

# Faculty grassroots leadership: Making the invisible visible

*Jaime Lester*

*George Mason University*

*Adrianna Kezar*

*University of Southern California*

**Abstract:** *The aim of this study is to examine faculty grassroots leadership in the context of faculty as managed professionals in capitalistic academic cultures. Faculty grassroots leadership may be one of the few ways they can exercise agency and play a role in campus affairs given their shrinking role in formal decision-making process and leadership on some campuses. Investigated through a case study of five institutions, findings indicate that academic capitalism has influenced the activities of faculty generally and specifically as grassroots leaders. Faculty sought out external grants, capitalized on their status as faculty stars, recognized the importance of tenure, emphasized market values and revenue generation, and centralized reform in curricular decisions. Faculty who engaged in these activities leveraged their legitimacy and credibility to successfully push forward change initiatives that challenged the status quo.*

Over the last two decades, many researchers have argued that the nature of the professoriate is changing (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Faculty have less input in governance and are being given less formal power and authority (see O'Meara, LaPointe Terosky, & Neumann, 2008 for a review). Part-time or contingent faculty and new faculty appointment structures that rely on renewable contacts are on the rise (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Recent studies show that less than 30% of all faculty are

---

**Jaime Lester** is an Associated Professor of Higher Education at George Mason University.

**Adrianna Kezar** is an Associate Professor of Higher Education and Associate Director of the Pullias Center for Higher Education at University of Southern California.

Copyright © 2012 by *The Journal of the Professoriate*, an affiliate of the Center for African American Research and Policy. All Rights Reserved (ISSN 1556-7699)

tenured or tenure-track (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Part-time or contingent faculty, the remaining 70%, are often excluded from participation in governance where most faculty leadership occurs. Rhoades (1997) observed that increases in administrative decision-making bounds the influence of faculty power into specific areas, such as curricular development, and not university budgets, facilities, employment policies, among others. Whereas faculty once enjoyed influence over many institutional matters, they are now restricted to curricular decisions and governance structures that have more local (departmental) influence. Faculty are also expected to increase their productivity by engaging in entrepreneurial activities by seeking external grants, establishing patents and copyrights, and developing highly resourced research centers; faculty are becoming academic capitalists (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Given the work climate for faculty (i.e., lack of influence in formal governance structures), alternative forms of faculty leadership need to be examined. We propose that faculty grassroots leadership<sup>1</sup> offers insight into the ways that faculty can promote change in an environment with declining faculty influence and power as well as a focus on greater productivity in research and development. Yet, little is known about faculty leadership beyond those in positions of authority, such as deans and department chairs (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Only a few recent studies on faculty leadership examine faculty from beyond the perspective of positional faculty leaders (for example, Astin & Leland, 1991; Hart, 2005, 2007, 2008; Safarik, 2003; Wolf-Wendel, Twombly, Tuttle, Ward, & Gaston-Gayles, 2004). Much of this research has taken a retrospective approach, looking back to the 1960s and 1970s

---

<sup>1</sup> Grassroots leadership is defined in social movement literature as the stimulation of social change or the challenge of the status quo by those who lack formal authority, delegated power, or “institutionalized methods for doing so” (Wilson, 1973, p. 32). Grassroots leadership is a non-hierarchical and often collective and non-institutionalized process. Leaders are typically volunteers and not hired or employed to lead efforts. Grassroots leaders are distinctive from those in positions of authority who tend to have a structure in place to enact leadership through rewards, establishing employee positions and responsibilities, and delegated authority. They also have a formal network of people that are conducting the same work. Grassroots leaders typically have to create their own structure, network and support systems.

to examine grassroots efforts for change in higher education during the civil rights and women's movements. Notably, Wergin (2007) produced an edited volume on faculty grassroots leadership that he termed "leadership in place." Although full of important advice, the chapters are anecdotal and do not provide evidence of how to lead in the context of the new challenges to the professoriate. Specifically, the aim of this study is to examine faculty grassroots leadership in the context of faculty as managed professionals in capitalistic academic cultures. Faculty grassroots leadership may be one of the few ways they can exercise agency and play a role in campus affairs given their shrinking role in formal decision-making process and leadership. The overarching research question for this study is: how do faculty play a leadership role in a changing academic workforce characterized by academic capitalism? This question is investigated through a case study of five institutions and grassroots faculty leadership within these different contexts.

There is a need to both understand and promote faculty leadership that emerges not just from faculty as they move into leadership roles, such as those of department chairs or deans, but also among the faculty themselves. First, the decline in faculty governance (see O'Meara, LaPointe Terosky, & Neumann, 2008 for a review) has led to fewer opportunities for faculty leadership and influence. Cultivating a sense of power within faculty that goes beyond those positional roles (i.e., department chair or faculty senate chair) will provide faculty with ways to influence administration leadership and decision-making within the academy. Second, insight into the nature of faculty grassroots activism provides information for individual faculty who may have a desire to change their institution, but do not have a framework for how to go about creating change. Faculty may desire to change curriculum, recruit students and faculty of color, develop community partnerships, create environmentally friendly practices in the academy, but do not have a sense of how to go about the process, particularly when faculty governance has declined in significance. Other faculty, such as contingent faculty, are often excluded from faculty governance and do not have a forum for pursuing organizational change. The data presented here highlights several of the ways in which faculty have conceived of and participated in changing their institutions. Finally, higher education will experience a large number of retirements of faculty over the next decade (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Providing a framework to engage new faculty in leadership early on in their career will enhance the

participation of faculty in campus-wide activities and promote a sense of empowerment in the workplace. Faculty grassroots leadership is a new framework to participate in leadership activities and to promote change within the current higher education climate where shared governance is in decline, for those who want to create change through nontraditional paths, and for new faculty who are just beginning their career.

## Theoretical Frameworks

We employ two interrelated frameworks – faculty as managed professionals and academic capitalism<sup>2</sup>. Each framework contextualizes the dramatic changes in the academy over the last few decades and how those changes have altered the roles of faculty. With these frameworks, we are able to understand how faculty grassroots leadership emerges and how academic capitalism impacts faculty seeking to play a leadership role.

