Therese A. Huston
Marie Norman
Susan A. Ambrose

Expanding the Discussion of Faculty Vitality to Include Productive but Disengaged Senior Faculty

Faculty Member #1

I came to the university excited about the prospect of working with a cohort of young colleagues who had impressed me when I interviewed. I liked the department head very much. He not only recruited me enthusiastically, but he was incredibly supportive. He was fair in distributing resources and made sure that junior faculty got high-quality graduate students. He provided a clear assessment of my progress each year prior to tenure and set a tone indicating that it was normal for junior faculty to seek help and mentoring. But the year I was granted tenure a new head entered the picture and life changed drastically. He rapidly alienated several senior colleagues I admired as well as some of my junior colleagues, many of whom ended up leaving the department. The new head played favorites, ignored established processes, and didn't support the promotion of several outstanding young faculty hired under the former head. He also reneged on several promises that the former head had made to me. It's been years since he became the department head, but I am still disillusioned and disappointed. I find myself advising newly hired colleagues to build their CVs and keep an eye open for other jobs; I tell them "outstanding work does not assure success in this department."

Faculty Member #2

When I first came to the university, one of the things that gave me the most satisfaction was working closely with two of my senior colleagues: Ed and Jon. I truly valued their collaboration on grants, research, and publications, and had always believed that we

The authors are indebted to Dr. Denise Rousseau, who introduced us to her work on psychological contracts. They are also grateful to Dr. Indira Nair, Dr. Sara Majetich, and the late Dr. Barbara Lazarus, who served as the steering committee for the larger study. They are appreciative of Lisa Ritter's efficient and meticulous editing. This project would not have been possible without the generous financial support of The Alcoa Foundation.

Therese A. Huston is Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Seattle University. Marie Norman is Teaching Consultant and Research Associate at the Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence, Carnegie Mellon University. Susan A. Ambrose is Associate Provost for Education and Director at the Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence, Carnegie Mellon University.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 78, No. 5 (September/October 2007)

worked well together and respected one another. That's why I was so taken aback, on the eve of my tenure decision, to learn from others in the department that Ed and Jon had voiced concerns to the tenure committee about my performance. Neither Ed nor Jon had ever shared these concerns with me, and I felt disconcerted and hurt. Although I eventually did receive tenure, the experience left a bad taste in my mouth. Now, when I hear Ed and Jon speak in faculty meetings, I wonder what their words are hiding. I see the glances they exchange when I'm speaking, and I resent their implication. Because I find it uncomfortable to be with these two colleagues, I avoid them whenever possible. I have extricated myself from joint research ventures and purposely avoid Ed and Jon in other venues of departmental life.

Introduction: What Our Research Revealed

What do the two stories above have in common? First, they portray senior (defined in this study as tenured) faculty members who are dissatisfied with their respective experiences at their institution. Second, in both cases, negative or disillusioning experiences at key times in their professional lives have colored the lens through which these individuals view their colleagues and experience life in their departments. They have responded to these events in ways that are counter to fostering collegiality and a sense of community—two primary sources of satisfaction in academic life (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Manger & Eikeland, 1990; Matier, 1990; Weiler, 1985).

Although dissatisfied senior faculty members are hardly rare in academia (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Boice, 1993; Hamrick, 2003; Karpiak, 1997; Mills, 2000), what is interesting about these particular stories is that they describe faculty who are not stagnant professionally but who continue to be remarkably productive: They publish extensively, secure prestigious grants, and succeed in a variety of other areas, as described below. In other words, these senior faculty members are at the top of their game. Nevertheless, they remain withdrawn in important ways at their own university, a problem we believe is not unique to this institution.

What characterizes the experiences of faculty such as these, and what is the impact on their institutions? To what extent does the literature help us to understand the sources of their dissatisfaction and their responses to it? Finally, what can institutions do to re-engage them? These are the questions we set out to answer in this article.

This study grew out of a larger research project we conducted from 2001 to 2003 at a midsized private research university. (A full discussion of research methodology and results can be found in Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005.) The purpose of the larger study was to identify factors that positively or negatively affected faculty satisfaction and retention. Toward this end, we designed a matched cohort study and inter-

viewed 124 faculty members (8.9% of the total faculty), half of whom had left the institution between 1991 and 2000 and half of whom had stayed. Seventy-seven former faculty members were asked to participate, selected to form a representative sample of colleges and departments within the university. Seventy-three of these 77 agreed to be interviewed. Of them, 62 were available for interviews during the necessary period, and one of the participants withdrew later in the study, leaving 61 former faculty members, 17 of whom were tenured before leaving the university.[1] Current faculty were then matched with former faculty by rank, tenure status, year of appointment, department, and, when possible, gender and race (although this was not always possible in small departments or for years with fewer new hires).[2] Seventy current faculty members were asked to participate and 62 agreed. Of them, 42 were tenured. These 42 senior, tenured faculty members who have remained at the university are the focus of this article.

We used a semistructured interview protocol (Chilcott, 1987; Fetterman, 1990; Maxwell, 1996; Merriam, 1998) in which respondents were asked to describe their experience at the institution and any significant factors or critical incidents that affected their experience.[3] They were encouraged to tell their own "stories" in their own style. We chose this method because we wanted detailed, context-rich data to clarify the subtleties and complexities of faculty members' experiences, thus capitalizing on what Maxwell has identified as the principle benefits of qualitative research (Lecompte & Preissle, 2003; Maxwell, 1996; Merriam & Associates, 2002). These benefits include its capacity to clarify (a) the meaning for participants (in this case, faculty members) of the events, situations, and actions in which they are involved; (b) the particular context within which participants act and the influence this context has on their actions; (c) unanticipated phenomena and influences, which emerge spontaneously in open-ended interviews in ways that cannot in structured surveys; (d) the process by which events and actions take place; and (e) complex causal relationships, in this case the varying and interacting causes of faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Maxwell, 1996, pp.17–20).

