


1-1-2018

Research Before Teaching And Service? Performances, Perceptions, And Experiences Of Faculty At Teaching-Intensive Institutions

Megan Elizabeth Throm
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations

 Part of the [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Throm, Megan Elizabeth, "Research Before Teaching And Service? Performances, Perceptions, And Experiences Of Faculty At Teaching-Intensive Institutions" (2018). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. 1971.
https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations/1971

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**RESEARCH BEFORE TEACHING AND SERVICE? PERFORMANCES,
PERCEPTIONS, AND EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY AT TEACHING-INTENSIVE
INSTITUTIONS**

by

MEGAN THROM

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2018

MAJOR: SOCIOLOGY

Approved By:

Advisor

Date

DEDICATION

In loving memory of Fred Salamey, Carol Bamrick and Polly Curtis.

Phoenix, you will always be my inspiration to get what everyone gets....a lifetime.

Carol and Polly, my two fiercely intelligent aunts, your encouragement and interest in my studies helped keep me inspired through tough times of self-doubt. Thank you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all of those who have helped me during this doctoral journey. I would especially like to thank Dr. Heather Dillaway, the chair of my committee. Without her patience, confidence, guidance, and determination this project would never have been completed. I am blessed to have been fortunate to work with her as a scholar, but appreciate her even more as the fantastic human being she is in this world. I would also like to thank Dr. Zachary Brewster for helping inspire the research topic, as well as Dr. Krista Brumley and Dr. Ben Pogodzinski for their participation on my committee.

Fellow graduate students Anabel Stoeckle, Jenny Lendrum, Heather Mooney, Beth Simmert and Monita Mongo also assisted me along this journey in multiple ways - you girls rule! Dr. Isaac Gottesman has been a source of great inspiration and guidance throughout my entire graduate school career, offering the occasional, and much needed, punk rock break from scholarship.

Finally, I want to thank my family, Chuck, Linda, Matt, and Amy, and life-partner, Paul, for being the best support system and cheerleaders a person could ever dream of. I couldn't have stayed sane without you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	11
The Teaching-Research Nexus (Plus Service).....	11
A Brief History of the Professoriate	16
The Feminization (and Devaluation) of Teaching	23
Teaching as Labor	28
Performativity	30
Chapter 3: Methodology	35
Aims and Research Question.....	35
Research Design.....	35
Participant Recruitment	36
Ethical Considerations	42
Data Collection Techniques.....	43
Data Analysis Techniques.....	46
Limitations	48
Chapter 4: Findings- Performativity of Research	51
Drinking the Kool-Aid.....	53
Colleague Comparisons	58
Tenure Denials	64

Aiming Higher	70
Chapter 5: Findings- Teaching Identities.....	77
Pathways to Teaching	78
The Students.....	98
Improving Teaching.....	109
Chapter 6: Findings – The Burden of Service	121
Volume of Service	122
Inequality of Service	153
Chapter 7: Conclusions.....	145
Summary of Findings and Connection to the Literature.....	145
Implications and Recommendations	151
Limitations	154
Original Contributions	156
Appendix A: IRB Approval.....	158
Appendix B: Informed Consent.....	161
Appendix C: Recruitment Email & Form.....	162
Appendix D: Interview Guide.....	163
Appendix E: Code Guide.....	166
References.....	168
Abstract.....	179
Autobiographical Statement.....	180

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Institutions in the Sample	40
Table 2: Participants in the Sample	41

CHAPTER 1-INTRODUCTION

“Megan, you should set your sights higher than *just* teaching”. It was a beautiful sunny fall afternoon on campus when the words struck me. The comment came in response to my stated goal of teaching sociology at a community college. While well-intended as a compliment to perceived intellectual abilities from an admired professor, the comment was vexing for me personally. With seventeen years of teaching experience, both at the middle school and post-secondary level, I know my first priority will always be teaching.

This condemnation of my professional goals was not the first time I’d encountered disparaging attitudes towards teaching in a university setting. On two separate occasions it had been suggested that I remove middle school teaching experience from my curriculum vitae due to its “unprofessional” nature. At a cursory level, such a suggestion contradicts my ultimate goal, which is to teach. On a deeper level, removing years of rigorous professional experience, which has been rewarded for excellence, was asking me to mask a master status of my identity. During presentations at conferences such as ASA (American Sociological Association), NCSA (North Central Sociological Association), and ISA (International Sociological Association), participants and audience members echoed similar experiences and frustrations regarding devaluation of their teaching identities in academia. This culturally dominant ideology suggests a status quo which honors research over teaching (and service)¹.

¹ The parenthetical reference to service is purposeful, as a way to indicate my own devaluation of service in the initial conceptualization of this project. Initially I focused solely on the analysis of the teaching-research nexus and had not considered service because of my own ignorance of the importance of service in faculty member’s lives. It was important for to me carefully consider how I dealt with this initial oversight in the literature review. I have chosen to indicate this by using the parenthetical addition of service to portions of the introduction and literature review where it is appropriate.

Such an ideology is problematic for faculty members in that it is likely to result in experiences of anomie, as described below. Furthermore, such separation of roles and identities works against the idealized notion of the faculty member as complete scholar. The structures which devalue teaching and service also contribute to the devaluation of labors of care. A healthy, well-trained, and well-balanced professoriate is imperative because academia is the setting and institution responsible for training people for all other professions and lines of work, and the institution responsible for creating and bolstering the humanistic characteristics needed for an evolving civilization. Yet, the privileging of research over teaching potentially has negative consequences for students, especially undergraduates, because the value placed on training undergraduate students (and, likewise, insuring comprehensive and thoughtful teaching) is diminished.

Academic structures which privilege research over teaching (and service) produce anomie among new and future faculty members when the realities of the present depart dramatically from an expected future (Durkheim 1893). Durkheim's anomie occurs when there is a breakdown between expectation and reality. Such a conflict occurs for faculty members who are socialized towards a career focused on research and then find their time dominated by teaching (and service). Hagstrom (1965) identified anomie in the academic profession due to a general absence of opportunities to achieve recognition for faculty work. Hermanowicz (2011) also suggests that marked changes in the academic professional structure will result in increased anomie as the institutionalized forms of recognition and reward for academic work define research through numbers of publications, citations of published work, awards for research; for instance, tenure and promotion systems reward academic work in this way. Disparities in recognition of research versus teaching (and service) further create conflict and status confusion

for many faculty members and graduate students, yet these disparities further reify the “central function” of research within the academy:

“That many academics are not productive in, and many institutions are not oriented to, research does not negate what such a framework asserts as the core social functions of the academic professional. Research is seen as central, since in the operation of the social system all other functions are contingent on it” (Hermanowicz, 2011:220).

Research also suggests that teaching awards are potentially detrimental for assistant or associate professors, because academic cultural norms suggest that the energy being expended on teaching should instead be focused on research. Putting your heart and soul into teaching detracts from time spent on research and often hurts rising professors politically (Riley 2012). In order to avoid the creation of anomie among new or future faculty, it is necessary for the domains of teaching and service, and other academic roles, to achieve greater recognition and reward. Without such recognition individual anomie, characterized by a sense of normlessness, lack of purpose, lack of meaning, and self-fragmentation, is inevitable (Hermanowicz 2011). Such a status quo is not conducive to a healthy academia or a healthy training ground for students.

According to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education 2015 Classifications update, 62% of postsecondary institutions in the United States qualify as teaching-intensive in that they are not doctoral degree granting and, thus, are not considered research intensive. Included in this category are colleges and universities that offer any combination of master’s degrees, baccalaureate degrees, and/or associate degrees. Doctoral granting, research-intensive universities made up 7% of postsecondary institutions in 2014, with the remaining portion of institutions being designated at “special focus” or tribal colleges. While only 7% of institutions are doctoral, research-intensive universities, 32% of students were

enrolled at such schools in the fall of 2014. Sixty-four percent of students were enrolled at teaching-intensive schools in that semester. This means that not only are there more teaching intensive institutions in the United States, but also these schools account for nearly two-thirds of post-secondary student enrollment.

Schuster (2011) sees the increase of contingent appointments, which includes both part- and full-time faculty off the tenure track who constitute two-thirds of all faculty appointments, as threatening the notion of the complete scholar, a scholar who presumably engages in both research and teaching. “We know a lot less than we need to know about vital developments that are redefining the faculty experience” Schuster (2011:4) claims. Geiger (2011) labels this structural phenomenon as the “bifurcation” of the professoriate (31) Due to an increase in research demands tenure track faculty have less time to devote to teaching; therefore, research institutions (and even some teaching institutions) rely more heavily on full-time, non-tenure track faculty to compensate for the teaching deficit.

This stratification of faculty roles serves to relieve the stress on tenure track faculty teaching undergraduate courses so that they can focus on their research and teach primarily advanced seminars. Geiger sees such changes as eroding the traditional faculty role as well as the notion of a complete scholar, particularly for the humanities and social sciences in research institutions. At teaching-intensive institutions, the complete scholar model has been put in jeopardy as well, as teaching institutions try to emulate the research productivity of prestigious research institutions (O’Meara 2005), a condition known as mission drift. The work experiences for faculty entering academia will likely become more, not less, differentiated. How graduate students are prepared and socialized for academic job opportunities will certainly affect their career success, in both teaching and research arenas. Understanding of academic recognition and

reward systems for both research and teaching and the teaching-research nexus in academia will also affect the connections between expectation and reality for new and future faculty members.

Research also suggests gendered trends in academic employment. Feminist scholars have argued that women have been left out of more prestigious institutions and positions – that is, jobs at research institutions -- as a result of patriarchy. For example, Ferree, Khan and Morimoto (2007) describe the *shunting* of women into teaching-intensive jobs and women as being *relegated* to jobs in teaching-intensive liberal arts colleges. The implication here, with terms such as shunting and relegated, denotes the devaluation associated with work at teaching-intensive institutions. Tolerating this point of view requires acceptance of a particular concept of prestige and professionalism- a view rooted firmly in the “publish vs. perish” climate at research focused universities. Also implicit in this viewpoint is an acceptance of teaching as insignificant. While Ferree, Khan and Morimoto were making a valid point about women not being offered positions of privilege in equal measure to their male counterparts as evidence of patriarchy, such arguments assume that women should want positions at research institutions because those positions are the “best,” compared to careers at teaching-intensive institutions which are, by default, less worthy and less important. Some see any increased legitimacy attached to teaching as a diminishment of the status of the professoriate (Brint 2011). On the other hand, positions at teaching institutions are important not only because they are more numerous but also because of the scores of undergraduate students who depend on the training that teaching institutions give them and, therefore, for the direct effect on their potential economic future.

Mass education has brought a diversity of students to college campuses, including students with wide variations in classroom preparation and academic orientation (Brint 2011). The structure of academia is under pressure to account more seriously for student learning,

especially at the undergraduate level. Critics claim that most college students learn little to nothing in the areas of critical thinking, analysis, complex reasoning and writing during their years in postsecondary education (Arum and Roksa 2010). Others proclaim that a bachelor's degree no longer certifies an individual with basic workplace skills or results in any specific job qualifications, let alone guaranteeing any real intellectual depth (Keeling and Hersh 2011). Less than half of the college presidents surveyed by Gallup in 2014 felt that colleges were effective at helping students develop skills employers desire, such as reasoning and analyzing complex problems. The changing characteristics and growing heterogeneity of college students and the growing expectations for professors to teach in a student-centered way without having an understanding of how deeper learning occurs or how variation in learner characteristics affect the ability to learn, is new according to Austin (2011). Those aspiring to the professoriate face different students and different work conditions than their predecessors. Additionally, a heightened demand for accountability means the public expects greater transparency from colleges, universities, and faculty members on how they are teaching, assessing teaching, and handling different types of students, all of which suggest that a greater emphasis should be placed on teaching and teacher training within the academy.

Much research exists on the teaching-research nexus (Taylor 2007; Bailey 1977; Gottlieb and Keith 1997; Pool et al 1997; Hattie and Marsh 1996; Friedrich and Michalak 1983; Webster 1986), and the roles of research, teaching and service in academic life in general (Furman 2004; Price and Cotton 2006; Neuman and Terosky 2007; Brazeau 2003; Porter 2007), as well as for women in particular (Park 1996; Pyke 2011; Mitchell and Hesli 2013). However most of this work has focused either entirely on the experiences of faculty members at research intensive institutions, has not differentiated results based on institution type, or has included both research

and teaching-intensive institutions in the analysis. Other work has focused on the lack of preparation for teaching in graduate school (Kain 2006; Weimer 1997), but not on preparation for service expectations. Similarly, most studies of graduate school socialization have focused primarily on current students or only the most recent graduates (Hermanowicz 2016). In *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990) Ernest Boyer hoped to end debates about the relative value of research and teaching. However, according to Brint (2011), more than two decades of reform regarding teaching have resulted in neither professional nor institutional transformation. All of the structural factors cited in this introduction -- potential for anomie, stratification of faculty roles, devaluation of teaching, heterogeneity of college students, and increased demand for quality undergraduate education -- challenge the value of the teaching-research nexus, particularly for faculty at teaching-intensive institutions who may be feeling the brunt of recent trends and challenges in higher education.

In this dissertation, I focus on the experiences regarding research, teaching and service of faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions. The focus on teaching-intensive institutions is driven by two goals. First, I aim to gain a better understanding of how the privileging of research over teaching and service is experienced, understood, performed, and reified by faculty members at institutions which have not previously been studied in depth on their own. Second, by giving voice to the experiences of those at teaching-intensive institutions I hope to add a new layer to the call for academia to increase the value placed on teaching (and service) in academia at large. Inquiry which focuses solely on research-intensive institutions promotes the privileged narrative that faculty at such institutions matter more, further undermining teaching in relation to research. If I am to take seriously the desire for greater privileging of teaching (and service) over research, it is appropriate for me to highlight the perceptions and experiences of faculty members

at teaching-intensive institutions. Boyer believes that colleges and universities should emphasize the forms of scholarship most appropriate for their missions instead of attempting to emulate recognition and reward systems at research institutions, but O'Meara (2005) contends that has not been the case, as is evidenced by mission drift. She claims that non-elite baccalaureate and master's institutions face the biggest structural challenges in involving faculty in multiple forms of scholarship, and recruiting and retaining faculty who support their primary teaching and service missions. Also, considering teaching is one of the first responsibilities new faculty members are likely to be held responsible for (Robinson and Hope 2013; Price and Cotton 2006; Hermanowicz 2011), it is important for graduate training institutions to be aware of the academic job realities that likely face most of their students upon graduation.

In order to establish the privileging of research over teaching, I now move to a review of the literature. Chapter Two delves into an exploration into the relevant literature on the teaching-research nexus, the historical lineage of the professoriate, and expectations for research, teaching and service. In order to better understand the devalued perception of teaching and service, I analyze the historical feminization of the teaching profession as well as teaching and service as emotional, reproductive, invisible labors of care. Finally, the concept of performativity is utilized to synthesize how the privileging of research, and subsequent devaluation of teaching and service, may be reinforced and reified through professors' own performances within my study.

After providing this background, I describe the qualitative methodology used to address the research goals in Chapter Three. By analyzing the stories of full-time, tenure track faculty members who are employed at teaching-intensive institutions, my goal is to explore the pathways, choices, influences and obstacles encountered by my participants as they found full-

time positions in teaching-intensive institutions in academia, and looking to see if their performances reify the privileging of research over teaching.

Chapters Four through Six comprise the findings chapters of this project. The order in which the findings chapters are presented is significant and was carefully considered. Again I had choices to make in this regard; 1) I could choose to discuss research first, which could both demonstrate its privileged nature over teaching (and service) while also perpetuating this privileging or 2) I could flip the script, and discuss research last. I opted here for the first route for a few reasons. Participants' normative performances do in fact reify this privileging of research, and thus it was important to remain true to their representation by discussing research first. Placing service last is further recognition of my own hierarchy of interests. While service is sometimes considered the ignored "middle child" of academic's job expectations (Brazeau 2003), in my results teaching suffered from this syndrome, therefore it seemed fitting to discuss teaching in the middle of the findings sections.

In Chapter Four I explore the performative nature of participants' descriptions of their relationship with research. Participants' conversations about research included boasting about quality and quantity of their research accomplishments in comparison to their peers, as well as outlines of their desires for more emphasis on research at their teaching-intensive institutions. These performances are described as being indoctrinated during graduate school. In Chapter Five I turn to how participants' developed their teaching identities, beginning with graduate school experiences, and then analyze how these experiences evolved upon gaining employment at teaching-intensive institutions. Here, participants' performances demonstrate a lack of boastful language in describing teaching achievements. Instead, they rely heavily on describing relationships with students, illustrating a different kind of discourse about teaching, in

comparison to research. In Chapter Six I turn to the invisible nature of service. The invisibility of service was first made apparent to me through my own exclusion of it as a topic in the original conceptualization of the project. Participants described the heavy weight of burdensome service responsibilities as those which they were least prepared for in graduate school. This burden, however, was only seen as detraction from being able to conduct research, not as a roadblock to improving teaching and learning experiences for students.

In Chapter Seven I summarize and connect the findings described in Chapters Four through Six back to the related literature. Through this analysis I attempt to examine the academic structures which allow for the continued privileging of research over teaching (and service) within teaching-intensive institutions. Implications for academia are described. I evaluate previously offered recommendations related to these topics and propose iterations based on the findings from this project. I also discuss limitations and biases present in the project in Chapter Seven. Most notable is my own strong identity as an educator, teacher, and academic. I conclude by pointing to contributions I feel this project makes to existing literature on the sociology of higher education. O'Meara (2005) warns that unless academic recognition and reward systems place more weight on faculty involvement in service, advising, teaching and outreach, we will continue to see a faculty whose well-being and commitment are in question, a condition of anomie which is not healthy for faculty, students, or the institution of academia as a whole.

CHAPTER 2- REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

THE TEACHING-RESEARCH NEXUS (PLUS SERVICE)

The teaching-research nexus refers to the relationship between teaching and research responsibilities in academia. This phenomenon can be analyzed from both the perspective of the employer (the university itself) and the employed (professors). Beginning with the perspective of the university and administration, John Taylor (2007) found that colleges stress the importance of both teaching and research in their marketing materials, and that many university administrators suggest that solid research is beneficial for excellence in teaching. However, the truth is that marketization of higher education has resulted in increased pressure for universities to focus on producing research. The marketization of education can be seen at all levels, as measurable results and central control become the norm as part of the neoliberal requirement for efficient and “correct” methods for all processes (Apple 2005). This marketization can be found in new ranking systems and other measures of institutional prestige that rely heavily on scholarly publications and research funding dollar amounts as indicators of faculty quality, all non-teaching centric outcomes (Volkwein and Sweitzer 2006). While there have been some attempts to apply pressure on academia to measure and be held accountable for student learning outcomes, these assessment movements have been unsuccessful for the most part, especially in changing faculty mindsets and/or the systems of faculty recognition and reward (Brint 2011).

The marketization of academia creates what Wright et al. (2004) classify as “greedy” institutions, a designation based on the amount of effort expected of academic staff with insufficient compensation. University professors face increasing workloads, including teaching, guidance, research, committee involvement, grant/funding acquisition and service expectations placed on them by administrators (Kain 2006). In this environment of multiple expectations it is

difficult to assess all of the roles academics must fill; thus, promotion procedures (Blau 1973) and reward structures (Kain 2006) rely heavily on evidence of research activity because it is easily measured and quantifiable. This reliance on research as a means for evaluation has led to what is commonly referred to as a culture of “publish or perish” (Booth 2004). In order to gain and maintain tenure, or other advancement, professors must be productive producers of published research.

While universities do measure effectiveness in teaching to some degree through course evaluations, this method of evaluation is often regarded as unreliable. Additionally, the shift in focus to teaching evaluations in the 1970s encouraged faculty to pay attention to students as consumers and opt for behaviors which would amp up evaluation scores, such as focusing on entertaining delivery, clarity of lecture, and expression of kindness and respect. While these are not necessarily negative qualities for a teacher to have, focusing on such surface traits and on utilizing weak student evaluations for gauging teaching resulted in decreased expectations of students according to Brint (2011). A common quip in the literature is that only “absolutely awful” teaching performances would result in possible denials of tenure (Park 1996; Price and Cotton 2006). Carl Wieman (2010, 2011a, 2011b) has argued fervently for changes to the traditional lecture format in science education in addition to pushing for advances in methods for evaluating effective teaching at research-intensive institutions, but Wieman in particular (and academia in general) has ignored the importance of providing training on such pedagogical practices.

The strain of being paid to do one job (or multiple jobs) while having your worth evaluated on how well you do another -- that is, research -- is a potential source of anomie for faculty (Brint 2011). While there is some evidence that administrators see greater acceptance of

different types of scholarship as valuable at their institutions, faculty are wary about recognizing such cultural and structural shifts (Clegg and Esping 2005). When surveying faculty, Clegg and Esping found that simply having a university policy of valuing teaching and the scholarship of teaching does not necessarily result in changes to practice. Beliefs that faculty will not get promoted if primarily teaching, or that colleagues who emphasize teaching are simply not as capable as those who emphasized research are still alive and well. Such ideology portrays teaching as a burden, similar to how faculty members in my sample describe service as well. Some institutions, such as Kansas State University (KSU), have instituted teaching recognitions (e.g., the University Chair for Distinguished Teaching Scholars) but these new initiatives have seen mixed results. The majority of nominations for these positions (70%) have come from just two colleges at KSU, and three colleges at KSU have never made a single submission. KSU faculty surveys further indicate that the campus community is not well informed about the position (Clegg and Esping 2005). Additionally, sparks of change regarding greater emphasis on teaching have primarily been voluntary within academia, and Brint (2011) blames this for the relatively slow and shallow adoption of good pedagogical practices within the college classroom. Without a culture of teaching undergraduate students are not likely to experience anything significantly different than their predecessors, and middle level institutions will continue to experience mission drift. In many ways, it is easier to continue placing priority on research than it is to shift emphasis to teaching.

Gayle Brazeau (2003) suggests that service suffers from the “middle child syndrome” in that it has received even less attention in tenure and promotion policies, in comparison to teaching and research. Kerry O’Meara (2002) further explains that the culture of research, which is resistant to change, has at times hampered attempts at assessing service in tenure and

promotion decisions. Andrew Furman (2004) calls for a need to make changes to the overvaluation of research at the expense of service in tenure and promotion decisions. He further argues that too much emphasis is placed on the quantity, instead of the quality, of service participation when it is considered in such processes, mimicking similar evaluations of research.

Prior to undergoing any evaluation procedures, academics must be hired in the first place and, while nearly all academic job postings list teaching experience as a requirement, very few require evidence of effective teaching or teaching credentials of any kind (Kain 2006, Mahaffey and Caffrey 2003, Wright et al. 2004). Considering that teaching is the most common activity shared by academics, the focus on research for determining hierarchies and employment qualifications by universities becomes problematic. The academic structure is also compliant in the privileging of research over teaching (and service) in the preparation of graduate students. Austin (2011) suggests that doctoral students' expectations about the kinds of careers and life situations they seek often differ from the expectations and assumptions of established faculty. Hermanowicz (2016) also suggest that there are discrepancies between expectations and experiences in the socialization process of graduate students. Despite interested in teaching, students' socialization experiences are heavily oriented in research which contributes to a reality shock among those who enter the professoriate. Career goals stressed in school are not met, which reinforces disillusionment (Hermanowicz 2016). Doctoral education serves as a period of socialization to beliefs, ideologies, norms, values, behaviors, and practices. Austin suggests that socialization processes should introduce graduate students to the history of higher education and its role in society. O'Meara (2005) sees socialization of graduate students toward traditional definitions of scholarship as one potential barrier for reform in higher education. If graduate students continue to be socialized to prioritize research, there is little hope for changes in

academia; if trained to emulate their mentors, graduate students will continue to reify and perpetuate the values for which they were socialized. Austin (2011) does not see increasing preparation for teaching in graduate school as necessarily resulting in lower research productivity. Ultimately, she believes that better preparation for teaching would ultimately result in new and future faculty members having to spend less time figuring out their new roles, thus resulting in an opportunity for increased research productivity and less disconnection between expectation and reality.

Utilizing data from the Carnegie International Survey of the Academic Profession, Gootlieb and Keith (1997) and Poole et al. (1997) investigated the teaching-research nexus of academics from around the world. While entering higher academia generally requires obtaining a PhD (or equivalent), 90% of recently graduated doctoral students were employed in teaching-centric institutions, “causing the familiar complaints about the discrepancy between a training in research and a career in teaching” (Gottlieb and Keith 1997:401). Kain (2006) suggests graduate students are generally inadequately prepared for the teaching roles they will be expected to fulfill upon entering academic positions. Maryellen Weimer (1997) points to evidence of the devaluation of teaching in the reluctance graduate schools have fostered toward offering pedagogical preparation.

Criticisms of the primacy of research over teaching cannot be placed completely on the shoulders of the structure of promotion procedures and graduate school preparation. The culture of academia maintains and perpetuates this legacy in the ways academic professionals regard and police one another. In interviews with academic staff, Taylor (2007) found that while nearly all faculty members emphasized the importance of both teaching and research, they also believed that esteem from their peers was based primarily on their research activities. Similarly, Booth

(2004) interviewed academics and found that even those who prized teaching regarded it as less sophisticated than research. Furthermore, even when academics did talk about the importance of quality teaching, a common theme placed the emphasis on research as a necessary means for recruiting students and in ensuring that teaching was up to date and relevant. So while instructors believed that research was important for their teaching duties, the reverse was not necessarily the case (Taylor 2007). Furthermore, in a meta-analysis of 58 studies incorporating 498 correlations of effectiveness related to teaching and research, Hattie and Marsh (1996) found zero correlation overall between research and teaching in universities. “We must conclude that the common belief that research and teaching are inextricably entwined is an enduring myth. At best, research and teaching are very loosely coupled” (pg. 529).

This existing literature shows that research is privileged over teaching in graduate programs, evaluation systems, and is felt via peer pressure as well. Thus, interactions among academic professionals reaffirm and reify the privileging of research, and the structure of graduate training programs as well as recognition and reward systems for faculty further hold up this privilege. In previous literature faculty members do indicate that teaching is undervalued in the university relative to research. Booth (2004) points out that, at the beginning of the 20th century, British and North American universities actually focused more heavily on teaching because of a commitment to the moral and intellectual development of individual students. After World War Two, however, any importance placed on teaching gave way to a scholarly research model, with publishing becoming a distinguishing feature of the professoriate (O’Meara and Rice 2005; Boyer 1990). To better understand this shift in academia, I now turn to a brief history of the professoriate.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PROFESSORiate

The university most of us are familiar with today began to take shape after the culmination of World War II. Previously, the opportunity to study at university was available primarily to a small number of predominately white, male, upper class citizens. Scholars were relatively limited in number, functioning as mentors for small groups of students engaged in academic pursuits which highlighted the importance of knowledge for knowledge's sake. These scholars intertwined the activities of research and teaching, enjoying a great deal of autonomy. The end of the war, however, brought about many changes to this model. First, the federal government became increasingly involved with research conducted at universities. Introduction of the government as the major patron responsible for funding research in both applied and basic fields (Lowen 2005) resulted in significant alterations within the American university. Besides a seismic change in funding sources, the quantity and volume of colleges and universities swelled in response to calls for institutions of higher education to aid in the creation of a democratic egalitarian citizenry (Altbach 1980) in addition to advancing research and training after the war. This increase in the number of colleges and universities also resulted in an increased demand for academics to fulfill faculty roles.

As career opportunities and research funding flourished for scholars, the tradition of dedicating one's career to any one particular institution drifted away. Stanley Katz (2006) argues that the post-war boom in higher education resulted in a shift of many academics' loyalty from institutions to commitments to national disciplines and research. Not only were academics in high demand as college attendance levels swelled, but they now had gained additional autonomy over administrators, vis-à-vis their direct connection to funding sources. Prior to the war it had been the responsibility of administration to search for and procure financial support, but now

postwar faculty members were able to attract patronage themselves (Lowen 2005), and thus were able to market themselves based on the ability to attract outside financial resources. Such practice has become systematically expected of those applying for academic positions today, as evidenced by the common job posting requiring evidence of successful attainment of external funding. Schuster (2011:7) uses Kerr's vocabulary to describe this model as the "multiversity," as universities experience an expansion of missions to serve a greater variety of clients with multiple demands.

As the nation edged closer to the Cold War, funding for research skyrocketed, bringing institutions of higher education along with it (Altbach 1980). The alteration in focus of the professoriate towards research has been judiciously documented by historians, as is illustrated by analyzing themes presented by former presidents of the AAUP. In 1930, the presidential address by Henry Crew framed the professoriate as a teaching profession, but by 1942 president Frederick Deibler claimed that faculty members are more akin to entrepreneurs (Lewis and Ryan, 1976). Because increases in public funding correspond with increases in accountability, the attachment of colleges and universities to government funding meant that they also had to rely more heavily on publications as proof of productivity (Altbach 2005). Thus began the now common practice of evaluating faculty based primarily on publication of research, which is often referred to as a climate of "publish or perish" in the modern university. Lewis and Ryan (1976) quote the AAUP's president Edward Kirkland as arguing that "publication is practically the only means by which the professor is brought to the judgment of his peers" in 1948.

The importance of peer judgment reflects the AAUP's attempts at mimicking the mode of professionalization utilized by the fields of medicine and the law. Rebecca Lowen (2005) indicates that Stanford was known to overturn or endorse departmental decisions related to hiring

and tenure based on research patronage early on. And, while Phillip Altbach (2005) asserts that teaching and research are mutually beneficial to one another, he argues that research has always garnered greater levels of prestige compared to those who focused primarily on teaching.

Stanley Katz (2006) confirms that the reward structure set up for faculty now exists mainly to serve the research community, which he warns is too narrowly defined and has caused major dysfunction within the rest of the academic realm. The AAUP's own philosophy echoes this sentiment, citing that the purpose of educational institutions is to bring together teachers and students in an environment that supports the learning process, and that everything else is subordinate to this primary goal (Himstead 1942). However, colleges and universities seemed to have missed this memo, and have transformed themselves into institutions that more closely resemble factories churning out degrees than places harboring intellectual rigor on the one hand, and mini enclaves of research activity nearly completely separated from the majority of the students they serve on the other. Schuster (2011) defines this era as the academic capitalist university. He sees the paradigm shifting now to a stratified university, identified by a) an insurgence of off-track full-time appointments, b) threats to tenure and promotion systems (traditional systems of recognition and reward), and c) differentiated compensation packages for faculty. This latest model is compartmentalized, stratified, fragmented, and under increased financial pressure, which results in a more tightly managed workforce and a more polarized, vulnerable faculty. Additionally, a clogged labor market has had the effect of raising the (research) bar for hiring criteria as well as the evaluation criteria for promotion to tenure (Geiger 2011).