The first theoretical framework introduced by Gary Rhoades (1997) defines the role of faculty as managed professionals. He argues that faculty exhibit less influence over academic labor conditions due to an increase in power and influence by administrators. Traditionally, faculty are viewed as professionals whose specialized training require formal education, public recognition of autonomy and standards of practice, and a commitment to public service (Sullivan, 2005). Faculty have specialized education gained in graduate school in specific disciplines, have affiliation with disciplinary associations that often define ethical codes and licensing, and have autonomy to conduct research and design curricula. The changes in the academy (i.e., a new climate of accountability, decrease in state appropriations for public higher education, a decline of faculty governance, a rise of part-time faculty, and academic capitalism), argues Rhoades (1997), have led to a restructuring of the academic profession decreasing authority and autonomy. Higher education administrators have sought to increase the

---

<sup>2</sup> Academic capitalism is the engagement in market-like behaviors by faculty and universities related to the competition for resources in the form of grants, contracts, partnerships with industry, endowment funds, and spin-off companies (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

influence over academic labor by, —controlling the configuration, distribution, activity, and output of the academic work force” (Rhoades, 1997, p. X).

Evidence that illustrates the increased power of academic administrators and the decrease of faculty authority and autonomy (or the view of faculty as managed professionals) is seen in the reorganization of the faculty workforce and intellectual property. First, academic administrators now have more power to reorganize faculty work by laying off faculty, hiring non-tenure track faculty, or by reassigning faculty to different departments or units (Rhoades, 1997). Reassignment is often justified by institutional financial difficulties. Moreover, different sectors of faculty are being created based on status (full or part-time), by sector (community college to research university), and disciplinary field (English to Engineering). Second, administrators are increasing their control over intellectual property (Rhoades, 1997). Faculty ownership of course curriculum and content, copyrights, and patents are no longer assumed. Many colleges are taking control over these academic products. Finally, faculty participation in formal campus governance has steadily declined over time. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) found in their 1997 research study that only one in seven faculty note high campus influence, a decline from one in six in 1969. The result of these trends is that faculty professional status is being altered; their authority and influence decline, placing faculty in a role of being managed.

Related to the role of faculty as “managed professionals” is the rise of academic capitalism, the second theoretical framework used in this study. Academic capitalism is one of the more overarching and highly influential movements that have dramatically altered faculty work. Academic capitalism has been defined as the engagement in market-like behaviors on the part of faculty and universities related to the competition for resources in the form of grants, contracts, partnerships with industry, endowment funds, and spin-off companies (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The reach of academic capitalism within higher education is vast, changing the way the academy functions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Academic departments, such as biotechnology and medical science are positioning themselves within business and industry to capitalize on funding and the development of patents. There is little separation between science and

commercial activity” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 29). In addition, academic managers have been given increased oversight to engage in market behaviors. There has been a rise in patents and trademarks illustrating the intensified role of higher education in the market (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Administrators are also playing a significant role through economic development offices and foundations.

For faculty, the focus on market-like behaviors has resulted in an increased demand for external research dollars, partnerships with business and industry, and an erosion of the focus on teaching and service work. Productivity standards for faculty are on the rise with tenure and promotion often including the expectations for external research dollars. Moreover, the relative importance of teaching evaluations and portfolios in tenure and promotion has declined with increased emphasis on peer-review publication and research dollars (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Faculty note the existence of two value sets in the academy – one that is market-oriented and focused on external funds and the other on traditional academic values related to intellectual contribution in one’s field, teaching, and mentoring. Faculty often struggle to maintain these two value sets, experience time constraints that take them away from traditional academic values and are often faced with situations that illuminate the contradictions between these values. For example, faculty in the sciences find that collaborating with corporations or research and development organizations result in ethical dilemmas that question their commitments to traditional academic values. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) found that faculty experience intense guilt related to the issues of who benefits and who pays for research products, timing of academic publications and patent applications, and ownership of research products. Faculty often question who should financially benefit when buildings and laboratories are partially state or federally funded and if they should hold back on academic publication to secure a patent that may provide financial benefits to the university. They also question their own participation in start-up companies that create personal financial benefits. These dilemmas call into question the boundaries between work internal and external to the university.

Faculty also experience time constraints when attempting to uphold productivity standards and often spend less time on teaching, mentoring students, and university service (Gumport, 2002, Kerr, 2002; Lee &

Rhoades, 2003). Faculty work on research grants and in external collaborations often resulted in reduced teaching loads, fewer hours spent on campus, less time spent mentoring students and decreased engagement in service activities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Gumport (2002) argues that graduate student training is tailored around industry partnerships and not the training of students for academic work. Lee and Rhoades (2003) and Mendoza and Berger (2008), however, found that some faculty used their participation in market-oriented activities – consulting and collaboration with corporations – as a way to connect graduate students to industry. The faculty believed that their entrepreneurial activities benefitted the students by providing new opportunities post-graduation in addition to traditional faculty roles. Despite the findings that faculty can balance the two value sets with graduate student training, Ylijoki (2003) concluded in a study of faculty and academic capitalism that faculty felt less job satisfaction when unable to balance the two value sets. Faculty desired above all financial benefits work on intellectually challenging topics and the ability to follow their own research interests. These activities proved challenging with increased pressure to seek external funding and secure patents.

The two frameworks do not entirely dispute the influence that faculty have over certain areas of the academy nor do they claim that faculty do not have agency. Rhoads (1997) clearly states that, “The closer one gets to classroom decisions (and to students' academic lives), to decisions about the content of academic programs, and to evaluations of peers, the stronger is that academic influence” (p. 5). Faculty continue to be involved in curricular reform, service activities within departments, decision-making in tenure and promotion, and socializing graduate students. Yet, increased expectations on publishing impact if and how faculty engage in change related activities (Hart, 2005, 2007, 2008; Pulido, 2008; Safarik, 2003). Safarik (2003) found that strong research and publishing norms serve as a barrier to faculty leadership. Pulido (2008) notes how faculty have to consistently produce impeccable publication and research records and that this can prevent many faculty from being able to operate as grassroots leaders. We sought to understand the ways in which faculty engage in change initiatives from the bottom-up and exercise their agency given this new climate and role of faculty work.

## Research Design

This article is part of a larger study that examined grassroots leadership among faculty and staff on college campuses. For the larger study, we chose an instrumental case study research design (Stake, 2005) to foreground the phenomenon of grassroots leadership (including processes, activities, strategies, and barriers) and background the particular case setting. We are ultimately interested in examining and understanding the grassroots leadership efforts of faculty and staff working within “typical” institutions of higher education (i.e., those institutions not characterized by an institutional commitment to innovation, activism, and change). Our criteria for selecting cases was: 1) typical institution; 2) presence of more than one grassroots leadership effort; 3) grassroots efforts among faculty and staff; 4) different institutional types; 5) presence of a series of nested cases (e. g. environmentalism) with multiple individuals we could interview per case; and, 6) located close enough to one of the researchers so that repeated visits could be conducted. None of these institutions has a well-documented record of promoting innovation or grassroots change so they are not unique cases. However, the informants noted that some grassroots efforts were underway, and thus served as an appropriate site for case study.