This nondirective, qualitative approach yielded data that we believe accurately reflect the priorities and concerns of the faculty themselves. However, there were limitations to this approach as well. Because faculty participants told their own stories, they did not necessarily all raise the same issues, and thus some comparability across interviews was lost. Furthermore, because interviews were conducted with faculty members only, we cannot provide the department or university perspective. In fact, it would have been impossible to get triangulation by talking with

In a small institution, and particularly in small departments, even a small number of disengaged senior faculty can have a disproportionately harmful effect, especially for junior faculty whose status in the institution is most tenuous and whose need for mentoring and collegiality is greatest. As we analyzed the narratives from dissatisfied senior faculty, two themes emerged. First, several respondents discussed an "ideal" situation into which they were hired that, for a number of different reasons, changed over time (illustrated in the first vignette). Second, a number of respondents described one particularly painful incident, often taking place during a key transition, that negatively colored their subsequent experiences in their department (illustrated in the second vignette).

We found that the literature on faculty vitality was only marginally helpful in explaining these patterns and determined that new models were needed. In this essay, we begin by examining and challenging the way in which faculty vitality has been operationalized in the past, arguing for the value of institution-specific analysis of the faculty vitality issue. We then propose alternative models for understanding previously unexplored aspects of faculty vitality, drawing on research in organizational behavior and adult development. Finally, we discuss the institutional implications of vital but disengaged senior faculty members and suggest steps to prevent or address this problem. We end with a call for future research that broadens the definition of faculty vitality and that addresses the distinctive cultures of particular institutions.

The group we have identified as disengaged senior faculty represents almost 30% of the total number of current senior faculty interviewed, and their disengagement, as we will argue below, has ripple effects throughout the university community. However, this group does not in itself constitute a large enough sample for a systematic empirical exploration of the issue. Thus, this study should be understood as exploratory and speculative as opposed to definitive. Following Talburt, our general intention is to open "new paths of thought" (2004, p. 81) rather than verify a particular phenomenon through the use of hard data. Our specific intention is to propose alternative models for understanding previously neglected aspects of faculty vitality and to launch further investigation into this unexplored terrain.

Faculty Vitality Reexamined

Research on faculty vitality was sparked by concerns about what Kanter (1979) dubbed "stuck" professors—that is, faculty members whose productivity or teaching performance falls off in mid- to late career. The faculty vitality literature draws on theories in organizational behavior and developmental psychology to chart academic career stages and

identify how the needs of senior faculty differ from those of their junior colleagues (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981); it attempts to distinguish characteristics of vital faculty members from those of their "stagnant" colleagues (Baldwin, 1990); and it offers strategies for fostering professional development and renewal at all career stages (Bland & Bergquist, 1997; Bland & Schmitz, 1988).

The literature on senior faculty vitality has provided a number of important insights, among them the need to examine the interaction of individual and institutional factors that contribute to professional stagnation or vitality (Bland & Bergquist, 1997; Bland, Risbey, Berberet, & Brown, 2004; Clark, Corcoran & Lewis, 1986). However, there are two shortcomings in the literature on faculty vitality. First, while the existing literature has examined vitality in the settings of both research universities (Clark et al., 1986) and teaching colleges (Baldwin, 1990; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Palmer, 1998), it often makes generalizations based on national data sets that do not help individual institutions assess the complex interplay of local factors that enhance or detract from faculty vitality. Second, the existing literature defines faculty vitality broadly but operationalizes the concept narrowly in ways that may conceal important phenomena. We explore these two issues below.

The Value of Institution-Specific Analysis

A number of scholars have questioned the usefulness of national-level research for illuminating the local conditions that shape faculty and student experiences at particular institutions (Bensimon, Polkinghorne, Bauman, & Vallejo, 2004; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). As Bensimon, Polkinghorne, Bauman and Vallejo point out:

> Colleges and universities cannot be treated as if they were all identical. They differ in mission, structures, student bodies, funding sources, resources, etc. They also change over time so that what was true of an institution in the past may not necessarily be so in the present. Neither are generalizations about institutions and interventions always applicable. (2004, p. 124)

By focusing on patterns common to all institutions (or to all institutions of a certain type, e.g., research universities or teaching-oriented colleges), the faculty vitality literature often overlooks the unique attributes of individual institutions that impact faculty lives in key ways (Clark et al., 1986). Such local factors are particularly influential for midcareer or senior faculty who have been at the institution longer than junior faculty and have enjoyed (or regrettably endured) the prevailing culture for many years (Wood & Johnsrud, 2005). Fortunately, there is a growing emphasis on assessing the local factors that enhance or detract from

faculty vitality (Bland, Seaquist, Pacala, Center, & Finstad, 2002), as reflected by the fact that recipients of certain National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health grants have administered "climate" surveys that assess local factors affecting women faculty (e.g., Malley, Rainwater, & Stewart, 2005).