Considering the decline in the traditional role of holistic professor with a career involving integrated teaching, research, service and administrative duties, William Plater (2008) asks

whether the current model of doctoral education is sufficient for emerging workforce realities. Logic suggests that, given academics general proclivity for analyzing institutions, academia would be acutely aware of these changes and in an advantageous position to make suggestions on how institutions might adjust accordingly. Academics pride themselves on reflective, in-depth thought experiments, often urging others to see new ways of thinking and understanding the world. Somewhat ironically, academics have been reluctant to apply these tenants of thought to their own stations in life. Stanley Katz (2006) laments the fact that most academic disciplines are training faculty members much in the same way they have for decades, as though they will all inevitably become research university professors, although statistically very few will. John Dewey, founder of the AAUP, bemoaned such unwillingness as an inability to “inquire into our own situation” (Plater 2008). In their report on “The Word of Faculty: Expectations, Priorities and Rewards,” the AAUP (1993) advocated for scholarship that would embrace a variety of intellectual activities and the totality of scholarly accomplishments, instead of the standard, narrowly focused concept of research, in addition to recommendations that institutional reward systems should reflect the fundamental importance of effective teaching, arguing that teaching is a basic activity of the professoriate.

This argument was also made famous by Ernest Boyer in his reports for The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1987 and 1990. In the first of these reports, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (1987), Boyer argued that institutions should put less emphasis on research, suggesting instead that undergraduate students needed the full attention of their instructors. He followed this with *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), in which he challenged the stagnant view of scholarship, calling for a broader understanding of scholarship which would include discovery, integration, application

and teaching. After *Scholarship Reconsidered* there were some progressive attempts to improve teaching and change the culture of scholarship, but none have been able to take hold in a significant enough way so as to alter the structure of academia in ways Boyer hoped. Champions of these progressive attempts face problems winning support and, in many fields, pedagogy is still considered new and suspect as a topic and method of serious research. Research about post-secondary classrooms is neither well understood nor well regarded (Huber, Hutchings and Shulman 2005). Scholars of teaching and learning face structural hurdles for funding, lengthy human subjects reviews, and little recognition. Scholars of teaching and learning must be prepared to legitimize their work in ways that many other researchers do not. The culture, academic discourse, and recognition of the scholarship of teaching and learning is still lacking (Huber, Hutchings and Shulman 2005).

In those areas where teaching and learning scholarship have been able to take hold, the transition has been slow and spotty. Evans, Grace and Roen (2005) claim that it takes at least three to five years for faculty to transition from traditionally teacher-centered to learner-centered paradigms, and enacting a scholarship of teaching can take an additional five or more years. Workshops, a common method of training faculty in regards to progressive teaching methods, have a poor record of driving change (Evans, Grace and Roen 2005). Much more needs to be done to align recognition with scholarly teaching practices. While there is much rhetoric about intersections and connections among teaching, research, and service, the academic policies and practices, and more importantly systems of recognition and reward, have not kept pace. Boyer (1990) proposes that colleges and universities should emphasize the forms of scholarship most appropriate for their missions instead of attempting to emulate recognition procedures at research universities. But across institutional types scholarship of discovery has persisted as the most

legitimate (O'Meara 2005) and in terms of valuing academic roles, teaching still only has to be good enough (Harland 2016). Instead, the slight expansion of the definitions of legitimate scholarship used in faculty evaluation or mission statements has caused greater confusion and ambiguity for faculty rather than less.

Altbach (1997) points out that there has been little to no support from the professoriate on increasing emphasis on teaching, although 42% feel that the pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching at their institutions. This pressure to publish reinforces the hiring of contingent faculty members to free up time for tenured faculty members to conduct research (Altbach 1997; Geiger 2011). Altbach argues that not only does this research-centric focus add to the decrease in attention to teaching, but that it also creates a narrowly focused research agenda globally. The 10-20% of the American professoriate at major research universities maintains control over the focus of research, funding and access to publication, thus marginalizing those who are not part of the U.S mainstream research system. Compounding this problem is the fact that many academics who would like to be more involved in research, but who find themselves struggling to make ends meet by teaching multiple classes (often at multiple colleges), have little to no time left over to devote to research and publication (HCEW 2014).

Altbach (1980) sees the expectation of research and publication from ALL faculty members as neither realistic nor functioning to meet the needs of mass higher education systems. William Plater (2008) asserts that sustaining faculties based on the ideal of the complete scholar engaged fully in research, teaching, service and governance is unsustainable for American colleges and universities. Katz (2006) suggests that teaching should be the core mission of the professoriate, pointing out that teaching is a much more complex and variegated activity than it was a century ago, thus deserving of higher prestige and attention than it currently receives.

Service has also emerged as necessary for institutional welfare while remaining unacknowledged as a form of real work (Neuman and Tersoky 2007). Others argue that the notion of the complete scholar who is engaged fully in research, teaching, and service, is possible only when Boyer's four domains of scholarship are treated as equal (Huber, Hutchings and Shulman 2005; Evans, Grace and Rowen 2011; O'Meara 2011).

The emphasis on research has also disproportionately affected scholars in terms of gender. Teelken and Deem (2013) found that female faculty members were more likely to compromise research endeavors in favor of teaching and domestic related responsibilities. Park (1996) argues that jobs identified as culturally feminine, such as teaching and service, are undervalued and underpaid in relation to those, such as research, which are culturally defined as masculine. Pyke (2011) suggests that structural and cultural solutions are required in order to correct the systematic problem of gender imbalances in faculty service demands. These demands arise partially because women are "asked more often" to participate in service and teaching, leaving men to spend more time on research (Mitchell and Heslie 2013; O'Meara et al 2017). Park (1996) further argues that the research university is a hierarchy which replicates the patriarchal family wherein capable women are encouraged to identify more with masculine labor (such as research) than to identify with feminine labor (such as teaching and service). She demands that in order to create a more women-centered university this gender hierarchy must be deconstructed by re-assessing the prevailing criteria for tenure and promotion. In order to more fully understand this definition of teaching as feminine labor I turn now to a brief history of the feminization of teaching.

THE FEMINIZATION (AND DEVALUATION) OF TEACHING

While so far I have referred to teaching primarily as it relates to the professoriate, the colloquialism “teaching” is most often connected with those activities engaged in by elementary and secondary educators in k-12 schools. Additionally, it is important to recognize that not all teaching practices are considered equally acceptable in either of these realms. For example, in academia, teaching of graduate students is considered more prestigious than teaching undergraduates. A similar phenomenon holds true for teachers in secondary grades (primarily high school) in comparison to elementary school teachers. A brief history of what is commonly referred to as teaching, referring to teaching in k-12 schools, will be useful in order to better understand how and why teaching is denigrated in academia. Understanding the history of teaching, as well as what is commonly referred to as the feminization of teaching, helps to make sense of the subsequent privileging of research and devaluation of teaching in the modern university.

Every teacher has most assuredly been exposed to the vapid expression “those who can-do, those who can’t- teach”. At its core, this statement suggests that those who choose to become teachers only do so because they are not capable of becoming successful in some other more worthwhile career. This sentiment is echoed when faculty believe that colleagues who emphasize teaching are simply not as capable at research (Clegg and Esping 2005). Interestingly, the roots of this assertion are most likely related to the initial dominance of education by men. Moss et al (2008) suggest that colonial male teachers were “mocked as pathetic, unmanly creatures that did not have the physicality for farming or the gumption for the legal profession” (p 4). In the early 1900s male teachers were often seen as effeminate and submissive (Blount 2000). While there are reasonable arguments to be made linking the devaluation of teaching to its feminization, such

ideas show us that the occupation was venerated long before women were most likely to teach. Hence, before getting to the feminization part of this story, we begin with teaching as an emasculated occupation.

During the colonial period, schools in the United States employed almost exclusively men who were charged with educating young white children, primarily boys (Lortie 1975; Moss et al 2008). These men were hired for specific, often brief, periods of time, and enjoyed nearly complete autonomy in all matters of the school. They were typically young, single, having no official preparation, but instead were chosen for religious/moral character. These teachers also likely held other jobs when school was not in session, such as farming, surveying, and innkeeper, and only taught for a few years before entering training/academia to prepare them for alternative careers such as ministry, medicine and law (Lortie 1975; Moss et al 2008; Montgomery 2009; Levin 2000). These men saw teaching as a means of making additional money and rarely fully identified themselves as teachers (Lortie 1975; Moss et al 2008; Montgomery 2009; Hoffman 1981). During this time the school year was short compared to today's standards, and attendance was not mandated. While some women ran dame schools in their homes for very young children, women were not welcomed into classrooms until the 19th century.

Urbanization on the East Coast, and industrialization in parts of the Midwest, had a huge impact on changing American schools. When the first multiple classroom schools were built in the early 1800's men still made up a vast majority of the teaching profession, but that was about to change (Lortie 1975). One of the starkest contrasts between the one-room schoolhouse and the larger multiple classroom schools was a decrease in teacher independence. In colonial one room schoolhouses, there was no need for administrators of any kind; teachers were responsible for all aspects of running the school. With larger schools came increased oversight (Lortie 1975). While

it is difficult to show causation due to a myriad of intersecting social situations occurring at the time, this increase in oversight directly correlates with the beginnings of feminization in education. Strober and Lanford (1986) claim that school officials believed women teachers, being more docile and willing to take orders, would be more compliant than their male counterparts in carrying out centralized directives.

At the same time, these larger school districts were increasing the length of the school year, which made the custom of teaching during one's "off season" difficult for men. Teaching never was regarded as high-paying work, so the wages (for male teachers) were a bonus of sorts. Lengthening the school year made it nearly impossible for men to maintain two occupations, but the salary from teaching was never high enough for men to support a family on it alone (Strober and Lanford 1986; Warren 1989). In addition to the longer school year and increases in oversight, the more formalized curriculum and increase in the number of children attending school for longer periods of time meant that becoming a teacher now required additional training (Strober and Lanford 1986; Montgomery 2009; Hoffman 1981; Warren 1989). Certification requirements, while not entirely universal, were becoming the norm, and Normal schools began training teachers, many of them women. Preparing teachers became the focus of the Normal School movement, and its father, Horace Mann, was a vocal advocate for hiring women (Moss et al 2008). Thus, by the end of the 19th century, the United States witnessed the feminization of teaching as an occupation.

While teaching was becoming less advantageous to men economically, industrialization brought them an increase in employment opportunities outside of teaching (Griffiths 2006). At the same time, modernization in farming techniques, urbanization, and shrinking family sizes also offered women, particularly daughters, decreased domestic responsibilities at home

(Warren 1989; Montgomery 2009). Increasing awareness of issues related to child labor, plus surges in immigration, led to huge increases in school enrollment (Montgomery 2009). The nation desperately needed teachers, and there weren't enough men to fulfil the demand.

Elementary grade teaching in particular was seen as an extension of women's "natural" child-rearing capacity (Hoffman 1981; Strober and Lanford 1986; Warren 1989; Bascia and Young 2001), and Horace Mann viewed women as having a "preponderance of affection over intellect" (Moss et al 2008,), making women ideal teachers for young children. Proponents of allowing women to teach, such as Catharine Beecher, viewed teaching as valuable preparation for their roles as wives and mothers (Blount 2000). However, Beecher also viewed teaching as providing a safer work environment for women than the few alternatives available to them at the time, such as in clothing mills. Beecher was concerned by women's economic vulnerability, and hoped that teaching might be viewed as an acceptable alternative to mothering for women who did not marry or start families (Hoffman 1981). Returning to the "Those who can do" sentiment from earlier on, a new interpretation arises with roots in the gender inequality of work. Those who can do other jobs, aka men, do them. Those who couldn't, aka women who aren't allowed to work in most other fields, could teach. Teaching did provide an unprecedented level of independence for women, being one of the few paid employment options available to them (Moss et al 2008), and some saw teaching as a way of becoming part of the movement towards women's rights (Hoffman 1981).

The aforementioned historical shifts in American society were important for attracting women to the teaching occupation, but economics also played a role in regards to income. Wages for teaching were never very high; for example, in 1890, the earnings of teachers was ½ that of skilled blue collar workers (Warren 1989), and women were paid much less than men (Lortie

1975; Montgomery 2009; Strober and Lanford 1986; Warren 1989). While it is nearly impossible to say for certain whether the feminization of teaching is responsible for the depressed salaries in schools or whether the low salaries deterred men (a classic “chicken or the egg” scenario), it remains that by the end of the 19th century women had virtually taken over the teaching profession. This was particularly true in the younger grades, with women holding 86% of teaching positions in 1920 (Warren 1989; Hoffman 1981). Male teachers were employed largely in the upper grades and in newly formed administrative roles, which was often used as an excuse for the extreme wage differentials experienced by gender. Male high school teachers earned up to twice as much as the more numerous female teachers in the elementary grades at the time (Lortie 1975; Stober and Lanford 1986; Richardson and Hatcher 1983; Bascia and Young 2001; Moss et al 2008). The feminization and devaluation of teaching is connected to the current devaluation of the teaching profession in American society, even at the college level.

Teaching not only suffers devaluation due to feminization, but also because it falls under the umbrella of emotional labor and labor of care. Shelly Park (1996) argues that a gendered division of labor exists in academia because women’s traditional work, that of teaching and service, are undervalued in comparison to men’s traditional work of research. She categorizes this as women being assigned greater responsibility for domestic and emotional labor in their workplaces much as they are in their homes. Thus, women faculty members perform the majority of caregiving work within the institution while, simultaneously, receiving little credit for doing so. In order to further discuss the devaluation of teaching and service in comparison to research, it will be helpful to understand teaching and service as emotional, reproductive, and invisible labor.

TEACHING AND LABOR

Reproductive labor comprises those activities required for maintaining and enhancing the health, welfare and capabilities of individuals, families and communities organized by families, the state or markets in households or other institutions (Glenn 2010). Teaching and service fall under this categorization, in that both teaching and service can enhance the health of individuals as well as civic health in general. At all levels (i.e., elementary, secondary and post-secondary) teachers enhance the human capital of others by increasing their levels of knowledge and skill in a multitude of ways, consequently increasing their marketability in the labor force. The labor of care is also seen as a subset of reproductive labor which centers on production of affective relations with individuals which enhances workers' capacities to labor (England, Budig, and Folbre 2002). Teachers also ensure the mental health of their students by teaching coping skills, time management, metacognition and how to interact successfully with their peers. The labor of care, which produces immaterial goods, is a contradiction to the assumption of the care-free rational economic man theorized by Weber, Marx and other labor theorists. The labor of care ranges from caring, feeding and clothing, to teaching, and other methods of nurturing individuals (England et al. 2002; Perrenas 2008).

Teaching and service also involve emotional labor, which is the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display, requiring the suppression of (true) feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others (Hochschild 1983). Emotional labor requires contact with other people, requires employees produce an emotional state in others, and ultimately these emotions are controlled by employers (Steinberg and Figart 1999). Brown, Horner, Kerr and Scanlon (2014) further suggest

that the emotional labor of teachers differs from the types of work usually involving emotion work in that teachers' interactions with students are repeated, intense and long term.

Forms of emotional labor, reproductive labor, and/or labor of care are done primarily by women. Employers have paid lower wages for this type of work (Hoyle 2001; Perrons 2007), thus reinforcing the rendering of such labor as less prestigious than other forms of economically productive labor. Reproductive labor has been traditionally seen as existing in the private realm, in contrast to the public forms of productive labor.

Service work of all types involves unrecognized and unremunerated tacit knowledge and emotional labor. In addition, teaching has become subjected to deskilling and degradation through the separation of conception (the intellectual nature of teaching pedagogy) and execution (the act of teaching), and increased levels of administrative control and logic (Apple and Junyck 1990). Apple and Junyck are speaking to the scriptive nature of modern curriculum materials, removing creativity and autonomy from teaching in the name of increased rigor and common curriculum standards. This deskilling also plays into the notion that anyone can teach, assuming that teaching requires little thought or intellectual rigor. Shelley Park (1996) describes this notion as being similar to the notion that anyone can parent or be a good housekeeper because it assumes these activities are uncreative and unchallenging. This deskilling, coupled with the connection of teaching (and service) with reproductive, and thus gendered, labor is largely responsible for the lack of prestige awarded the profession of teaching.

Researchers such as Park (1996) argue that current working assumptions regarding what constitute good research, teaching and service, and the relative importance of each of these endeavors, reflects and perpetuates masculine values and practices which prevents the professional advancement of feminine faculty if they are primarily in teaching-intensive

institutions. While I cannot evaluate whether women faculty are unable to advance their careers in this dissertation, this devaluation negatively affects both men and women who are employed in roles which prioritize teaching and service over research because these roles and responsibilities are associated with feminized, emotional, invisible, reproductive labor of care.

I now turn to the idea of performativity, specifically Judith Butler's theorizing of performativity, to understand how faculty member's performances are entwined with these habitual and taken for granted practices of prioritizing research and devaluing teaching and service. Performativity is useful in understanding the socialization and norms in academia which perpetuate the privileging of research over teaching.

PERFORMATIVITY

Judith Butler's initial conception of performativity focused primarily on gender performativity, as discussed in *Gender Trouble* (1990). Butler further delineates the idea in later works such as *Bodies That Matter* (1993) and *the Psychic Life of Power* (1998). While Butler's initial conceptualization focused solely on performativity of gender, she and other theorists have broadened these original conceptualizations so that they are able to describe a range of performative identities. Authors have since used the concept of performativity to examine the perceptions and experiences of the Dutch Police Force (Halsema and Halsema 2006), project managers (Hodgson 2005), social workers (Powell and Gilbert 2006), and many other defined groups in society (Gregson 2000). While acknowledging Butler's original focus on gendered performativity, I use a broader notion of the concept so that I can assess how participants in my study perform and reify the primacy of research over teaching.

Butler's conception of performativity builds on subjection work by Foucault and Austin's speech acts. Austin (1962) and Butler (1993) distinguish performative utterances as forms of

authoritative speech. This understanding of performative acts provides a way for identity to be seen as constructed in and through one's actions, instead of merely existing prior to the action (Hodgson 2005). Identity is therefore established through reenactments of previous performances, or citations, and occurs through the forced reiteration of norms (Butler 1993, Hodgson 2005). Viki Bell (1999) links performativity and the citational nature of belonging. Such a performativity of belonging cites norms that make real a community or group through repetition of normalized codes. Damian Hodgson (2005) utilizes performativity to analyze the subversive nature of professional performances carried out by project managers. Hodgson argues that the citational repetition of jargon and normalized actions helps workers to embody and carry forth a professional identity. These performances are enacted with the effect of both encouraging such conduct in others, and legitimizing the behavior of the performer.

Annemi and Lilian Halsema (2006) apply performativity to evaluation procedures involving of the Dutch police force. These authors see the definitions of jobs, titles, duties and tasks as fixed by gendered meanings of work like those discussed in a previous section of this literature review. Halsema and Halsema argue that these gendered meanings of work can make invisible some forms of work, especially work involving emotional demands. When such work is made invisible it is not valued in job evaluation systems, much like how service is not valued in tenure and promotion procedures within academia. Jason Powell and Tony Gilbert (2006) also utilize Butler's notion of performativity in regards to service work and professionalization in an analysis of the social work profession. Powell and Gilbert describe the legitimacy of many professions as being dependent on the establishment and maintenance, or performance, of appropriate norms of knowledge and conduct. Powell and Gilbert define Butler's (1993) notion of performativity as the "reiterative power to reproduce a phenomena" (professionalization)

which the performance then regulates and constrains. As discussed in Chapter Four, participants in my study reify and reproduce the privileging of research over teaching in their performances, thereby reinforcing what it means to be a good academic.

Nicky Gregson and Gillian Rose (2000) differentiate Goffman's concept of performance and Butler's concept of performativity by explaining that performances are what subjects do, while performativity involves the citation practices which reproduce and/or subvert discourse and identity. However Gregson and Rose see both concepts as important for maintaining and reifying existing power relations. Gregson and Rose (2000) detail the reflection of the researchers on their own reiterations towards research as an academic performance.

Execution of research projects, their writing, and their dissemination, are supreme examples of academic performance and performativity. Riven with power, including the citation reinscription and disruption of established academic knowledge; produced, received and interpreted interrelationally by networks of academics; and themselves constitutive of spatialities of knowledge, these performances seem to us to be little different in their fundamentals to the very sorts of social practices which we examined above (in studying car boot sales and community artists). And yet there is a remarkable reluctance on the part of academics to acknowledge this.....notably they permit the representation of academic activity as the performance of intentional, knowing, anterior subjects; able to interpret and represent a vast range of other social practices for academic audiences to interpret in turn, yet being themselves somehow immune from the same process.

Gregson and Rose (2000) call for academics to admit to the citationality of the power structures which produce academic performances, and perhaps reflect on these academic subjectivities and

their written performances. In uncovering the dominant and systematic practices that are perpetuated by participants in their performative conversations with me, I hope to offer opportunities to disrupt these patterns and provide a space for teaching and service to gain greater value within academic culture.

Having laid the foundation of research privilege and performances as reenactments of socialization, I now turn to describing the data collected in this project which attempts to further explore these ideas. First, in the methods chapter I explain in detail the qualitative interview methods utilized for this project, followed by three findings chapters.

CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I present information related to the methodology used to investigate the relationship of teaching and research in academia through analysis of individual experience and related structural elements present at the institutional level. First I summarize the project aims and research question. This is followed by a description of the research design, participant recruitment, ethical considerations, and data collection tools utilized. Finally, I present the data analysis techniques employed, concluding with a discussion of limitations of the research project.

AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTION

By analyzing the stories of faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, my goal is to explore the pathways, choices, influences and obstacles encountered throughout their lives in academia. Through this analysis I hope to examine the academic structures that allow for the continued privileging of research over teaching, even within teaching-intensive institutions. The main research question associated with these goals is:

- How is the teaching-research nexus experienced, understood, managed, and navigated by faculty at teaching-intensive institutions?

RESEARCH DESIGN

Qualitative interviewing served as the main method of data collection for this study. I relied heavily on the guidance and strategies regarding interviewing offered by Corrine Glesne and Robert Weiss. Glesne (1999) states that the strength of qualitative interviewing can be found in its ability to shed light on that which is not readily visible. Glesne describes life history interviews as focusing on the life experiences of individuals with the intention of better understanding concepts of culture. The goals of this dissertation project were multi-faceted, with

aims of understanding the culture of academia by exploring how individuals experienced teaching and research throughout their academic lives, as well as looking to uncover how the structure of academia influences these experiences. Weiss (1994) sees interviews as the method of choice for projects with the following aims: developing detailed descriptions, integrating multiple perspectives, describing processes, developing holistic descriptions, learning how events are interpreted, bridging intersubjectivities, and identifying variables and framing hypotheses for quantitative research. This project aligns with the aims of integrating multiple perspectives and describing processes. I hoped to integrate multiple perspectives in order to describe the institution of academia writ large. I also attempt to describe processes in analyzing how participants experienced the teaching-research nexus as they progressed from graduate school into teaching-intensive careers.

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

A combination of variation and homogenous purposeful sampling techniques were used to select rich cases for in-depth study. Variation sampling allowed for the selection of cases that cut across various departments and institutions in the quest for common patterns, while homogenous samples involving social science/humanities departments at teaching-intensive institutions allowed for selection of similar cases (Glesne 1999; Weiss 1994). Therefore, my sampling method involved first identifying teaching-intensive institutions in a Midwestern state which included 2-year community colleges and 4-year undergraduate-focused schools, followed by selection of participants within these institutions from relatively homogenous social science and humanities departments.

First I identified all post-secondary institutions in a Midwestern state using the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Data on Schools, cross-referenced with data from

the state's Department of Education and The Higher Learning Commission (formerly NCA). Next, that list was narrowed to only include only "teaching-intensive" institutions, or those not qualified as research-intensive. Finally, for profit, special focus, tribal, rural, very small and schools outside of a 1 hour driving radius of Detroit were eliminated. After selecting six institutions meeting these qualifications, I utilized college websites and brochures to identify potential faculty members in Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science, History, Psychology, and Economics departments as candidates. While not entirely homogenous, these departments are representative of humanities/social science divisions, and thus will provide a baseline for analysis that could potentially be expanded to include other departments in future work. These departments were chosen because the studies which sparked this interest were focused primarily in similar departments. Sociology was also of interested being as that it is the department I am in.

This selection process yielded a total of 301 candidates. Beginning in August of 2015, personalized emails (Appendix B) were sent to all 301 candidates introducing myself as a graduate student at Wayne State University and explaining that I was interested in finding out about experiences of faculty at teaching-intensive institutions as part of my dissertation project. I chose mid-August for this initial contact purposefully knowing that candidates would potentially be returning to campus to prepare for the fall semester, but might not yet be totally overwhelmed with job responsibilities.

Candidates were informed that interviews would take 1-2 hours and would be audio-recorded. They were given the option to call me or use a secure form (Appendix B) to indicate willingness to participate. The form allowed candidates to agree to participation without responding to the email, and was intended to serve as a protection of confidentiality. Participants could choose to use either their home or academic email address, or phone number, for further

communication in order to ensure identity protection. Because of the nature of the research project, a slight degree of deception regarding the project's goals was used so as to not skew responses during interviews. Specifically, if participants were aware of my interests in privileging of research over teaching they may have either underplayed, or over emphasized, the reality of these experiences.

Some candidates elected to complete the form, while others replied to the initial e-mail. No one opted to call me. Upon either the reply email or completion of the form I then followed up with candidates with a list of dates and times for the interview to occur. Candidates then selected the date, time, and location of the interview. I was purposeful in my attempt to make participation as convenient as possible. While the vast majority of the candidates never responded, this initial outreach resulted in six interviews scheduled throughout the months of August and September 2015. There were ten candidates who initially indicated willingness to participate but who then did not respond to follow up attempts. Two potential candidates were not satisfied with the lack of detail provided regarding the aims of the research project. They requested more detail regarding my dissertation proposal, theoretical background, and research questions. I explained that these were not provided purposefully so as to not skew potential candidate's responses to questions, but that was not enough for them to be willing to participate. Five candidates responded that they were interested but were not able to participate at this time. Seven candidates indicated that they were too busy or not interested to ever participate, in which case their names were removed from the candidate list.

After completing the first round of 6 interviews I then re-contacted anyone who had said they were interested but did not end up scheduling an interview. I also went back through the initial contact list and sent a second round of emails in an attempt to recruit participants. Finally,

during the third round of contacts I used a more targeted sampling procedure, focusing on particular disciplines, institution type, gender, and race in an attempt to increase the variation of voices being represented. Throughout the spring and early summer of 2016 I completed an additional 10 interviews as a result. I did attempt to recruit a larger sample of participants but, after the third round of contacting candidates, I did not feel it would be appropriate to continue this process since I was contacting the entire population of eligible participants each time. Perhaps I would have increased participation had I instead attempted to recruit via phone call or personal visitations, but these methods were not included in my original IRB approval.

In order to preserve the confidentiality of participants I have purposefully limited identifying information in this methods chapter, and I also mask many details in the findings chapters that follow. Throughout the findings chapters, I have included details regarding type of institutions and disciplinary affiliation, but have purposely left out many details about participants to maintain confidentiality. The sample data provided in the tables below are intended to serve as a brief, yet masked, overview of the participants and institutions involved in the research project. Table #1 summarizes the institutions represented in the study by pseudonym, type of institution, departments represented in the sample, and number of participants. Table #2 summarizes participants with their assigned pseudonym, gender, race, # of years since obtaining their PhD, and employing institution type.

Table #1- Institutions

Institution	Years	Size	Public/Private	Departments	#of Participants
A	4	Large	Public	Sociology, Political Science, History	4
B	4	Small	Private	History	1
C	4	Small	Private	Sociology, History	2
D	4	Medium	Public	Sociology/Women and Gender Studies, Economics, Anthropology	3
E	4	Medium	Public	Sociology	2
F	2	Very Large	Public	Sociology	1
G	4	Medium	Private	Psychology	1
H	2	Large	Public	Psychology	1
I	2	Very Large	Public	Political Science	1

Table #2- Participants

<u>Pseudonym</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Years Since PhD</u>
Bernice	Female	White	<5 years
Gertrude	Female	White	25-30 years
Phillip	Male	White	15-20 years
Betty	Female	White	<5 years
Norma	Female	Black	5-10 years
Ruby	Female	White	15-20 years
Frances	Female	White	15-20 years
Samuel	Male	White	>30 years
Laura	Female	White	10-15 years
Claude	Male	White	5-10 years
Curtis	Male	White	5-10 years
Katherine	Female	White	20-25 years
Sue	Female	White	25-30 years
Anita	Female	White	5-10 years
Hugh	Male	White	20-25 years
Kenneth	Male	White	20-25 years

Of the six departments represented, sociology had the highest number of participants, with five out of the 16 interviewees. Political science and history were represented by three participants each, psychology was represented by two, and economics and anthropology specializations both had a single participant in the study. A single respondent was dually appointed in women/gender studies and sociology. More women (10) than men (6) participated in the study. Overall, 94% of the sample is White, which is a limitation of the study. However, considering that academia suffers from lack of racial diversity this is not surprising. According to the National Center for Education Statistics only 6% of full-time faculty at degree-granting postsecondary institutions was Black in 2015.

All of the 4-year institutions rank faculty as associate, assistant or full professor. Six participants in my sample held the rank of full professor, while five were assistant rank, and two were associate rank. All three faculty members from community colleges were full-time faculty members. The length of time participants had spent in academia since graduation ranged from 2-38 years, with a fairly equal distribution throughout that range. Three participants had graduated in the previous five years; another three had graduated within the last 10 years, and one graduated within the last 15 years. These seven participants all graduated since 2000. Prior to 2000, three participants had graduated within the past 20 years, another three within the past 25 years, two within the past 30 years and one more than 30 years ago.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Most of the ethical considerations regarding confidentiality were mandated by the IRB process. The use of the form for participants to respond to my interview request was the first layer in protecting candidate's identities. Pseudonyms have been used to mask participant identities, and other details which could possibly identify participants have been removed from

the findings section. Specific institution names have also been masked to protect confidentiality. Participants were provided with informed consent forms prior to participation. When interviews occurred in offices I recommended the closing of office doors so as to limit eavesdropping, but ultimately left this up to respondents. All identifying information has been removed from transcripts and printed copies of transcripts are stored in a locked file cabinet. All electronic information has been stored in password-protected files. Because the participants are generally not considered to be part of a vulnerable population these were the only ethical requirements demanded by IRB.

DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Prior to conducting interviews with faculty members I first tested the interview guide with two non-tenured faculty members in person as well as with one tenured faculty member over the phone. Participants provided feedback not only regarding the interview guide but also on my interviewing techniques. These practice interviews not only helped to shape and improve the interview guide, but also provided me, as a novice qualitative researcher, with necessary experience of asking questions, successfully tape recording, and note-taking. The final interview guide was composed primarily of open-ended questions aimed at uncovering thematic coherence related to the teaching-research nexus experienced by participants. A copy of the interview guide can be found in Appendix D. As described in the participant recruitment section, interview locations were selected by participants, with most (9) interviews occurring in participants' offices, while four took place in homes, and three occurred in public coffee shops. Upon meeting for the interview participants were provided with informed consent forms (Appendix B) as is required by IRB and were asked once again if audio-recording was acceptable. IRB approval was secured before any recruitment or data collection took place (Appendix A).

I began the interviews by providing participants with an overview of the topics which would be covered throughout the experience, starting with questions related to experiences during graduate school in preparation for teaching and research activities. This line of questioning was followed by inquiries into the job search process, focusing on how teaching and research played into choices related to jobs applied for, how positions were advertised, focus on teaching and research during the hiring process, as well as how they played into acceptance of job offers. Next the interview turned to how teaching and research are framed/positioned both officially and unofficially in their institutions, conflicts or tensions in the message, and expectations related to these activities. Participants were then asked about the tenure process and how teaching and research priorities are imbedded. Interview sessions ended with a general open-ended question inquiring as to anything related to teaching and research they felt had been omitted during the interview by my line of questioning.

Interviews were tape-recorded and I jotted notes during interviews in order to capture tone, inflection, pauses and other details, as recommended by Weiss (1994). However, I did limit this notetaking as I felt it was more valuable to establish rapport with subjects as an actively engaged listener. Because of this I worked to transcribe interviews as quickly as possible after the interview took place so that the experience would be fresh in my memory. I am still able to recall nuanced details from these interviews, such as intrusive bees interrupting one backyard interview, and another participant's son attempting to wiggle out of nap time early on an extremely sweaty summer afternoon. Another participant attempted to lunch on yogurt and granola throughout the interview, but was so engaged in the interview process that this proved to be difficult. At other times I worried about the whirring of coffee grinders negatively affecting the quality of my audio recordings (but recordings were not affected). I have confined these

details regarding interview setting in the methods chapter because they are not relevant to the reported findings. I bring them up here to vouch for my ability to remember nuanced details without the need for overly-intensive field notes. In addition, most of the necessary details regarding participants' attitudes, when not explicitly stated, were easily gleaned from tone of voice in the recording. These nuances are brought forth when relevant in the findings section; I make it clear when a participant is adding emphasis to their words as I quote portions of their interview conversation with me.

Interviews lasted two hours on average, with verbatim transcription occurring shortly after the interview had taken place. Participants were also asked if they would be willing to share their curriculum vitae at the conclusion of the interview. While all participants agreed to share these documents, only six participants completed that step of the process despite repeated requests. For those who did not voluntarily provide this documentation I was able to locate three of them via their institution's website or other public source. While I planned to gather curriculum vita for all participants so that I could do a comprehensive content analysis of how they organized their vita, I did not feel that it would be appropriate to repeat these requests if participants did not supply them after being asked numerous times. In a few cases, I used the curriculum vitae as a source to confirm interview details or to fill in relevant information that was left out of an interview but, because I could not collect vita from all participants, I did not engage in a full analysis of the contents or organization of vita as planned. These textual documents provide valuable data on the importance of teaching and research but a full content analysis of curriculum vita will have to be a project for another time.

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

John Creswell's (2003) six step process for analyzing qualitative data was utilized for this project. For Step 1 (Organization and Preparation), the six initial interviews were transcribed verbatim. In Step 2, all six of the initial interview transcriptions were read through to obtain a general sense of the information and initial notes were made in the margins of the transcripts. In Step 3 I began the coding process and a list of potential topics was made. This initial list included the following: family influences, pathways to graduate school, mentors, thrown in the deep end of teaching, prevalence of research, social class connections, service, and structure vs. agency. From there, more topics were added and topics were clustered together. Steps 2 and 3 were then repeated after the remaining 10 interviews took place. This initial coding process resulted in a total of 71 distinct codes in 11 broad categories. From there, all interview transcripts were re-analyzed to determine the accuracy of the original coding and data were recoded if necessary. In the second round, some code categories were then collapsed, and others expanded, after comparing data across the two sets of transcripts. Finally, all interviews were re-coded for validity purposes. Only at this point did deeper analysis of codes begin. During this analytic stage, I first analyzed the frequency of codes, and then looked for patterns of relationships among codes and related demographic data (e.g., gender, institution, department, time at institution, etc.). A final list of codes is found in the Appendix E.

In Step 4 of my analytic process (the descriptive phase), codes were used to generate themes and sub-themes for analysis (Creswell, 2003). The main themes of teaching and research were not surprising based on my research questions and interview questions. A third main theme of service was unexpected, which is in itself relevant data. I did not anticipate service to be a major theme because it is hidden work, and I was not fully aware of the impact that service

responsibilities have on faculty members' lives. Ultimately, I organized my findings into three chapters: (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. The themes in the research chapter are: a) Drinking the Kool Aid b) Colleague Comparisons, c) Tenure Denials and d) Aiming for Higher Achievement. Themes in the teaching chapter are: a) Pathways to Teaching b) The Students, and c) Improving Teaching. Themes in the service chapter are: a) Service Volume and b) Inequality in Service. All quotes related to these themes were extracted and organized together in separate Microsoft Word documents, to be analyzed once again to ensure coherence and nuanced analysis and were then further organized into subthemes.

Step 5 of my analytic process involved decisions about the narrative representation of themes (Creswell, 2003). Here decisions are made regarding how to present the analyzed data. I am cognizant of the fact that in presenting the research findings first, teaching findings second and service findings third, I run the risk of potentially biasing (and reifying the privilege surrounding) one domain of participants' work lives over others. Considering the topic at hand is the privileging of research over teaching, the ordering of my findings chapters is particularly relevant for this project. However, I have chosen to present the research section first, in part because participants demonstrated and emphasized this privileging, and I discuss this further in the findings chapters. Teaching is presented second because, throughout the analysis, teaching most often is described as secondary to research. Finally, service is presented last for two main reasons: First, because of the three realms it was the least valued by the majority of participants; and, second, service was also an interview topic I did not expect. By positioning service findings last I am recognizing my own hierarchy of interests and my lack of awareness regarding faculty service responsibilities. In Step 6 (interpretation), I tried to contextualize and interpret my

findings for the reader and I also summarize the importance and implications of these findings in the conclusions chapter.

LIMITATIONS

Because of the qualitative nature of the project there are some inherent limitations, although this is true of all research. The targeted sampling techniques employed and low number of participants means that generalizability of findings is not possible. Additionally, the specificity of geographic location limits my ability to generalize about faculty across all teaching-intensive institutions. Furthermore, my participants are from social science and humanities fields only. However, Creswell (2003) argues that generalizability plays a minor role in qualitative research as it is not the goal of these research endeavors. Reliance on volunteers for interviewing adds the potential for self-selection bias. Although I attempted to reduce this limitation by not fully disclosing the aims and objectives of the research project, the known focus on faculty at teaching-intensive institutions may have deterred some participants. It is possible that my sample is biased with a large number of faculty members who are the most productive or most successful, and thus they were proud to share more about their work than those who did not participate.

Bias is of particular concern because of my strong connection to and experience in the field of education. Vigilant awareness of such bias was necessary and I utilized the perspectives of my committee members as checks on potential bias in interpretation of findings. The teaching chapter was particularly difficult for me to analyze without bias. This chapter required the greatest number of revisions and still likely shows some evidence of my bias. My passion for teaching is an important reason for this research project and therefore I cannot remove my bias

entirely. Joey Sprague (2005) argues for feminist researchers to increase the researcher/researched connection through the use of emotions as an analytic guide.

Part of the critique of positivism is based on its assumption that the subjectivity of the investigator can be minimized in the process of research. Investigators cannot help but respond emotionally to what- and whom- they are studying, and these emotions are bound to influence emphases and interpretations. Being explicitly aware of this dynamic is much better than letting it steer research implicitly (Sprague, 2005).

Adhering to this perspective, my feelings about my interactions with participants regarding teaching and research are relevant primary data. My choice to study the teaching-research nexus is grounded in my identity as a teacher; I see teaching as an intellectually engaging responsibility, equal to if not more important than research. Additionally, I view teaching as having an important impact on the lives of real people; thus, teachers should be required to be fully invested in high quality, rigorously researched teaching techniques. While my standpoint as a woman and an educator are obvious, also visible are the standpoints which are not part of my identity. While I grew up surrounded by a working class narrative, based on my parents' social class background, my own experience has been primarily of upper middle class location and status. Other relevant identities I have not focused on in this project are race, sexuality, disability, or religious affiliation. While some of these identities become relevant in the chapter on service, it is likely that I have not analyzed the data about inequalities in service in the same way that another researcher who holds different social locations might have. It is important for me as researcher to recognize and admit as fully as possible the ways in which my own experiences and point of view are likely involved, shaping or not shaping the research project.

Validity is considered to be one of the strengths of qualitative research methods because qualitative research is able to capture and analyze “the real world” as it exists and is understood by participants. However, reliability can be more difficult to ascertain based on the somewhat subjective nature of the coding process and the open-ended nature of participants’ responses within a qualitative interview setting. I have attempted to address these issues through a variety of techniques, including providing thorough details of the research process, providing copies of my interview questions (see Appendix D), and using participants’ words verbatim. At the very least, because I have provided this comprehensive information about my study, another researcher should be able to replicate my methods at a future time point and compare my findings to theirs.

I now present the findings of these interview sessions, organized by the themes of performativity of research, teaching identities and the burden of service. As discussed in the introduction, the order chosen to present these themes is intentional and reflects the valuation of each of these activities for most of my sample.

CHAPTER 4- PERFORMATIVITY OF RESEARCH

One would expect all professors to experience the teaching-research nexus - that is, the balancing teaching and research responsibilities in academia - to some degree. For participants who desired careers at research-intensive institutions but were not able to fulfill those goals, I expected them to place a significant level of importance on maintaining a research agenda, especially if they had hopes of climbing the ladder of institutional prestige with eventual employment at a research-intensive institution. However, for those participants who expressed a sense of intentionality over their careers at teaching-intensive intuitions, I expected teaching to be valued over research. Most people will go to great lengths to substantiate the value of their work and, thus, it would make sense for those who feel at home in teaching-intensive institutions to place less priority on research, and instead display a greater sense of honor for their teaching abilities.

Instead, nearly every participant shared an overwhelming sense of pride in their research. While it is normal to be proud of one's accomplishments, further examination of this finding makes it significant in two ways. First, participants were not as boastful about the quality of their teaching as they were about the quality of their research. Second, no particular interview guide questions were related to participants bragging about their research. In a sense, there was no common prompt which resulted in this behavior; it came about in different ways and in varying portions of the interview. The high value placed on research is evidenced not only in these types of conversations, but also through the lack of similar sentiments related to teaching (as discussed in the second findings chapter). Participants' need to ensure awareness of their research record reifies and reinforces the high status of research, despite that fact that they have seemingly chosen not to make it the highlight of their career. Such performances were exhibited by fourteen

of the sixteen participants. In contrast, one respondent spoke at length about how ridiculous he perceived such inflated attitudes towards research to be, and another shared her exasperation with the focus her institution placed on research over teaching. Throughout this chapter I analyze these descriptions of research expertise through the lens of performative acts.

Erving Goffman (1959) offered that one way performances are socialized is through the tendency for performers to offer idealized impressions. Performative acts are characterized by Judith Butler (2009) as recapitulations of the norms that have been experienced by the actors. In this case, professors in this sample are reinforcing the prominence of research over teaching through their interview discussions with me, because they understood this (even if unconsciously) as the normative expectation. In this chapter I first highlight the performative privileging of research over teaching by analyzing the roots of these performances in graduate school. I then share the competitive performances participants utilized when comparing themselves to their colleagues, as well as how such competitiveness has harmed professors during tenure and promotion decisions. Finally, I analyze participants' desires for higher research standards at their institutions, a final performative act of privileging research over teaching.

As Butler (1988) describes, such performances are not created by the performer but, instead, are stylized repetitions of acts. Participants reflected back to the messages they received from faculty within their graduate programs regarding research versus teaching, and therefore we can begin to understand that the dominance of research exists as a long-term, ingrained academic discourse. Some of the messages participants received while in graduate school were perceived as overt, while other messages were seen as more covert. Regardless, most of the participants described feeling pressure to find employment in research-intensive institutions as they left

graduate school. Ten of the sixteen participants said that the overt expectation was to get hired at a research-intensive institution. Participants who did not feel such overt pressure still showed awareness that such expectations were the norm.

DRINKING THE KOOL AID

Laura and Samuel both discussed the impact of the pressure to find a job at a research-intensive institution. Put bluntly, Laura, a 2003 sociology graduate, explained, “They all want you to go to some research one university because that makes them look good.” The prestige of the graduate program itself, then, seems to be measured not only by the productivity of faculty, but also in the perceived quality of the jobs obtained by graduates of the program. As Laura’s statement demonstrates quality is determined by how research-intensive one’s job placement is. Samuel, a 1979 political science graduate, describes feeling like he owed it to his program to take a job at a research-intensive university even though that was not the only offer which had peaked his interest.

When I got the offer at [an R1] I was also considering an offer that I had from a small college. When I got to school the day after I got the offer there was a note on my mailbox from the chairman, [and it] just said, “See me”. He said, “Listen, congratulations on the (R1) offer, I want to go over the faculty there.” I said, “Well I’m sort of thinking of this other place,” and he said, “Oh no, you’re going to [the R1].” I mean, it was made pretty clear to me that that’s part of how we build a program here, and you’re part of that. I didn’t resent it terribly. It’s true, they’ve trained me and I have a debt to them. Same thing happened to a colleague. Her first offer was at [an R1], she had about 6 other offers. “Well, congratulations. Oh, you’re going to a big ten school. You got an offer at a big ten

school and you're going to a big ten school. That's what is going to happen. This is how this is going to turn out."

Frances, Norma and Bernice describe more covert messages regarding their employment decisions. Frances, a history graduate in 1996, learned that a former professor had written an unflattering letter for her, which she feels negatively affected her ability to find a job right out of school. When she was finally offered a position on the west coast, which would have uprooted her entire family and added uncertainty of employment for her husband, she declined the position. In describing a discussion with her advisor about declining the position, she shares, "She looked at me and she said, "I really question your commitment to this profession," and I was like, UUUUHHHH, well, what about the profession's commitment to ME?!?! [Her emphases]"

Family played a similar role for many professors' decisions. Norma, 2009 sociology graduate, was already working at a community college as she finished her dissertation and, as a single mother with a mortgage, did not see any advantage in leaving her current job for an R1 where she might possibly get denied tenure down the line and then have to start over again. During her dissertation defense, she described the following scenario:

The chair of my committee expressed his disappointment and others nodded in agreement. They said they were disappointed that I was teaching at a community college.

As a matter of fact they felt I was on the level of university teaching, that I was capable of so much more. The chair described [my actions] as picking low hanging fruit.

The metaphor of "picking low hanging fruit" represents her chair's assumption that she was engaging in the simplest paid work, and was only interested in a quick fix in the face of her personal situation. This belittling of Norma's employment at a community college is an example

of her advisor's performative privileging of research over teaching, as well as privileging of research over family concerns. He was unwilling to acknowledge the risk Norma perceived in exploring other types of academic positions. As the sole income earner in her family, Norma feels that she does not have the luxury to throw a salary away. Frances also describes frustration with her graduate program's misunderstanding of the job market. "Be a professor at a research university,' that's what we were prepared for. It has taken them such a long time for them to think, like, 'Wait a minute, there aren't enough research jobs!'" Bernice, 2014 sociology graduate, also shared what her graduate program expected of her.

Absolutely, the message was that an R1 was the way to go! My advisor was not pleased with me taking this job. I know I disappointed people by choosing this. It was very explicit. We had lots of conversations where she said, "If you don't have graduate students you're going to miss out on that," and "You love research, I don't understand why you would choose to go to this type of school." I didn't perceive it as a choice not to value research, but it was definitely talked about in that way.

The feeling of not pleasing one's advisors, and knowing that they are disappointed in the choices regarding employment, can be tricky for graduate students to navigate. The advisor/graduate student relationship involves a power imbalance, so making a choice that does not garner approval from one's advisor is potentially tumultuous. The closer the graduate student gets to dissertation defense, job search, and graduation, the more likely the student is to feel stressed and doubtful about their own choices within the context of this relationship. Bernice found herself being snubbed in her own graduate program just for accepting an interview at a teaching-intensive institution, and this snubbing continued after she accepted the position. She uses a

whiney, mocking tone of voice when describing a conversation about her going for the interview at her current job:

My advisor said, “Bernice is going to do this interview, and they’re going to LOVE her, and she’s going to LOVE them, and she’s going to take the job” and I was like, “Yeah, that sounds great! I hope that’s what happens [with a big hearty laugh]!” I had two colleagues at the same time who got jobs at R1’s and we would be standing around and their jobs would get announced, but mine would be *forgotten*. I think I started to look at it in a more ethnographic way maybe, [thinking,] “What’s going on here? How are things being talked about in a way that just inherently values this career path?” [Her emphases]

Bernice shares her recognition that certain careers have more value in the institution than others, and that those values are transmitted through open discourse and public performances. Frances did not perceive this message as explicitly, yet still recognized its presence.

I think [the message] was understood, not as much explicit. It was very much cultural transmission through the older graduate students and expectations.... I kind of drank the Kool-Aid, you know. I accepted all of the values around it, it was like the most conformist phase of my life where I just was fitting into this culture and I did what they wanted.

Similarly, Ruby, a graduate of sociology in 2000, received a message of concern about what might happen to her research if she took a position at a teaching-intensive institution. Ruby, much like Norma, had a child to provide for and expressed her need to quickly find a job because family stability took primacy over other concerns during her job search.

They definitely wanted me, were directing me, to a research-intensive university when I went on the job market. I was an older student, I had a daughter. I think being an older

student they understood that I wanted to go ABD [i.e., find a job as soon as she defended her dissertation proposal], I need a job. I do think there was some disappointment that I did not go to an R1 intensive. They did write me strong letters of support [for my current job], but they also expressed concern about what would happen to my research if I took this position.

For Anita, a 2010 psychology graduate, the message was that even a research-intensive institution was not good enough because of the clinical nature of her work.

My mentors, whenever I said anything that suggested I wanted to go teach in a PhD program, it was ignored or people would pretend they didn't hear me. The values of that institution were that the only acceptable outcome was to be in a tenure-track position in a medical school. So the values were such that the only thing that was acceptable was to be a researcher in a medical school.

Gertrude and Phillip both expressed strong interests in teaching early on in their graduate school careers. Gertrude, a 1989 psychology graduate, was actively advised to keep such desires quiet, as it might affect her acceptance into doctoral programs. She shares this in describing her application to PhD programs: "One of the things I was told was not to breathe a word that I wanted to teach. I was only to say that I wanted to do research, I had to make it sound like research was what I was born to do, even if I didn't feel that way."

Making it sound like you wanted to do something different than what you truly desired has to be a conscious act, a public performance that negates one's true self. Phillip, a political science graduate in the 1990s, recognized the value of research to his graduate institution but felt that he was able to balance those pressures with his interests in teaching. "The emphasis, the official line, was research. My attitude was, 'If I'm going to be a professor I'm not only going to

be an excellent researcher, I'm also going to be an excellent teacher.” Katherine, a political science graduate in 1992, demonstrates that in her graduate school not only was research privileged in open discourse, but also the message was that teaching did not really matter at all.

Go forth and be a scholar, be a researcher. There was never any emphasis on teaching. The assumption was that if you're a good researcher, of COURSE you'd be a good teacher [Her emphasis]. And if you weren't such a good teacher, well, that's not a terrible thing, really.

These privileging performances were then carried from graduate school into participants' teaching-intensive positions. First, participants demonstrated a sense of superiority compared to their peers in regards to research production. For some, the privileging resulted in problems with tenure and promotion. Finally, participants described the research expectations of their employing institutions as being sub-par. I will now turn to these two topics.

COLLEAGUE COMPARISONS

The most blatant of participants' performances can be characterized as the “Big Fish, Small Pond” performance, which focuses the comparison on one's colleagues. The big fish, small pond metaphor was used literally by two different professors working in very different institutions, one in a medium-sized, 4-year public institution, and the other in a small, private, 4-year institution. While only these two participants used the metaphor explicitly, the performance was echoed by other participants in less direct terms. In conversations about this phenomenon, participants exhibited a self-concept of research brilliance in comparison to their colleagues.

Curtis, an assistant professor of anthropology at a 4-year public university, described the job search and hiring process while he shared the following:

Coming here as I did with a lot of *big names* on my CV and a lot of *big publications* comparatively, I came here with more publications than some of the tenured faculty here already and I've been publishing here more since, there's definitely a bigger fish smaller pond thing here. [his emphasis]

Curtis points out that he not only has big names, i.e., other highly ranked researchers, on his CV, but he also has published in more prestigious journals in comparison to other faculty members at his current institution. Furthermore, he has continued to publish more than his colleagues. Curtis declares that a teaching-intensive institution is not what he had hoped for, as he quips: "It certainly wasn't the kind of institution I wanted to be at... after being at three of the top ten research institutions in the world". In reminding me of the institutions he attended in undergraduate and graduate school, and ensuring that I was aware of just how prestigious they were, Curtis establishes himself as a "big fish," and infers the lesser nature of his current institution and colleagues. He hints that this highly-valued research experience is likely why he got the position in the first place, and that it will be advantageous for him in the future for tenure and promotion when he continues:

I've gotten a lot of very active support from upper administration on certain things. Things I say I need [in order] to do research, space things, attention. When I talk to the dean, he knows me and he likes me, and he's interested in keeping me. That's practically useful.

Pointing specifically to the Dean's desire to keep him signals that others also recognize the value and prestige he brings to the institution. In sum, Curtis establishes himself as noticeable, and better than, his colleagues because of his research productivity.

Betty, a sociology professor at a 4-year private institution, also calls upon the “Big Fish, Small Pond” metaphor. Betty does not just see herself as a big fish in a small pond, but in a “tiny” pond, and is concerned that remaining at her current institution may ultimately damage her productivity.

My biggest fear is that if I stay here too long I will get dumber. I was used to being challenged in rigorous programs where I was a small fish who grew to be a big fish in a big pond and now *I'm a big fish in a tiny pond*.... I feel like I'll just get stagnant if I stay here too long. [her emphasis]

While Betty's institution is indeed smaller than Curtis's, the pond reference does not signify the size of the pool as much as the quality of colleagues and the research expectations set by their current institutions. Betty lays some of the blame for this on the institution itself, saying “I'd like more pressure to stay current and a fire under me to be a player in soc(iology), but I'm not getting that here.” Being “a player” -- i.e., someone important and more highly respected in her field -- would require more intensive research work. Because she works at a teaching-intensive institution, Betty explains, “It's all I can do to stay on top of my family and then my paid teaching”.

While no other participants in my sample used the “Big Fish, Small Pond” metaphor directly, similar performative language demonstrating greater research production in comparison to one's peers was echoed by five other participants. Two participants, Kenneth & Anita, both reflected back to the publications they had in their arsenal coming out of graduate school, similar to Curtis's comments about “coming here with a lot of big names on my CV.” Kenneth, a history professor at a 4-year private institution, discusses getting hired at Institution B:

The thing I should probably mention, as a grad student, I had already gotten involved in conference activity and even publication so, when I came (here), this isn't a stellar place in terms of research and publication, I sort of *landed here as one of the most prolific scholars*.

What is unique about Kenneth in comparison to Betty and Curtis is both the time period in which he finished graduate school and the particular institution by which he is employed. Betty and Curtis were both fairly recent graduates, having both graduated within the last 3 years, while Kenneth entered the profession in the mid-1980s. The 30 years in between have been tumultuous for hiring in higher education, with more and more pressure put on graduates to have publications in order to gain employment at any type of institution. And, while Betty and Kenneth are both employed by small, 4-year, private schools, Kenneth's institution awards tenure and bestows the title of Professor even on those who have not earned a PhD, something of a rarity in the modern academic climate. Additionally, Kenneth was hired before he finished his dissertation, which he did not finish until he went up for tenure review six years later. Even so, Kenneth proclaims himself to be "prolific" as compared to the "less than stellar" research records of his colleagues. Kenneth seems to vacillate on this topic, at times prioritizing teaching and then, at other times, admonishing it in comparison to research. One example of this is his response upon being asked what he likes about his current position. After first saying he enjoys being a part of an intellectual community, he backtracks by saying:

Some of my colleagues just don't seem to be quite engaged intellectually. I get a little tired of all the conversations about teaching, about syllabi, about assessments. Like, let's talk about some ideas. Let's talk about some interesting things. You know, sometimes I wish it was a little bit more [of an intellectual community].

Kenneth's comments suggest that teaching is unintellectual. He is "tired of all the conversations about teaching" and instead wants to "talk about ideas" (presumably research ideas). Kenneth demonstrates an othering of teaching, defining it as uninteresting and less worthy of his time than research pursuits.

Anita, an assistant psychology professor at a 4-year private institution, is also a recent graduate like Betty and Curtis. However, as one of only two psychology professors in the study, she also brings with her a history of clinical experience in addition to teaching and research experience. These clinical experiences, both through graduate school and in post-doctoral appointments, provide her with the ability to brag about the volume of research she had under her belt upon arriving at the teaching-intensive institution which employs her. "I came here with a CV that looks like I was headed to an R1", she shares, implying that the volume and quality of publications she had acquired would qualify her for employment at a more research-intensive institution. She described her job search process and suggested that she was not initially interested in teaching-intensive institutions. Anita explained, "[Some institutions] were more teaching-oriented and I felt like I wouldn't have been, like, living up to my full potential". In describing how she felt during her job search, Anita defines teaching-oriented institutions as having less potential, and infers that her abilities (and research focus) are better than that. She felt that she would have been better situated in an institution with some research focus.

Other participants displayed pride in the research they managed to produce since gaining employment. Frances, a history professor at 4-year private university, compared herself to colleagues when discussing her overall job responsibilities and research production.

There didn't used to be a strong push to publish; now they want some publishing but they're not that exacting. That said, I did publish a book because I wanted to. I've

published a couple of articles and book reviews and I just finished a textbook that I worked on with two other people that's going to be published next year, so I'm like *one of the more published people* on the campus. [her emphasis]

Like others in the sample, Frances points out that, even with increased research expectations on her campus, she is “one of the most published people on campus.” She achieved such a feat even when there “didn't used to be a strong push to publish”. When pushed to discuss her identity as an academic, and the relevance of research for that identity, Frances expressed the following:

You know, it depends on where I am. When I'm here people think like I'm this great intellect, but then when I go to conferences I'm with the REALLY productive people who publish a LOT, and are up on everything I feel like a yokel, so I sort of go back and forth between the two of them. [Her emphasis]

This juxtaposition of “great intellect” versus “yokel” in reference to research productivity demonstrates Frances' assessment of the differences between colleagues at her institution (less research-productive) and colleagues in her discipline at large (more research-productive). Being less research-productive also equates with not being “up on everything” – that is, not being familiar with contemporary ideas in one's field. The jump from “great intellect” to “yokel”, a slang term referring to someone who lacks education, may seem extreme, but this performative talk demonstrates the heavy weight felt by Frances as she contemplates the value of research in her field.

As Anita does above, participants in this sample also used the opinion of others to justify their value. Katherine, a political science professor at a large, 4-year, public university, is hoping to increase her research production in the coming years. Like Kenneth, Katherine came out of graduate school in the late 1980s and started a job before her dissertation was completed.

Initially Katherine was hired at a research-intensive institution that was attempting to build its political science department, and this increased pressure to publish. With the looming reality of being denied tenure, Katherine left that position and was employed by two other institutions over the years before coming into her current employment situation. When asked about tensions between research, teaching and service in her current job, she laments how much her research has suffered. However, Katherine points out that her department head labels her as a highly productive researcher in comparison to her peers:

There's not a lot of incentive to actually publish. . . . Yes, I would love to publish more but it doesn't change how much I get paid. It would not, in fact, change my life in any way -- it would just make my life busier. I think my department head would say I'm one of the more active researchers in the department already. I've certainly published more than most of my colleagues.... In the next stage of my career I really do want to focus on research because I have a lot to say and a lot of unfinished papers in the file cabinet. I'm about to get a book contract very soon. I'm excited about that. I really hope to change that pattern.

The prevalence of the "*I do more research than anyone else*" conversation within my sample reflects individual actors' attempts to legitimize their accomplishments within the context of dominant expectations within academia.

TENURE DENIALS

Participants in my sample do not only judge themselves in comparison to their colleagues, but also are judged by others in ways that they view as unfair. Four participants found themselves at institutions that were increasing their publication standards for tenure/promotion, which resulted in either delayed or denied tenure decisions. Three of these

situations occurred at research-intensive institutions and in these cases the tenure denial is described as the event which ultimately led the professors to teaching-intensive institutions. The fourth tenure denial occurred at one of the teaching-intensive institutions, but that professor was eventually granted tenure. In all four cases participants were women, and all discuss the unfairness associated with research obligations to some extent. Gertrude, Sue, and Katherine were all denied tenure at research-intensive institutions, and all of them describe situations within which the publication expectations were unclear and not equally applied to all professors.

Gertrude, a full time psychology professor at a community college, shares a particularly heartbreaking experience. She had not intended to work at a research-intensive institution, but was ultimately hired at one. Changing leadership resulted in changing publication expectations, which occurred just as she was going up for tenure.