Because a variety of studies have identified how institutional type impact organizational processes (Birnbaum, 1988; Kezar, 2001), we identified five institutions from different sectors: 1) an urban, private, doctoral-granting institution with an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 17,000 students and a graduate/professional student enrollment of 16,000; 2) a public regional comprehensive institution with an undergraduate enrollment of 20,000 and graduate enrollment of 8,000; 3) a liberal arts college in a suburban area with enrollment of 3,000 students; 4) a community college in an urban area with enrollment of 22,000; and, 5) a regional liberal arts college in a rural area with an enrollment of 17,000 students (see Appendix A for a table of the characteristics of the campus sites).

Because case selection is one of the most important criteria for informing trustworthiness in a case study, in order to select institutions for study, extensive document analysis and a set of interviews were conducted in order to determine if the site was appropriate for study. Three or more

context interviews were initially conducted with campus informants to understand if the site had a concentration of individuals who would be considered grassroots leaders. In addition, a document analysis of campus papers, faculty governance minutes and agendas, strategic plans, and curriculum were compiled in a report to understand the campus culture related to change, potential nested cases, and the names of potential participants.

### **Identification and Recruitment of Participants**

Despite adopting a broad framework of grassroots leadership that is not contingent upon the pursuit of a particular type of change (e.g., social justice), we felt it necessary to initially narrow the scope of our research interest in order to identify a point of entry into the case setting. To that end, we limited our initial participant recruitment efforts to those faculty actively involved in grassroots leadership efforts to bring about change related to institutional diversity and/or student learning. As an initial means of identifying these grassroots faculty, we contacted university administrators responsible for the oversight of campus diversity, multiculturalism and instructional development/innovation initiatives to ask for assistance identifying faculty actively involved in related grassroots (local, bottom-up) change efforts. Two members of the research team also acted as key informants for the referral to potential study participants. Faculty identified as engaged in grassroots leadership were then contacted by a member of the research team and invited to participate in this study. After this initial round of participant recruitment, a snowball sampling technique was used to recruit additional participants. Specifically, each research participant was asked to recommend other faculty on campus who are actively involved in grassroots leadership efforts for change. We continued to seek additional research participants until we had exhausted our recommendations and saturated the sample. The larger study resulted in 165 interviews -- staff (84) and faculty members (81) at five different institutions engaged in grassroots leadership. We only analyzed the faculty interviews, 81 interviews in total, for this specific study (Appendix B provides an overview of the sample demographics by institution).

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

One-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with faculty at each of the five case sites. In total, there were 81 research participants,

all of which were faculty members. Each participant was interviewed once with the interview lasting approximately one hour. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. The interview questions and prompts focused on three key themes: 1) the ways in which faculty conceived of their grassroots change efforts, 2) the impact of conceptions of grassroots efforts and individual activities, and 3) the relationship between their grassroots efforts and their role as a professional. In addition to the interviews, case site visits were conducted resulting in detailed field notes. The nested case initiatives (e.g., diversity, environmentalism, etc.) were systematically detailed in reports that served as description of the history, timeline, and strategies of each effort. We also gathered documents from the institutions website related to the change efforts and articles, books, and reports that participants mentioned in relationship to their change efforts.

Consistent with methodological norms of qualitative inquiry (Boyatzis, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994), the systematic coding of texts for themes (i.e., interview transcripts, institutional documents) served as the primary means of data analysis. The data analysis processes and procedures employed in this study reflect the researchers' commitment to collaboratively and rigorously examining and interpreting the qualitative data collected during the course of this project. Accordingly, all research team members took an active role in the data analysis. Each member of the team read and coded their own and one other team member's interview transcripts. Contradictory and disparate codings were discussed, which at times resulted in the recoding of some transcripts. Code tables were created to compile the coded data from each transcript, sorted by theme. Each member of the research team read through the full code table, and, together, the team decided on the four main prevalent themes from the data. In addition to the transcripts, we analyzed the field notes that were gathered during the case site visits. We visited each campus several times at some visits stayed on site for a week. For this analysis, we found five themes related to faculty as managed professionals and academic capitalism.

### **Trustworthiness**

We used several methods in order to ensure trustworthiness within the study (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). First, because case site selection is one of the primary ways to ensure trustworthiness within case study, we spent several months identifying the institutions where we would

conduct the study, being sure that these campuses had ample grassroots activity. Contacting individuals on many different campuses, conducting informant interviews and document analysis, and having extensive dialogue in regards to each site, accomplished this. Second, we spent considerable time on each campus. Researchers visited the campuses regularly – several times a month over a six-month period or spent intensive intervals on campus -- conducting interviews, meeting with informants, gathering new documents, and observing campus life. Third, we interviewed both grassroots leaders as well as other members of the campus (informants) in order to get a fuller picture of the work of grassroots leaders as well as the nested cases we were describing. Fourth, we had multiple researchers at most sites (two sites had primarily one researcher) who talked and journaled regularly trying to provide richer interpretations of the data.

### **Limitations**

There are also several limitations to the research design that impact the study conclusions. First, we were only able to capture the impact of academic capitalism and the role of faculty as managed professionals through the perceptions of the research participants. We acknowledge that people might have a false sense of consciousness or misinterpret their environment. While we rely mostly on the perceptions of grassroots leaders, we looked for and found limited data to disconfirm these interpretations. We also know that it would have been valuable to observe these leadership processes over time as they unfolded. Given the long-term nature of grassroots change efforts (often five to fifteen years), such observation would be extremely difficult and time-consuming. Yet, our various sources of data – interviews (with grassroots leaders and some outside observers), observation, and documents – helped create a trustworthy and robust portrait. Second, our data collection method was retrospective and many people reported on activities that took place five, ten and fifteen years in the past. Data that are older are subject to alteration over time. Third, the sample was skewed towards tenured faculty. We had less access to non-tenure track faculty, as they are overwhelmed with other activities and less known by our informants who recommended interviewees. Also, tenured faculty noted that they did not participate in grassroots leadership until they received tenure. Several non-tenure and tenure-track faculty would support the work of others

privately by attending meetings and helping to organize events, but we know they often would not actively network or sign letters of petition.