Given the importance of local factors, we will first describe the university that is the subject of this research. Located in a mid-Atlantic state, the university sits centrally in a city of approximately 335,000 (2.4 million in the metropolitan area), with a low cost of living and yet many "big city amenities." It is a private institution with approximately 5,400 undergraduates, 4,000 graduate students, and 1,400 faculty members. The university has a strong research emphasis, with $280 million in sponsored research in 2004. It also has these characteristics: (a) an institutional emphasis on collaborative and interdisciplinary research and innovation; (b) an exceptionally "nimble" bureaucratic structure that allows faculty to pursue new research trajectories with relatively few bureaucratic obstacles and delays; (c) an extraordinarily high-visibility faculty, deeply engaged in applied research and consulting work with government agencies and industry in the United States and abroad; (d) a decentralized administrative structure in which department heads possess considerable power and authority; (e) a particular combination of financial realities, including a small endowment, an exceptionally strong track record in attracting soft money, and high graduate student costs; (f) a 9-year tenure clock; (g) a scientific/technological orientation; and (h) relatively small departments (in comparison to the kinds of institutions with which the university competes for students and funding).

Each of these features has particular implications for senior faculty satisfaction and, by extension, vitality. For example, because there is an emphasis on collaboration and innovation—two behaviors characteristic of vital faculty, according to Baldwin (1990)—the university might appear to provide its senior faculty with opportunities to expand their research into new areas, thus preventing stagnation and promoting vitality. But is that the whole story?

Here we must look more closely at institutional characteristics. Interdisciplinarity, for instance, can involve faculty from different, yet still traditionally defined, disciplines working together to solve a common problem, *or* it can involve the creation of new research areas that do not fit comfortably within disciplinary boundaries and thus do not lend themselves easily to traditional performance criteria. While the university in question subscribes to the first definition of "interdisciplinary," its hiring often implies a commitment to the second. Some faculty members in our study, however, felt that this commitment was not met.

Several had been actively recruited for their work at the intersection between or among disciplines. However, they found that their work was misunderstood or underrecognized within departments that continued to assess the quality of research according to traditional disciplinary criteria (a common problem in interdisciplinary research; e.g., Campbell, 2005). In such cases, the institutional emphasis on collaboration, innovation, and interdisciplinarity did not lead to greater faculty vitality and engagement, as might be expected, but rather to a sense of isolation and bitterness.

Thus, we must look closely not only at the features of particular institutions but also at how these features operate on the ground. Furthermore, their implications for faculty cannot be assumed *a priori*. A quick review of some of the other institutional characteristics in the list above illustrates this point. On one hand, the university's decentralized and "nimble" bureaucratic structure allows faculty to respond quickly to political, economic, and disciplinary shifts, but it also means that departments change rapidly, shifting focus and reprioritizing in ways that might leave previously supported senior faculty feeling unsupported and isolated. Moreover, the high visibility of the faculty at this particular institution can create incongruities between the recognition that highly regarded researchers receive outside their institution, and the recognition they receive (or do not receive) on their home campus. Because of the university's scientific and technological focus, moreover, teamwork among colleagues is critical for research productivity. Thus, interpersonal issues may have a greater impact on faculty success and satisfaction than at some other institutions. Additionally, the 9-year tenure clock, although intended to relieve pressure by giving new faculty more time before they face a tenure decision, also prolongs the anxiety for junior faculty, which has implications as well for satisfaction and retention. Finally, the small size of many departments (relative to those of other competing research institutions) means that the satisfaction of a single senior faculty member can have a profound impact on the rest of the department. This last point underscores why institution-specific analysis is so critically important: Since even small numbers of disengaged senior faculty members can have a disproportionately damaging effect, administrators cannot afford to rely solely on the faculty vitality research done at other institutions but must find ways to identify the particular issues faculty members encounter at their own institutions.

Reconsidering How Vitality Is Operationalized

If lack of institutional specificity is one shortcoming in the faculty vitality literature, another limitation is how vitality itself is operationalized. Bland and Bergquist acknowledge that vitality is an elusive, if

useful, concept: "a term that holds the potential of defining (without oversimplifying) a complex and multidimensional phenomenon" (1997, p. 2). However, despite a widespread acknowledgment of the issue's complexity, there is a tendency in much of the faculty vitality literature to reduce vitality to an issue of teaching performance and/or research productivity, whether defined in terms of quality or quantity.

In one influential study, for example, vital faculty members were those identified as "highly active"—that is, "they continually publish, teach, and perform administrative and/or professional services at highly productive levels" (Clark et al., 1986, p. 182). In another study, the criterion for inclusion in the "vital" group was that the faculty members in question be "star performers in those areas that [the] institution most prizes" (Baldwin, 1990, p. 163). The focus on performance and productivity is understandable; after all, both individual success and institutional reputation depend on these qualities. However, by using this narrow operational definition of vitality, we neglect other critical aspects of faculty work life.

Other researchers have also called for broader definitions of faculty vitality. Productive faculty have been defined as individuals who share a clear, common vision with their colleagues (Bland et al., 2002), whereas faculty who express profound dissatisfaction with their jobs (Woods, Reid, Arndt, Curtis, & Stritter, 1997) or stop participating in campus affairs (Brown, 1996) are seen as having low vitality. These expanded views of vitality underline, among other things, the importance of effective departmental leaders who create collegial climates where faculty invest in and communicate with their peers (Bland et al., 2002).

Building on this notion of participation and shared vision, this article seeks to add a new, easily overlooked dimension to the discussion of vitality. As the stories that introduced this article illustrate, there is a group of senior faculty members who *would* be classified as "star performers" according to Baldwin's criteria for vitality but who are profoundly disillusioned and disengaged. Although their disengagement does not manifest itself as low research productivity or lackluster teaching, it does appear in behaviors (discussed below) that can be harmful to the institution. It is our contention that by examining aspects of faculty vitality that are not tied to performance and productivity, we illuminate an influential category of faculty who might otherwise be invisible to researchers and administrators trying to improve faculty life.