The year I went up for tenure I had a few papers published and I had gotten an NIH grant, which is as big as it gets. Nobody else in my faculty had (a large grant) at the time, or had had one in 3 years. I'm the only one with a grant and a few papers published. My faculty supported me but the provost stepped down that year. The previous provost had given everyone (in her department) tenure with WAY fewer publications than the standard because we didn't have the money; we were built to give academic reality to student athletes and have [academics for athletes] not be a farce. When they (previous provost) stepped down we had an interim provost who didn't know why any of us had tenure, and I certainly wasn't going to set the example. I was devastated! They gave me a probationary 3 years. I tried. I did get more papers published, and I had presented data from the grant at conferences.... I always say I was the only person in the world turned

down for tenure twice. When I grieved it the person I was grieving against was the person hearing the case. Everywhere I turned there was nowhere to go.

Sue, an associate professor of sociology at a 4-year public university, similarly attempted to grieve the tenure decision with no success. She also discussed being compared unfairly to her colleagues at a time (in the mid-1990s) when it was difficult to verify publication records. During the revise and resubmit process a journal lost her paper, which she ultimately blames for her losing tenure.

I ran into these monumental problems getting published....So I revise and resubmit, and he called and said it was more appropriate for the leading publication on the planet, "Here's how you revise for us, completely reorient your literature review," and I did that. And then I sent it back, and I did that really quickly, and they lost it! And in the meantime I lost tenure! Because I had invested so much in this stupid paper, I had other things going, but at that university it's a much shorter tenure clock than anywhere else.....After I was denied tenure the college published their 3-year thing of publications, they left out things I had done, I actually had MORE referred publications in MORE prestigious journals than all 20 members of the department combined [her emphasis]. But I was unemployed. I appealed and went through all of these processes...the appeal committee and the lawyer who represented them asked my department chair to submit a summary of other people who had tenure and what their publication records were. I objected to that because you're not supposed to be judged against anyone. The department chair submitted this summary of 5 people and at the time, in 1996, you couldn't really check it out very easily, you couldn't really tell. It was very sloppy evidence.

Sue continues to describe her attempt to appeal the decision, and claims to have followed up years later, looking into the CVs of those colleagues to whom she was compared.

I got in my car and drove to several universities to find copies of these things. He [one of the professors to whom she was compared] just published the same thing in more than one journal. And, in another case, he had 8 refereed publications, 5 were sole authored, the rest he was the 3rd or 4th author. But you don't know those things at the time.

This quantified comparison to others is part of the performance of privileging research over teaching, and it is clear in these stories that the university calculates the sheer volume of publication as a key marker of productivity. Katherine, whose department was working towards becoming a bigger name in political science at the time of her tenure decision, feels that, if she had known about the changing tenure environment, she would have made a different career choice.

So what was happening was that the standards for tenure, the expectations, were being ratcheted up really quickly and so I was behind when I started. I started publishing good articles, good places, but they kept telling me, "You're not on track, and you're behind, and this isn't going well." I had colleagues who were very supportive and sympathetic to me who said they wouldn't have gotten tenure with the new expectations. They got tenure on an article and now the expectations were 3-4 articles in top journals and a book in 6 years.

Katherine's experience with a change in both the quantity of publication expectations (an article changing to 3-4 articles and a book) as well as the perceived quality of publication type (in top journals) demonstrates the university's reliance on publications (as well as the quantity of publications) as a measure of success. Katherine also felt that gender played a significant role in

her tenure denial in two main ways. First, she and her children had moved to take this research-intensive position, but her husband had stayed behind because he could not find a job. “When I interviewed they said, “Oh, we have this great spousal placement system, the university will work to find your spouse a job.” However, the spousal job placement program was set up to find wives, not husbands, jobs. The options they provided were not professional in nature. Thus, during the years when she needed to be working on publishing in order to gain tenure, she had the added responsibility of virtually being a single mother. “I was really like a single parent, he would come down on weekends....it was very stressful”. She also feels that the department itself treated women faculty members differently than their male counterparts.

I did believe at the time, and I still believe, that there was a large degree of sexism in that [tenure denial] because there were a couple of men that were hired at the same time as I was and they were treated very differently. There’s no doubt. When I arrived there was only one woman who had been tenured in the department in its history, and they had a long history going back of women who lasted a year or two.

As Sue described in her experience, sometimes the quantity of publications can be misleading, as when someone publishes the same article numerous times and is allowed to count all redundant publications within their tenure application. Such practices are likely less common in today’s academic climate because of how easily publication records are verified within electronic databases, but it is still possible that a tenure review committee can simply count the number of publications and not choose to dive deeper into the quality or distinctiveness of those publications.

Laura, an associate professor of sociology at 4-year public institution, was denied tenure the first time around but was later awarded tenure. She speaks not only to the changing target of

number of publications, but also to the perceived quality of the journals in which one is published.

We lose people, we lose good people, because they can't do the kind of research they need to do for tenure and promotion. In terms of number of publications it's not that high, although it's a moving target and everyone is 100% uncomfortable with what the expectations are. . . . We say we're this teaching-focused institution, which isn't actually true, and it should be true. While there's tons of support for teaching, all of the anxiety and tenure decisions rest on publication. Depending on the field, 4-5 publications is enough for tenure, mainstream types of things, not necessarily high ranked journals. The constant discussion, which is really telling, about whether or not pedagogical publications count, drives me CRAZY! [her emphasis] Because these are peer reviewed scholarly publications, we are supposed to be fairly teaching focused, we put a lot of resources into high quality teaching, so I don't know why we would have the conversation.... I didn't do enough mainstreamy kind of stuff, I did some pedagogical publication stuff and I did a ton of work in the institution. I actually got denied tenure the first time I went up because I didn't have enough mainstream publications. There's also a little political stuff going on. I was told, "You're fantastic," by the dean, "you're great, we think you're so valuable. But you're fired. So, go get at least one more mainstream publication and go up again next year." But other people (who had gotten tenure) had very similar looking packets. . . . There are sometimes people who have these ideas about the kind of institution we ARE and the kind of institution we SHOULD be [her emphasis], and what is good scholarship.....If I wouldn't have gotten tenure the next time around I would have sued them. I think that was pretty clear. There's a whole, there's a clear pattern at

our institution of people, there were 4-5 women in that time period who were denied tenure in various fields. When I look at CV's I think, "This doesn't make any sense, this looks fine to me," and a couple of them I was like, "Wait-WHAT? WHAT?" This was happening with women. [her emphases]

The notion of a moving target, which depends on one's field, allows for ambiguous tenure decisions. Adding to this the lack of acceptance of teaching-related scholarship (what Laura calls "pedagogical research") highlights the further privileging of research over teaching, as publications are judged for "quality", and teaching research is considered lower quality. Luckily, not everyone's institution viewed scholarship on teaching in the same way.

Kenneth, while still proud of his research repertoire, recognized the value of having a range of expectations depending on department and degree attainment. "I would say I'm probably more accomplished in scholarship than many of my colleagues, but they all seem to do it in different ways." Thus, scholarship on teaching may be valued more at Kenneth's institution than Laura's, which means unique institutional contexts do matter. Gertrude's narrative also suggests that specific contexts matter, as a new provost dictated new tenure guidelines as her tenure application was denied. However, participants at times also expressed a desire for increased research standards at their teaching-intensive institutions.

AIMING HIGHER

Publication expectations at teaching-intensive institutions are generally less stringent than at research institutions, mostly as a function of the increased teaching load placed on professors at the former type of institution. However, many participants in my sample still expected to accomplish a greater volume of research than was required, and often viewed expectations as too low. Nine participants described research expectations at their institutions as either too low, or

lower than what they expect of themselves. The three professors at community colleges did not share this sentiment, as they did not define any research expectations at their institutions, so they are an exception among others in my sample. That is not to say, however, that professors at community colleges do not still value research and have personal research goals. In contrast, three professors described the research expectations at their institutions as being too high, but all three worked at institutions aligned with an R1, even though they work on regional campuses, each of which having their own research requirements for tenure.

Katherine set the tone when she said, “The bar is like, really, really low for research. I have colleagues who have not written a word in 20 years”. She continues:

Everyone kind of has this mentality, not everyone because there are some people who are amazingly productive researchers. I don’t know how they do it. Well, I do know how they do it. They’re not involved in anything, they don’t do any service. And they find ways to get out of teaching. So, it’s possible, it’s difficult, but it is possible [to do more research]. But then they usually don’t stay here very long. They leave. That’s their real goal, because that’s your ticket out of here. . . . There have been times where I resented it. But I’m at the point now in my career where, I love teaching, and . . . my expectations have adjusted. I had really, really high expectations [for research] and I had to ratchet those down [here she is laughing so hard that her response is almost inaudible].

As mentioned earlier in the chapter, Katherine describes how unproductive her colleagues are in scholarship. She suggests that those who are able to research are only doing so as a way out of her teaching-intensive institution. She relays her own disappointment at not having the opportunity to do more research, while eventually acknowledging how she is “ratcheting down those expectations” and coming to terms with reality of teaching taking precedence over

research. The remorse felt in Katherine's statement, including her own admission of resentment about having to spend more time on teaching than research, works to further privilege research over teaching, even if indirectly. Betty also talks about the low research expectations at her institution.

The expectations are very low and there's kind of a disconnect here between the old guard faculty and the new guard faculty. New guard faculty, like myself, we come from places where we were trained to do research well, and we were told, "Publish or perish." The research expectations here are that you have tried to submit something in your 6 years. Very, very low. The soft expectation is that you'll get a pub somewhere in your 6 years, but they will LITERALLY take any action toward that end [her emphasis]: if you're collecting data, as long as you're doing something, evidence of some basic productivity they're cool with.

While the research expectation is understandably low because of the increased teaching expectation, a sense of urgency regarding publication, in terms of both quality and quantity, remained among those I interviewed. Some participants focused specifically on how their expectations compared to those of the institution itself. Similar to Katherine, Anita sees her expectations for herself as a product of the post-doc and graduate school experiences she had.

The research expectations here are very modest from my perspective, but that's because I came out of the post-doc I did. It's just a different, it's very different, it's different from how I was trained... . . . So my expectations for myself are a little bit different than what the institution's expectations are.

Kenneth also mentioned earlier that he did not view his institution as “stellar” in terms of research. Bernice, an assistant professor of sociology at a medium public 4-year school, also sees herself as doing more than her institution requires.

The tenure expectation is 6 publications by tenure, so one a year, which is TOTALLY doable [her emphasis] and obviously I will try to go beyond that. The book will be about, will account for about half. I’m not going to put all of my eggs in the book basket though. I’ve seen that backfire on people. So I’m going to try to do 6 publications and a book.

Here, Bernice mentions part of the reason she wants to go above and beyond the requirements for tenure is to provide some protection for her tenure case when she says she’s seen over-reliance on book publication as backfiring on people. Ruby, a full professor of sociology at a 4-year large public school, has already reached the level of full professor but also describes wanting to push herself beyond the minimum requirements set forth by her institution.

I think what I feel, I don’t think they’re measuring me as harshly as I’m measuring myself. . . . We have a new program here of “post-promotion promotion,” . . . I’m at the rank of full professor and so I have another 5 years to prove myself, another 5 years to prove that I could be granted full professorship again. So I’m on a mission, I am on a mission before I retire, I’m going to be granted full professor position AGAIN because I want that respect as a researcher. . . . I’m very proud of my tenure case too, that was very competitive. And I was promoted to associate at the same time. I’m not as proud of my case to full professor. I would have liked to have had more publications. I still received promotion to full, there was no deficit noted by the evaluators in my research. I wanted to do more. I wanted more for myself. I met their benchmarks, I just had a higher standard

for myself. . . . I could just not do anything for the rest of my time here and be ok, but that wouldn't be ok with me.

Ruby does not say directly that she views the research expectations as being low or modest at her institution, as the previous respondents did, but conveys the same message as she proclaims that her standards for herself are higher than those of her institution.

Others focused more on the glory of publication in its own right. Several times throughout the interview Sue mentions that she values research more than teaching, which is the focus of the next chapter. Nonetheless, Sue sees publishing as her main goal as an academic:

I would like to do what I got a PhD to do. I would like to finish the two things I'm working on, get them published in really good journals. That's what gives me professional satisfaction, is to see MY name on a journal article [her emphasis]. That's what I care about.

Norma, a full professor at a very large community college, while not as strongly as others, still demonstrates pride in researching beyond what is required in a community college setting. "I'm proud to say I still do research, I wrote a book , so not only did I publish at a university press I won a major award!" Phillip also shares this pride in publishing while working at a community college, when he says "I'm an academic. I'm an intellectual. I'm still going to be an intellectual even at a community college."

The reasons why participants from teaching-intensive institutions might converse so much about research are varied. First, it is possible that the views and discourse of my participants are not the same as others in their institutions. In other words, there could be a selection bias in my sample and participants could have opted into this study because of their views about the importance of research. However, nothing in the tools used to recruit

participants makes that seem plausible. Another possible explanation for participants' desires to speak at length, often in boastful terms, about their research experience can be found in the gendered nature of research versus teaching and the performativity of privileging research. Teaching, being feminized, has less institutional value and less identity value than research. Participants demonstrated this devaluation of teaching through their discussions about research productivity.

Katherine specifically names this process as socialization later in the interview when describing her curriculum vitae (CV).

My CV still looks like a CV for a person at a research university. I don't put a lot on there about my teaching and service. In fact, compared to a lot of my colleagues, it looks a little weird because for them it's all about teaching and service and I hardly have any of that on there because that's the way I was socialized. I don't really feel the need to [change my CV] because I feel that your CV should primarily be about your role in the discipline as a scholar.

Katherine's effort to privilege a research-based CV is evident in her interview conversations. The organization of the CV represents another performance in which research is privileged over teaching, and graduate programs have socialized students towards this type of performance as well.

In sum, participants in this sample reinforced the dominance of research in how they talked about their own career trajectories and identities. First, participants described how the types of messages they received in graduate school placed a higher value on landing research-intensive jobs over teaching-intensive ones. I then demonstrated how participants often viewed their research productivity as superior to their colleagues. Participants also described being

disappointed by the lack value placed on research by their teaching-intensive institutions. This privileging of research appears to me to be a conscious act in that professors know that research is highly valued, and thus wanted to ensure that the importance they place on research was well documented. This is what I expected for those participants who did not actively choose a teaching-intensive institution for their careers, but contradicts what I expected for those who did. In the next chapter I will turn to analyze how these professors view themselves in terms of their identities as teachers, and how those performances contrast with the performative privileging of research.

CHAPTER FIVE- TEACHING IDENTITIES

All participants are teachers and have developed some form of identity as a teacher because that is their primary job responsibility at their current place of employment. However, because academia is structurally designed to prioritize research over teaching, faculty members in teaching-intensive institutions are not socialized to teaching as a primary role. While participants do not explicitly discuss teaching as a devalued activity, the general lack of discussion of teaching as a primary job duty and the general absence of talk about pride in teaching hints at a structural devaluation of teaching, especially when compared to talk about pride in research.

In this chapter I will focus on how participants performed their teaching identities and how they negotiate their teaching roles. First I describe participants' pathways into teaching-intensive institutions, from experiences in graduate school to coming into their roles at teaching-intensive institutions; I also analyze participants' lack of socialization for their primary role of teaching. Next I explore the language participants used to discuss teaching, and how they often focused primarily on telling me about relationships with students, including their goals for student empowerment, student engagement, and meeting the needs of diverse learners. How participants discussed teaching was different than how they discussed research. Whereas they told me about the exact articles and conferences they attended and exhibited pride in the details of their research, they did not tell me about the intricacies of prideful teaching, almost as if they did not have the same language to laud their accomplishments in teaching realms. Participants relied heavily on descriptions of relationships with students in the absence of a full discourse on teaching. Finally I examine the ways in which participants work to improve and expand their

teaching expertise, which serves as a guide for making systematic recommendations in preparing future faculty.

PATHWAYS TO TEACHING

Austin (2011) posits that graduate school education is the primary period during which future faculty members are socialized to the work life of a professor, a bi-directional process that affects both the individual and the longterm health and sustainability of the organization. In Chapter 4 I highlight how participants explained the ways in which their graduate school programs socialized them to privilege research. The lack of similar socialization for teaching demonstrates the different values placed on research and teaching within academia, as well as the dissimilar preparation for research and teaching work longterm.

Graduate School Preparation

The most common way that graduate programs prepare their students for teaching is through experiential training, such as serving as a teaching assistant. A few participants also reported that their graduate programs offered graduate level coursework related to teaching. In this section I describe the varied experiences participants had with both of these types of preparation, and the differences across participants' experiences with these two domains of training. Of the sixteen interview participants, four had required coursework related to teaching as part of their graduate school experience. All four were more recent graduates (graduating after 2000). Of these four, three were the most recent graduates, finishing their PhDs in 2011, 2012 and 2014. Not all recent graduates had such required coursework, which demonstrates that the incorporation of teaching pedagogy into graduate school training is not ubiquitous, despite the decades of research that advocates for this pedagogical training (Boyer 1990; Robinson & Hope 2013). That is, of the eight participants graduating after 2000, only half were required to take

coursework specifically related to teaching. None of the participants who graduated prior to 2000 were exposed to teaching-related coursework while in graduate school.

Bernice, a 2014 sociology graduate, described her graduate school as a “university [who] would market themselves as being much invested in preparing teachers”. She goes on to describe this investment in teaching in minimalistic terms, however. “[Basically] what that means is that we taught while we were in graduate school and I had one graduate seminar that was about teaching.” She sees this single seminar as a low bar in terms of requirements for preparation for teaching. “In the realm of graduate programs that’s so remarkable- that that makes you this really teaching friendly place, (laughing), because you have *one* class!” [Her emphasis] She did, however, describe quality instruction in that course. “The person who taught was brought in from a teaching college and she was fantastic!” Bernice is one of two participants who eventually exhibited pride in teaching, and thought about teaching as both pedagogy and behavior. Her unique socialization during graduate school is potentially related to this variation, as is shown below.

Betty, a 2012 sociology graduate, had what she described as a very “useful” course, an “actual teaching prep class”. She provides some details regarding what was included in this course. “We designed a syllabi (sic), a pretend syllabus, and then we had to design a lecture, give it, be videotaped, and then watch that videotape and critique. I had no idea, I said *UMMMMM* so many times! It was very useful”. The usefulness Betty describes is a reference to the practical, nuts-and-bolts type of training that is necessary for graduate students if they are to understand how to carry out teaching activities on a daily basis. Curtis, a 2011 anthropology graduate, also shared that he had a “teaching required pedagogy class.”

Claude, a 2006 economics graduate, described two different types of teaching courses he encountered in graduate school, with one designed specifically for foreign graduate students. “They do have a teaching program where they teach the foreigners who come in how to teach in the U.S.” He explains this is necessary because of differences in what is expected of students and professors at colleges in the U.S. in comparison to his home country. Some of the notable differences described by Claude included the idea that professors should be available during office hours to help students, the frequency of student assessments, and the idea that professors should be entertainers. “In [my European country] it’s much more like the professor is the God like figure, you don’t ask questions and you certainly don’t expect a lot of help.....You’re not expected to be an entertainer, there’s no evaluation, there’s no feedback on your teaching.” Brint (2011) pointed to student evaluations as encouraging professors to focus on entertaining delivery in order to score well. While socialization towards more engaging material is certainly encouraging, Claude’s experience also demonstrates heightened focus on socialization to the practical side of teaching. In addition to this course for foreign students, Claude’s graduate program required a course on teaching economics after completion of two years of graduate school. He describes this course as focused on “teaching techniques - what things work, what doesn’t work - and how to do multiple choice questions”.

The courses described by these four participants include many of the rudimentary aspects of teaching a new professor must contemplate, such as designing a course syllabus, student engagement, and assessment. These are certainly important topics to contemplate if one’s primary job duty is teaching. Considering that only a quarter of participants in this study had any coursework socializing them for teaching, however, potentially demonstrates the devaluation of teaching within higher education institutions, and also in most graduate school programs. That

the majority of participants had no coursework in how to teach means they were not given training on how to teach well. It makes sense, then, that participants in my sample had a limited language with which to talk about teaching when I asked them about this topic. Within my sample, though, more recent graduates are receiving course-based training in teaching than those who graduated in decades past, so attention to teaching may be increasing within the academy. Nonetheless, this training is not yet uniform across doctoral programs, according to my participants.

While most participants in my sample did not experience course-based training during graduate school, experiential training of some kind was common among all participants. The variation of experiences in these roles was extreme, ranging from serving as a grader to being handed a course to teach on their own right off the bat. For three of the participants, all of whom graduated in the mid-1990s, being a teaching assistant meant being a grader and managing sections of a large lecture course. These participants were not designing course syllabi, creating assessments, or preparing instruction in anyway but, instead, were tasked primarily with grading. Frances, a 1996 history graduate, felt unprepared for this expectation. “For teaching it was the WORST [her emphasis]! I was 23; I had no idea what I was doing. I was the hardest grader in the world. I just figured everything out on my own. It was definitely the bad old days in regards to preparing graduate students”. She describes her main criteria for assigning grades to undergraduate students as whether or not they wrote as well as she did, which she admits was “not the best criteria, but I just figured everything out on my own.....I was a TA, but I really didn’t know how to do that [be a TA]”. Frances’ phrase, “the bad old days in regards to preparing graduate students,” comes from her belief that things have changed when she later says “I think that now they do have some pedagogy seminars that the students take, and I think that’s

really good. I think *anything* would have been better than what I had, which was *nothing* [her emphasis].”

Hugh, a 1995 history graduate, also did not receive any formal training or experience while in graduate school and worked primarily as a grader. “They called it a reader, I just graded papers. I didn’t even lead sections”. When asked about the overall preparation for teaching in his program he says, “Not about pedagogy or anything. There wasn’t focus on teaching except in the very traditional old fashioned way of – you learn your field, you become an expert in it so you must be qualified to teach it - without knowing anything about teaching.” Boehrer and Sarkisian (1985) refer to this phenomenon of being accepted into graduate school equating to a license to teach, presuming that if a person can learn a subject they can automatically teach it.

Katherine, who also had experiences running grading sections as a teaching assistant in the early 1980s in a political science department, laments the lack of preparation for the task she was assigned to.

I had sections- they have the large lecture classes with 400-500 students and then we would each have 2 sections a semester of 20-25 students in each section. We did all the grading of course. There was NO preparation [her emphasis]! I tell people how I arrived on campus and someone handed me a class list and it had a room number on it; these are your students - have at it!

Some participants were not merely assigned sections of lectures without preparation, but were immediately made entirely responsible for their own courses with no prior experience or mentoring. Four respondents found themselves in such situations. Two of these participants attended the same institution, although in different departments (history and sociology) and at very different times (one graduated in 1993, the other in 2009). Norma, a 2009 graduate in

sociology, was assigned to teach courses as an adjunct while working towards her master's degree. When she asked for advice from her advisor on what to do, she was told "pick a book and you take it from there". Norma excuses this because she doesn't see teaching as something professors at research-intensive institutions would even think of as being important because of the nature of their work. "In retrospect I can see why [they didn't teach me how to teach] because university professors, they're not about teaching as much as they are about publications and research, and that kind of thing. Teaching is something that they do but it isn't something they necessarily master". This speaks to the structure of higher education institutions, in that disciplines are organized to promote knowledge in that discipline rather than how to teach the tenets of that discipline to students. Thus, in this context, and as Norma explains, professors never learn how to teach from others, nor do they know how to transfer knowledge about teaching to their own doctoral students.

Kenneth, a history department graduate in 1993, also was given independent courses to teach upon entering his graduate program, explaining, "All of a sudden thrown into a classroom never having done such a thing before!" The shock of that experience still doesn't sit well with Kenneth, nearly 25 years later.

I can still picture that first semester. I get shudders down my spine. There really wasn't good preparation; there should have been better preparation for people like me before going in. I was only a year away from having been an undergrad, and all of a sudden you're in there, you're before a bunch of people, for the most part I was left alone, you know, with a pack of students!

Not only was Kenneth not prepared to teach the undergraduates he was charged with, but believes the added demands of teaching took a toll on him as a graduate student. "It slowed me

down. I had to get incompletes and so forth, because I [felt I] have to teach this class that night, and that took precedence”. The experience of teaching is surely valuable for graduate students, but considering the lack of preparation and mentoring provided, these arrangements could be harmful for graduate students trying to balance their own lives as students, as Kenneth felt, while at the same time potentially offering sub-optimal learning environments for undergraduate students.

Ruby and Gertrude both considered themselves non-traditional students because of their ages upon entering their programs. Ruby states, “I was a non-traditional student; I did not go to the university until I was 34.” Both were also given their own courses to teach immediately upon entering graduate school. Gertrude, a 1989 psychology graduate, shares, “I had my own sections with 40-45 students, I had two sections, I did all of the work for them, but I was called a teaching assistant.” Gertrude taught subsequent courses at other local colleges while working on her degree. “People heard I was doing a good job of it, a podiatry school needed a statistics teacher, and then a professional psychology school needed a teacher. I taught mostly statistics.” Gertrude also sought out more guidance in teaching by creating an independent study for herself related to teaching. “I met with someone who was in charge of evaluating teaching a few times and I wrote a paper about evaluation. There was nothing else. That’s the big downfall of college teaching compared to k-12”. The “downfall” Gertrude refers to here is the lack of socialization to teaching and the lack of learning about pedagogy. Gertrude wanted to think more deeply about teaching but, because teaching is not valued as much as disciplinary content and research training, this option did not exist structurally at her doctoral institution; thus, she took it upon herself to create an independent study course with teaching as a focus.

Ruby, a 2000 sociology graduate, shared that she felt tracked to teach upon entering graduate school.

I actually started teaching my very first semester there. One of the professors at the last minute got a research grant, so here I was [with] nothing more than a completed bachelor's degree and I had a full teaching load. I had no preparation for that at all. I had no mentoring at all during that time. So it was really a trial by fire, I had to figure it out on my own, and that was very rough and I felt very much consumed by it. I very quickly got the feeling that I was being tracked as being someone to JUST teach [her emphasis]. But in terms of mentoring I got for teaching there was no formal coursework on how to teach.

Ruby's experience ultimately led her to transfer to a different graduate institution where she felt more supported in her research. Her feeling of being consumed by teaching so early in her graduate school career mimics the sentiments shared by Kenneth, both describing being overwhelmed because of the level of teaching they were asked to do so early in their careers, and that taking precedence over their studies. Ruby's attempt to create more time for research (through switching graduate programs) suggests that she understood the need to privilege research, at least in part, and the need to avoid getting "tracked."

In comparison to these extremes, however, nine participants described some combination of first working with a mentor professor and then moving on to teaching their own classes. Anita, a 2010 psychology graduate, started as a teaching assistant for statistics before teaching her own courses. Sue, a 1987 sociology graduate, began as the teaching assistant for a "computers in society" course: "I really thought I could do a better job than the person I was the TA for, and I could, so they gave me the class to teach." Laura, a 2003 sociology graduate, experienced a

combination of observing as a teaching assistant, then being a teaching assistant for courses, and finally teaching large sections (130 students) of courses on her own. She says there was “one semester where you really observed as a TA, and other than that [there was] not really any [preparation for teaching].”

Samuel, a 1979 graduate in history, felt as though he was trusted a lot when given an independent course to teach at the end of his second year of graduate school. He also was directed towards opportunities at satellite campuses and other institutions where he was paid at significantly higher wages than those he would earn as a graduate student teaching courses. He says he was given opportunities to teach, but not that was given any help in this realm. “I got opportunity, but I won’t say that it was support. The support did not being to match the opportunity”. Samuel describes “opportunity” as having the chance to teach courses, which he did have, compared to the lack of “support,” which is perhaps the socialization and training of pedagogy, which should have accompanied the opportunity.

Phillip, a political science graduate in the 1990s, also worked as a teaching assistant prior to being assigned his own sections to teach outright. Because Phillip had considered going into k-12 education he was more socialized to teaching pedagogy than most participants in my sample. “There was not a class, not a workshop, not anything..... Teaching pedagogy, and thinking about what works, and connecting with students and getting them to retain was something I personally did on my own”. However, his decision to put forth more energy on quality teaching was not respected by his department.

The graduate advisor said ‘Don’t waste your time on teaching, that’s not going to get you a job, focus on research’. Even as a TA I took teaching as a very serious job. My attitude

was, if I'm going to be a professor I'm not only going to be an excellent researcher, I'm also going to be an excellent teacher.

Phillip says that focusing on teaching was a choice he made, not something which was expected of graduate students. "You could choose to be a good teacher or not, and I chose to focus on teaching and learning. It wasn't really talked about in higher education at all". This idea of there being a choice, not an expectation, of quality teaching further demonstrates the structural devaluation of teaching through the systematic lack of socialization as well as a lack of recognition and reward for good teaching.

On the other hand, Betty, a 2012 sociology graduate, was encouraged to pursue teaching, but did not see that option being as prestigious as doing research.

I was an outstanding TA, I was awarded for it a couple of times. Even as a pretty young student other faculty would hear me and would pop in and say "Oh, you're so good at this, you should teach". But I was like, no, anyone can teach but I'm going to do research, that's a special skill. I was very highfalutin.

Betty's comment here reflects the common misnomer that research takes skill but teaching does not. She adds "I had a bit of that when I was younger as well. Research is *the thing*, teaching is just, whatever. But NO! Teaching is a lot of work; it's a lot of prep! [Her emphasis]" Park (1996) also argues that teaching is subject to devaluation in academia because it is classified as an unskilled form of labor requiring little thought or effort. In reality, quality teaching requires much thought and significant effort. Weimer (1997) suggests that there is a problem with teaching being conceptualized as merely the concrete things teachers do, which trivializes the complexities of the teaching and learning process. But because most professors and graduate

students are not socialized to be “good” teachers there is little awareness and a lack of discourse on good teaching and good pedagogy in higher education.

Regardless of how unprepared they were to teach, all of the respondents ended up working in teaching-intensive institutions. These teaching-intensive jobs are vastly different than the research focused ones for which their graduate programs primarily socialized them. The teaching loads are higher and the research expectations are lower, sometimes non-existent. All three participants at community colleges shared that they had no research expectations, but taught on average five courses a semester. Those at four year schools taught three or four courses per semester and described having minimal requirements for research productivity, with the exception of the participants working at regional institutions affiliated with an R1. How participants came to their current positions in teaching-intensive institutions is what I will analyze next.

Entering the Workforce

There were three main ways participants became employed at teaching-intensive institutions: by choice, by change, or by chance. Ruby, Norma, Bernice, Laura and Hugh all describe being drawn to teaching-intensive positions. This group of participants, in other words, purposely chose their current employment. For Ruby, a full professor of sociology at a large 4-year public school, the attraction was having a positive impact on working class students.