## Findings

Five main themes emerged as critical for understanding faculty grassroots leadership. Each of the themes is tied to academic capitalism and faculty status as managed professionals. Academic capitalism has influenced the activities of faculty generally (e.g., increased grant seeking and publishing) and specifically as grassroots leaders. First, faculty grassroots leaders *sought out external funding*, often in the form of grants to establish credibility and legitimacy in the organization before pursuing grassroots activities. Faculty in this study are acutely aware of the decline in state and federal revenues and the value placed on external funding by campus administrators and used grant seeking to establish credibility. Their credibility shields them from criticism and backlash for participation in change efforts and allows them more autonomy to pursue initiatives that may be against the status quo. Other faculty used their grant seeking skills and their contacts within granting agencies to secure grants to directly fund their change initiatives. For example, several faculty applied for dissemination or diffusion grants within the federal agencies to establish special programs for specific students groups. The funds allowed the faculty to push for change while appealing to the academic capitalistic value of external funding.

Second, credibility was also granted through productivity in publishing and to those *faculty stars* who take on more public roles (i.e., appear as experts in the media or lead academic associations). Particularly for social science and humanities faculty who do not have access to large research grants seen in the sciences, faculty who produced influential scholarship within their disciplines capitalized on the respect and autonomy given when productive in publishing to move forward change. In addition, winning awards for influential books or articles, getting a MacArthur grant, being visible on international advisory boards, speaking as an expert in the media, regularly appearing in top tier journals, and having a steady publication record afforded faculty influence and respect that shielded them from backlash.

Third, faculty grassroots leaders recognized the importance of *tenure as protection* against backlash. While tenure is not directly tied to academic

capitalism, this theme illustrates the importance of institutional protection in light of the decline in the number of tenured or tenure-line positions. Many of the participants in this study did not engage in change activities until they received tenure or engaged under the radar as invisible supporters of larger initiatives run by tenured faculty. Once tenure was granted, faculty noted increased authority and protection from backlash and other forms of resistance.

Fourth, faculty and staff grassroots leaders were keenly aware of the changes to the academy and *timed their efforts* to capitalize on the priorities of the administration and *worked locally* to organize change efforts before approaching the administration. Faculty and staff grassroots leaders were aware of the increase in power afforded to campus administration and understood that they needed to engage the campus administration, appealing to capitalistic priorities and values. For example, many faculty grassroots leaders spoke of the decline of faculty governance and a more top-down approach to leadership. Faculty and staff partnered with campus administration and carefully timed their efforts to appear aligned with the priorities of the administration. This often left faculty and staff leaders waiting years before they could push for change. Faculty and staff also worked in their disciplines, units, or social networks to develop ideas before going to the campus administration. That way, they could time their partnerships with administration and strategically develop the message before approaching the administration.

Fifth, faculty grassroots leadership was *more centralized in curricular decisions and reform and operated in the classroom*. Traditionally, faculty have maintained a strong sense of organizational citizenship through participation in campus-wide governance and responsibility for curriculum reform. With the erosion of participation in campus-wide governance and the influence of multiple internal and external stakeholders in curricular reform, faculty have retreated to grassroots leadership as a way to maintain influence in the academy. One of the major activities is grounded in faculty commitment to teaching and learning. Faculty not only felt a responsibility to oversee curriculum development at the university level, they also used their academic freedom in course development to promote student leadership and a commitment to social justice. Faculty extended this commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom in either community or

campus-based activism. To illustrate each of these themes, three narratives of faculty are presented below. Each faculty represents a different institutional type (community college, liberal arts college, and a research university) and initiatives -- environmentalism, curriculum reform, and diversity and tenure versus non-tenure track to demonstrate how campus context and initiative impacted their activities as grassroots leaders. While each of the narratives represents the impact of external funding and curricular reform, individually they illustrate distinct themes, such as the importance of faculty status as a faculty star and appealing to the need for revenue generation at the research university. We explore these differences in the discussion section.

### **Kathleen – Environmentalist at Activist Community College**

The first narrative illustrates the importance of tenure, external funding, and centralizing curricular decisions and reform in the classroom. Kathleen spent the majority of her teaching career as a non-tenure-track faculty member at Activist Community College. Kathleen's focus on environmentalism began several decades ago in college where she studied as a wildlife biologist. During her studies in tracking elk, she began to witness the need for more environmentally friendly practices. She decided to transition from doing research to teaching with the goal of teaching environmental studies, as opposed to biology, but found that environmental studies was not offered at many institutions of higher education. She explained:

Then I got out [of college] and studied animals, and soon realized that things I cared about were falling apart. So I decided to go back to education, and that's when I learned environmental studies was not being taught anywhere. Biology was being taught, the majors, the hardcore majors, and I didn't fit into that world. I could teach biology, but it wasn't my passion. I wanted to teach around the environment, biology, conservation. So I had seen some things that helped me realize that if I didn't provide leadership, a lot of people weren't going to see these things. So that, for me, was my driver that pushed it.

In order to fulfill her goal of teaching, Kathleen reluctantly entered the community college as a part-time biology instructor with the intent of questioning faculty in the sciences and attempting to introduce environmental studies into the curriculum. As a part-time instructor,

Kathleen did not have access to some of the traditional structures (e.g., faculty governance) that supported faculty leadership. Therefore, Kathleen worked from the grassroots of the college, networking, establishing support, and incrementally changing practices to introduce an academic program and more sustainable policies in the college.

After many years of success as a non-tenured faculty person, Kathleen found support within the institution to create a full-time position in environmental studies and, much to her surprise, was hired as a full-time faculty member. Getting on the *tenure track* made all the difference in Kathleen's efforts. Not only was she a dedicated full-time faculty member that legitimized environmental studies, she has had many of the protections offered by tenure. She explains, "Once I got in the tenure track, I could push more. That was critical. That's what tenure was created for. We all know that...As part-timer I had some impact, but once [I] got hired, and then I could start working, and I only do team building. I don't do it behind the scenes." Another important event in Kathleen's framing of her grassroots leadership work is the support from *external funders*. Several private funders gave money to build a sustainable garden and eventually donated money to help build the environmental studies building. Tenure provided the necessary institutional protection from backlash while funding from external sources legitimized her initiative and provided attention to the issue.

In all of her work from introducing environmental studies to her courses to pushing for an environmental studies program, Kathleen maintained a steadfast commitment to student development and *centralized curricular decisions and operated in the classroom* to create change—a way that she maintained influence as a managed professional. She notes, "The cool part is instruction belongs to faculty, my full focus now is the students. I know what I'm doing is right, the team knows what we're doing is right, they're my full focus." A commitment to teaching and learning is at the core of many of the grassroots leaders. Faculty have traditionally been responsible for curriculum from the local department level to general studies curriculum, but faculty grassroots leaders view their commitments focused more on individual student development and work towards integrating new curricular practices within their classrooms. Part of the reason may be due to the erosion of faculty participation in campus governance where curricular decisions are generally handled. For Kathleen, she has placed students at the center of all of her efforts.

