	Teacher who desperately <i>wants</i> to be a researcher; looks to and references major research universities to help him set his agenda; uses teaching and local service as a way to build up his research agenda/data base; limits service engagement; writes for top tier journals.
Pena - C	Researcher who uses teaching as a tool for research and thinking; likes teaching, but prefers research, does whatever it takes to keep research going; sleeps little at night to do research
Rivera – C	Activist educator who has always dreamed of SWU becoming a Tier One, wants to write for the widest audience available; believes and looks forward to the day when SWU stops “coddling students” – what others might refer to as student validation approaches
Ortiz – C	Writer who writes for a very national, international audience, talks about being bound to the border, but not to the institution itself, raises money for self to support work, does not rely on institution for any conference money, but looks instead to his discipline peers.
Jackson LC	Did not “get into this for the teaching side but for the research side of it”, but now has found ways to integrate his t and r, researcher who uses his teaching to help him improve his writing, involved in improving undergraduate education via grant funded intervention; would like to turn this work into scholarship; believes new model is possible, points to his own work on undergraduate education that facilitates solid undergrad education, access, and excellence by a researcher.
Marks LC	Looks at national departmental peers to understand what faculty members need to do to compete, researcher who uses teaching to help her think about her research, has found ways to integrate t, r, s; believes new model is possible, refers to SWU practice of involving undergrads in research as a sign of a new model, believes that faculty work can and should be tied to local community; suggests this to new faculty.
Matthews LC	Came to be a teacher, a successful writer, who has published, found a way to integrate teaching and research, believes that they are interconnected; believes that SWU can and deserves to become a Tier One, but is selective when it comes to explaining what kind of Tier One. Has not changed her work habits, continues to publish and connect her teaching and research; believes that new model is desirable in terms of SWU becoming the first Tier One university on the border, but not necessary from an access perspective, despises the notion of “equal opportunity” or the idea of SWU becoming a Tier One University that prides itself on cultivating the next generation of scholars that look like the 21 st century demographic (like the President often describes).
Arguello LC	Came to SWU to prepare for other higher education leadership positions (in administration); came to work with border Hispanic population that he strongly identifies with; writing a mini-grant; fundraising to support research/students; work on multiple research projects; facilitate research with baby steps; always work to fit in research “baby steps”; refuse to teach summers; operate like you’re already at a national research university; minimize service; draw boundaries around your teaching; draw strong perimeters around your time, esp. regarding students; believes new model is possible access and excellence.
Samuels LC	---

Survey Data *	"I came here BECAUSE of SWU's desire to focus on research"; "that's why I came to SWU" ; "I have always aspired to do "Tier One" research. I think it is great that the University is recognizing research." ; been at SWU for awhile, it's about time it recognizes my research; "My own work has always taken priority and I believe that it is the only way to keep on top of the field, engage the field, and contribute to teaching."; "No overarching goals, I did it because I was interested in my field."; "I wanted to find answers that are important to me and people in my field"; "I love my field beyond belief."
---------------	--

What does it mean to Negotiate?

When faculty NEGOTIATE TIER ONE, they account for the organizational transition at hand and then try to figure out a way to fit their work inside the changing University. Negotiating signals an attempt to make some sort of trade-off or bargain. To this end, Negotiators are highly skeptical about what this Tier One transition means and most do not "buy into" it. Negotiators are not only skeptical but they are also critical and so they interrogate the purpose and the thinking behind Tier One. Some specific examples of negotiation include one's insistence on writing for local newspapers and outlets, one's attempt to keep her work very local and also very applied to local problems, one's agreement to produce and be engaged more in her scholarship than in previous years, but not becoming overly concerned with the kinds of outlets that she is publishing in. Another example includes writing grants to satisfy one of the tenets of Tier One even if grant writing is something they never wanted to do. However, others try to write more while refusing to grant write. Others simply "hold back" because they do not have faith or really believe that SWU can or should make this change.

The negotiators (N = 9) embody what I call a "local-cosmo" habitus. This means that several are connected to the local region, some identify with the Hispanic, first generation student population, and came to the institution to fulfill the regional, historical teaching mission SWU has long employed. This local connection and disposition also means that much of their negotiation comes from a point of critique and worry about how to uphold the regional/access/teaching mission. They want to uphold their commitments to the regional, local purpose of the organization as much as possible, and search for ways to fit their work in here. Their cosmopolitan habitus, however, keeps them connected to and informed about what the wider institutional field defines as a legitimate Tier One University and faculty member.