Two New Perspectives on Faculty Vitality

Recall that there were 42 current senior faculty members in our original study, 12 of whom were disengaged and 30 of whom were both satisfied and engaged. At this point, it is germane to ask how the

experiences of these two categories of faculty differed. Their narratives were, in fact, strikingly different. Members of the "engaged" group simply did not mention disillusioning or painful experiences, focusing instead on constructive mentoring relationships, successful negotiation of the promotion and tenure process, and satisfying professional and social relationships with colleagues. While some of them brought up negative experiences that had affected colleagues, their accounts of their own experiences were, predictably, far more positive than those of the "disengaged" group. But does this mean that their experiences were *objectively* more positive, or does it mean simply that negative experiences did not remain in their memories, shape their narratives, or affect their overall perceptions in the same way?

We do not discount the possibility that aspects of personality (e.g., resilience versus rigidity, optimism versus pessimism) played a role in shaping faculty responses to positive and negative professional experiences, and they might help to explain the patterns we observed. While we acknowledge the relevance of personality research to the phenomenon of disengaged senior faculty and welcome further investigation into these questions, it is outside the scope of this study to compare engaged and disengaged faculty on the basis of personality. Instead, we opted to focus on those features of senior faculty disengagement that have an explicitly institutional component. We sought theories that would offer clues to the sources of senior faculty disengagement, illuminate its impact, and suggest possible institutional responses (one approach is discussed in Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006). Research in organizational behavior provided one fruitful explanatory model, and research in social and developmental psychology provided another.

Violation of Psychological Contracts

The first body of literature comes from research in organizational behavior (also known as industrial psychology), a branch of applied psychology that studies how people behave in structured organizations. The majority of organizational behavior research seeks to explain individual and group behaviors within industrial and corporate environments, but the basic principles can be applied to academic organizations.

Organizational behavior's powerful concept of "psychological contracts" (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1995; Schein, 1978; and in the higher education literature, see Bess, 1998) helps to explain why some senior faculty are so enduringly dissatisfied and why they respond to their dissatisfaction in different ways. Like theories of organizational "fit" (Holland, 1966, 1985), the concept of psychological contracts concerns the match between the individual and the organization,

but the latter concept focuses on the expectations that an institution meets or fails to meet. In this section, we will define psychological contracts, apply this concept to faculty life, and explain what happens when psychological contracts are violated.

When an institution hires a new faculty member, both the new hire and the employer develop expectations of the other. These expectations constitute psychological contracts (Rousseau, 1995). Unlike a written contract, which explicitly states concrete, negotiated items such as one's salary, title, and so on, a psychological contract involves unwritten (and often unverbalized) expectations about less concrete issues such as work environment, frequency and types of communication, allocation of resources, and the like. For some institutions, faculty members may have these expectations of the college or university in general. In a decentralized institution such as the one we studied, however, where department heads directly negotiate salary and other terms, the faculty member usually holds the department accountable for meeting both written and unwritten expectations. Psychological contracts might include, among other things, expectations regarding how physical and human resources will be allocated, what kinds of collaboration and collegiality there will be in a department, what sorts of effort will be rewarded, and how promotion and tenure decisions will be made.

Because such expectations are often not verbalized, uncertainties abound. A mismatch can develop between what a new hire expects of the department and what the department or institution delivers (Bess, 1998; Watson, 1995). In our research, for example, one junior faculty member described enjoying a very collegial departmental atmosphere when he came for his interview. He found his would-be colleagues energetically debating their research over dinner, and he got the strong impression that the department functioned as a close and cohesive group. Once he took the job and arrived on campus, however, he discovered a different reality: His colleagues were too busy to socialize or discuss their work on a regular basis; their doors were closed most of the day; and departmental functions had low faculty attendance. Although no one had explicitly promised him collegiality or a high level of intellectual exchange, the discrepancy between what his colleagues' behavior had led him to expect and the reality he encountered left the faculty member feeling disillusioned, the psychological contract broken.

Even when expectations are verbalized beforehand, there can still be a subsequent disagreement in interpretation. Take, for example, a situation in which the department head promises a new hire that she will have at least one graduate student by her second year. In her second year, the faculty member is offered the department's least capable graduate

student, one who has been unsuccessful with several previous advisors. Here, despite the fact that the department head has technically delivered on his promise, the faculty member feels let down, perhaps even deceived, and potentially less motivated (Bess, 1998).

When an institution fails to keep a perceived commitment (as in the collegiality example) or when the commitment is fulfilled in an unsatisfactory way (as in the graduate student example), a professor is likely to experience a violation of her psychological contract. Faculty members may not call it a contract violation, but the sense that an implied promise has been broken can be as frustrating as failing to meet the terms of a written contract (Rousseau, 1995).

In some cases, the experience of contract violation comes early in a faculty member's career at the institution. In other cases, the disillusionment emerges more slowly, as it becomes clear that important expectations will not be met. Of the 12 disengaged senior faculty we interviewed, 7 experienced contract violations as we have defined them, summarized below.

Loss of key colleagues. Two of these faculty members came to the institution with the express intention of working with a particular group of colleagues. These desirable colleagues, however, left the institution, either because they did not receive tenure or because they were unhappy with departmental leadership. In each case, losing these valued colleagues and collaborators left the interviewed faculty member feeling isolated and disillusioned and thinking that the department was not the one he had initially joined.