She notes, “The students were always a part of this, and we started a student ... program early on, where they’re in the class teaching with us, and you’ve got to really be open to them, and they help with all the classes, and it’s a program—that’s been twelve years ago.” Furthermore, Kathleen (similar to other faculty grassroots leaders) integrated experiential learning to engage students. Kathleen explains that she took a different approach to teaching by integrating an action project into an environmental studies class:

We had a class that we created called Ten Effective Learning Strategies in Environmental Studies, and I taught it... so what we’ve created here is a model where students are the center, and we just say to them, “Here’s a project, take it and run with it,” and our job is to facilitate that. So we said to them, “OK we’ve got ten years to open up movement quarters,” so we’re looking at wildlife quarters between the outer coastal range and the inner coastal range. How would animals move across those quarters? They have taken this baby, they are now part of the draft EIR work for the state of California, and they are in there doing data collection at a two year level that will now influence the outcome of this project. It’s thrown this whole wrench into the plan.

Kathleen is an example of a faculty grassroots leader who used different strategies to be an activist as a managed professional. She grounded her interest and activities in her political and intellectual commitments to environmentalism. Her activities are characterized as outside of traditional faculty responsibilities, such as creating networks across campus. Kathleen’s experiences also illustrate the importance of academic capitalism in grassroots leadership activities. As a part-time instructor, she was able to move forward her initiative, but did so at risk of losing her job. When she achieved tenure and acquired external funds, she became less susceptible to harmful backlash and was able to be more assertive and direct in her grassroots activities.

### **Carlos – Professor at Tempered Radical University**

The second narrative illustrates the phenomenon of faculty grassroots leadership as related to faculty work in a research university and illustrates the importance of grant seeking, credibility of being a faculty star, and working locally within departments to time change activities.

Carlos, a person of color, is a professor at Tempered Radical University in a large urban area who has worked for the last decade to provide access to doctoral education for students of color. He has held several administrative positions, including director of an American Studies program and as a director of several initiatives related to student access. Carlos has a deep commitment to transformational change in academe rooted in his identify as a person of color. He explains:

I come from a generation of people who I call basically an Affirmative Action generation. We would not be in schools. We would not have been – I would not have gone to graduate school. I would not have become a faculty member if it wasn't for individuals and staff and funding that was directed toward minority students. And so, having kind of grown up in that environment, I sort of feel that it is my responsibility to turn around and continue that for another set of students and another set of faculty and other generations.

The primary grassroots initiative that Carlos has engaged in is the creation of “multi-racial discussions” within his department. He engaged faculty in discussion about race and ethnicity in order to establish the desire and value of having multiple perspectives, not just faculty of different races/ethnicities in the department. He describes his desire to change the local department, “You have to have different people in the room. Most faculty are incredibly comfortable being in departments in which there are 99% white European ancestry. It's really important to create situations in which people who are different, people who are of color, people who do other sorts of things have actually a community that supports and nurtures their research.” He continues:

I see so clearly in a lot of History departments some notion that all civilization started in Europe and the fact that no History Department is worthwhile if it doesn't center Europe. I just don't believe that and I don't believe that that's true intellectually. It gives you sense of how it daunts and it dominates intellectual life when you hear all about these global programs, world programs and what they really end up being is US and Europe with usually a touch of Japan or a touch of Asia of some sort and that's it.

Carlos frames his grassroots activities as a process of organizational change that begins by building local communities to influence the beliefs of others. This strategy of *working locally* helped to create support, social networks, and strategize the appropriate time to diffuse his efforts and appeal to the campus administration. Local work helped grassroots leaders to plan, organize, and strategize the ways to appeal to the discourse of academic capitalism.

Out of his engagement in local work and an understanding of the discourses of academic capitalism, Carlos created a fellowship program that provides scholarships, programming, mentorship, and support for graduate student of color across the discipline. He requested and obtained funds (*external funding*) from a major foundation to support this vision he had for the fellowships. As an externally funded program, this program has been highly successful and is touted as responsible for the success of many graduate students of color. In Carlos's word the program is, —. about creating funding for graduate students that we were going to admit into the new Ph.D. program but at the very same time, improving a variety of disciplinary – the experiences of minority students in a variety of disciplinary Ph.D. programs. That was also kind of fundamental in how transformation would occur. It couldn't be done just in isolation in one program.”

Carlos frames his grassroots activities as a process of organizational change that begins by building local communities to influence the beliefs of others. He *worked locally* within his discipline before attempting to engage other units and campus administration. When he did engage the campus, he did so through external funding which has a strong value in an academic capitalist research university.

Carlos is also a highly respected scholar – a *faculty star* – who came to the institution with tenure and with legitimacy in his academic field. He is pedigreed with a respected degree, is well published, has held national leadership roles in his discipline, and speaking nationally. Carlos explains, —You know, my [job] has never been jeopardized partly because I've always taken care of the basics which mean faculty are protected by virtue of their scholarship. It was hard to say no to a Stanford Ph.D. It's hard to say no to an Oxford book. It's hard to say no to the president of a disciplinary society. I mean, all those things are things that I have accomplished, that are things that protect me in the

local community.” Productivity and external grants are all valued in a culture of academic capitalism. To be successful grants faculty certain powers and privileges to push forward change efforts that may be contrary to the university culture. Carlos has actively capitalized on his success to promote the success of graduate students of color on campus.

Carlos’ success is influenced by his ability to leverage his productivity in *seeking external funds*, in *being a faculty star*, and *working locally* to time his efforts. He worked locally with a focus on change within his department before he attempted to diffuse his efforts across the university. He gained support and had proof of concept for his change strategies and tactics. Finding external money legitimizes his grassroots activities even those that question individual beliefs about race and calls attention to the significance of his efforts. For Carlos, the access program was funded by an external foundation, which asked for institutional support. The foundation provided the excuse necessary to get internal buy-in and additional money to support graduate students of color. Finally, the university, as a research university, places increased emphasis on grant seeking, publishing, and national reputation as a *faculty star* which Carlos is able to capitalize on successfully pushing forward initiatives to assist students of color. As Carlos states, it is difficult to say no to a faculty member who has achieved national credibility. At the research university in our study, external funding and being a faculty star was paramount for success.

### **Neeta – Professor at Hidden Tempered Radicals College**

The third narrative of a faculty grassroots leader illustrates the importance of external funding, a theme across all the faculty narratives, and an ability to leverage funding to establish innovative curriculum and student support programs. Neeta, who has been at Hidden Tempered Radicals College for several decades, was initially a postdoctoral researcher in the chemistry department. After several years of research, she was hired in a faculty position at the associate professor level. Immediately, Neeta became involved in several formal committees, as was the standard at the time of her appointment to associate professor. The first committee that she became involved in was the diversity committee that actively shaped her activism agenda for the next several decades. She explains, —~~at~~ually one of the first committees I was on was the diversity committee with, actually, all the members of the faculty, people who had been here a long time, so I learned from them and came

to learn the issues really fast, I think, from those members, so I enjoy the committee work and I eventually got onto a lot of different committees.”