I knew I would want to teach, and being a working class student myself I was very dedicated to a working class population/student body. I’m a very good teacher, and it’s really easy to teach students at the top universities and quite frankly, this sounds so arrogant, I thought I had more talent than that, so I really wanted to target a university that had a large population of working class students. I was very committed to that.

In proclaiming that “it’s really easy to teach students at the top universities,” Ruby makes an argument that teaching is “easier” when working with more prepared or advanced students. Ruby feels that students at other types of institutions, with different socioeconomic locations and who might not be as traditionally prepared for classroom learning, need instructors who are “talented” and “committed” to teaching. She is clear in her identity as a good teacher, and clear in her choice to work at an institution where she might find these students who are not as “easy” to teach.

Hugh, a full professor in history at a large 4-year public school, shares a similar sentiment when he says, “I didn’t want to try to get to a prestigious place. . . . I had this idea that I wanted to teach someplace where it was more useful”. Hugh does not say, as Ruby did, that there was anything particular about his teaching skills that drove this desire, but he does suggest that his teaching is more “useful” at a less “prestigious” institution where students might need more of his help. Hugh infers (like Ruby above) that students who attend teaching institutions can gain more from classroom learning than students at “prestigious places.” In choosing a teaching-intensive role, he prioritizes teaching as well as particular types of students.

Laura, an associate professor of sociology at a medium 4-year public school, also knew she did not want employment at a research-intensive institution because she was more interested in teaching.

I was pretty clear, I wasn’t going to do R1, that’s not what I wanted to do. I wanted to teach more. What impacted me was these really great professors I had, it was really compelling to me. I was pretty clear I really wanted to work at a state school with a diverse population for whom college was really going to matter.

Laura's desire to work with students "for whom college was really going to matter" is similar to Hugh's desire to "teach someplace where it was more useful" and Ruby's dedication to a working class student body where her talent could be utilized. In all three of these examples, it is important to acknowledge that participants in my sample are using research institutions and/or more "prestigious" institutions as their reference point, actively reifying the importance of these "top universities" in their interviews with me. Even when they explicitly choose to work at teaching-intensive institutions over research-intensive institutions, and defend the reasons why they want to work with students at their current institutions, participants still reaffirm the devalued nature of the teaching-intensive institutions within which they work and the devalued nature of teaching itself.

Norma, a full-time sociology faculty member at a very large community college, was teaching as an adjunct when she decided that teaching was what she wanted to do. "I decided I wanted to teach, 'cause I realized THIS is what I wanted to do when I grow up [her emphasis]." She goes on to describe being turned down once for a full time position, then biding her time as an adjunct and completing her PhD, until she got another chance for a full time community college position. Norma also saw the opportunity to teach at a community college as a more stable employment option than searching for a position at research-intensive institutions. Her assessment was related to her family situation. "I told [my advisor], "Look, I'm a single mom. I bought a home. I can't just uproot my daughter to go someplace on tenure track, not get tenure, and start all over 5-7 years down the road. I love what I do. I love teaching." In this case, then, teaching felt like a safe option for Norma.

Some participants arrived at teaching institutions because of their interests in particular jobs (not necessarily because they wanted to be at a teaching institution). Bernice, an assistant

professor who is dually appointed in women's and gender studies and sociology at a medium 4-year public school, was not focused on institution type when casting the employment net. Instead she focused on positions that fit her particular areas of expertise and interests. Bernice applied evenly to research and teaching-intensive institutions, institutions that felt like "a perfect fit" for her interests. Bernice eventually landed her "dream job": "I actually get to teach queer studies and to come in to a place where it didn't exist before, and students were saying, 'We want this, we really want this,' there was so much energy and excitement about it coming." Thus, it was possible to arrive at teaching institutions because of one's chosen subject matter interests, not just because one prioritized teaching. Bernice arrived at her institution because it felt right at the end of her job search and because it allowed her to teach in a subject she loved. Therefore, her teaching identity evolved out of her affinity for a disciplinary subfield, sexuality studies.

While the first group came to teaching-intensive institutions on purpose and by choice, five participants arrived after beginning their careers at research-intensive institutions. Katherine, Sue and Gertrude all were denied tenure at research institutions, which eventually led them to teaching-intensive careers. Katherine, a full professor of political science at a large public 4-year school, was denied tenure at an R1 after publication expectations were ratcheted up as described in the previous chapter. She then moved to another teaching-intensive school, claiming, "That's where I began to learn how to teach". Geography played a major role in her switch from that first teaching-intensive position to her current one. Katherine's current position allows her to live where her husband is also teaching.

Sue, an associate professor of sociology at a medium 4-year public school, described a traumatic tenure denial, after which she took time to finish some publications.

I gave myself a sabbatical; it's how I was able to finish up all [of] the revise and resubmits. I really for three years had no income to speak of. I moved here with less than \$5 in my account, but no debt. The whole thing was horrible. But this is the thing if you're in the social sciences, the humanities, the foreign languages, philosophy. If you're an engineer and you don't get tenure BIG DEAL [her emphasis]! You can get hired in industry. So I thought if I could get a different job, if I could go into to a different field, I would totally be giving up academia so I stuck it out. I stuck it out because it's what I already knew and I was 53 years old. I did get a few interviews.

Sue goes on to explain that "in the end they offered me the job, and I have to say I applied because (of geography), and I needed a job. You have to have a job, right? They gave me 10 days to accept and I took 9 days 23 hours". She was holding out for another position at a technical university closer to her hometown, but the necessity of a paycheck won out and she arrived at her current position.

Gertrude, a fulltime faculty member in the psychology department at a community college, actually applied to two non-research-intensive institutions at the same time she applied for the position she eventually lost upon tenure denial. She describes, "I looked for a straight up teaching job." The two teaching-intensive institutions did not offer her interviews, but the research-intensive institution did. "I didn't necessarily want [the research-intensive job], but it was the most prestigious. I realized it was prestigious, and I got the job." After her tenure denial, she wanted to move but her husband would have had to throw away the tenure he had been awarded.

I googled teaching [jobs] and I saw a job opening at [Institution H]. I saw the description, I wanted it but I wasn't dying for it. I wanted to be back in California but I didn't want to

be in an office as a research scientist. I got a call from [Institution H], I kept smiling and answering questions and being vivacious. He was concerned, because I had taught at [a prestigious research-intensive] for 10 years, that I wouldn't be able to relate to the clientele at a community college.

Gertrude's story is particularly interesting because she started by looking for a "straight up teaching job", yet still had to endure the trauma of the tenure denial before landing the kind of job she wanted in the first place. All three participants who suffered tenure denials at research-intensive institutions were women. In these cases, the three women had no choice but to look for new employment. In their second job searches, they often chose teaching. In some cases, though, they were simply looking for a change, or for an institution who would hire them. The other two participants who made drastic career changes were men, who described their moves from administrative roles at research-intensive institutions to other work at teaching-intensive institutions as purposeful and chosen.

Samuel and Phillip both had administrative roles at research-intensive universities before making career changes into teaching-intensive roles. Samuel, a full professor of political science at large 4-year public school, described a meandering career spanning 20 some years and four prestigious institutions, both as a professor and in administrative roles such as dean, director of academic affairs, and vice president of academic affairs.

When I arrived here I thought I would be department head for 5 years or so, and then move on, sort of into a larger dean's position or provost, and then push ahead. I had any affection I might have had for administrative craft beaten out of me in my 5 years as department head, and have since said "no" to more administrative things than I care to remember. Someone pointed out to me that I made a terrible mistake [in leaving teaching

for administration], and 5 years later I said, “Dammit, that person was right!” I hadn’t liked what I was doing so I thought, “I’m going to go back to teaching.” I tell people unabashedly that I’m probably the happiest tenured professor they’ll ever meet in their life.

Phillip, a full time faculty member in political science at a large community college, spent his time at a research-intensive institution as a director of information systems in a research division. He was able to teach some classes while also fulfilling the administrative role, which he enjoyed. He had administrative offers at other institutions, both within and outside of academia, but liked the balance of some technological work and some classroom teaching. Because of changes in administration policies over time, he was not able to continue to do both, so he started looking for other options.

I started looking and [Institution I] opened, and by that time my criteria was staying in [his Midwestern state]. I liked the fact they had a mission that was clear...I figured that the job here, this was something I could do until I died. And I would find room to do research that was relevant and make a bigger contribution to student learning...It’s quality of life. It’s doing what I wanted to do. I’ve always been teaching my whole life in different avenues.

Phillip’s desire to “make a bigger contribution to student learning” harkens to Laura’s desire to work with students “for whom college was really going to matter”, Hugh’s desire to “teach someplace where it was more useful”, and Ruby’s dedication to a working class student body where her talent could be utilized. Samuel’s, Phillip’s, and Gertrude’s moves “back to teaching” suggest teaching identities are prioritized at times and that, even when individuals are lulled into

prioritizing employment at research institutions at times, teaching identities are maintained and can be reprioritized.

Six participants told variations of the same story, specifically of landing teaching-intensive positions by chance. They discussed stumbling into their teaching-intensive positions at times. Geographic preference and family life situations dictated some decisions. Other participants simply needed employment. Frances, Claude, Curtis and Anita had all hoped for positions at research-intensive institutions. Frances, a full professor of history at a small private 4-year school, had just about given up on finding a position in academia, when she got a tip from a former college peer.

Somebody I knew who was here had this job before me, somebody I knew from grad school, was leaving and they had a one year position so she said, "Throw in your application." I thought, "Oh, whatever, what the hell." So I did, and then I got the job! Just at the moment I was going to leave academia. And then I got hired into a tenure track position the year following.

Frances goes on to admit that she really did not intend to work at a teaching-intensive institution but, in retrospect, is happy with how it worked out: "Now I think it has all worked out for the best." She explained that work at research-intensive institutions was all she was socialized for during graduate school, so she never considered teaching-intensive places because they were not on her radar. Claude, an assistant professor of economics at a medium public 4-year school, shared a similar sentiment.

Initially I was searching for research oriented positions. Looking around trying to find two positions (he and his wife) is not easy. [Institution D] is the place where both of us got something offered. For my wife a tenure track position, and for me a lecture position.

We both had offers from other places, but nothing for the other person, so by default it was going to be [Institution D]. Last year it ended up I got the tenure track position.

Later in the interview Claude said that he feels more than satisfied with the type of position he has, even if it is not what he planned: “I’m beyond those vanities now. I have to admit to myself that this is the right fit for me actually....I don’t like stress, I like balance, and [Institution D] seems like a good place for that”. Claude makes it clear as he talks that he held research aspirations initially; therefore, he cannot help but compare his current employment to foregone employment at a research institution. Even when declaring himself to be “beyond the vanities,” his language makes it clear that his institution is lesser than the ones for which he was initially aiming. He landed his current job by chance, likes his job and does not want a research position now. But, comparisons between research and teaching jobs form the basis for how he talks. These comparisons are noted particularly among the participants who landed teaching jobs by chance.

Curtis, an assistant professor of anthropology at a medium public 4-year school, still seems unsure of his satisfaction with working at Institution D.

To be honest I wasn’t overly excited [about the job offer]. I was excited to have a job, but it certainly was not the kind of institution I wanted to be at. I wanted to be at a research 1. And there are definitely things that I haven’t enjoyed as much here, but in my 3rd year here I see advantages, and I like it more than that I thought I would.

Curtis’s conversations demonstrate his initial preference for a research institution and, further, a notion of settling for a lesser position simply because he needed a job. Perhaps Curtis is coming around to France and Claude’s acceptance in that he likes working at a teaching-intensive institution more than he expected, but he still is aware of the fact that he did not land at a

research institution (still, his first preference). Curtis is clear that he does not like all parts of his current job, saying that there are things he hasn't "enjoyed as much here", and continues to make comparisons to research-intensive institution. Curtis' talk during the interview performatively devalues teaching and values research.

Anita and Betty were swayed by geography in seeking their current positions. Anita, an assistant psychology professor at a medium private 4-year school, had extensive postdoctoral experience due to the clinical nature of her work. She describes several interviews and offers that just did not feel right for her, and how difficult it was for her to figure out what kind of position would be the right fit.

It was a priority for both me and my husband on where we wanted to live (sic). I really started to hone in on the factors that were important to me in a job....My mentor said something around this time, I had turned down all of these jobs and I'd applied for things and made choices, and she said to me "I think what you have to remember is that you're looking for the perfect job and you're never going to find it. But you're looking for potential. You're looking for something that has enough of what you want and that has flexibility for you to move, to progress." And so that's what I felt about here.

Anita's current faculty position, while at a teaching-intensive institution, does involve working with Masters students and being very involved in research projects, so she feels she has a nice balance of teaching and research. She did initially seek her current position for geographical reasons, however not for the type of institution itself. Betty, an assistant sociology professor at a small private 4-year school, explained that family circumstances amplified the importance of geography.

I had just found out I was pregnant before the interview, and my husband and I are loosely from [this Midwestern state], so I thought “Oh, this would be very convenient.” The best of my alternatives, it’s in the state where I would have liked to be having a baby. We’re 2 hours from my family and 2 hours from his.

While participants were socialized to desires jobs at research-intensive positions and their conversations during interviews reify the privileging of research-intensive institutions over teaching-intensive ones, they were employed at institutions which emphasize teaching. Whether arriving at their teaching-intensive institutions by choice, by change, or by chance, participants in my sample shared a commitment to students and a desire to teach well, as will be clear in the next section. Some participants work to make their classrooms liberatory spaces and are very clear about what students should gain from their college experiences. Other participants see a need for institutional change in order to meet the needs of diverse student populations. In the next section I describe how participants in my sample talk about students.

THE STUDENTS

Lacking a natural discourse to discuss good teaching or accomplishments in teaching, most participants instead focused on talking about their students when it came to describing this primary job duty. Regardless of how straight or meandering the path was to teaching or their teaching-related preparation, most participants discussed their students in positive ways. Ten of the sixteen participants shared that either “teaching” or “students” were the best part of their job. “I love our students”, says Laura. Bernice appreciated how well the faculty at Institution D knew their students when she was interviewing for her position. “The students, I love, love, love the students. I also saw that within women and gender studies, people talked to one another about students by name, and knew their students that well.” This attention to students was influential

for Bernice as she was making her decision about whether to join the faculty at Institution D. Norma talked about her fellow colleagues in a similar way: “I think a lot of us who work here are passionate about teaching, we love teaching, and we come alive in our classrooms. I think we all have that passion for teaching, I think we’re here because we want to be.”

Conversations about strong relationships with students and fostering student growth were common in my interviews, and participants used these conversations not only to describe their own teaching, but also that of their colleagues. Participants also spoke of the challenges of working with diverse student populations, but almost always in a caring and loving way. That participants relied mainly on emotional language to talk about teaching demonstrates the larger cultural socialization to teaching as caring and emotional labor. As discussed in Chapter 2, this labor of care is devalued in society. I discuss participants’ emotive conversations regarding students in the next section, because it is clear that this emotional, caring work actually becomes a central part of teaching, and talking about the labor of care is the way in which participants know how to talk about teaching (especially within the context of not knowing how to talk about teaching as pedagogy or what good teaching is).

On a Mission

Anita explains that relationships with students are key in facilitating students’ abilities to learn, because those relationships build a necessary foundation of trust. Anita’s training as a psychologist is evident in her choice of language below, and her understanding of the need for students to feel safe in order to be able to learn.

Learning happens in the context of the social system and social interaction so, to me, what’s central to learning is the social interaction I have with students. I think that when you have enough of a relationship with students, and they feel like it’s ok to make a

mistake or they feel like it's ok to ask questions, that's when they learn, because the context actually promotes learning.

Maslow's (1943) classic hierarchy of needs describes cognitive needs -- i.e., the desires to know and understand -- as both related to the achievement of basic safety and an expression of self-actualization. Maslow's hierarchy rests on the idea that when a need is fairly well satisfied only then can our conscious selves turn to the higher needs, such as self-actualization. When Anita explains that students feel like they can ask questions or make mistakes because of the relationships she has fostered with them, she is utilizing Maslow's framework for understanding student learning.

Ruby enjoys being able to help students gain access to the resources necessary to be successful, describing it as a highlight of her job. When asked what she liked most about her work, she responds:

Probably the satisfaction of being able to spot a student in my classes, and sometimes more than one, that I get a sense has something that they're struggling with. And if you can pay attention, if you can get enough focus on the student to be able to ask them the simple question, "What is there in your life I can help you with this semester?," they'll give you an answer. And almost always it's something that I can marshal resources on this campus to help the student with. So to be able to see, to be able to help, a student or many students on their way, for them to become unfettered by something that has become a burden to them.

Ruby's focus on assisting students to overcome some burden involves helping students meet basic needs so that they can then focus on academic endeavors. The relationships that participants developed with students also increased their satisfaction and sense of duty in

teaching. Katherine spoke about the relationships she is able to form with students and how watching them grow is one of the best parts of her job.

You develop relationships with them. I have a whole bunch of students right now that have had me for 4-5 courses, so I know them really well, mentor them through their senior thesis. I have a bunch of kids applying to graduate school right now and they're counting on me to write great letters of recommendations. Graduate school didn't prepare me for any of that. I just learned through doing. It's been kind of a painful process. I love teaching, and I love them.....that's the most enjoyable thing that I do. And the satisfaction of seeing students grow across 4 or 5 years and really develop in all sorts of ways. Not just intellectually or in their academic abilities, but personally become adults in this time period. So they go from being kids, a lot of them you see them as freshman they're still like high school kids, and by the time they graduate they're fully adults now. They go off and do great things.

Katherine's pride is palpable as she describes the "great things" some of her former students are doing with Doctors without Borders and other international organizations. Her performance demonstrates emotion work and labor of care very explicitly when she says "I love them". Ruby similarly feels a sense of pride in watching students grow, "I really get a lot of satisfaction watching students improve their work. I get a lot of satisfaction seeing student success, whether that is academically or whether that is emotional or personal growth." Ruby also described a philosophy of student "empowerment."

I think I gear it all toward empowerment. Sociology does no good if it stays in the book. So getting students to understand that they may not be able to solve the whole problem they don't have to be a part of the problem is #1. And if you can extricate yourself so

you're not part of the problem, or you can help educate other people, just to give students a sense that they are NOT that turtle on their back that can't turn over [her emphasis], that they can turn themselves over and they can take actions that have real consequences, not only for their personal life but may indeed have consequences for the lives of other people. I think from that empowerment standpoint, I'm a very strong advocate of "see how far you can engage self-determination" embedded in your social context. Acknowledge where you are and see how far you can go with that.

Ruby wants students to take what they learn about social context and use this knowledge to gain a sense of power in their lives. Six participants described encouraging student skill development, specifically highlighting critical thinking and "an understanding of the world" as key knowledge that students should leave their classes with in order to be successful. Frances further describes three main components to her teaching philosophy:

There's the skills piece and then this really sort of deep belief that I have that you have to understand history so that you can understand your world. And then there's the other piece which I don't tell the students because I don't want to be too preachy. Which is you can't change the world if you don't understand the world. So I have sort of a social justice agenda that I keep on the down low.

Frances's "down low" social justice agenda is similar to Ruby's empowerment philosophy. Frances claims that some students figure out her secret agenda, but that she does not want to be too blatant about it at her small private school. Bernice also describes a similar mission but is more explicit about it with her students.

[I want them to] recognize that on any given day when you're sitting in the classroom you don't know what the person next to you has gone through to be there, and so respect

their time and respect them being there and value listening to them and having communication with them. I feel that is one way I communicate to students what kind of classroom experience I want them to have..... I think that I'm just constantly thinking about how to make my classroom a more liberatory space.....nobody's learning experience should come at the expense of somebody else's humanity.

For Bernice, a social justice agenda is not just in the content she teaches but in the expectations she sets for her classroom. Norma feels that it is important to recognize students' needs and tries to combine her goals with theirs.

I know it's important for you to get an A in this class, and it's important to me that you learn something in the process. Maybe we can combine our two agendas where you actually learn something *and* you do well [her emphasis]. It's always good to hear "your class got me really thinking" or "I'll never see the world the same way again." Mission accomplished! If you start asking questions, if you develop a critical stance, if you never take society for granted again, then mission accomplished.

While there was some variation in focus on what participants felt was most important for students to learn based on their department, there are similar threads through all of these participant interviews, regardless of discipline. Participants in my sample want students to be able to improve their lives, whether through job prospects, resources management, critical thinking, or other skills. Participants saw their teaching identities as tied to the improvement of student lives, and identified as laborers of care as they attempted to bolster students' successes. While most participants do not have the language to describe how best to help students achieve their goals or how to assess whether or not they have been successful in their teaching missions, they kept their discussion focused on feelings and emotions. One of the greatest challenges

participants faced on this front, however, was in being prepared to meet the needs of a diverse learning community.

Diverse Needs of Students

Striving to meet the needs of a diverse student body was seen as both a challenge and a rewarding aspect of working at a teaching-intensive institution. Seven participants spoke about their roles in helping all students grow, regardless of ability. One participant raised concerns about the institution's exploitation of students who were not prepared for a college experience. Sue pointed to her institution in particular for admitting students who were not prepared for college, and then taking their money, which she felt was wrong. Frances and Curtis both spoke specifically to the idea of helping all students learn. Curtis shares, "My approach to teaching is to expect students at all levels, no matter where they're coming from, to achieve something. The end result is that I teach pretty hard classes, I have a high expectation for everyone." Frances shares a similar feeling, but admits that it took her some time to realize that not all students were just like her.

A lot of our students aren't super well prepared. [When] I came here it used to make me mad and depressed. I'd be like "Oh, these students, why don't they know how to, blah, dah, dah" and now I've really gotten to a different place. They're not where I was when I was 18, but who is? I was like a really geeky, nerdy kind of person, most people aren't like that and that's probably a good thing! So now I just think my job is to take them from where they are and raise their skills.

Instead of expecting all students to know and understand the world in the same way she did when she was 18, which she admits might not be the best way for everyone to be, Frances now sees her job in a different light. Because she was not socialized for her teaching-intensive job it

took her some time to adjust to this environment. Her purpose now is to accept students where they are and move them forward in some way. Norma includes the concept of differentiated teaching in her conversation with me.

Being a community college teacher, most of what you do is teach so you have to be someone who has what they call a differentiated style of teaching. You have to teach to different audiences. You have to be able to tweak your information to be able to reach certain students, because not everybody is on an even playing field.

Creating an even playing field in the classroom could mean many different things, from evening out socioeconomic background to evening out educational preparation. Norma suggests that faculty in teaching-intensive institutions need to be able to teach differently to diverse groups in the classroom because an even playing field does not exist. Norma's performance does include some pedagogical language as she refers to "differentiated" styles of teaching. Other participants gave specific details of how students' abilities varied. Hugh sees classroom expectations as conflicting with students' abilities at times.

Getting students to read even simple assignments and comprehending the content of the assignments can be very difficult, both because of their lack of reading skills and just they don't do it, they don't have the time, and the ideas and information are way above what they've been prepared through their own experiences to deal with. In graduate school you focus on complicated nuanced explanations of everything, and those explanations are very valuable, I believe in them, I spent a lot of time thinking about those things. But they're totally beside the point for what most students need or can absorb. And I can say they do need it, but if I present it, and it's 3000 feet above their head, it's pretty useless to them, and it's setting them up to fail.

Hugh mentions several different ways that students' lives and experiences affect their abilities to fully engage in class. He mentions a lack of reading skills, lack of motivation, lack of time (because of potential work and family obligations), and lack of experience or exposure to the kinds of information he presents in class. While he sees value in the content of his courses, he does not want content expectations to cause students to fail.

Sue acknowledges the same potential conflict between lack of preparation and expectations in post-secondary education, and blames larger structural forces for this tension.

This university was on this big push to grow enrollments. We admitted students who really ought not to be here. They really cannot write. They cannot construct a sentence in the English language. They cannot add a column of numbers. I don't know if they can't read, but they don't read. This is very, very problematic. It's problematic from the students' perspective; we're taking their money, they're borrowing the money, they're going into debt, it's hurting them, and it's exploiting them. And it's very demoralizing from a faculty position. You don't get a PhD so that you can work in a head-start program, or you'd get a PhD in head-start. It's also tough in that we have many students here who could and would be aces at Harvard or Brown or anywhere, they are phenomenal students. We have amazing students, but it's very difficult to meet the needs of both of those kinds of students in your class.

Laura works for Institution E as well, and expressed similar sentiments about students not being prepared.

We have a lot of students who are not very well prepared, by no fault of their own, but who see the value in education and are actually interested in learning things. But they don't actually have time to do it. They're pretty engaged in asking questions and thinking

about things, so I love that about them. We could support them better. I have a lot of colleagues who care a lot about our students, and the institution, and the community, and things like that. It's the bigger structural stuff that's a problem. While I love our students, I think many of them have no idea how this is supposed to work.

Nonetheless, Laura does not mention academic ability as the barrier for students' success in the same way that Sue does. She, like Hugh, mentions time constraints as a likely factor hindering student success. Laura also suggests that her students are first generation college students and therefore "many of them have no idea how this is supposed to work." Laura also uses the language of emotion work when she says "I love that about them" and "colleagues who care a lot about our students". Bernice spoke directly about the needs of first generation college students and students who work fulltime, and how they do not have as much time to devote to school as more traditional college students might have.

In terms of having a majority of students working, a lot of students have families, a lot of students are 1st generation college students.... how I learned to be a teacher was in working with this type of student population. It's not about showing students that inequality exists, but it's giving them tools to deal with the inequality that they know all too well. And I think other things about my teaching have been profoundly affected by that too. Like how do you deal with absence? My students were like "I missed class because I was being evicted, or my boyfriend got shot, something happened, people would bring their kids to class, my kid is out of school but I have nowhere [to take them]." I still want to hold students to the same high standard, and I would talk to them about that, you're still deserving of the same standard but I would work with students a little bit more around their circumstances. For example, if there was group work I always

make time for it to happen in class because when people leave class they have other stuff going on.

Katherine similarly sees the need to support students in order for them to be successful. She describes really learning how to teach in these circumstances while working at her first teaching-intensive institution, before coming to Institution A.

These are kids coming from the coal fields of southern West Virginia, absolute dire grinding poverty, poorly, poorly educated. But bright as, sharp as a tack and just really needed a lot of support. That's where I began to learn how to teach....But I'm always pleasantly surprised, I have lots and lots of excellent students, so the big difference [at a teaching-intensive] is that the range of abilities is just immense.

As described in the opening section of this chapter, only a quarter of my participants were required to take any sort of teaching course, and those courses were primarily focused on practical aspects of teaching, such as designing a course syllabus, grading, assessments, and classroom management. Because research-intensive institutions are set up to socialize graduate students to be researchers first, and because graduate students may not see as vast a range of undergraduates in their experiential training in research institutions, participants in my sample may have never received training on how to deal with diverse students' needs. After working in her current institution for over a decade, Laura sees opportunities for teaching-intensive institutions to better support students. Participants also suggest that graduate schools could be held responsible for training graduate students to teach the diverse range of students that they are likely to encounter in their future positions.

Ruby sees online opportunities as one particular method for teaching-intensive institutions to better meet the needs of their students.

One of things I like about the online teaching I've begun to do is I see that it can be an amazing advantage for students for whom learning doesn't come easily, or who are living in a very chaotic home situation. They do well in my online classes because they can find their own time to devote to it and when you allow students that flexibility, and at the same time give them support, because I'm very interactive.

Ruby focuses in on an important factor in creating student success when she says "[I] give them support, I'm very interactive". She recognizes the need to still find ways to support students and create those relationships in a virtual environment. Some faculty members in my sample, such as Anita, choose not to teach online courses, however, because they feel it is impossible to build the relationships vital for students' success. Thus, participants in my sample had mixed feelings about certain types of teaching environments or vehicles for student learning.

A reader might wonder where Ruby's inclination to be "very interactive" in her online class comes from, or how any of my participants continued to learn about teaching, considering with the lack of consistent training in graduate school. Thus, in the next section I discuss participants' conversations about improving teaching. Because so few participants had formal coursework or comprehensive socialization for teaching in graduate school, nearly all of the learning they have done has happened "on the job" in some way.

IMPROVING TEACHING

A majority of my participants (eleven out of sixteen) discussed some mechanism for improvement in teaching. Some suggested that their institutions provided professional development on teaching, and others explained that they had to seek out this training for themselves (indicating that their universities did not automatically provide it). Only one participant commented blatantly on not working to improve, stating "I hate to say that when

you're decades into it, it is hard to teach an old dog new tricks. I'm guilty as charged." In other cases, however, participants' opportunities for improvement varied considerably. I've categorized these improvement mechanisms broadly into two categories: formal and informal.

Formal Mechanisms for Improvement

The formal mechanisms for improvement in teaching included attending conferences/workshops outside of their institutions, attending professional development opportunities provided by their institutions, and engaging with pedagogy via journals/books. The most common method of improving one's teaching was attending professional development opportunities provided by one's own institution. Six participants spoke at length about offices of teaching and learning on their campuses, rigorous teaching evaluation systems, or teaching-related workshops provided by their different institutions.

Laura spoke about evaluations, offices for teaching and learning, and a group she participated in on campus which focused on student learning goals. Laura was also one of the participants who was very purposeful about her choice to work at a teaching-intensive institution, so it is possible that she is more acutely aware of, and involved in, the opportunities for improving teaching offered by her institution.

We have a good center for learning and teaching, support for teaching I think is strong. It's really well utilized, there's a variety of things from monetary support for course redesign, to support to go to conferences and workshops, to stuff on campus, and I think people use it..... I participated in this small group of professors and we read this book called *Creating Significant Learning Experiences*. That had a huge impact on me.

Frances, Ruby and Anita all described professional development seminars provided by the institution to help those who wanted to improve their instruction. While Anita's institution does

not have a formal office for teaching and learning like some others do, her institution still worked to provide teaching-related professional development.

We do have something called colleague development days, which comes every year and it's a full week and you can sign up and go to different seminars and they're all put on by folks here. I've gone to a couple really good ones on teaching, and different teaching elements, but you pick and choose what you want to do.