Gap between policy and practice. In two other cases, there was a critical discrepancy between the university's or department's policies (as understood by the faculty member in question) and its actions. In the first case, a faculty member recalled an incident in which his department hired someone with tenure from outside the university, despite the fact that the new hire lacked the accomplishments he would have needed for tenure if he had "come up through the ranks" within the university. For the faculty member interviewed (who was himself untenured when this seemingly less rigorous person was hired with tenure), this inconsistent application of tenure criteria was galling. Even many years later, long after he received tenure, this incident colored his feelings about the department. It combined with another incident—in which he had been promised a raise only to have the raise rescinded—to convince him that "nothing is guaranteed around here," a perspective that he conveys to junior faculty whom he mentors.

In the second case, the discrepancy between policy and practice concerned interdisciplinary work. The senior faculty member in question

had created an interdisciplinary program that was nationally respected and that had successfully attracted strong students from a variety of fields. Nonetheless, he reported a high degree of frustration with his department where, he said, disciplinary prejudices were such that junior faculty were discouraged from doing interdisciplinary work, only graduate students with traditional disciplinary interests were accepted to the department, and students who did develop interdisciplinary interests were "given such conflicting advice, they can't make it through the program." Under these circumstances, the faculty member found it difficult to do the collaborative work he valued. The wider university, moreover, had promised to strengthen its faculty in certain disciplines that were critical to his interdisciplinary program but had failed to deliver on that promise. He felt increasingly discouraged and detached from a department he considered "narrow-minded" and from a university he believed had not fully honored its commitment to interdisciplinarity.

This story is particularly noteworthy because, as mentioned previously, the institution that was the subject of this study prides itself on encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration. Several junior and senior faculty members in our study were recruited specifically to bring a different disciplinary perspective to an existing program or to start an interdisciplinary program of their own. These faculty members came expecting that interdisciplinary work would be appreciated and rewarded, but in a number of cases it was not. This disjuncture between the university's rhetoric and actual departmental processes was a theme that emerged fairly frequently in interviews with current junior faculty as well as with former faculty. Such examples also underline the need for institution-specific research to identify the particular expectations that the college or university creates for its faculty.

Lack of collegiality. In the remaining three cases, the broken psychological contract concerned an ideal of collegiality that was not met. One faculty member was dumbfounded that, after 20 years in the department, none of his colleagues—including those with whom he had worked closely—asked him about his family or knew his wife's name. He said he felt like he had two families, one at home and one at work, "and they don't talk to one another." He believed that this lack of community was terribly destructive to the department. "A lot of people leave because they have no particular attachment to the place," he said. "If I left, I don't think anyone would care." The faculty member, who is Asian American, said he thought his cultural expectations had something to do with his sense of disillusionment. He was not used to an environment in which "people are reduced to social security numbers, where their work is encouraged, but they are not given any sense that they matter as

human beings." In this socially disconnected environment, his own research continues undeterred, but his sense of loyalty and commitment to the department and institution has seriously eroded over time.

This was also true in the case of two female faculty members. Given their impressive professional accomplishments that earned them tenure within prestigious departments, both women assumed that they had the respect of their male colleagues. Instead, they each reported, with considerable dismay, that their male colleagues did not take their ideas seriously. The fact that their input carried little weight, despite their high performance, was jarring and had profound implications for their sense of attachment to the department. As one of them said, "I would not let my daughter accept a job here." As in all the other cases mentioned, their expectations of what their professional lives should be clashed with the reality of their experience: A critical psychological contract was violated, leaving them feeling disappointed, cynical, and disengaged.

In contrast: realistic expectations. The examples above point to situations in which faculty expectations were not met. It is interesting to note, however, that when faculty expectations were more closely aligned with institutional realities, faculty were more likely to accept those realities, *even though the realities were sometimes suboptimal.* Here is one illustration. The university studied has a reputation for demanding very high levels of productivity from its faculty, yet almost none of the faculty respondents in our study, junior or senior, complained that the workload was too heavy (in fact, only 2 of the 62 current faculty members interviewed cited heavy workload as a source of dissatisfaction). This stands in stark contrast to the general literature on faculty stress, which indicates that one of the most common complaints is a heavy workload (e.g., Barnes et al., 1998; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). We believe that the psychological contracts model helps to explain the lack of faculty dissatisfaction in this area: Throughout our interviews, faculty members repeatedly said they knew the workload would be heavy before they arrived. Because they came with realistic expectations, faculty members did not perceive their heavy workload as a contract violation; thus, it was not a source of frustration or disillusionment.

It is when faculty expectations are out of line with institutional realities or when faculty feel that implied promises have been broken that disillusionment and disengagement ensue. As we will see shortly, when influential senior faculty members enter this state, it can have serious ramifications for the department as a whole and particularly for junior faculty.

Negative Transformational Experiences

Perspectives from developmental and social psychology provide a second possible explanation for the phenomenon of disaffected but productive senior faculty. The life-span literature in developmental psychology points to the importance of key life transitions in shaping individual perceptions. These include both experiences in which individuals are "aware of a state of being in transition" and those in which people are unaware of having undergone a transition until they look back and "see that they and their lives are inexorably changed" (McAdams, Josselson, & Lieblich, 2002, p. xvi). Denzin (1989) observes that as people describe these aspects of their stories later, the experiences are brought alive with all the intensity of emotion originally felt. Thus, a negative transition can have emotional resonance long after the fact. This was clearly the case in our interviews, where, in several instances, faculty members became quite emotional when recounting difficult or disillusioning experiences.

The literature from social psychology points to the fact that the long-term impact of a key life transition can be especially pronounced if the experience involved a breakdown in expected sources of social support. Rook and Pietromonaco (1987) show that negative social interactions are often more memorable than positive social interactions and that they might consequently affect well-being more powerfully. Experiences in which an individual expects support from friends or associates and does not receive it, or in which an individual is intentionally hurt, harmed, or sabotaged, can have particularly lasting effects (Newsom, Nishishiba, Morgan, & Rook, 2003). Many faculty in our larger study reported breakdowns in support, which may help to explain why even established and well-regarded senior faculty view their professional lives through the lens of painful events that occurred far earlier in their careers at the university.