The activities of faculty grassroots leaders illustrate leading that relies on local practices, such as smaller scale curricular changes, than the more traditional faculty leadership expressed during involvement in academic senate and other forms of campus governance. Similar to Kathleen, Neeta uses her classroom as a place to create change (*centralized curricular decisions and operated in the classroom*). She uses experiential learning and new pedagogical techniques to create access and success for students. For example, Neeta and her colleagues have developed a new curriculum for organic chemistry, “We’ve also worked hard to change our curriculum, like organic chemistry, especially in our second semester, and it’s more like a research project-based. So, they’ll work on modules. One takes 4-5 weeks. We were very fortunate; we got funding from the NSF for that. They make a molecule, then they test, characterize it using all the spectroscopy techniques, then they test that molecule.”

Much of Neeta’s success has come in seeking *external grants*. As a chemist who focuses on the designing of pharmaceuticals, she has found collaborations with faculty in other fields, such as biology, important to her research and to grant seeking. She explains how she has learned to value interdisciplinary research which has been promoted by federal funding agencies (e.g., National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation), “Well, we may hate to admit it, but a lot of the grant-funding agencies have been pushing that. “We don’t want to do this, and blah blah blah. I’m going to go change my research to fit whatever they want,” but then when you really start sitting down with a bunch of colleagues in the room and start talking, you find out, “Maybe I have a lot in common, and maybe we could work really well together,” and that’s happened. I’m happy to encourage that.” Another influence of her discipline is the attention to the need to promote women and people of color in the sciences. Over the last few decades, the National Science Foundation has created initiatives to promote access and retention for women and minorities in the sciences. These initiatives have made scientists more aware of issues for women and students of color that Neeta has taken up as one of her major initiatives as a chemistry instructor. As a scientist, Neeta’s narrative represents the impact of disciplines in ways that differ from Carlos’ narrative. While Carlos was

critical of the theoretical traditions of history, Neeta is more strongly influenced by the interdisciplinary values of external funding agencies.

Neeta also mentors students in a campus-wide program that brings inner city youth to the liberal arts campus. Her involvement is high touch in that she is actively involved in the educational and social experiences of her mentees. Her perspective on student success is derived from a belief in the success of assisting student on an individual level. She notes, “I think it was just close interaction. One thing with us, we have an open door policy and close interaction with professors, and they could come in and ask questions, and you problem solve with them, show them how to work through the problem, how to think through it. I think it really helps.” Neeta is able to extend her focus on teaching and learning in her research because she is a successful grant writer who has the connections to acquire funding for these program. Neeta consistently has multi-million dollar research projects where she hires postdoctoral researchers as well as undergraduate students. She explains, “Yeah, and I think, also—and to go back to the research thing, research is supposed to be a good way of targeting students, and getting them excited about it and bringing them to the lab, so I think that’s been good.” This connection between grant writing and innovative curriculum is well received at a liberal arts institution that values high quality teaching and high research activities. Neeta explains:

I don’t think you face that because in terms of research you’ve got to establish your credibility first, and when they see—I mean, if somebody’s not doing research and suddenly starts talking about research and including people, I think that would be a hard sell. It’s not difficult for me because I’m coming from a very strong place. I think that’s why I also was hired into Liberal Arts University, because I had done researching for ten years, a very strong publication record, and you’re coming with that credibility and high esteem in the external science community in the rest of the country. I think your job is a little easier. So they listen.”

Neeta has maintained an active research agenda and has consistently acquired large grants from several federal agencies. Her success has given her credibility within her department and in the university that she has leveraged to her advantage in the context of her grassroots efforts.

Gaining legitimacy through grant seeking and publishing is a common practice among faculty grassroots leaders who recognize that in a climate of academic capitalism, institutions value productivity. Therefore, academic capitalism may limit the kinds of activities (services versus research productivity) that are considered valuable, but it also provides an opportunity for faculty to engage in activism outside of the traditional faculty service activities.

Neeta's experience as a grassroots faculty leader began with her formal involvement in several campus-wide committees. Her entry into grassroots leadership work differs from Carlos and Kathleen in that Neeta started with a more formal and traditional faculty service activity – the diversity committee. However, Neeta's activities did not continue within the context of traditional faculty service. Neeta turned her attention to local forms of activism, focusing on her course curriculum and getting students, undergraduate and graduate, involved in research. She also continued to participate in high touch advising to assist students into and through the science pipeline. Of note in Neeta's narrative is the impact of the science discipline on grassroots activities. Because science does not necessarily grapple with multiple paradigms and requires extensive money for laboratories and experimentation, the influence of the disciplines comes in the form of external funding agencies. The National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institutes of Health are just a few of the major funders that seem to set the tone and become influential in grassroots activities. For example, NSF assisted Neeta and her colleagues in creating new curricula within their chemistry courses. Without the money, their efforts may have been derailed or taken longer to initiate. Like her faculty grassroots leader colleagues, Neeta found credibility and success under the auspices of academic capitalism. She succeeded in grant writing and leveraged her reputation and success to legitimize her activist efforts. Neeta's narrative represents the combination of a focus on teaching, research, and the differences that emerge from the paradigms and influences of different academic disciplinary associations in the activities and framing of faculty grassroots leaders.

## Discussion

The aim of this study is to examine faculty grassroots leadership in the context of faculty as managed professionals in capitalistic academic

cultures. We took a different approach from the studies on faculty leadership and shared governance, by examining those faculty who are engaged in grassroots or bottom-up activism. We hypothesized that faculty activism is more likely to happen from the bottom-up given the decline in the power of faculty in decision-making, supporting faculty as managed professionals (Rhoades, 1997). And, we believed that faculty grassroots leadership may be one way that faculty choose to create change in this new climate of the professoriate.

Academic capitalism impacted the activities of grassroots leaders. Faculty in this study were acutely aware of the culture of productivity and the tension between productivity and other forms of service. Faculty viewed activism as a luxury that can only be achieved after productivity standards are met. Many faculty used research and grant seeking to establish credibility that would allow for activism to challenge the status quo. However, seeking external grants varied according to institutional type and disciplinary affiliation. Kathleen, being a community college faculty member without strong ties to federal agencies or foundations, found sources of funding through the community. The mission of the community college helped to draw influential individuals from the local community who were interested in funding the programs, including an endowed faculty chair. As a humanities faculty member, Carlos looked to private foundations and funding internal to the college. He had a positive track record with private foundations more interested in funding work in the humanities. Neeta, a scientist, leveraged her relationships within the National Science Foundation (NSF) and approached her efforts in a more interdisciplinary fashion, as is the trend in NSF.