Norma's options sounded similarly optional: "There are opportunities for training, [and] when the money's available they support us going to conferences and things like that." Academics notoriously have a high degree of autonomy, and these examples highlight that autonomy in regards to opportunities for improving teaching. Their institutions provide opportunities, but attendance is not required. Laura believes that professors at her institution do take advantage of the opportunities provided for improving teaching. "We have a good center for learning and teaching, support for teaching I think is strong. It's really well utilized, there's a variety of things from monetary support for course redesign, to support to go to conferences and workshops, to stuff on campus, and I think people use it."

Not everyone felt that professional development opportunities were beneficial, however. Betty shared, "The teaching resources, they aren't like ways to help you improve, it's more like we're going to guilt you if you don't go." She views the teaching workshops provided by her institution as a punishment rather than an opportunity. Without having been socialized to value teaching, it is difficult to see such opportunities as more than a nuisance. Frances, who also works for institution C, similarly said, "I think there is pressure to improve teaching, but there isn't always adequate support." While she didn't feel the teaching resources were terribly useful, Betty did describe an evaluation process geared towards improvement.

They do emphasize teaching, that's what they expect. We are observed by our colleagues, the dean will come and observe us periodically, she will offer comments along the way, if she observed my lecture and there was something about it she didn't like we'd debrief. For your 2 year review she comes in announced, she works with you, pick a lecture you'd like me to come and I'll make room in my schedule if I can. And then by 4th year she pops in unannounced. And we also have a wrap up with her after both the 2 and 4 year review, in prep for your big tenure review she'll tell you, she'll go over her notes, these are the things I noticed, she'll go over your syllabi with a fine toothed comb, so that helps.....you have to account for your teaching philosophy, your courses, how you approach your courses, things you would change in your courses, you have to address your teaching evaluations and speak about those.

Betty is the only participant who described this intense tenure review process, but she also is one of the most recent hires of the sample. Others did know, though, that their evaluation systems were being revamped to rely less on student evaluation forms and more on observations and mentoring to evaluate teaching. Laura shared that it was something her institution was working towards: "Right now they're working on more of a peer evaluation, really training faculty to be peer evaluators." Without recognition and reward systems in place to adequately recognize and encourage quality teaching, there is no pay-off for putting additional time into teaching and the scholarship of teaching. Participants are already spending more time on teaching than they were socialized for in graduate school; thus, any pressure to improve one's teaching feels burdensome to participants in my sample.

Although institutions provided some forms of professional development, other formal mechanisms were found at disciplinary conferences and through workshops that participants

attended on their own. Kenneth, Bernice and Hugh all described such experiences as being transformative. Hugh's comments about a teaching-related workshop exemplifies their experiences:

I was looking for various ways of engaging, of creating more engaging classrooms, which is why I became a subscriber to the *Chronicle [of Higher Education]*. I went to a workshop [for a particular teaching technique] and it was immediately convincing to me. I was skeptical, but tried it and it worked near miracles. Very few [professors] do it because they have these perfect lecture notes that students NEED to hear [his emphasis], the sage on the stage. But, in reality, if students are responsible for the ideas they learn them better than if someone else explains them. On my campus I have staked a big claim to creating engaged learning experiences, but there's no pressure to innovate.

Hugh was one of the few participants whose interview conversations included bragging about his teaching in the way others boasted about their research. His efforts to evaluate and engage his own teaching was rare among my participants and many made it clear that teaching-related professional development is optional. The autonomous nature of academia, added to the culture in research institutions that reinforces the notion that one's disciplinary research is primary (and therefore learning about teaching is secondary, if visible at all), is evident in teaching-intensive institutions as much as any other institution, as there is no mandate to critically analyze one's teaching. Within this context, it is not surprising that Hugh thinks that very few professors are interested in changing their techniques. This is also why Samuel was comfortable mentioning his own feelings about improvement of teaching: "Why teach an old dog new tricks?" Luckily for students there are some participants in my sample who are willing and interested in deepening their engagement with teaching and pedagogy. Bernice realized that there was an entire branch

of research dedicating to teaching, and this realization opened up a new world of knowledge for her.

I went to take part in the teaching pre-conference at [my professional organization and] it was great, I loved it! My mind was kind of blown being around people with so much pedagogy; it was like, OH, MY GOD [yelling], this whole like realm of knowledge of which I know nothing! This was exciting. It was very energizing, very exciting.

Bernice's surprise in discovering such intellectual rigor in the scholarship of teaching not only demonstrates a sheer lack of exposure during graduate school, but also her assumptions that teaching was just something one does, not something one thinks about.

Voluntary involvement in formal teaching-related professional development was mentioned by six participants. Some discussed workshops or conferences, like Bernice and Hugh, while others had groups they met with, like Kenneth, who shared, "I also belong to a network of historians who teach history at local colleges, small colleges and community colleges. We meet twice a year. We always have sort of a research presentation, I just gave one, and then we also have sort of a teaching presentation." The most common, although still voluntary, formal method of improving one's teaching centered on reading, with five participants mentioning this form of improvement. However, two of them indicated that doing such reading was more a goal than something they actually did. Norma and Hugh both mentioned the *Chronicle for Higher Education* specifically as a source for teaching research. Anita proposed, "We have teaching journals in psychology that are good, and so that's an opportunity also to pick up different specific kind of ideas or modules". Betty and Curtis mentioned the existence of such research, but also mentioned not reading in this literature. For Curtis, time was the major roadblock to such engagement: "[It's] frustrating not to have the time. In a teaching position you

have to be reflective and work on it, but you're also less and less able to do that. . . . I have not really dealt with those books [pointing to pedagogical books] as I would like to. It's a goal but hasn't happened." Goals, and effort towards achieving those goals, are indicative of participants' and academia's priorities. Pedagogy is not recognized or rewarded and, thus, it is not surprising that participants have not prioritized engaging the scholarship of teaching.

While many participants partook in formal mechanisms of improvement, the more common approach was engaging informal mechanisms. Considering the burdens of time on faculty members' lives, with a combination of research, service and teaching responsibilities stealing the time of most participants in the sample, it is not surprising that many participants had to resort to using only informal mechanisms of improvement of teaching.

Informal Mechanisms for Improvement of Teaching

Informal mechanisms for improvement of teaching are those which occurred naturally, or are not embedded in the institution in the way that centers for teaching and learning, professional conferences, workshop, journals, and teaching evaluations are. The most common informal way of improving teaching, described by four participants, was that of copying others, a type of socialization. Ruby was given this advice earlier in her career:

Someone once made a very good suggestion to me - think about the professor that you felt had the greatest benefit *for you* and then model what they do. I was fortunate (in graduate school), as well as (in) my undergraduate, I had excellent professors. I had a wealth of models to choose from, and I picked and chose what felt best to me.

Anita and Sue shared similar learning experiences. Anita proclaimed, "A lot of what I do related to teaching is simply how I was taught." Equally common was for participants to describe

learning about teaching through conversation. Frances learned a specific technique, that of using a grading rubric, through casual discussions with colleagues.

I really didn't even know what a grading rubric was when I got here and then I had this colleague who was like "where I used to teach they had these rubrics". I was like "Oh, my god, that's such a good idea! You mean you tell the students how you're going to grade, and you have to decide how you're going to grade. I was like, WOW! I was an instant convert. And then they really don't complain about their grades as much because it seems fair because, it IS more fair (sic), you're not just making it up as you go along.

[Her emphases]

This example, where Frances describes learning about a teaching technique and its effect on student outcomes, demonstrates an important point. Teaching is not just about being entertaining or having students like you. Teaching is also about making sure that students are given opportunities to learn and clear assessments of learning. In this case, Frances learns about a way to increase clarity for students and better assess their learning, and she adopts this method successfully after hearing about it. Phillip also spoke at length regarding how not only he, but his colleagues across departments, engage seriously in improving their teaching, although mostly informally.

I can speak to the faculty that we, we're always talking about how can keep the students, how can we engage them, how can we deal with their personal problems. We're doing a lot more of that than obviously any generation past. And I think a lot of the faculty, in social sciences and English, are a lot of the people who have been hired understand that that's what it's about, it's about the student, it's not about them, it's not about the purity of the discipline or anything else.....We are constantly talking about things, whether it's

pedagogy, a lot of it recently has been sort of the IT in terms of how do you deal with cheating, learning, and engagement. We're ALWAYS talking about that informally. We're trying to do a better job of codifying what we do informally, because of higher learning commission..... The engagement in the community college of faculty is much greater than at the university. [His emphasis]

These efforts towards informal methods of improving teaching do point to participants' identities as teachers. However, without either formal socialization or recognition and reward systems in place which value teaching and encourage teacher training, it is unlikely that faculty members are exposed to the teaching and pedagogical scholarship that would provide the most optimal learning opportunities for their students. Interview conversations with participants in this study suggest that there are relatively low expectations for this kind of teaching-related improvement, even at teaching-intensive institutions. Participants have to be self-motivated and committed enough to teaching to want to do this work on their own.

While one quarter of participants did experience coursework related to teaching and pedagogy while in graduate school, an equal number were placed directly into independent teaching without any supervision. Approximately half of the participants had experiential training (through teaching assistantships), but no real pedagogical preparation. While the main mission of the faculty members at research institutions is research, and the structure of higher education supports and rewards research over teaching, doctoral students often graduate and receive their first jobs at teaching-intensive institutions. In other cases, graduate students may take meandering paths to eventual teaching-intensive positions. Considerable numbers of undergraduate students attend teaching-intensive institutions as well, and these students are

deserving of the best educational opportunities possible. Thus, graduate training should include more substantial training in how to teach, as well as how to think about teaching.

Participants who chose to take employment at teaching-intensive institutions right after graduate school were also more likely to be the ones to report interest in teaching-related professional development and building more engaged learning environments. Laura, Bernice and Hugh are all examples of this group who purposely chose teaching as an identity and profession; that is, they wanted to teach well from the very outset of their careers. These faculty members would likely have benefited greatly from additional opportunities to explore teaching while in graduate school. Considering that they described knowing early on that teaching was a priority for them, it is likely they would have taken advantage of such coursework had it been made available to them.

Participants came into their teaching-intensive roles equally by choice, by change, or by chance. Many of those who initially sought out research posts came around to enjoying their teaching-intensive positions but may be completely unprepared to teach a diverse range of students as they enter teaching-intensive institutions, especially since they might not have chosen to be teachers first and foremost. Teaching-intensive schools might invest in professional development opportunities specifically for those who are coming to teaching as a second career of sorts, or by chance, since these faculty members may not be ready to think about student learning, student abilities, or even the best assessment methods. Most of the participants who talked about student learning environments or student needs were also those who initially chose teaching as an identity, and sought out employment at teaching-intensive institutions. Other groups of participants were less likely to identify as teachers first, and were less likely to engage in formal methods of improvement of teaching.

Overall, participants in my sample share a desire to help their students achieve and were committed to teaching at the time of interview. Finding ways to better support faculty members in this work, through both formal and informal mechanisms, should be a priority of teaching-intensive institutions as well as graduate training programs. Unfortunately, it is clear in many comments that participants make about teaching that employment in research institutions is still more highly valued. In fact, some participants made it clear that teaching is still devalued when compared to research. For the most part this devaluation was not blatant and most of the language participants used did not directly devalue teaching. Instead, indirect devaluation of teaching was made apparent through participants' notable lack of socialization to teaching, lack of language for describing (and lack of emphasis on) good teaching and/or teaching accomplishments, emphasis on emotion work and relationships with students, and little/mixed desire to improve on one's teaching.

Other than Hugh's interview performance, within which he bragged that he had "staked a big claim to creating engaged learning experiences", no other participant bragged about being a better teacher than their peers in the same way that they did with research. No one described losing tenure because of poor quality teaching either, in the same way that they described being denied tenure for lack of research productivity. Finally no participant called for increased teaching standards or expectations at their institution in the same way they talked about wishing there was more pressure to engage with research. Teaching discourse included conversation about their labors of care, and the need to increase attention on students, but it was clear that participants did not feel as if being a good teacher was something for which they would get rewarded. In sum, participants' discourse about teaching was very different than their discourse about research, and it is clear that there are not parallel discourses to converse about these two

job duties. The next chapter focuses in on another set of devalued responsibilities: service, or what one participant calls the “third leg of the stool.”

CHAPTER 6-THE BURDEN OF SERVICE

During one of the very first interviews I conducted for this project Samuel, from Institution A, used the analogy “three legs of a stool” to describe research, teaching, and service responsibilities. Because the project was a study of the teaching vs. research nexus, service was not considered in the initial literature review, nor was it included in the crafting of the interview guide. However, service regularly came up as a salient topic for participants. It was so prominent that one quarter of respondents named service as the area they felt least prepared for by their graduate program. Because the interview guide did not prompt respondents to discuss service, it is possible a greater number of participants would agree with the notion that they were unprepared for service had they been asked directly about this topic. The absence of discussion on service in the original literature review and in the conceptualization of the project is itself a reflection of the undervalued nature of service work because it was invisible to me as researcher. Service is devalued because it is considered to be instinctual, natural, and unskilled (Park, 1996).

Overwhelmingly participants described service responsibilities as daunting and burdensome, and linked these feelings to structural factors. For faculty members service is expected in relation to their institutions, their disciplines, and to society. Service by faculty is a structural necessity for institutions to be able to build and sustain quality programs. Service is a structural necessity to disciplines in order for them to continue publish academic journals and put on national conferences. Service is a structural necessity for society to function well (Brazeau, 2003). However this service work is often ignored, or at least undervalued, by being almost entirely un-incentivized. Rarely do additional service responsibilities result in course releases, pay increases, or promotions (Furman, 2004). Service work is therefore even more undervalued than teaching, and hence becomes a burden for faculty members. I’ve organized participants’

portrayals of these service burdens into two main categories in this chapter: service volume and inequality in service. I use this chapter to analyze these categories of service burden, and then end the chapter with an analysis of how the dynamics of service work impact the teaching-research nexus and the privileging of research.

VOLUME OF SERVICE

Participants felt they were expected to spend an unreasonable amount of time on service activities given that service is viewed as the least important factor in tenure and promotion evaluations, in comparison to research and teaching. Service is a virtually invisible job responsibility according to my participants. Higher education institutions do not advertise faculty service responsibilities in job advertisements or job descriptions in the same way that they do teaching and research, and they do not train or socialize graduate students to the fact that service exists and will be burdensome. Participants noted this fact in their interviews with me. Similarly, participants suggested that service is not considered as important in tenure and promotion decisions, in comparison to teaching and research. The expectation to perform service is less formalized than teaching and research responsibilities, as I demonstrate later in the chapter, yet still functions as a structural burden. This structural burden is created through the conflict of being expected to participate in service while at the same time needing to be productive in research in addition to teaching for most faculty members. It is also burdensome because of the lack of recognition and rewards given for completing service work. One way participants expressed this structural pressure was in describing the amount of time and/or energy they expended on service. This volume of expectation exceeded what many felt was reasonable. They also voiced being unprepared for the amount of expected service.

An example of this unequal volume comes from Curtis, an assistant professor of anthropology at a 4-year public institutions, who uses sarcasm to describe the impossible nature of teaching, research, and service demands placed on faculty at his public four-year university.

50% research, 50% teaching, 50% service is the joke but, in reality, most people will say 40/40/20. Lots of little things, the library liaison, and then big campus wide things [go into service]. I also try to do other things, I try to review manuscripts and journal articles, you get credit for that and I like that stuff. I put service for the discipline on the shelf.

Curtis points out that while the official policy may be that teaching and research are evenly weighted at his teaching-intensive institution (40%/40%) and that service is supposed to take up a much smaller percentage of one's time (20%), in reality faculty members end up spending equal amounts of time on teaching, research, and service. This means that the faculty workload percentages add up to an amount beyond what is manageable ("50%/50%/50%"). He further demonstrates this when he mentions in an exasperated tone how he tries to do other service activities external to his institution, such as reviewing manuscripts. Curtis notes that some of the service activities that he enjoys, such as reviewing manuscripts, "counts" – i. e., "you get credit for that" -- but explained that he had to put this type of service on the shelf because of the extraordinary amount of service required of him at his own institution ("lots of little things and then big campus wide things"). Curtis is therefore constrained in his ability to choose what types of service he engages. Even though the service activities he wants to do would "count" in his yearly evaluations, it would not reduce the pressure and/or burden to participate in on-campus service. Thus, because of the sheer volume of service work at his own institution (and the seemingly compulsory nature of this work), Curtis is constrained in the amount of external service activities he accepts.

Discipline and Institutional Factors

The burden of service volume is exacerbated for faculty members who find themselves in multiple departments or colleges within one institution. In these situations it is common for faculty members to have a home unit or affiliation, within which service responsibilities should be confined. However, faculty occupying roles in multiple departments often find themselves pulled into extra service work in two ways. First, a professor in multiple departments might be drawn to participate in dual-department service because of a desire to form networks and relationships across units. Second, faculty members identify with and value the service work being done in both units and, thus, are drawn to both. Bernice, an assistant professor at a 4-year public institution is the only participant in my sample who is dually appointed, serving in both women and gender studies and sociology departments. She recognizes that her dual appointment has the potential for doubling the volume of her service work.

I'm joint appointed, I'm 2/3 Women and Gender studies and 1/3 Sociology. It does mean that I have to be careful about service. Because I go to two sets of meetings, I also potentially do two sets of service, so I have to be cognizant of that. I have to remind the sociologists that women and gender studies is where (her main affiliation lies). Whatever I do for you [sociology] I have to do twice as much for women and gender studies as a rule of thumb.

Regardless of her awareness that she must be cautious of over-committing to service, this awareness alone cannot ensure that Bernice will lessen her volume of service work. Furthermore, the added burden of having to remind colleagues of this balance increases pressures on Bernice, since she is also cognizant that it could undermine her rapport with colleagues. Despite the reality that Bernice should not have to participate fully in Sociology service activities given her

dual appointment, the possibility of contempt amongst colleagues still exists and is something she wants to avoid.

Service quantity is sometimes increased because of the nature, size, and resources of the institution. For instance, according to my participants, smaller schools have fewer administrative and staff positions than larger institutions. This may mean that while the types of service work are the same across institutions, the number of people employed to handle these responsibilities is lower. Hence, at smaller institutions, or in smaller units within an institution, each individual is expected to do more, when compared to larger institutions, or larger units within an institution. Anita, an assistant psychology professor at a private, 4-year school, talks about the high service burden and attributes this burden to the variety of service work that needs to be done.

This is a university but it feels like a small liberal arts school. There are all these different committees, we have shared governance in each college, and the university, and there's curriculum committees for undergrad, there's curriculum committees for grad students, so all of this stuff. So even though service comes 3rd, at a place this size there's only so many people so everybody is doing something, and doing MULTIPLE things [her emphasis].

Anita reiterates that service is considered least important of the teaching, research, and service trifecta when she says it comes in 3rd, but then goes on to discuss the structure of her institution and blames its structure for causing service burden. Because of the size of the institution, all employees must have higher service volume in order for the institution to operate effectively. Furthermore, Anita suggests that all individuals must engage in multiple types of service as a result. So, not only does the volume of service increase in smaller institutions but so does the

variety of service. Frances, a history professor at a 4-year private school, offers a similar analysis.

It's a very under-administrated college campus. I mean, it's shocking! There's a dean and an assistant dean and a president and then people in charge of enrollment and finance and things like that, but, as far as the academic sub-structure, there's a lot of committees that do things that administrators would do in other places.

Kenneth, a full professor of history at another 4-year private school, also defines the wide variety of service expectations placed on faculty as a negative.

There's different levels (sic): department, college wide, beyond the college. So, for most people, service was an expectation that everybody had to be on a committee every year. For the most part it's committee service, showing up at meetings, participating in meetings. There are also many ad hoc groups. I just sort of find myself all over the place. That's the kind of the downside of the small place, [we're] really stretched thin, *lots* of responsibilities.

All three of the participants who described feeling that the size of their institution played a role in increasing the burden of service worked at different private institutions. Two of these were classified as small, while one was classified as medium. It's possible then that the more salient variable here is funding source instead of size of institution. However, just because none of the respondents from public institutions echoed this narrative of having to cover a wide range of activities does not ensure this does not exist, but would warrant further investigation.

Service volume, then, is not only the amount of time spent or the number of activities, but also the different types of service work one is assigned. This variety adds complexity because the various service requirements require different types of knowledge and skills, forcing participants

to constantly switch back and forth between roles, while (presumably) attempting to maintain high quality participation in all of them. Frances adds in exasperation after describing her current service-related leadership roles, “and that doesn’t count like the 37 committees! I don’t think it’s 37, I think it’s, you know, 18 or something, but it’s a lot!” The exaggeration, “the 37 committees!” makes a point about the sense of volume and over-commitment felt by participants.

Types of Service

Another aspect of the volume burden involved in service work is the reality that certain committees and commitments require more time and effort than others. In effect, then, it is not just the quantity of service activities that matters; it is also the time required in particular service activities. Some committee work requires an extreme level of service, which means that certain service assignments are more burdensome than others. Type and extent of service work, then, posed an additional structural burden on participants in my sample. Job descriptions and tenure and promotion factors do not differentiate the difficulty level, effort level, or time commitment of particular service responsibilities compared to others, and therefore participants often learn by experience that some service work is more burdensome than other work. In addition, the lack of weighting of different service types in annual evaluations or tenure and promotion systems represents yet another problem for my participants.

Hugh, a history professor at a 4-year public institution, describes his position on the faculty senate as more burdensome than other service assignments: “That’s a lot of work; evaluating instructors and promotion and tenure, sabbaticals, things like that.” Katherine, a political science professor at a 4-year public institution, shares a similar sentiment about serving on the committee for research and sabbatical leaves: “So we’re evaluating all these applications, from all over the university, for internal funding, and that’s *real* work.....really extensive

amounts of work!” Both of these examples point to higher workload as well as “hard” or “real” work as key components of particular service activities. Hugh, a historian, and Katherine, a political scientist, are not trained experts in evaluation or finance, yet find themselves in positions requiring these skills. As professionals, they would want to be successful and credible in their roles, and thus must put forth additional effort in order to provide quality service for their departments and institutions.

Sue, an associate professor of sociology at a 4-year public institution, highlights the sheer amount of time spent in some service tasks. “Some of these things are *really, really* intense. The search committees- it isn’t just reading CV’s! It’s going to dinner, it’s going to talks, and it’s calling references. It’s amazing how much work it is!” The burden of being on search committees involves not just time, but time outside of one’s regular work day when activities like going to dinner are a part of the requirement. Given that most job postings involving a search committee would include multiple candidates which, in turn, means late nights and dinners, attending multiple talks, and calling dozens of references. Extra hours and late nights can put stress/strain on familial relationships as well as teaching and research responsibilities, as faculty members often also have family obligations.

Faculty members may not have enough time or expertise to engage in some of the service activities they are assigned but, as highly educated, successful professionals, they also would not want their service activities to be viewed as partial, subpar, or underperformed, as this could reflect poorly on their capabilities. Participants in my sample must put forth extra effort to ensure their service activities are successful and that these activities stand as a positive reflection of their work ethic, intelligence, and values, even though service is mostly an invisible portion of their job responsibilities. That is, participants must participate in overwhelming amounts of

service and do it well, just to make sure that lack of service or partial service does not reflect badly. As a general rule, one does not want to be caught doing a “bad” job in service or not performing service, but being successful in service activities only allows one to maintain their position in the university. There is no formal recognition for successful service or high levels of service.

The feeling of being overcommitted in service was echoed by many participants in my sample. Kenneth, who is working on changing policies at his institution in hopes to alleviate some of the service pressures, proclaims: “It isn’t necessary for EVERYbody, at EVERY moment, to be on a committee, especially if many of the committees are totally useless!” To further highlight the feelings of having a wide variety of service responsibilities that are just “extra,” and using sarcasm as a coping mechanism, Sue shouts with awkward laughter, “I chaired a committee on the role of chairs!” The volume of service work is not only too much, then, but also the service performance is not always useful and seems unnecessary. In addition, since service does seem to play an indirect role in tenure and promotion evaluations, at the very least priming committees to think about how much of a “team player” a tenure applicant is, faculty are not in a position to blow off service responsibilities, no matter how useless participation seems.

Service Consequences

Service volume is especially significant as a structural burden when it correlates negatively with tenure and promotion decisions. Participants in my sample voiced that the requirements for tenure and promotion are often described as vague, making it difficult for faculty members to know exactly how much of each activity (i.e., teaching, research, and service) they should be involved with in order to be promoted and/or receive tenure. Tenure and

promotion are tied both to job security and salary increases and, therefore, are an intimate reflection of a professor's economic reality. When describing negative tenure and promotion issues at his institution, Kenneth describes over-commitment to service as a common mistake of junior faculty.

We often see that they might be doing a lot of service, and good attention to teaching, but the scholarship, too little attention. They're being overwhelmed with service because everyone's asking them because they're very competent. It's like you need to be able to say no to them, and focus. Balance is always an ongoing issue.

Kenneth's recommendation to find the appropriate level of balance is well-intended, but there are no concrete guidelines about what that balance should be or how to achieve it within the context of expectations that faculty will engage in high levels of service. As Kenneth suggests, junior faculty are likely to be overwhelmed by service demands because they feel the need to impress anyone who might be involved in future decisions regarding tenure and promotion; consequently, they do not feel comfortable turning down service requests. Katherine's comment exemplifies this notion.

There are people who have gotten into trouble for not doing enough service, so you're paranoid as an untenured faculty member. And especially I was, because I was sort of convinced it [i.e., not gaining tenure] might happen [to me] again. So maybe I went a little overboard in service. I mean, anything anyone would ask me to do, I just kind of said yes to anything that people asked me to do.

As mentioned in previous chapters, Katherine was initially denied tenure at a research-intensive institution before being employed in the Political Science department at her current institution. She consciously "went overboard" because of fear of another tenure denial, and going overboard

meant “saying yes to anything.” Thus, there are times when participants in my sample very purposely acquiesced to a service overload, although we might not see this as an unrestricted “choice.” Saying no to service was not always an option.

Participants in my sample highlight that junior faculty are perhaps asked more often to participate in service. First, because senior faculty members are bound to standing service obligations when new obligations come up, junior faculty may be the first to be asked to take on responsibilities. If new faculty are asked to take the new service work that comes up, in addition to the required service responsibilities that all members of a department/college are expected to accept, junior faculty may get asked to do more than senior faculty in the long run. Senior faculty may also feel they are doing junior faculty a favor by providing opportunities when suggesting they take on service roles. The inability to say no, or fear about turning down these requests, leads to junior faculty in this sample being unable to find the balance Kenneth mentioned. Subsequently, service volume for junior faculty is highlighted as a problem by some participants in my sample.

Not only are the requirements for service volume and type not well-defined and, thus, can work against faculty in my sample, there is no preparation in graduate programs for the volume of service work most students will find themselves required to do upon full-time employment. Unpreparedness for service was a common theme within participants’ interviews, with a quarter of participants describing service as the aspect of their career they were least prepared for. Previous researchers (e.g., Price and Cotton, 2006) have called on graduate schools to improve developing awareness of service requirements by requiring students to engage in service work while in graduate programs. Because graduate students do not enter the job market with exposure to the full cadre of academic job responsibilities, individuals teaching and mentoring in doctoral

level graduate programs are complicit in the service struggles faced by junior faculty members early in their careers.

Ruby and Laura both expressed a desire to have been better prepared for the volume of service work they would find themselves expected to participate in. For Ruby, a sociology professor at a 4-year public institution, it was not only that she was unprepared for service, but also she sees this unpreparedness as adversely affecting her in the profession. “What really *took me down*, and I was not prepared for at all, was the amount of time the service work took, and that continues to be an issue for me today.” Ruby laments not being able to complete as much research as she would like to, and this is what she infers when she uses the phrase “really took me down”. Ruby was never denied tenure and has not suffered any permanent professional damage stemming from too much time on service work; rather, she is bothered by it from a personal goal vantage point. Ruby would like to have been more productive in research activities, and attributes both service and family obligations as preventing her from reaching that goal.

For Laura, an associate professor in sociology at a 4-year public institution, service volume and unpreparedness for service was more than just a personal hiccup. Instead she feels it was a confounding factor in her initial tenure denial. “I could have been much better prepared and supported in how to do research and publication, and in making decisions about service stuff. I do *way* too much of. It’s all of these things I care deeply about, but [service work] ended up not being a good idea in the end.” Laura views doing “too much” service and not being able to achieve Kenneth’s “balance” of service, teaching and research as one of the reasons why she was initially denied tenure. Tenure denials are extremely stressful for faculty, leading to potential loss of employment altogether. Tenure denials also represent a negative mark on one’s

professional record for the duration of one's career. If service volume and lack of preparedness for service are reasons for some tenure denials, then participants in my sample are highlighting important structural problems within higher education that need remedies.

Faculty at teaching-intensive institutions have increased pressure of needing to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service, when compared to their peers at research-intensive institutions, according to participants in my sample. Yet, teaching and service activity are often judged more subjectively than research activity. The vagueness surrounding what "good" teaching or service activity is, coupled with sheer service volume, makes service a particularly salient factor in determinations of the evaluations of faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions. This was evidenced by Kenneth, who said some junior faculty do too much service, and Katherine's description of people getting in trouble for not doing enough service. At the same time, service volume represents burden. As participants in my sample have demonstrated, service volume can manifest in terms of additional time burdens, effort burdens, expertise burdens, and unpreparedness burdens. Additionally, some faculty members find themselves asked to do more service than their peers. I'll now turn to the analysis to this latter form of structural burden: inequality in service.

INEQUALITY OF SERVICE

Participants in my sample also explained the structural inequalities of service through conversations about three aspects of service work: forced appointments, minority status, and lack of oversight. Forced service appointments occurred when a faculty member is required to take on a particular service role without specifically consenting to this work. While service work itself is required for all professors regardless of institution type or departmental affiliation, expectations for service work are not evenly distributed. Two participants found themselves pushed into

specific service activities in ways that they felt were unjustified. Inequalities in the volume and types of service work expected of minority professors is well documented (e.g., O'Meara et al. 2017), and expectations for minority participation in service work were echoed by three of my participants. The demands on minority professors place unequal burden on faculty occupying one, or multiple, minority statuses. Participants also spoke of a burden of inequality for junior faculty, as mentioned in an earlier section of this chapter, and also faculty without children. Lack of oversight surrounding service burdens and inequality in service serves as an umbrella phenomenon that envelopes all burdens related to service work. Overall, participants' discussions of service work reflect the lack of oversight and the lack of processes for evaluating service requirements or recognition of "good" service. Participants in my sample make it clear that there is no method for gauging or creating parity of participation in service work on their campuses.