Five of the 12 disillusioned senior faculty members told stories in which it was clear that one negative and obviously traumatic experience colored the lens through which they viewed their colleagues, their departments, or both. Two of these experiences involved initial experiences at the university, and three others involved the tenure process; all of these situations are described in more detail below. Although these numbers are admittedly too low to generate firm conclusions, these stories do not exist in isolation. Rather, they are reinforced by the narratives of many junior faculty who have already reported similarly negative, embittering experiences. If early disappointing transitions can negatively influence long-term satisfaction, then many of the university's current junior faculty may be poised to become the disengaged senior faculty of the future.

Difficult initial transition. Two senior faculty members in our study experienced a difficult initial transition to the university. The first recounted a series of three negative initial experiences. Before arriving at the university, this faculty member negotiated an extra semester to finish his dissertation, planning to start during the spring rather than fall semester. However, he finished his dissertation earlier than expected, and so made plans to go abroad for the fall term, figuring that he was free until the spring. The department head, however, told him that the deferment could only be used for writing his dissertation: Since his dissertation was complete, he would have to begin work in the fall. Many years later, the faculty member interviewed recalled this incident, saying that the department head's "overly legalistic" approach had left him with a "bad taste" in his mouth. His negative reaction was intensified when the same department head pressured him to apply for a grant while he was still working on his dissertation, before he had arrived at the institution. He got the grant and was happy to have the money during his first year on the job, but he found the experience of balancing dissertation writing and grant writing frustrating and overwhelming, making the transition to his new job difficult and taxing. If these two experiences set a negative early tone, his initial experience on campus did not help. The faculty member recalled that no one spoke to him his entire first day on campus; he felt ignored and unwelcome. This came as a particular shock because he had moved to academia from industry, where he had worked on teams and felt a strong sense of contact and inclusion. These three negative early experiences combined to leave him feeling vaguely resentful and with "no initial sense of ownership" in his first years at the university. At the time of the interview, he was contemplating other job offers and advising some of his graduate students against careers in academia.

A second faculty member from a different department recounted similar frustrations upon his arrival. Shortly after coming to this university from another academic institution, he found that he had to forfeit a month's salary because of lack of summer funding. The fact that his first month's salary was contingent upon his own external funding had not been made explicit. As the primary breadwinner for a large family, he faced a significant hardship. Second, he found that the package he had been offered by the university and had counted on "was not real money" and did not materialize. His sense from the beginning, thus, was that the administration was "nickel and diming" faculty while playing fast and loose with their own financial commitments. This impression came into play later in his career as well. Although promoted to full professor, he was not given a raise until he secured an outside job offer. While this practice is fairly common at the university in question, the faculty mem-

ber was particularly bothered by it because it seemed to confirm his sense that the university conducted its financial dealings in a disrespectful, even somewhat dishonest, way. A number of other faculty interviewed (some of whom had left the university) also reported finding it distasteful that administrators expected faculty to use outside offers to negotiate salary and resources. Even senior faculty members who had successfully employed this strategy nonetheless lamented that the university only seemed to value faculty members when other institutions courted them. They questioned why they should feel committed to an institution that was not fully committed to them.

Painful tenure experience. In the two cases described above, negative experiences during the transition to a new job (in the one case a first job, in the other a move from one institution to another) made a deep impression with obvious lingering effects. Another key transition for faculty is, of course, tenure, a stressful and difficult experience for faculty at many institutions. The build-up to tenure and thus the emotional impact of disappointing or painful experiences connected with it are all the more potent at a university like this one with an exceptionally long tenure clock (9 years). Understandably, experiences connected to reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) figured large in all our interviews. However, whereas we expected painful RPT experiences to surface in interviews with former faculty and anxiety over tenure to punctuate interviews with junior faculty, we were surprised to hear current tenured faculty focus on these experiences as well.

One senior faculty member, for example, was approved for tenure but not the promotion that usually accompanies it. He later learned that the decision was based on criticisms four colleagues had expressed about his work. It came as a shock to him, because no one in his department had previously voiced any concerns about his research. He felt "stabbed in the back" and humiliated. To this day, he finds it uncomfortable to be with these colleagues and avoids faculty meetings as a result.

The second case (described in the second vignette at the beginning of this essay) is remarkably similar. Like the individual above, this faculty member received tenure but was later told that two colleagues with whom he had enjoyed a close, collaborative relationship had argued against his case during the tenure deliberations. Also like the faculty member above, he was caught completely off-guard: No one in his department had ever expressed reservations about his work, for which he had received accolades in other contexts. The experience led him to avoid these particular colleagues and to withdraw from joint research ventures. It also jaundiced his feelings about the department in general. In our interview, which occurred years later, his sense of hurt and betrayal was still palpable.

In a third case involving tenure, a senior faculty member recalled a pretenure exchange with a departmental administrator. The faculty member had expressed a desire to teach courses in line with his research interests, but the administrator appealed to him to teach another set of courses that the department required for majors. The faculty member agreed, eager to "be a team player." He found, however, that this willingness actually worked against him during tenure consideration. In fact, the same administrator who had asked him to teach these required courses later criticized him in writing for agreeing to do so, citing his acquiescence as a lack of focus on research goals. Although the faculty member ultimately received tenure, he reported feeling manipulated and betrayed. The lesson he learned, and which he passes on to junior faculty, is that efforts to help the institution will not be rewarded: "The university won't remember."