The faculty grassroots leaders also used productivity in terms of teaching and service. Several faculty used their status as faculty stars, particularly their exposure in national disciplinary associations and through national teaching awards, to protect them from backlash and to gain administrative support. Yet, the theme of faculty stars was most prevalent among faculty at the research university, such as Carlos. Those faculty were more likely to recognize the importance of media exposure through influential books and MacArthur grants because the private research university stressed the value of prestige. Carlos, Kathleen, and Neeta all used classroom and curriculum, but did so in different ways. Kathleen and Neeta focused on experiential learning within specific courses and as a component of degree requirements. They use local

forms of activism by changing the curriculum in one or two of their classes by adopting new pedagogies and experiential learning that would help students to gain a consciousness around issues and support their efforts, such as a leadership course to promote environmental stewardship. These practices differ from just simply retooling a course because they challenged the traditional culture of teaching by introducing new pedagogies to the campus. Carlos, however, created mentoring and professional development programs for graduate students outside of their degree programs and specific classroom curricula. The common thread across the faculty grassroots leaders is the fact that the pedagogies were often in direct conflict to the traditional way of teaching supported by the institution.

Faculty in this study worked locally more often than not to create change which is likely due to the lack of effective formal governance on college campuses. Grassroots leaders did not go through formal governance committees, consult the administration, or engage in collaborations to create change. They operated locally and under the radar, intentionally creating network and changing practices that would cause concern if made public. The local activities support ways to be successful within an environment in which faculty are managed professionals (Rhoades, 1997). With administrative decision-making prevailing across college campus and faculty have less power, authority, and autonomy in institutional matters, using more localized forms of power to exert influence would appear to be the best course of action for faculty to create change. This is an important strategy because it allows faculty to build some momentum and influence before they expand and try to make a difference more broadly. For example, Carlos and Neeta had small-scale experiments in the classroom that they expanded to department and then campus wide efforts over time. In this new environment, faculty are more successful working through more local efforts and units than through faculty senates or campus-wide committees.

The tactics expressed by the faculty grassroots leaders illustrates an awareness of the two value sets – market orientation and traditional academic values noted in the literature (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Ylijoki, 2003). Their tactics illustrate intentionality in the merging and balancing of the two value sets not just to meet the productivity standards and push for change, but to find ways that promote commitments to communities and to serve their individual passions. Faculty would use

their successful grant writing skills to develop campus-based programs to help underrepresented students and/or curricular reform efforts. They also integrated work within the community to create new opportunities for students or bring in additional funding. Safarik (2003) and Pulido (2008) noted similar strategies of using productivity standards and respect and power from meeting those expectations as ways to influence change and gain autonomy.

These tactics described by the grassroots leaders are also important to higher education because of the decline of faculty governance and tenure-line positions, a symptom of faculty as managed professionals and academic capitalism (Rhoades, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Faculty members who realize that traditional institutional processes of shared governance no longer have influence and are not a vehicle for real influence retreat from involvement. This leads fewer and fewer faculty involved and little reason to push back for more authority in faculty governance. The faculty grassroots leaders in this study illustrate faculty can stay involved in faculty governance and use those areas of influence (no matter how minimal they may be on some campuses) to create change. In addition, tenure was consistently mentioned as a tool to protect faculty from backlash and resistance for grassroots efforts. Tenure had the greatest impact among those who experienced faculty work either as tenure-track or contingent faculty before becoming tenured. Perhaps, the contrast between the successes as tenured versus non-tenured faculty made the relative importance of tenure more significant. Kathleen's narrative illustrated the explicit importance of having tenure to move forward with change initiatives. The job protections, power, and authority given with tenure made her change efforts possible. This finding is significant because the number of faculty in tenured or tenure-line positions is declining (JBL and Associates, Inc., 2009). Without tenure, faculty grassroots leadership may be in jeopardy. While non-tenure track faculty can play a leadership role, the lack of protection from tenure creates a disincentive to challenge the status quo. Pushing for change may put their job at risk.

The new pathways for faculty leadership from the bottom-up have complications, particularly for non-tenure-track faculty. Both of the strategies found in our study are reliant on traditional spheres of influence (curriculum) and defined expectations around productivity (academic capitalism). For faculty who are in non-tenure-track positions,

their influence over curricular matters is minimal and they are not afforded the job protections of tenure. Expectations are often poorly defined and evaluations occur only through student evaluations. Kathleen who is one of the few non-tenure-track faculty that participated in grassroots activism was most active after receiving a full-time appointment and achieving tenure. Tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty were poorly represented in this study because of their lack of participation in grassroots activism. The few faculty in non-tenured positions who did participate only provided behind the scenes support and were careful to not reveal their affiliation to the larger campus. While Kathleen is a community college faculty member, her narrative is representative of those few non-tenure and tenure-track faculty that we spoke with in four-year universities. Another limitation to the use of local forms of activism, primarily through curricula reform, is having to navigate larger institutional structures where they may have less control. While the narratives presented here show success in using faculty authority and autonomy to change course syllabi and teaching methods, navigating various curricula committees and oversight bodies proved difficult for other grassroots leaders. Curriculum committees and oversight bodies consist of faculty and representatives from across the campus and may not share similar teaching philosophies and perspectives. Without a collective network of likeminded people and support, diffusing change through curricula is difficult, if not impossible.

## **Conclusion and Implications**

The results from this study have implications for the ways that faculty agency is viewed in an academic capitalistic culture. Much of the research on academic capitalism implies that faculty only have agency to participate in entrepreneurship and do so for self-promotion (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This study illustrates that faculty may have alternative reasons for engaging in academic capitalism. Participating in the culture of productivity that narrowly defines productivity in terms of research dollars and publications affords faculty authority and autonomy to engage in activism work and challenge the status quo. Yet, faculty who do not engage in the culture of productivity or whose research does not have a ready funding source, are at a disadvantage and often feel backlash and are marginalized when they attempt to create change. These faculty primarily find success in groups and networks with those productive faculty. More research is needed to unpack the various ways

in which academic capitalism supports, enables, and alters faculty leadership with an emphasis on how all faculty can use the culture of productivity to their advantage.