Negotiating (includes survey data under want to comply, resistance, worries, and Commitment to teaching, students, region, etc)

	Faculty Member	Categories/Evidence from the Data
1	Aaron LC	Came to be a teacher & also to do work with local practical relevance; investing more time in scholarship, reconsidering outlets, but divesting time from service; fundraising for local, practical work; teaching and conducting class in ways that reflect demands of students lives, very appreciative of student's complex lives.
2	Munoz LC	Came to be a teacher/mentor; took action after third year review to prioritize scholarship and is attempting to be more productive, yet she refuses to get "caught up" in "outlet types" and will not fundraise, does the best she can with her classes, but has attempted to draw boundaries around her time when possible, appreciative of the challenges that students face and takes pride in working with students like her.
3	Reyes LC	Came to have balanced t & r career & also to do work with local practical relevance; has attempted to fund raise to buy out teaching time, but works hard to ensure that she is available to her students, takes pride in acting as a mentor to her students, works to integrate her t, r, s in very savvy ways, conducts local, action based research and will not compromise that "I do applied work"
4	Baines LC	Came to have a balanced t & r career; writes grants and actively researches, tries to send out to top notch journal at least once per year, but "less than she would try to do in a top tier university;" insists on the development of a graduate teaching assistant program where G.A.s can learn how to teach before she is willing to let go of her teaching responsibilities as would be the case in a Tier One; points out to the fact that she has to tie teaching and community work into every aspect of her work on her dossier as evidence that SWU does not really want to move to a Tier One, will not produce at level of Tier One until she has teaching assistants and adequate resources.
5	Valdez LC	Came to have a balanced t & r career and also to do work with practical relevance; has let go of program that he was developing for local professionals; discusses how he has "reoriented" his work rather than made a transition from a teacher to researcher; works to allocate more time to research; but will never agree that research trumps teaching; this is a teacher who uses research as a tool for teaching; teaching and producing practical or useful knowledge is at heart of work; has given up multiple service commitments on other hand.
6	Estrada LC	A research staff member turned faculty member, and who initially was encouraged by the possibility to have a "balanced" career at SWU (unlike her experience in grad school, which made her not want to enter academia!); uses her experience to write grants and fund raise to contribute to the transition, but constructs her assignments and syllabi in ways that reflect her student's complex life styles, very student centered, identifies and appreciates student's multiple roles, but admits that she has de-emphasized teaching and service.
7	Lamar LC	Came to have a balanced t & r career and to work with a working class, Latino community; at one time, poured all time into teaching, has now joined writing group to help her write and thus produce more scholarship, at one point, adamantly opposed grant writing, has recently submitted grant application, but notes that if open access closes down, she will take to the streets to protest. <i>Believes a new model is possible, access and excellence.</i>
8	Simon LC	Came to have a balanced t & r career, but prefers to accent the teaching; put off social justice research agenda to collaborate in project where publications would come sooner and be more numerous, insists on writing for local outlets and addressing local problems, spends inordinate amount of time on teaching, "will not let go of that," responds to every student comment on-line, attempted to fund raise although not very excited about it. <i>Believes a new model is possible where there will a place for master teachers, access and excellence.</i>
9	Garcia LC	Came to SWU to work with Hispanic students as they prepare in a field that the

		believes needs to be diversified, only “Chicano” in courses while in college, truly wants to ensure success of other Hispanics and thought SWU was place to do so; began by spending a lot of time on program development and teaching (almost 100%), but as of late has “divested self of service and advising;” notes that he is willing to write grants but needs support in terms of grant writing and administration, will not compromise work with students. <i>Believes a new model is possible, access and excellence.</i>
	Survey Data*	Enjoy research and teaching – maybe equally, strive for a balance; believe a balance is important to self and to SWU; “Although I am more focused on research, teaching still matters to me and I enjoy working with students”; “My main concern is whether or not we will really be given the teaching release time to the research that is expected of us – I love research, I love teaching – but there are only so many hours in a day.”; “I do less undergrad teaching which I also feel is important.” Skepticism about SWU’s “true” intent to transition; “pie in the sky;” “I have not seen any concrete indication of the assertion.” “I don’t believe SWU really desires to be a m more research focused university.”; “ they system does not seem to promote research”; “There is more pressure for research production with the support for such work”; “SWU’s focus seems out of touch with its financial reality. Additionally, most folks’ interpretations of “research focus” seem to be outdated (e.g., they think a “Research 1” scholar could get tenure with 10 mediocre journal articles. Not true...”“Research 1 status is much more costly that folks around here seem to realize...” “helping students achieve is why many (most?) of us are here. We risk a lot with Carnegie 1 focus”; “I have always wanted to impact the way students teach. That is my on one mission and goal.” “Want to be a teacher who makes a difference”; “try to help young people: students.”

What does it mean to be ACQUIESCENT?

When faculty ACUIESCE, they account for the organizational transition, step aside and then insert a new role for self, ignore it, resist it or defer to it all together. Some specific examples include how faculty members accept the transition and then “quietly” reconstruct a new role for self as a “facilitator,” which means they take up more service commitments, work to protect junior faculty members from overload of service commitments, take up heavier teaching or more intensive teaching assignments, share data and invite junior faculty to write with them, attempting to be a mentor as much as possible, share resources when possible.

Acquiescing also takes place, though, when faculty acknowledge, ignore, and then continue on with their work without making changes. This means that they do not attempt to “re-insert” themselves into the University as the faculty above attempt to, but they simply ignore it and continue on with their work the best way they know how. Another instance of acquiescence includes the ultimate deferral: retirement. Three of the 6 Acquiescent faculty members mentioned concrete plans to retire, but one hopes to retire and then come back to work strictly as a teacher to work with undergraduate students and invite them into his research.