Each of the cases above involved a key professional transition, and in each case the senior faculty member in question felt betrayed or undermined by individuals he had trusted; in other words, he experienced profound negative support. Our data suggest that experiences such as these can create a lens through which subsequent experiences are perceived. In other words, one experience can set the tone for all others, and in extreme cases it can lead to what Kramer terms "sinister attribution error" (Kramer, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1999)—that is, the tendency for individuals to overattribute hostile intentions and malevolent motives to the actions of others, to the point that even benign behaviors take on sinister import.

Impact: changed perspectives. Whether caused by attribution errors or accurate perceptions, this pattern seemed to hold in our interviews: The senior faculty members who had recounted early negative transitional experiences described subsequent incidents in which they felt ignored or badly treated. In many cases, they attributed these later experiences to factors such as sexism, disrespect of a certain subfield, cronyism, and favoritism. For example, the second vignette at the beginning of this essay describes a faculty member who was convinced that his colleagues did not respect him based on his negative tenure experience, so the glances they exchanged at faculty meetings seemed both significant and threatening. Another senior faculty member's job satisfaction began to decline precipitously when key colleagues left the program, in part because of what the faculty member considered to be a hostile work environment for women. She recounted how, on several different occasions, she had recommended potential candidates for positions in her department. None of these candidates were ever considered in the applicant pool. The respondent believed that the search committee ignored her recommendations because she was a woman and noted a

history of similar sexist slights. While her analysis of departmental sexism may very well have been accurate overall, it is possible that there were other explanations for particular events (for example, the search committee may have had other motivations, such as the need to bring in a person with connections to a specific funding agency or experience with a cutting-edge technology, both highly valued resources at the institution we investigated). However, early experiences with sexism understandably predisposed her to interpret later experiences through the same lens, creating patterns of perception that lasted for years and that eventually led her to withdraw from certain aspects of departmental life.

Faculty Responses

What implications do these sorts of faculty experiences have for the institution? The organizational behavior literature identifies four possible responses individuals can have to contract violations (Farrell, 1983; Hirschman, 1970; Rousseau, 1995). Although negative transitional experiences are not explicitly discussed in that literature, our research suggests that the same four responses are applicable in these cases as well. These four responses are voice, exit, silence/loyalty, or neglect/destruction.

Voice and exit are two ways that faculty typically make their dissatisfaction known. The most positive response, voice is a constructive action in which a faculty member tries to remedy the situation and change what she finds objectionable, either for herself or for others (Rousseau, 1995). Alternatively, and at the other end of the spectrum, a professor could choose to exit or voluntarily leave the institution when he is dissatisfied. Research indicates that exiting is more likely when colleagues are also exiting, when other potential jobs are readily available (as may be the case for highly visible, prolific senior faculty members), or when previous efforts to voice and remedy the situation have failed (Rousseau, 1995). In our interviews, several faculty members described situations in which they voiced their unmet expectations in faculty meetings or to their department head or dean. Some of these faculty were satisfied with the outcomes that resulted from their voicing, but many met with unsuccessful outcomes. Several current faculty members who had already voiced without success said they were considering exiting if their continued efforts to voice dissatisfaction led to little or ineffective change. These sentiments are of particular concern because stated intent to leave is the strongest predictor of actual voluntary turnover (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Olsen, Maple, & Stage 1995; Steers & Mowday, 1981).

Silence/loyalty and neglect/destruction are typically less visible and less concrete responses. Silence/loyalty lacks an outward action but

"reflects a willingness to endure or accept unfavorable circumstances" (Rousseau, 1995, p. 138). Whereas loyalty connotes the optimistic attitude that things will improve with time, silence often reflects the pessimistic attitude that nothing can or will be done. One memorable example of silence is the faculty member, mentioned earlier, who reported that even after years at the institution, none of his colleagues showed any interest in his family or would care one way or another if he stayed or left. This was a strong psychological contract violation for someone who said he had initially believed that his department would become his "second family." Yet despite expressing a long-standing disappointment with this aspect of his professional life, he accepted the situation quietly rather than exiting or seeking to change it (for himself or others).

The fourth potential response to deep career dissatisfaction is what Rousseau identifies as neglect or destruction (1995). A faculty member who perceives that the department has failed to keep its commitments (a theme that came up in our discussion of both contract violations *and* negative transformational experiences) might respond passively by neglecting or avoiding responsibilities. Multiple senior faculty members in our study, for example, reported that they routinely skip faculty meetings as a result of their frustrations. One highly regarded and otherwise amicable researcher explained that after years of trying to change the RPT process and after repeated protests of the criteria for judging "good work" in his department, he refused to participate in tenure or promotion decisions any longer. By his standards, the process had become capricious and unjust, but he had stopped trying to change it because his colleagues continued to ignore the alternatives he presented. In other words, after years of voicing, he became increasingly disillusioned and eventually withdrew from the process.

In contrast, destruction involves actively engaging in counterproductive, damaging behaviors. Although it may seem unlikely that a senior professional in academe would behave destructively, in our interviews we heard from senior faculty members who, believing they were looking out for the best interests of their junior colleagues, encouraged them to leave the department. For instance, one senior male faculty member advised his junior female colleagues to get out of academia as soon as possible if they planned to have families. He explained that in industry, women could take longer maternity leaves and work flex- or part-time without losing credibility as experts in their field, whereas academia was not nearly so accommodating. Another senior faculty member was disappointed by the institution's failure to reward service, and he bluntly recommended that his pretenure colleagues not waste time with committee work or responsibilities that would build community, such as attend-

ing departmental luncheons or parties. He told his junior colleagues "to look out for themselves" and to build stronger CVs so that they could leave for better positions if they became available. Although the faculty member who offered such advice did so out of genuine concern for his junior colleagues, he was responding to problems within his department in a way that harmed the department in the long run, by motivating good people to leave and by perpetuating a lack of collegiality.