Forced Service

The most frequently-cited forced service requirement, shared by two participants, involved the role of department chair. Because the role of chair is seen as administrative, it may be considered a promotion and not service. While the role of chair itself is not always defined as a service role, when faculty members are required to serve as chair, versus willingly seeking out this leadership role, it can be defined by the participant as part of their service responsibilities. Both Laura and Sue work at a public 4-year school, in the Sociology department. Sue expressed anger when describing being forced into the role of chair. "I became chair and at the end of 3 years because nobody else would be chair. *And* I had to do it for 5 years! Then, as soon as that was up, I became the director of the graduate program in public administration. And, in the meantime, I was on the IRB for 8 years." Not only was Sue forced to become chair when no one

else was willing to do so, but also was required to remain in that role for longer than she expected, in addition to maintaining other service responsibilities. Laura also shared a sense of duty in becoming chair when no one else was willing to do so, even though it was not a role she wanted.

The reason I ended up being the department chair, I had been adamant [in years past]. . . no, no, no, it's not my turn! Nobody wants to do it because the work load has increased exponentially.....[Later the department] was a mess, and we had 2 brand new faculty come in last fall so, after all of this happened, it was winter, and another [semester passed] and no department chair. And then . . . it was clear, I had a little bit left in me.

Laura felt forced into the role of chair, even though it was “not her turn,” because no one else had taken the role and she felt a responsibility to the newest faculty members. When departments do not have clear guidelines for promoting individuals and/or fulfilling leadership roles, individual faculty members may feel forced take on these roles. Laura and Sue are both employed by the same institution and in the same department, so it's possible this forcing into position of chair is unique to their situation. Although less dramatic, Katherine was also forced into a service role at her institution.

In my first 2-3 years here, I was on the general education committee, which designed and implemented the whole system of general education that we now have at the university. I was responsible for global awareness [education requirements], and they also put me on the committee for research and sabbatical leaves.

Being placed on a committee is different than choosing to participate. Service for which one signs up for willingly is more likely to be of interest to faculty members, and is more likely to fall within their area of expertise. So, not only are there service roles that faculty members do not

feel as if they chose freely, but also, as discussed in a previous section, it is these same roles that tend to take more time and effort to complete (because of lack of preparedness and expertise).

Minority Status

Another form of inequality in service relates to the unique burdens placed on minority faculty members. While some additional minority status service may be voluntary, that is not always the case. O'Meara et al (2017) found that service responsibilities fall more heavily on women and other minority groups not by choice, but because they are asked more often asked to engage in such work. While they may not always feel forced into this service work, minority faculty members in my sample definitely feel the extra burden. Bernice shared that she felt overwhelmed by students asking for her mentorship because of her minority status (in this case, her minority status was her sexual orientation).

So, I think that there is a dimension of when you come in representing a minority position in your department -whether it's about race, whether it's about sexual orientation or something else- you do more mentoring because you are the person that students will come to, who they know and they trust. That is such a rewarding and gratifying thing, [but] at the same time it becomes very time-consuming and a ton of emotional energy.

The additional emotional energy requested of and invested by faculty who occupy a minority status is the result of many factors. As Bernice points out, students come to minority faculty members because they know and trust them. Feelings of trust form when faculty members occupy a similar minority status and are able to provide safe spaces for students to share experiences and seek help. The situations that students may need help with, however, are often stressful and, in some cases, seriously traumatic. Students may want advice on experiencing bias and prejudice, or experiencing outright discrimination from peers, family members and the

community at large. Helping students deal with these situations requires emotional energy from faculty members in two main ways. First, they must empathize and care for students and, in doing so, may face strong emotions when students share struggles related to their minority status. Empathic and caring work also takes effort, no matter how invisible it is. Second, faculty members may end up reliving similar situations in their own past as they deal with students. While there are potential benefits in being able to provide this valuable service to students, as Bernice suggests, serving in this role still creates an emotional burden that is not experienced by non-minority faculty members, resulting in an unequal service burden.

Laura also sees gender inequality in service, and the connections between gender and race inequality in service work.

Women do more in the department [in terms of service], but thinking in the college and university.....women in general do more, so we're no different than anyplace else. We're expected to do more and women of color, especially. In the college there's a lot, it's hurting them for sure.

The gendered nature of service work and labor of care often falls unequally on the shoulders of female faculty members. This burden is increased for women occupying intersectional minority statuses because of their race, according to Laura. Another example of these intersectional service inequalities comes from Sue, whose comments further explain what Laura means when she says that women of color are expected to do more. Sue describes the advice she gave to a colleague:

I gave her advice when she was hired- that because you're African American and because you're a woman people are going to want you on all kinds of committees so that they

meet their diversity targets. Fight that, because you'll be sacrificing yourself for checking the boxes off somebody else's agenda.

In the same way that it is difficult for junior faculty to say "no" to service participation requests because they feel both obligated to say yes and are afraid to say no, faculty who occupy minority statuses may feel obliged to agree to the higher number of requests they receive. While Sue sees this as sacrificing yourself for someone else's agenda, participants in my sample do also understand the importance of diverse representation within an institutional framework. Ideally this would not place a substantially unequal burden on minority faculty members because they would be well represented across the ranks of faculty. Unfortunately because minority faculty members are few in number, they are likely to find themselves with unsustainable amounts of service work. Minority faculty members may feel a sense of personal reward and gratitude for being given an opportunity to shape an institution's policies in way they believe reflect the priorities, interests and cultural relevance of their particular status group. While Sue understandably recommends resisting this urge to preserve personal energy, the trade-off of not having one's voice heard may not be worth it. Until the proportion of minority faculty within institutions increases, minority faculty find themselves facing dual burdens of high service volume and an obligation to serve because they know they represent an important cultural perspective. All three of the participants in my sample who voiced concerns regarding service inequalities were women, which suggest that this type of inequality in service may not be visible to all involved.

Oversight

Finally, the burden of inequality in service is felt by anyone who suspects they invest more effort in service work than their colleagues. This inequality arises from lack of clarity

regarding expectations, not holding all faculty members accountable for service, and physical presence on campus. For instance, Laura and Sue both commented that the amount of service one does is directly related to how often faculty are physically on campus. Because institutions allow for faculty to weigh in on their own teaching schedules, it is possible for them to be present on campus only a few days a week. Laura highlights this by saying:

When you're [only] there two days a week you're teaching all day, which means you're never present to be available for other stuff. There are sometimes conflicts [within the department] over that. There are some people who come to the office and work every day. And if they come to the office to work every day they're available when a student walks in.

Inequality in service exists among faculty members who choose to do their work on campus compared to those who do not according to Laura. Because faculty members hold a high degree of autonomy within their professional work, colleges and universities can only require presence during class time and office hours and perhaps a few other departmental events and meetings. Those faculty members who do work in the office on a regular basis are potentially unequally burdened by students seeking assistance, administrators who come looking for members of committees and, in general, day-to-day operations of academic units as evidenced by participants' responses. Sue provides additional insight on this matter.

People don't come to campus. But if you are on campus then you're doing the work for the people who didn't come to campus.....People who don't have children end up carrying the load for people who do. And I'm willing to do this once in a while, but they talk about the institution accommodating, and I believe in that. But it's not the institution

that accommodates, it's individuals [who accommodate]. And if it's the same individuals every single time, that's a problem.

Sue points out a crucial inequality in service experienced by single, or childless, faculty members. Because they may not have spouses waiting for them, or children to take to ballet or soccer practice, these faculty members are more often asked to participate in service which occurs in the evenings or on weekends. Sue also described living closer to campus than most faculty members, a choice which also resulted in her being asked to take on after-hours type commitments disproportionately.

With no systematic oversight surrounding the distribution of service activities, faculty members in my sample experience multiple inequalities in service. Curtis experiences this lack of oversight in his fight to keep his department flourishing.

I'm doing all of those things [research & teaching] and take up slack on the service, and they [i.e., other faculty members in department] don't do anything to add to the reputation of the program. I'm now the second most senior on campus, and the first is the kind who abandoned responsibility once they got tenure . . . who's doing no research, whose teaching I think is questionable, everyone gets an A, and who doesn't involve himself in any service, who refuses. Effectively I am in charge of [the department], which everyone says is not fair as [I am] a junior, untenured, faculty person. No one has done anything except to say it isn't fair. I could abandon it and say it isn't for me to figure out, but if I did that then there wouldn't be a department for me to get tenure in.

Curtis has colleagues who recognize the inequality, "which everyone says is not fair", but this recognition has not resulted in change. He admits to having some perceived agency in that he could choose to do nothing, but that is a false option in his opinion. If he does nothing then her

worries about the future of the department that he will be tenured in. This structural burden is created when senior faculty members are able to refuse to participate in service without consequence. When some faculty members choose to participate in less service this increases the already-demanding burden on those who do engage with service. Curtis makes it clear that this unfairness is caused directly by a lack of oversight.

The subjective nature of evaluations of service also makes it difficult to measure or provide oversight on its distribution, as Hugh points out when he sarcastically shares the following: “It’s easy to fake it. Being on a committee that never does anything can count, you can check it off. I served on the do-nothing committee all year, and we did nothing all year.” Frances also bemoans the unclear nature of service expectations and how it results in inequality: “You know you’re supposed to do something. They don’t really specify how many, so I think there really are these inequities in terms of how much people do.....There’s no set standard”. Gertrude, a full time psychology professor at a community college whose 2-year institution has no research expectations does attempt to quantify the service load, also sees oversight as an issue. “When you sign the contract it says that you should do the equivalent of five hours a week of service. There’s absolutely no system in place to notice if you’re doing it or not. What I have learned is that one third of the faculty do all of the service.” If one third of the faculty take on all of the service burden then they are doing more than the system intends for them to do. Phillip, a full time political science faculty member who is also employed at a 2-year institution with no research responsibilities, similarly names accountability as an issue, claiming, “I think the one thing that obviously all of these administrations could do better is hold people more accountable for their service outside the classroom.”

When the structural burden of service is not well defined or managed by institutions, faculty members will experience unnecessary strain caused by lack of oversight. This strain is exacerbated for faculty who occupy minority statuses within the institution, both because of the increased volume of requests they are likely to receive, and because of a sense of obligation to represent their community's best interests. In this sample, participants named race, gender, and junior faculty status as important statuses that potentially led to extra service. Physical presence on campus, living close to campus, and having no children also encouraged extra service requests. Finally, no oversight over senior faculty members' lack of service led to additional requests on others.

The themes of service volume and inequality in service combine to create a formidable structural burden for my participants. Laura clarifies why this service burden is important: "If you don't work in the office then you're not [there when a student walks in], which means you don't have to do that work, which means *you can do your other work*. [her emphasis]" While service burdens are not unique to faculty at teaching-intensive institutions, service burden was described as a roadblock to participants' abilities to complete the research they would prefer to spend their time on. In contrast, no participants in my sample complained that service got in the way of teaching, even though all were working at teaching-intensive institutions which claim to prioritize teaching over research. This omission of teaching conversation further demonstrates the devaluation of teaching in comparison to research. For example, Sue exclaimed, "But my, the reason you get a PhD, to do research, becomes almost immaterial! I like the service part. It's just that it interferes with so many things." Ruby also explains that while she sees some service as a choice, it is not a choice she is necessarily happy with: "It is frustrating. One of the reasons I

do so much service is that everybody else is so busy with their research and what they have prioritized, that things that I would like to see get done just don't get done."

Frances also sees such a bias but goes further to see the university as systematically enabling such patterns. "Some of the people who do the most publishing get away with not doing it (service), and I think there's sort of a tacit agreement. Like, ok, you published so much [that] we're not going to make you do this, and that's a little bit annoying." Publishing and research productivity are seen as valid excuses to substitute for service requirements, but teaching is not given that same leeway. It stands to reason that faculty would not be granted the same leniency for doing less service work should they choose to put that energy into teaching in the same way they can for choosing to do more research. Ruby adds a final note:

If I were to say I'm not doing any more service then I would be able to be more research-active. I think for various reasons I have chosen to organize my work life as I have and I realize that, [but] I can hear several of my staunch feminist friends saying you just do not sufficiently recognize your exploitation. [But] I do not feel exploited.

While some participants in my sample may feel they are making a choice of service over research, the theme is still clear in participants' conversations: service time replaces research time. Consequently, conversations about service burdens ultimately further demonstrate the structural privileging of research over both teaching and service.

Participants in my sample described service as burdensome, with a quarter reporting it is the area they felt least prepared for upon entering the professions. This burden of service was described both in terms of there being too much of it (volume) to be able to manage adequately and feelings of service obligations not being fairly shared among faculty members (inequality).

Volume of service burden was described as being related to one's department affiliation, and for one participant being dual appointed required increased vigilance regarding service commitments. Volume of service was also potentially related to institutional type, as three participants who saw the size of their institution as playing a role in their perception of increased service expectations all worked for private institutions. Volume of service burden was also related to the type of service participants engaged in, as they saw some service commitments as taking up more time and energy than others, with no method in place for accounting for such variability when comparing faculty member service commitments. Finally, volume of service was described as having potentially negative consequences for tenure and promotion decisions by participants in this study- as some were judged as not having done enough of it, while others saw doing too much service as a problem.

Inequality of service burden was experienced by two faculty members through forced appointments. Both of these individuals worked for the same institution, in the same department, so it is possible this was unique to their situation. Female participants described the role minority status sometimes plays in unequal service burdens, expressing that faculty members occupying minority statuses find themselves putting forth more effort in terms of service than their peers. Finally, participants in my study described lack of oversight and common expectations for service as the greatest contributing factor to the burden of service inequality, with half of the participants expressing this sentiment. In the next chapter I will offer recommendations for reducing the service burden described by participants, as well as for lifting up the visibility of teaching and service in academia.

CHAPTER 7- CONCLUSIONS

In this study I analyzed how the teaching-research nexus was experienced, understood, managed and navigated by faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions to gain an understanding of the academic structures which allow for the continued privileging of research over teaching. I expected participants in my sample to privilege teaching more than research because teaching presumably comprises a larger portion of their work lives than it does for faculty members at research-intensive institutions, with the latter being where most of the scholarship on the teaching-research nexus has focused. In this chapter I begin with a brief summary of the main findings from Chapters Four, Five and Six, making connections back to the literature review. I then discuss potential implications and recommendations based on these findings, the limitations with the study, and the original contributions that this study makes to sociological study.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONNECTIONS TO THE LITERATURE

Participants' performances reified and reproduced the privileging of research over teaching in several ways. The privileging of research was most obvious in the messages participants received in graduate school, as to which types of institutions (research-intensive versus teaching-intensive) were more highly valued for future employment. This is an example of the socialization O'Meara (2011) described as a potential barrier for reform in higher education. Because graduate students are almost entirely socialized to value research over teaching they do not often come to their teaching-intensive institutions focused on teaching. This socialization further legitimizes the current structure of the professoriate by maintaining the accepted norms of knowledge and conduct (Powell and Gilbert 2006).

Participants also demonstrated such privileging of research through boastful conversations about their own research skills as being superior to their peers. Their socialization in graduate school instilled a set of beliefs, ideologies, norms, values, behaviors, and practices which focused primarily on research. Their expectations about the kinds of work they should be doing then vary from the expectations and assumptions of established faculty at teaching-intensive institutions as predicted by Austin (2011). However, these interview conversations also exemplify faculty members' experiences of professional anomie once employed at teaching-intensive institutions. Hermanowicz (2011) established that although an institution may not be oriented to research that does not negate the fact that research is still seen as the core social function of the academic profession. Faculty members at teaching institutions may feel torn between their socialization (and thus, expectations) and the reality of their current employment that may enforce teaching as an identity and primary job duty.

The privileging of research over teaching (and service) was also evident in the tenure denials of four participants in my sample, all of whom were women. As Chegg and Esping (2005) pointed out, simply having a policy of valuing the act of teaching and the scholarship of teaching does not necessarily result in structural changes to reward systems. Research is still valued more than teaching and service and promotion might be in jeopardy if teaching is prioritized, as one respondent explained. Other participants seemed to experience tenure denials as a function of the increased expectations for research at teaching-intensive institutions, during what Schuster (2011) referred to as the rise of the Academic Capitalist University and what O'Meara (2011) describes as mission drift. O'Meara (2011) claims that "while standards for faculty work may be a moving target, it has been constantly moving upwards.....traditional

research counts more now than it did 10 years ago”. Participants in my sample reiterated this proclamation.

Finally, in calling for their teaching-intensive institutions to place a higher value on research than currently exists, some participants expressed a desire for increasing the privileging of research at their institutions. Within the context of mission drift (O’Meara, 2011), as teaching-intensive institutions begin to push for increases in research productivity, newly hired faculty are likely to be those who have been socialized entirely to focus on research (Hermanowicz 2011). Because these new faculty have been socialized to value research it is logical that they would support the missions to increase research productivity on campus. As a result, teaching-intensive institutions may focus even less on teaching in the future than they do now, unless mission drift is corrected and these institutions find some reason to focus more heavily on teaching as a primary job duty.

Participants’ conversations also reflected arguments made by Altbach (1980) that expectations of research productivity in addition to teaching duties are often not realistic. Participants in my study described tensions between research, teaching, and service as untenable. While these sentiments echo other scholarship regarding the teaching-research nexus, it is relevant to see that these performances are not limited to those employed at research-intensive institutions. Based on my findings, faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions may feel the same pressure to privilege research over teaching as faculty at other types of institutions, even if the specific expectations for research productivity are lesser at their places of employment. This finding runs counter to my expectations, but my participants were very clear about the importance of research.

Participants described a wide variety of teacher training opportunities while in graduate school, but only four reported any formal coursework on teaching. This, in conjunction with participants' general socialization to the privileging of research, is evidence of higher education's devaluation of teaching. This devaluation is most obvious in the lack of formal coursework regarding teaching scholarship and pedagogy experienced by most participants. Participants also were given little to no mentoring in their graduate school as they entered teaching assistantship assignments. Some participants were even told to keep quiet about their desires to teach. Clegg & Esping (2005) found that, even in doctoral training institutions that attempt to promote teaching and the scholarship of teaching, faculty members retain an attitude that teaching is easy, and that it is primarily seen as a burden; it is not seen as something to aspire to or improve upon. At least according to participants in my sample, graduate students are socialized in the same way.

Relatively equal numbers of participants arrived at teaching-intensive institutions via different pathways, by choice, purposeful change, or chance. While some participants had intentions of working in teaching-intensive positions, others felt relegated to these roles. Although participants in this study did not boast about their teaching in the same way they did research, they did talk positively about their students and wanting to provide successful learning experiences for them. A discourse of emotion work and labor of care was used by respondents to describe their teaching identities because their socialization had not provided them with an alternative discourse regarding good teaching or the importance of pedagogical accomplishments and learning. Brint (2011) claims that teaching has become an accepted core identity of professors but that this has not solved the problem of status inconsistency because the support for teaching has not been in the realm of teaching scholarship; instead, college teaching has been

transformed into a helping profession. Nonetheless, many participants described either teaching, or their students, as the best part of their jobs. Overall, most participants expressed a desire to make significant impacts on the lives of their students and for opportunities to become more proficient in doing so. Thus, it is clear that participants – regardless of how they arrived at teaching-intensive institutions – cared about their students and held identities as teachers. They wanted to help their students succeed and took this labor of care seriously, even if doing so was not an initial career expectation and was the reason for some anomie (due to the disconnection between career expectations and reality).

Regardless of their career goals, and despite having little to no training for teaching in most cases, participants described formal and informal methods for learning about, and improving, their teaching. The one participant who actively did not seek to improve his teaching described himself as “an old dog unwilling to learn new tricks.” Most others did attempt to improve their teaching somewhat, but there is still a lack of recognition to support these attempts. O’Meara (2005) suggests that chairs, deans, and faculty lack the skills and knowledge to effectively assess the scholarships of teaching, integration and application; this may be why there is lack of recognition and reward for good teaching.

Findings in Chapter Five align broadly with those of other researchers such as Robinson and Hope (2013), The American Association of University Professors (2000), and Weimer (1997) who all conclude that there is a need for increased focus on rigorous teaching methods throughout academia. Similar findings by Johnston (1997) suggest that the common method of providing faculty with voluntary professional development for teaching is unsuccessful primarily because faculty members do not have adequate time for such activities. This was echoed by participants who, although describing interest and engagement in both formal and informal

methods for improving instruction, ultimately did not have the time to engage fully in such activities. While interest in the improvement of teaching would likely be echoed by at least some faculty members employed at research-intensive institutions, I found it surprising and relevant that there were not more formal, mandated, mechanisms for improvement of teaching for participants employed at teaching-intensive institutions.

The greatest structural burden perceived by participants in my study, however, was in relation to service expectations. Both the sheer volume of service and inequality in service were described as burdens for participants. Importantly, participants most often saw service as a barrier to their research goals but never mentioned service as a roadblock to teaching; thus, my findings on service further demonstrate the privileging of research over teaching. A few participants in my study echoed the findings of O'Meara et al. (2017), citing that gender inequality related to service work is a problem. Participants in my study also shared that additional minority status positions such as race, sexuality, ability, and age may also add to inequality when it comes to service commitments. Several participants perceived that the size and type of institution they were employed by resulted in an increase in differential service expectations, and also that teaching-intensive institutions required more service compared to research-intensive institutions. Whether or not such a service disparity exists would require further research. However, considering that research expectations are lower for faculty at teaching-intensive institutions than for those employed at research-intensive institutions, it seems plausible that faculty members at certain types of teaching-intensive institutions would be expected to shoulder a higher service burden.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings in this study support further study of the recommendation for graduate programs to increase pedagogical training for students (Cross 1990). One argument against this is that it would increase the course-load for graduate students and thus would potentially dissuade some from pursuing graduate school that path at a time when programs are looking to increase enrollments (Robinson and Hope 2013). Additionally, for graduate students with little interest in teaching such a comprehensive requirement might be seen as futile. One alternate recommendation for change is, instead of overhauling graduate programs completely and forcing more students to prepare for teaching careers, graduate programs could offer a teaching-intensive option in lieu of another course requirement. Such an option would only be plausible if enough students enrolled for the courses to be viable. Pedagogical coursework could also take the place of a cognate requirement found in many masters and doctoral programs.

Either of the above options would allow for students most interested in teaching-intensive work to become better prepared for those roles. However, this recommendation also depends on hiring institutions to value such training when comparing multiple applicants in a tight labor market where many people are competing for the same jobs in higher education. Furthermore, before instituting any systematic changes to graduate school training there is a need for more scholarship on the learning outcomes for students enrolled in courses taught by professors, and graduate students, who have had such pedagogical training.

The findings in this study warrant consideration of the recommendation made by many (e.g., Weimer 1997; AAUP 2000, Knapper 1997, Johnston 1997, Robinson & Hope 2013) for changes in how teaching is incorporated into the academic pursuits of faculty members, such as allowing for professors to choose which areas (research or teaching) they would like to spend

time in. Weimer (1997) asks “Why expect faculty to do both (teaching and research) at the same time? Why not let an individual select to emphasize different activities at different points in their career?” Two of my participants, Laura and Kenneth, made similar recommendations. Laura asks:

So why not, if somebody is so passionate about teaching, and research is not really where their passion lies, why would we not totally support them in being an amazing teacher? In the pieces of the pie, make that bigger for them in progressions from assistant to full. And why would we not, if somebody is a good teacher still, but who really has this great research agenda, and really would integrate students into their research and wants to publish more, why would we not give them time away from teaching, why would we not support that? Why not build on people’s strengths? It doesn’t make any sense to me, we become a stronger whole.

The inherent problem with this recommendation is ensuring that enough faculty members would choose to be engaged fully in teaching duties at any one time to meet the demands of students. This would require careful coordination of who is focusing on research and teaching at any given time to ensure resources (that is human capital) were appropriately divided. Considering the privileging of research over teaching this concern is especially worrisome, as the findings in this study indicate that many faculty members may opt to focus more on research than on teaching if given the opportunity. This is not to say that I see such a recommendation as implausible but I believe an additional layer of re-focusing hiring practices, as well as an overhaul to tenure and promotion procedures, would be required in order to make these solutions practical. Considering the difficulties that already exist in evaluating teaching and research

equally, creating fair tenure and promotion procedures which allow for such differentiation would be a monumental undertaking.

Weimer (1997), Boyer (1990), O'Meara (2011) and others recommend increasing the value placed on teaching scholarship. If teaching scholarship was as highly valued as other types of research, then faculty members might be more likely to engage in such work. Laura, from institution E, hoped her institution would re-examine their assessment of this kind of publication: "The constant discussion, which is really telling, about whether or not pedagogical publications count drives me crazy!" This recommendation could be taken one step further by encouraging graduate students to focus their research on the scholarship of teaching. If such scholarship was encouraged for graduate students they would be able to potentially learn and grow in both research and teaching. Consequently, they could then enter teaching positions with more developed understandings of teaching as well as a pragmatic research agenda to continue as faculty. Graduate students who are studying best pedagogical practices would also have an opportunity to pass on increased learning opportunities for students enrolled in their courses while in graduate school. Faculty members serving on graduate students' thesis and dissertation committees would also benefit from additional exposure to the scholarship of teaching, potentially learning about teaching from their students. Austin (2011) also suggests that increasing preparation for teaching in graduate school does not necessarily have to result in less research because, having been prepared adequately for teaching, faculty members would be able to more efficiently manage their time, potentially resulting in increased research productivity and job satisfaction over time.

As Hermanowicz (2011) claims the health of a postsecondary higher education system is necessary for the success of an evolving society. Improving the status of teaching in academia is

imperative for several reasons. First and foremost are the undergraduate students who suffer from the systematic lack of attention to good teaching, teaching pedagogy, and the scholarship of teaching. Undergraduate students deserve to gain human capital for the financial and time-based investment they make in higher education, and the evidence shows that students are not gaining the skills and abilities desired by employers in contemporary times (Arum and Roksa 2010; Keeling and Hersh 2011). Faculty are also at risk of anomie due to an absence of opportunities to receive recognition for their primary job duties (Hagstrom 1965) given the disconnection between their socialization (expectations) and career realities. Increases in the types, and therefore numbers of, institutions that privilege research over teaching has two implications for recognition systems. First, recognition of research in more numerous institutions could “water down” what research is, making it less meaningful. Second, competition for recognition in research could increase the numbers of faculty members who are trying to reach research expectations, but all faculty members may not be able to meet these expectations because of the realities of their current employment (at institutions with high teaching and service loads). Thus, the increased and expanded attention to research productivity, and the mission drift that O’Meara (2011) documents, is not helpful for individual faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions. Elevating the scholarship of teaching, however, serves multiple goals. First, it is advantageous for graduate students to read, since they would benefit from improved pedagogical training. Second, faculty members could gain recognition and rewards based on teaching performance and also contributions to teaching pedagogy.

LIMITATIONS

The nature of my data does not allow me to generalize to larger populations, as was discussed in the methods chapter. While I would have liked to analyze differences in experiences

based on gender, race, sexuality, race, and other indicators, the size of my sample did not allow for this level of analysis. The main finding related to gender was that of tenure denials, which were all experienced by women. Future research can attempt to rectify the deficiencies of the current study. My analysis is focused on faculty members at select teaching-intensive institutions in the Midwest as well and most of the participants in this study earned their graduate degrees at institutions also found in the Midwest. Therefore my analysis is likely influenced by the policies and practices found in the graduate programs of major universities in this region. It is possible that the findings from this project would not be common in other geographic regions.

Another limitation of this study relates to the data collection process. Because information was obtained through interviews these data are limited to what participants chose to share, and by what types of questions I as the researcher chose to ask. For instance, because the project focused on the teaching-research nexus, I did not include questions specifically regarding service. This omission is further evidence of the invisible, devalued, nature of service work. Therefore the findings regarding service must be considered partial and incomplete. Self-selection bias in my sample also potentially limits the strength of my findings. For example, the faculty members in my sample who bragged about doing more research than their colleagues perhaps really were the most productive, which is why they chose to participate. Those who did not opt in to the study may have done so because they were not as proud of their academic career.

My background as an educator and my interest in teaching has likely biased this investigation as well. Throughout the analysis it has been difficult for me to remove my voice and my desire for a larger focus on quality teaching, and what the lack of focus on teaching means for higher education in general. I also likely have been drawn to literature which argues

for an increased focus on teaching and, thus, am not challenging the literatures I cite in this dissertation. I also start with the premise that engaging in the scholarship of teaching will ultimately lead to improved teaching pedagogy in post-secondary, higher education institutions, and that this would have beneficial outcomes for students and society.

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

In addition to the recommendations for change described in the previous section, this study contributes to the literature by highlighting the voices of faculty members in teaching-intensive institutions. Most of the previous research related to the teaching-research nexus has focused on graduate students or faculty members at research-intensive institutions. Considering that a majority of professors in academia reside in teaching-intensive institutions, it is critical to examine their experiences with the teaching-research nexus as well. Scholarship focused primarily on research-intensive institutions works to further privilege research over teaching. While the findings in this study may not seem to vary from those of similar studies at research-intensive institutions, the potential commonality in findings alone is worth noting. Considering the variation in job requirements at these different types of institutions, I expected that the performances, identities, and experiences of faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions to reflect the privileging of teaching, but I did not find this to be the case among my participants.

While research exists on the teaching-research nexus, and other studies highlight inequalities in service burdens among faculty members, the findings of this study point to a further devaluation of teaching when service is taken into account. While service is considered the “third leg of the stool,” and generally worth less than both research and teaching when it comes to tenure and evaluation, participants only discussed service burden in terms of its effect on research productivity, but not on teaching productivity. This finding is particularly surprising

since all of my participants were employed at teaching-intensive institutions. In highlighting how my participants reify the privileging of research in comparison to teaching and service, I hope to raise awareness among the faculty at teaching-intensive institutions to refocus on the teaching mission of their institutions and bring about greater support for teaching both in graduate school preparation as well as for faculty.

In this study I analyzed how the teaching-research nexus was experienced, understood, managed and navigated by faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions, specifically to gain an understanding of the academic structures which allow for the continued privileging of research over teaching. Participants demonstrated their involvement in a socialization process which ensures the systematic privileging of research over teaching during graduate school, and the consequent disconnect between their career expectations and realities. Participants reify and reproduce this privilege upon entering the profession, even within their employment at teaching-intensive institutions.