Moreover, the framework of faculty as managed professionals does not entirely eliminate faculty authority and autonomy. Faculty may find it difficult to become equal partners in decision-making around budgetary issues, facilities, and fundraising, but we should not assume that faculty are entirely powerless as campus leaders. A recent book by O'Meara, LaPointe Terosky, and Neumann (2008) argues for a new vision of professionalism that focuses on the ways in which faculty use agency to advocate for groups and engage in long-term activities. For example, faculty can organize in collectives and document inequities based on race and class, develop new interdisciplinary programs that focus on social justice, and develop their own work priorities (primarily post-tenure review) that reflects their activist interests. Faculty may have decreased authority and autonomy around formal decision-making, but can find ways to overcome the decline to create change around initiatives that hold deep personal commitments and by working within the curricular sphere of influence and as faculty mentors. We need to consider new ways that faculty can create change and influence institutional processes. More research is needed that uncovers that ways in which faculty participate in change outside of formal governance structures and outside of their traditional spheres of influence (i.e., curriculum). By uncovering these practices, faculty agency, autonomy, and authority may be redefined to account for the current climate for faculty work.

To promote more faculty grassroots leadership, colleges and universities need to consider the role of tenure. Many of the faculty grassroots leaders in our study deferred engagement in leadership activities until after they achieved tenure. The overwhelming argument was that tenure would be in jeopardy if they challenged the status quo, even locally. The rise of non-tenure-track faculty further complicates the implication that faculty do not engage in activism without job protections afforded by tenure. The majority of faculty on college campuses are now non-tenure-track and without even the future potential of protections from tenure or other forms of job security, it is likely that these faculty will not engage in activism and, therefore, promote innovation. Colleges and universities need to consider acknowledging grassroots leadership work of faculty as service in tenure and promotion, placing more weight on service work in

tenure and promotion, reducing the stigma of activist work (particularly the work that challenges the status quo), and developing professional development opportunities or mentoring to promote grassroots work are important in sustaining and promoting activist work for faculty and staff. Faculty are crucial to innovation in teaching and learning.

## References

- Astin, H.S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gappa, J.M., Austin, A.E., & Trice, A.G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gumport, P.J. (2002). Universities and knowledge: Restructuring the city intellect. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 47–81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hart, J. (2005, Summer). Activism among feminist academics: Professionalized activism and activist professionals. *Advancing Women in Leadership*. Retrieved from [http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social\\_justice1/Hart.html](http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social_justice1/Hart.html)
- Hart, J. (2007). Creating networks as an activist strategy: Differing approaches among academic feminist organizations. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 2(1), 33-52.
- Hart, J. (2008). Mobilization among women academics: The interplay between feminism and professionalization. *National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal*, 20(1), 184-208.

- JBL Associates, Inc. (2009). *American academic: State of the higher education workforce 1997-2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.aftface.org/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=530>.
- Kerr, C. (2002). Shock wave II: An introduction to the twenty-first century. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 1–19). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Recent research and conceptualizations*. Washington, D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports.
- Kezar, A., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). *Rethinking the “L” word in higher education: The revolution on research in leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, J.J., & Rhoads, R.A. (2003). Faculty entrepreneurialism and the challenge to undergraduate education at research universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(7), 739-760.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mendoza, P., & Berger, J.B. (2008). Academic capitalism and academic culture: A case study. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 16(23). Retrieved from <http://eppaa.asu.edu/eppa/v16n23/>
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O’Meara, K., LaPointe Terosky, A., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pulido, L. (2008). FAQs: Frequently (un)asked questions on being a scholar/activist. In C. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging contradictions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship* (pp. 341-365). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Rhoades, G. (1997). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Safarik, L. (2003). Feminist transformation in higher education: Discipline, structure, and institution. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(4), 419-445.
- Schuster, J.H., & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stake, R.E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, W.M. (2005). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wergin, J.F. (2007). *Leadership in place: How academic professionals can find their leadership voice*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Wolf-Wendel, L.E., Twombly, S.B., Tuttle, K.N., Ward, K., & Gaston-Gayles, J.L. (2004). *Reflecting back, looking forward: Civil rights and student affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Ylijoki, O. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study of changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education*, 45, 307-335.

Appendix A

Table 1  
*Characteristics of the five campuses*

| Characteristic   | Community   | Research University   | Public Regional  | Technical   | Liberal arts   |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| pseudonym  | Community activist college  | Tempered radical university   | Innovative regional public   | Almost untempered polytechnical institute   | Hidden tempered radicals college   |
| size   | 25,000  | 25,000  | 17,000   | 30,000  | 3,000  |
| control  | public  | Private   | public   | public  | private  |
| selectivity  | open access   | Highly  | moderately selective   | moderately selective  | highly   |
| resources  | constrained   | moderately strong   | moderate, constrained more recently  | constrained   | strong resources   |
| location   | outside urban   | Urban   | rural  | suburban  | suburban   |
| student body   | diverse by race, gender, social class                                     | diverse by race & gender  | diverse by gender  | diverse by race, gender, social class   | diverse by gender, increasingly by race  |
| administration   | weak  | strong & controlling  | weak   | strong & controlling  | strong   |
| faculty and staff demographics and political orientation | very diverse and progressive  | increasingly diverse, moderately conservative;                        | not diverse and fairly conservative  | very diverse; mixed, progressive but more conservative  | increasingly diverse, progressive  |
| culture  | student oriented, developmental, proud of mission & colleagues, unionized | entrepreneurial, top down and hierarchical, image conscious, striving | student oriented; known for innovative teaching ideas; collaborative work relationships recent budget problems | very contentious relationship between faculty & administration, unionized, adjusting to more diverse student body | collegial, close knit, currently some politics between the administration & faculty, classic liberal arts experience |

## Appendix B

Table 2  
*Sample demographics by campus*

|                      | Number of faculty | Gender               | Race/ethnicity*                     | Rank                                    |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Community college    | 20                | 9 male;<br>11 female | 13 caucasian;<br>7 faculty of color | 6 assistant;<br>8 associate;<br>6 full  |
| Research university  | 15                | 9 male;<br>6 female  | 8 caucasian;<br>7 faculty of color  | 6 associate;<br>9 full                  |
| Regional public      | 15                | 8 male;<br>7 female  | 11 caucasian;<br>4 faculty of color | 3 assistant;<br>8 associate;<br>4 full  |
| Technical college    | 11**              | 4 male;<br>7 female  | 9 caucasian;<br>2 faculty of color  | 6 associate;<br>5 full                  |
| Liberal arts college | 20                | 8 male;<br>12 female | 12 caucasian;<br>8 faculty of color | 4 assistant;<br>6 associate;<br>10 full |
| Total                | 81                |                      |                                     |   |