Most of the Acquiescent embody what I call a local habitus (Gouldner, 1958) and were attracted to the University for its local, regional, and teaching focused mission. They often noted that undergraduate education is the most important function of SWU and that SWU is missing its mandate by making this move. They do not believe it is possible to create a new Tier One model, but they are for the most part, willing to step aside quietly and accept SWU’s aspirations for Tier One. Their privilege and position allows them to remain at the University and to insert themselves under this newly constructed role as “facilitator” or to remain without making any changes at all.

	Faculty Member	The Acquiescent (includes survey data above under resistance)
1	Walker L	Identifies most prominently as a teacher, came to SWU for its “student centeredness;” accepts that the university is just taking the “next step,” reconstructs role by facilitates research process/production with junior colleague by sharing data with him, allowing him to be lead author, looking carefully at service commitments amongst junior faculty and protecting them, writing grants to do action research in local schools, which allows him to contribute to transition and “name” a place for self.
2	Medina L	Identifies as a teacher-researcher, came to SWU because he thought it was a place to establish a balanced t & r career, wanted to “pay it forward and mentor Latino students; “steps aside” and lets newer, t-t faculty make decisions at department level, has not made changes, but works from home more often, admits that he is of limited help for t-t folks who are experiencing a much “higher” standard than he did as t-t faculty; admits that if possible, he would just sit on a teaching faculty to absorb that work load.
3	Martinez L	Identifies most prominently as a teacher, returned to SWU to fulfill the regional mission and prepare professionals (teachers) for work; reconstructs role as a facilitator; will use talents with technology to share with others; offers work as an editor for grant writers in her college, has taken more labor intensive teaching responsibilities, and is a good “committee person,” but grant writing, increased scholarship and research are just not what she wants to do.
4	Stevens L	Identifies as a teacher-researcher, but prides himself mostly on being a strong mentor, has not reconstructed or changed work in any way, thinks SWU is missing mandate.
5	Chavez L	Identifies as a teacher-researcher, especially inspired and driven to work with Latino students who are also first generation like herself, she has not changed anything about her work habits; “spends too much blood, sweat, and tears” on teaching, believes that SWU is missing its mandate, will try to protect junior people from too much service.
6	Jerry L	Identifies as a teacher-researcher, has an affinity for the local region and undergraduate education, believes in SWU’s undergraduate access mission, plans to retire but then return to teach and work with undergraduates.

In the analysis of my data, I attempt to untangle the nuances amongst these groups and subgroups by discussing the very important sources that faculty members use to help them define and make sense of the transition. I show how these nuances are not only shaped by the sources that they use to make sense of the transition (sources include the institutional field and the organizational culture), but that sense-making and role construction are anchored/mediated by a faculty member’s habitus (Bourdieu, 1988) and general disposition. Faculty member’s sense making and constructed roles are anchored in their personal and professional biography, their experiences, and their view about faculty work and higher education, in general.

I have used and extended Gouldner’s (1957) work on locals and cosmopolitans by considering Rhoades et al., (2008) work. To this end, I name three/four sorts of habituses that I found amongst faculty: Local, Cosmopolitan, local-Cosmopolitan, and Local Cosmopolitan.

To use Bourdieu’s habitus and then make it sharper or more precise by describing habitus as either “local” or “cosmo,” I aim to show that the personal and professional intersect and give shape to how people understand and take action, constructing a role and a space for self. In other words, a faculty member who once approached his work as a “cosmopolitan,” (a researcher who was always outwards looking rather than internally or locally engaged) can be structured with a local habitus over years. At the point of transition, then, he is able to pull from local-cosmopolitan habitus while using the substantial kinds of capital (tenure, networks, insider knowledge) to help him make sense of and take action inside this university.

CURRICULUM VITA

Leslie D. Gonzales was born in Clovis, N.M. in 1981 to Thomas W. and Louise D. Gonzales. She graduated from West Las Vegas High School in Las Vegas, N.M. After high school, Leslie attended New Mexico Highlands University in Las Vegas, N.M., where she majored in Political Science with a Law Emphasis and minored in Sociology. Immediately following the completion of her Bachelor of Arts degree, Leslie began her Master of Arts degree in Political Science at the University of Texas El Paso, where she conducted a cross-comparative empirical study of Latina youth political and civic engagement under the supervision of Kathleen A. Staudt, Ph.D.. After working as a Juvenile Programs Director for the state of New Mexico, Leslie applied and was accepted into the Education Leadership and Foundations Program at the University of Texas at El Paso in 2005. During her course of study, she taught government at the El Paso Community College, conducted qualitative and mixed-methods evaluative work for the Center for Research on Educational Reform under the supervision of Dr. Arturo Pacheco, and also worked as an independent program planner and evaluator with La Fe Preparatory Schools in the *Segundo Barrio* of El Paso. Throughout her program of study and the dissertation stage, Leslie has been involved in the professional field through meetings of the American Education Research Association and American Evaluation Association. She looks forward to joining the faculty at Clemson University upon graduation as an Assistant Professor of Higher Education Leadership.

Contact Address: Leslie D. Gonzales
lesliediane1999@yahoo.com