My findings demonstrate that the complexities of the teaching-research nexus, which have been well documented at research-intensive institutions (Schouteden, Verburgh and Elen 2016), also operate in teaching-intensive institutions. Without any form of structural change it is imperative that sociologists closely monitor the impacts of continued mission drift in teaching-intensive institutions on faculty and students. Ideally academia would recognize the need to adjust the socialization of future faculty members to provide a more useful foundation for the careers they are most likely to enter.

APPENDIX A



IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
<http://irb.wayne.edu>

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To: Megan Petersen
Sociology
College of Liberal Arts and Sc

From: Dr. Deborah Ellis or designee J. Wirth 12-2
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: August 05, 2015

RE: IRB #: 067215B3E
Protocol Title: Balancing Teaching and Research: Faculty Experiences
Funding Source:
Protocol #: 1507014150

Expiration Date: August 04, 2016

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

The above-referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were **APPROVED** following *Expedited Review* Category (#7)* by the Chairperson/designee for the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 08/05/2015 through 08/04/2016. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Revised Protocol Summary Form (revision received in the IRB office 08/03/15)
- Dissertation (received in the IRB office 06/30/15)
- Behavioral Research Informed Consent (revision dated 07/27/2015)
- Phone Script
- Email Script
- Data Collection Tools (2): i) Administrative Interview Guide, ii) Faculty Interview Guide

* Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You may receive a "Continuation Renewal/Reminder" approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval *before* the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can never be reported or published as research data.

* All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the IRB **BEFORE** implementation.

* Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the IRB Administration Office Policy (<http://www.irb.wayne.edu/policies-human-research.php>).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit the IRB Administration Office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the IRB website at **each** use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998



IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
<http://irb.wayne.edu>

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED CONTINUATION APPROVAL

To: Megan Petersen
Sociology
College of Liberal Arts and Sc

From: Dr. Deborah Ellis or designee A-Lalour 12-2
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: July 28, 2016

RE: IRB #: 067215B3E
Protocol Title: Balancing Teaching and Research: Faculty Experiences
Funding Source:
Protocol #: 1507014150

Expiration Date: July 27, 2019

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

Continuation for the above-referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were APPROVED following Expedited Review by the Chairperson/designee of the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of **07/28/2016 through 07/27/2019**. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Actively accruing participants
- Behavioral Research Informed Consent (revision dated 07/27/2015)
- Phone Script
- Email Script
- Please note: This continuation was reviewed under the IRB Administration Office Flexible Review and Oversight Policy, therefore the expiration date is July 27, 2019.

- * Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You may receive a "Continuation Renewal Reminder" approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval **before** the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can never be reported or published as research data.
- * All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the IRB **BEFORE** implementation.
- * Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the IRB Administration Office Policy (<http://www.irb.wayne.edu/policies-human-research.php>).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit the IRB Administration Office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the IRB website at **each** use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998

Notify the IRB of any changes to the funding status of the above-referenced protocol.

APPENDIX B

Experiences of faculty at teaching intensive institutions

Behavioral Research Informed Consent

Title of Study: *Experiences of faculty at teaching intensive institutions*

Principal Investigator (PI): Megan Petersen
Sociology
248-497-6240

Purpose: You are being asked to be in a research study of the experiences of professors because you are employed by a teaching intensive institution. This study is being conducted at Wayne State University. The estimated number of study participants to be enrolled at Wayne State University is about 50. **Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.** In this research study, we aim to deepen our understanding of teaching and research by exploring professor's experiences of the teaching-research balance at teaching intensive institutions.

Study Procedures: If you take part in the study you will be asked to participate in a 1-2 hour interview about your training in graduate school, job search and current position.

Benefits : As a participant in this research study, there may be no direct benefit for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future.

Risks : There is a minimal risk related to confidentiality related to the existence of a signed informed consent and data records. Informed Consent documents and all data will be kept in separate, locked, file cabinets to reduce the possibility of such a breach. There may also be risks involved from taking part in this study that are not known to researchers at this time.

Study Costs: There will be no costs to you for participation in this research study.

Compensation: You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality: All information collected about you during the course of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. You will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. Information that identifies you personally will not be released without your written permission. However, the study sponsor, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Wayne State University, or federal agencies with appropriate regulatory oversight [e.g., Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), etc.] may review your records. When the results of this research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity. If photographs, videos, or audiotape recordings of you will be used for research or educational purposes, your identity will be protected or disguised. After data analysis has been completed the audio-recordings will be destroyed.

Submission/Revision Date: 07/27/15
Protocol Version #: 1

Page 1 of 2

MP
Participant's Initials

Form Date 04/2015

Experiences of faculty at teaching intensive institutions

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal: Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you decide to take part in the study you can later change your mind and withdraw from the study. You are free to only answer questions that you want to answer. You are free to withdraw from participation in this study at any time. Your decisions will not change any present or future relationship with Wayne State University or its affiliates, or other services you are entitled to receive.

The PI may stop your participation in this study without your consent. The PI will make the decision and let you know if it is not possible for you to continue. The decision that is made is to protect your health and safety, or because you did not follow the instructions to take part in the study

Questions: If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Megan Petersen members at the following phone number 248-497-6240. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call the Wayne State Research Subject Advocate at (313) 577-1628 to discuss problems, obtain information, or offer input.

Consent to Participate in a Research Study: To voluntarily agree to take part in this study, you must sign on the line below. If you choose to take part in this study you may withdraw at any time. You are not giving up any of your legal rights by signing this form. Your signature below indicates that you have read, or had read to you, this entire consent form, including the risks and benefits, and have had all of your questions answered. You will be given a copy of this consent form.

Signature of participant

Date

Printed name of participant

Time

Signature of person obtaining consent

Date

Printed name of person obtaining consent

Time

APPROVAL PERIOD

AUG 05 '15

AUG 04 '16

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

MP

Participant's Initials

Form Date 04/2015

APPENDIX C

Email Script:

Subject Line: Research Project Participation Request

Hello Professor _____,

My name is Megan Thom-Petersen and I am a graduate student in the sociology department at Wayne State University interested in finding out more about the experiences of faculty members at teaching intensive institutions. I am hoping that you might be willing to contribute to this project by participating in a 1-2 hour interview about your experiences. Participation is completely voluntary and the interview will be audio-recorded. If you are interested in helping with this work please either call 248-497-6240 or [click here](#) to fill out a secure information form.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Megan Thom-Petersen



APPROVAL PERIOD

JUN. 28 2016

JUL. 27 2019

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

APPENDIX D

Faculty Interview Guide

- I. Pre-Interview Preparation
 - a. Information available via the institution website will be analyzed 24 hours in advance so that the interviewer is somewhat familiar with the subject's current position and history to aid in rapport.
- II. Introduction
 - a. Thank subject for participating
 - b. Provide information sheet (in lieu of informed consent)
 - i. Introduction to project
 - a. Today I'm going to ask you about some of your experiences at (institution name) as well as about your path to this position- Specifically about your graduate school experience, how you came to this position and your responsibilities related to teaching, research and service as well as about tenure/promotion/evaluation procedures at (institution name).
- III. Past/Pathway
 - a. Tell me about your experience in graduate school
 - i. Probes:
 - a. Did you always plan on going to graduate school (while in undergrad)? Was that an expectation/norm in your family?
 - b. Why that school/program?
 - c. Discuss your graduate program's preparation for doing research (courses, dissertation, etc...)
 - d. Discuss your graduate program's preparation for teaching (was this the same for all students? Voluntary?)
 - e. Messages from grad program regarding what was expected after graduation.
 - b. Could you describe your job search after graduate school?
 - i. Probes:
 - a. What types of institutions were you focusing on?
 - b. What were the main factors influencing your job search?
 - c. Did you have any other positions?
 - c. Now I'd like to know about how you came into your current position-
 - i. Probes
 - a. How was the position advertised/how did you find out about it?
 - b. Is this the kind of position you wanted?
 - c. How well prepared did you feel?
 - d. What could your grad program done differently to better prepare you for your current position?
 - e. What made you choose this position? (Probe for information related to family, geography, teaching/research, department strengths, student body, type of institution)
 - IV. Current Position
 - a. Now I'd like to find out more about what it's like for you as a faculty member at (institution name)
 - i. Your official role/job title
 - ii. How would you describe your identity as an academic?

APPROVED

AUG 05 2015

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH BOARD

- iii. Tell me about your job responsibilities-
 - a. What classes do you teach? How many sections? Average class size/student profile
 - b. What other responsibilities do you have/how is your time divided?
 - c. Do you feel any tension/strain related to your responsibilities?
 - d. How supported do you feel by your institution to satisfy your responsibilities?
 - e. How well does the position match
 - i. What you had hoped/planned to do after graduate school
 - ii. Your strengths and grad school preparation
 - iii. What do you like about your current job?
 - iv. What would you like to change/be able to do differently in your current job?
- iv. ? What's teaching like here?
 - a. Is this what you expected teaching to be like?
 - b. Is teaching a big part of your job here?
 - c. Was teaching a career goal for you? (explain)
 - d. Rest of department's interest in teaching/pedagogy
 - e. What's your teaching philosophy? Why do you teach the way you do?
 - f. Does your department/institution have an explicit teaching philosophy?
 - g. Pressure to improve teaching from institution or peers?
 - h. Rewards for teaching?
 - i. Overall how much do you think your institution values teaching? Do you think your institution values teaching or research more?
 - j. How do you think your institution compares to others in regards to teaching/research balance?
- b. What kinds of research responsibilities do you have in your current position?
 - i. Publishing and/or conference participation?
 - a. If they attend conferences, are they more likely to attend national or local conferences and why.
 - ii. Other research activities? (have them describe)
 - iii. How do they feel about research at their institution? What's research like here?
 - iv. Is this what you expected research to be like (if they engage in it)?
 - v. Is research a big part of your job?
 - vi. Do you have a research philosophy?
 - vii. Pressure to do research from institution or peers?
 - a. Rest of department's interest in publishing/conferences
- c. What is the balance of teaching and research at your university/school?
 - a. Do you feel that priority is placed on both or just one? What is the balance?
 - b. Does your university or college specifically advocate for faculty to do both research and teaching? Tell me about the messages you get about this.
 - c. How do you feel about the research-teaching balance at your university or college?
 - ii. Other responsibilities- advising, committee work, etc.....
 - a. Their involvement and colleagues- similarities and differences.
 - iii. What do you enjoy most about your position?

- iv. What does your university or college want you to enjoy most about your position?
- v. What do you find most challenging about your position?
- d. Can you tell me about your understanding of tenure/promotion/evaluation procedures at (institution name)?
 - i. What is the evaluation procedure? Frequency, process, who's involved
 - ii. How do you feel about the evaluation procedure in regards to fairness and relevancy? Does the procedure seem authentic? Does it seem effective/useful?
 - iii. Describe any negative aspects of the evaluation procedure you either have experienced or perceive.
 - iv. How do you think your colleagues/peers perceive the evaluation procedure?
 - v. How is your teaching evaluated? How is your research evaluated? How is your service evaluated? What is weighed most heavily? (Ask them what they think of this evaluation system.)
 - vi. Do you think the evaluation system is the same at other area universities and colleges?
 - vii. What did you expect the evaluation system to be before you came here?
 - viii. What do you think about the weight put on teaching and research at your university in regards to evaluation? Would you like it to be different? Or are you satisfied with the current evaluation system?
 - ix. Does your department have specific tenure & promotion criteria? If so do you know where I could get a copy?
- e. Now I'd like to ask you about your curriculum vitae/resume.
 - i. Is format set by institution or is there freedom? How many current versions do you have? If multiple, ask about differences and reasons for having more than one. Required to make public?
 - ii. How well do you feel your CV represents you? Describe changes you'd like to see in the format.
- f. Tell me about the gender breakdown at your institution
 - i. Probing questions
 - a. Faculty/administration
 - b. What do you think of the gender breakdown? Do they do different things?
- g. Are there other things I should know about why you chose your career or what you think about teaching and research?

APPENDIX E

B: Pathways into Grad School	B0: always wanted PhD
	B1: Mentor (Professor, friend, family, other)
	B2: nontraditional vs. traditional
	B3: 1st College (or not)
	B4: Understand value of college attended (or not), or picking who to work with
	B5: Accidental
	B6: not what I wanted, where I ended up

C: Graduate School Preparation for Teaching	C1: Thrown into deep end
	C2: Well supported
	C3: Discussion Sections/Part of Lecture
	C4: learned what works
	C5: formal training in grad school

D: Teaching Philosophy Pedagogy	D1: Passionate/Genuine Care/Love
	D2: I'm good at it/The Natural
	D4: Do what you've seen works
	D5: Want to work @ it
	D6: Take advantage of opportunities for growth
	D7: Survivalist
	D8: Teaching Awards
	D9: Really wanted to teach
	D10: Teaching well not important in grad school
	D11: Teaching not a huge priority for me
	D12: Teaching Journals
	D13: Broad definition/teacher scholar model
	D14: empowerment/social justice

E: Social Class Intersections	E1: Own History
	E2: Students NEED me here
	E3: Desire to work with students of less means

F: Tensions & Balance	F1: Missing Research
	F2: Feel even balance between teaching & research
	F3: Own fault
	F4: Emotional Labor

G: Service	G1: Overwhelming
	G2: Warn others
	G3: Have protections
	G4: Advising

	G5: Useless committees
	G6: Inequalities
	G7: Variety of responsibilities
	G8: Gendered

H: R1 Expectations	H0: non existent
	H1: Concern
	H2: Overt push
	H3: Covert Push
	H4: Tracked to teach
	H5: Timid support
	H6: Desire respect as researcher
	H7: Higher standard for self (more related to tenure)
	H8: I do more than others (more tenure related)
	H9: Negotiate (more related to tenure)
	H10: Big R versus small r
	H11: wanted teaching-intensive
	H12: This place is going to be good for my research
	H13: not enough support here for research
	H14: expertise increased at small school
H15: People at R1's are not happy/I'm not jealous	

I: Institutional Support for teaching	I1: (+pressure, - support)
	I2: (+pressure, + support)
	I3: (- pressure, + support)
	I4: (-pressure, - support)

J: Tenure	J1: Fair
	J2: Backstabbing
	J3: Teaching evaluated (+/-)
	J4: Bad Experience Personally
	J5: Bad Experience Others
	J6: Requires too much

k: State of academia	k1: Corporatization of Academia
	k2: Administration problems

L: Family Life	L1: Toll on
	L2: Gendered Discipline
	L3: influenced options

REFERENCES

- Altbach, Philip G. 1980. "The Crisis of the Professoriate." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 448:1–14.
- Altbach, Philip G. 1997. "An International Academic Crisis? The American Professoriate in Comparative Perspective." *Daedalus* 126(4):315–38.
- Altbach, Phillip G. 2005. "Academic Challenges: The American Professoriate in Comparative Perspective." Pg 147-165 in *The Professoriate: Profile of a Profession*. Edited by Anthony Welch. The Netherlands: Springer.
- American Association of University Professor. 1993. "The Work of Faculty: Expectations, Priorities, and Rewards." Retrieved January 11, 2014 (<http://www.aaup.org/report/work-faculty-expectations-priorities-and-rewards>).
- American Association of University Professors. 2000. *Statement on graduate students*. Retrieved February 11, 2018. (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementongraduatestudents.htm>)
- Apple, Michael and Susan Junyck. 1999. "You Don't Have to Be A Teacher to Teach This Unit: Teaching, Technology and Gender in the Classroom". *American Education Research Journal* 27 (2): 227-251.
- Apple, M. W. 2005. "Education, markets, and an audit culture". *Critical Quarterly* 47(1-2), 11-29.
- Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. 2010. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Austin, Ann E. 2011. "The Socialization of Future Faculty in a Changing Context: Traditions, Challenges, and Possibilities". Pg. 145-167 in *The American Academic*

- Profession:Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. C. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Austin, J. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bailey, F.G. 1977. *Morality and Expediency: The Folklore of Academic Politics*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Bascia, Nina, and Beth Young. 2001. "Women's Careers beyond the Classroom: Changing Roles in a Changing World." *Curriculum Inquiry* 31(3):271–302.
- Bell, Vikki. 1999. *Performativity and Belonging*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Blau, Peter Michael. 1973. *The Organization of Academic Work*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Blount, J. M. 2000. "Spinsters, Bachelors, and Other Gender Transgressors in School Employment, 1850-1990." *Review of Educational Research* 70(1):83–101.
- Boehrer, John & Sarkisian, Ellen. 1985. "The teaching assistant's point of view." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 1985(22):7-20.
- Booth, Alan. 2004. "Rethinking the Scholarly- Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in History". *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 3(3): 247- 266.
- Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship Revisited*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1997. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Wiley.
- Brazeau, Gayle. 2003. "Revisiting faculty service roles: Is faculty service a victim of the middle child syndrome?". *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. 67(1): 465-470.
- Brint, Steven. 2011. "Focus on the Classroom: Movements to Reform College Teaching and Learning, 1980-2008". Pg. 44-91 in *The American Academic Profession:Transformation*

- in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. C. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brown, Elizabeth L., Christy G. Horner, Mary M. Kerr, and Chritina L. Scanlon. (2014). "United States teachers' emotional labor and professional identities." *Journal of Educational Policy*. 11(2): 205-225
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 1997. *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Clegg, Victoria L. and Gretchen R. Esping. 2005. "Optimism with Our Eyes Wide Open: Reconsidering Scholarship at Kansas State University". Pg. 164-186 in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, edited by K.O'Meara and R.E. Rice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, John. 2003. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cross, K.P. 1990. "Teaching to improve learning." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*. 1:9-22.
- Durkehim, Emile. 1893. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Introduction by Lewis Coser. Trans. W.D. Halls. New York: Free Press.
- England, Paula, Michelle Budig and Nancy Folbre. 2002. "Wages of Virtue: The Relative Pay of Care Work". *Social Problems* 49 (4): 455-475.
- Evans, Don, Judy Grace, and Duane Roen. 2005. "Signs of Change at a Research-Intensive University: Promoting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Arizona State

- University.” Pg. 209-229 in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, edited by K.O’Meara and R.E. Rice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ferree, M. M., Khan, S. R., & Morimoto, S. A. 2007. Assessing the feminist revolution: The presence and absence of gender in theory and practice. *Sociology in America: A history*, 438-479.
- Friedrich, R. and S. Michalak. 1983. “Why doesn’t research improve teaching? Some answers from a small liberal arts college.” *Journal of Higher Education*. 54:145-163.
- Furman, Andrew. 2004. “Measure professors’ real service, not lip service.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 51(11):1-4.
- Geiger, Roger L. “Optimizing Research and Teaching: The Bifurcation of Faculty Roles at Research Universities” Pp. 21-43 in *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. C. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2010. *Forced to Care: Coercion and Caregiving in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Glesne, Corrine. 2014. *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. Pearson Education, Limited.
- Gottlieb, Esther E., and Bruce Keith. 1997. “The Academic Research-Teaching Nexus in Eight Advanced-Industrialized Countries.” *Higher Education* 34(3):397–419.
- Gregson, Nicky and Gillian Rose. 2000. “Taking Butler elsewhere: performativities, spatialities and subjectivities.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 18:433-452.
- Griffiths, Morwenna. 2006. “The Feminization of Teaching and the Practice of Teaching: Threat or Opportunity?” *Educational Theory* 56(4):387–405.

- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Anchor books. New York.
- Hagstrom, Warren. 1964. "Anomy in scientific communities". *Social Problems*. 12:186-95.
- Halsema, Annemie and Lilian Halsema. 2006. "Jobs that matter: Butler's performativity in the Dutch police force." *Critical Perspectives in International Business*. 2(3): 230-243.
- Harland, Tony. 2016. "Teaching to enhance research". *Higher Education Research and Development*. 35(3): 461-472.
- Hattie, John and H. W. Marsh. 1996. "The Relationship between Research and Teaching: A Meta-Analysis." *Review of Educational Research* 66(4):507-42.
- Hermanowicz, Joseph. 2011. "Anomie in the American Academic Profession". Pp. 216-237. *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Hermanowicz, Joseph C. 2016. "Faculty perceptions of their graduate education". *Higher Education*. 72:291-305
- Himstead, Ralph E. 1942. "Problems of the Professoriate." *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 28(4):498-504.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Hoffman, Nancy, ed. 1981. *Woman's "True" Profession: Voices from the History of Teaching*. Old Westbury, N.Y. : New York: Feminist Press ; McGraw-Hill.
- Hodgson, Damian. 2005. "Putting on a professional performance: Performativity, subversion and project management." *Organization*. 12(1): 51-68.

- House Committee on Education and the Workforce- Democratic Staff. 2014. "The Just-In-Time Professor". *A Staff Report Summarizing eForum Responses on the Working Conditions of Contingent Faculty in Higher Education*.
- Hoyle, Eric. 2001. "Prestige, Status and Esteem". *Educational Management and Administration* 29 (2): 139-152.
- Huber, Mary T., Pat Hutchings, and Lee S. Shulman. 2005. "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Today." Pg. 34-38 in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, edited by K.O'Meara and R.E. Rice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnston, Sue. 1997. "Preparation for the role of teacher as part of induction into faculty life and work". *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 72(winter): 31-39.
- Kain, Edward L. 2006. "Bridging the Gap between Cultures of Teaching and Cultures of Research." *Teaching Sociology* 34(4):325-40.
- Katz, Stanley N. 2006. "What Has Happened to the Professoriate?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 53(7):B8-B11.
- Keeling, Richard P, and Richard Hersh. 2011. *We're Losing Our Minds: Rethinking American Higher Education*. New York:Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knapp, Laura G., Janice E. Kelly-Reid and Scott A. Ginder. 2010. "Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2009, and Salaries of Full-Time Instructional Staff, 2009-10." *National Center for Education Statistics*. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011150.pdf>
- Knapper, Christopher. 1997. "Rewards for teaching". *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 72:41-52.
- Levin, Claudia. 2000. "Only A Teacher." Retrieved (<http://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/timeline.html>).

- Lewis, Lionel S. and Michael N. Ryan. 1976. "Professionalization and the Professoriate." *Social Problems* 24(2):282-97.
- Lips, Hilary M. 1999. "Issues of Power and Risk at the Heart of the Teaching-research Nexus". *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 23:215-217.
- Lortie, Dan C. 1975. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lowen, Rebecca S. 2005. "The More Things Change...: Money, Power and the Professoriate." *History of Education Quarterly* 45(3):438-45.
- Mahaffy, Kimberly A., and Elizabeth M. Caffrey. 2003. "Are Requests for Teaching Credentials Customary? A Content Analysis of the 1999 Employment Bulletin." *Teaching Sociology* 31(2):203-11.
- Martin, Elaine. 1984. "Power and Authority in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations". *Signs* 9 (3): 482-492.
- Maslow, Abraham. 1943. "A theory of human motivation". *Psychological Review*. 50(4):370-396.
- Mitchell, S.M. and V.L. Hesli. 2013. "Women don't ask? Women don't say no? Bargaining and service in the political science profession." *Political Science and Politics*. 46(2): 355-369.
- Montgomery, Sarah E. 2009. "Why Men Left: Reconsidering the Feminization of Teaching in the Nineteenth Century." *American Educational History Journal* 36(1-2):219+.
- Moss, David M., Wendy J. Glenn, and Richard L. Schwab. 2008. *Portrait of a Profession: Teaching and Teachers in the 21st Century*. New York, N.Y.: R&L Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics 2017. *Fast facts: Race/ethnicity of college faculty*. Retrieved February 3, 2018 (<https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>).

- Neuman, Anna. 2011. "Scholarly Learning and the Academic Profession in a Time of Change".
Pg. 191-25 in *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. C. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Neumann, A and A.L. Terosky. 2007. "To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*. 78(3): 282-310.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2002. "Uncovering the values of faculty evaluation in service as scholarship." *The Review of Higher Education*. 26(1):57-80.
- O'Meara, KarryAnn. 2005. "Effects of Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship Nationwide and Across Institutional Types." Pp. 255-289 in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, edited by K.O'Meara and R.E. Rice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn and R. Eugene Rice. 2005. "Introduction." Pg. 1-13 in *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*, edited by K.O'Meara and R.E. Rice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Omeara, KerryAnn., Alexandra Kuvaeva, Gudrun Nyunt, Chelsea Waugaman and Rose Jackson. 2017. "Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them." *American Educational Research Journal*. 54(6):1154-1186.
- Palmer, P. 1997. "Personhood and Power". Pp. 25-28 in *Doing Feminism: Teaching and Research in the Academy*. Edited by Mary Anderson, Lisa Fine, Kathleen Geissler, and

- Joyce R. Ladenson. East Lansing Michigan: Michigan State University Women's Studies Program.
- Park, Shelley. 1996. "Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count?." *The Journal of Higher Education*. 67(1):46-84.
- Perrenas, Rhacel Salazar. 2008. *The Force of Domesticity: Filipina Migrants and Globalization*. New York: New York University Press.
- Perrons, Diane. 2007. *Living and working patterns in the new knowledge economy: new opportunities and old social divisions in the case of new media and care-work*. In: Walby, Sylvia and Gottfried, Heidi and Karin Gottschall, Karin and Osawa, Mari, (eds.) *Gendering the knowledge economy: comparative perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK, pp. 188-206.
- Plater, William M. 2008. "The Twenty-First-Century Professoriate." *Academe* 94(4):35-40.
- Poole, Millicent, Laurel Bornholt, and Fiona Summers. 1997. "An International Study of the Gendered Nature of Academic Work: Some Cross-Cultural Explorations." *Higher Education* 34(3):373-96.
- Porter, S.M. (2007). "A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees?" *Journal of Higher Education*. 78(5): 523-541.
- Power, Jason L. and Tony Gilbert. 2006. "Performativity and helping professions: social theory, power and practice." *International Journal of Social Welfare*. 16:193-201.
- Price, James and Sheila R. Cotten. 2006. "Teaching, research and service: Expectations of assistant professors." *The American Sociologist*. 37(1):5-21.
- Pyke, Karen. 2011. "Service and gender inequity among faculty." *Political Science and Politics*. 44(1): 85-87.

- Richardson, John G., and Brenda Wooden Hatcher. 1983. "The Feminization of Public School Teaching 1870-1920." *Work and Occupations* 10(1):81-99.
- Riley, Naomi S. 2012. "Should tenure for college professors be abolished?". *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved March 14, 2018. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702303610504577418293114042070>
- Robinson, Terrell & Hope, Warren. 2013. "Teaching in higher education: Is there a need for training in pedagogy in graduate degree programs". *Research in Higher Education Journal*. 21(August):1-11
- Schouteden, Wendy, An Verburgh, and Jan Elen. 2016. "Teachers' general and contextualized research conceptions." *Studies in Higher Education*. 41(1): 79-94.
- Schuster, Jack H. 2011. "The Professoriate's Perilous Path". Pp. 1-17 in *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*, edited by J. C. Hermanowicz. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers: Bridging differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Steinberg, Ronnie, and Figurt, Deborah. 1999. "Emotional labor since the managed heart". *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561: 8-26.
- Strober, Myra H., and Audri Gordon Lanford. 1986. "The Feminization of Public School Teaching: Cross-Sectional Analysis, 1850-1880." *Signs* 11(2):212-35.
- Taylor, John. 2007. "The Teaching:Research Nexus: A Model for Institutional Management". *Higher Education* 54 (6): 867-884.

- Teelken, Christine and Rosemary Deem. 2013. "All Are Equal, but Some Are More Equal than Others: Managerialism and Gender Equality in Higher Education in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Education* 49(4):520–35.
- Warren, Donald R., ed. 1989. *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work*. New York: Macmillan.
- Weather, Ann. 1999. "Exploring a teaching-research nexus as a possible site for feminist methodological innovation in psychology." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 23:199-214.
- Webster, D. 1986. "Research productivity and classroom teaching effectiveness." *Instructional Evaluation*. 9:14-20.
- Weimer, Maryellen. 1997. "Integration of teaching and research: Myth, reality and possibility." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 72(Winter):53-62.
- Weiss, Robert S. 1995. *Learning From Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. Simon and Schuster.
- Wieman, Carl. 2010. "Why Not Try a Scientific Approach to Science Education?" *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 39(5):9–15.
- Wright, Mary C., Nandini Assar, Edward L. Kain, Laura Kramer, Carla B. Howery, Kathleen McKinney, Becky Glass, and Maxine Atkinson. 2004. "Greedy institutions: The importance of institutional context for teaching in higher education." *Teaching Sociology* 32 (2): 144-159.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Sweitzer, K. V. 2006. "Institutional Prestige and Reputation among Research Universities and Liberal Arts Colleges". *Research in Higher Education*, 47(2), 129-148.

ABSTRACT**RESEARCH BEFORE TEACHING AND SERVICE? PERFORMANCES,
PERCEPTIONS, AND EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY AT TEACHING-INTENSIVE
INSTITUTIONS**

by

MEGAN THROM**May 2018****Advisor:** Dr. Heather Dillaway**Major:** Sociology**Degree:** Doctor of Philosophy

The privileging of research over teaching is well documented in scholarship on the teaching-research nexus. In this in-depth qualitative interview project, I analyze the experiences and identities related to research, teaching, and service of sixteen faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions. The focus on teaching-intensive institutions is driven by two goals: First, to gain a better understanding of how the privileging of research over teaching and service is experienced, understood, and reified by faculty members at teaching-intensive institutions. Second, by giving voice to the experiences of those at teaching-intensive institutions I hope to increase the value placed on teaching, in comparison to research, within higher education.

My findings demonstrate that the complexities of the teaching-research nexus also operate in teaching-intensive institutions. Without any form of structural change it is imperative that sociologists closely monitor the impacts of continued mission drift in teaching-intensive institutions on faculty and students. Ideally academia would recognize the need to adjust the socialization of future faculty members to provide a more useful foundation for the careers they are most likely to enter.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Megan Elizabeth Throm was born on January 1, 1977, in Detroit, Michigan. She graduated from Dearborn High School in 1995, and attended Michigan State University from 1995-1996. Megan then transferred to Wayne State University, where she earned a Bachelor of Science in Education in 2001. Shortly thereafter Megan began teaching middle school math and science in the Berkley School District. In 2004, she earned a Master of Arts in Educational Psychology from Eastern Michigan University. She attended the University of Washington as a graduate student in 2004-2005, while also working as both a teaching and research assistant in the College of Education there. In 2005, she returned to Wayne State University and began pursuing a Master's degree in Sociology, which she obtained in 2009. She has been employed by the Berkley School District for 17 years as both a math and science teacher and a curriculum specialist, and also has taught at Washtenaw Community College, Henry Ford Community College, and Wayne State University.