Of the four possible responses to contract violations and negative transitional experiences elaborated above, voice is clearly the most constructive and positive because it has the greatest chance of leading to growth for the department and resolution for the individual. Exit, on the other hand, may appear to be an inherently bad outcome for the institution—but it depends upon the circumstances. A certain amount of faculty turnover is both necessary and healthy for an institution because it brings in new people and new ideas (Harrigan, 1999). However, if junior faculty members leave because disgruntled senior faculty members encouraged them to do so, then such turnover minimizes the very benefits that these new faculty members could bring to the department. Silence and loyalty have relatively neutral impacts if they are limited to one or a few individuals. The impact of a departmental culture of silence, however, can be cumulatively negative if many people are unhappy but no one takes action. In this essay, we are particularly concerned with the neglect/destruction response because, like silence, these reactions to dissatisfaction may go relatively unnoticed, but unlike silence or loyalty, they have the potential to do greater damage to the institution as a whole, for reasons that will be explored below.

Why might someone choose to remain at an institution and be silent, destructive, or neglectful? There were a number of answers that emerged from faculty interviews: Some faculty members had spouses who loved their job, others enjoyed the quality of life in the city (e.g., schools, low-cost housing), and still others mentioned salary, prestige of the institution, and/or their retirement plan as incentives to stay despite their dissatisfaction. In fact, Matier's work on faculty retention (1990) addresses these decisions. He distinguishes between two sets of factors relating to faculty retention: internal and external benefits. Internal benefits relate to factors internal to academic/professional life and include both intangibles (e.g., personal and institutional reputation, autonomy, influence, a sense of belonging) and tangibles (e.g., salary, facilities, fringe benefits, work rules). External benefits are non–work related and include quality of life, family, friendships, and financial considerations outside of salary. When these benefits are juxtaposed, Matier finds (and our research corroborates) that faculty who tend to leave are those with low

internal and low external benefits who have the ability to move, while faculty who stay may fall into any one of four categories: high internal/high external benefits, high internal/low external benefits, low internal/high external benefits, and low internal/low external benefits without the ability to move. The disengaged senior faculty members we are discussing fall into the low internal/high external benefits category. Because exit is not an option, they adopt silence, destruction, or neglect as a response to the environment.

Institutional Implications: The Ripple Effect

As the previous section illustrates, even highly productive, successful faculty members may disengage from their departments or institutions if they have experienced a particularly traumatic transition or a violation of an implicit psychological contract. Their disengagement may take many forms: They might withdraw from the intellectual life of the department and from collaborative relationships with colleagues; they might opt out of decision-making processes within the department; they might either withdraw from mentoring relationships or give cynical or discouraging advice to protégées; and they might stop interacting socially with colleagues. Clearly, all these responses have an impact on departments and on the institution as a whole. However, our observations suggest that such forms of senior faculty disengagement have a particularly pronounced effect on the happiness and professional success of junior faculty, whose position at the university is most insecure and who rely most heavily on mentoring from and collaboration with senior colleagues. If a university fails to retain promising junior faculty because of an environment tainted by disengaged senior faculty, the institutional costs can be high: Not only does the institution lose talented individuals, but it loses the departmental time, resources, and money that must go into conducting searches and providing attractive start-up packages for new faculty (Ehrenberg, Rizzo, & Jakubson, 2003; Harrigan, 1999; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Solomon & Fagnano, 1993). In other words, institutions that ignore senior faculty disengagement do so at their own peril.

Disengaging from Intellectual Exchange and Collaboration

The literature indicates that collegiality is one of the key predictors of faculty satisfaction (Barnes et al., 1998; Manger & Eikeland, 1990; Smart, 1990; Turner & Boice, 1987). In line with these findings, one aspect of departmental life that our respondents valued most was the healthy exchange of ideas among colleagues, whereas lack of intellectual community was frequently cited as a cause for dissatisfaction.

When junior faculty expressed frustration with the lack of intellectual community in their departments, they often attributed it to the unavailability of senior colleagues for discussion or research collaboration.

Clearly, senior faculty disengagement exacerbates this perception. When senior faculty members withdraw from departmental colleagues, their own work does not necessarily suffer as a result. They are generally well enough established in their own fields to collaborate with colleagues in other departments and at other institutions, and they might derive a sense of intellectual community from this larger sphere of interaction. However, this might not be true for junior faculty who often rely more heavily on senior departmental colleagues for intellectual exchange and collaboration. When dissatisfied senior faculty members disengage from their departments, they might inadvertently deny junior colleagues opportunities to exchange ideas and to work together on collaborative projects. In turn, this might lead to frustration and reduced productivity for junior faculty.

Withdrawing from Decision-Making Processes

When senior faculty members withdraw from decision-making processes within the department, they surrender these processes to others, narrowing the available expertise and range of perspectives. If the disengaged faculty member is one of a small number of departmental colleagues representing a subfield (not a rare occurrence given the small size of some departments at this institution), her lack of involvement in decision-making can have a significant impact. Take, for example, a hypothetical junior faculty member who is up for review. If, in considering his case, one of the three senior faculty members most familiar with his subfield opts out of the decision-making process, the opinions of the other two will carry more weight, as will the opinions of colleagues outside his subfield who may not fully understand his work. For the tenure candidate, this could be disastrous. Since the senior faculty members we have identified in this essay are highly engaged in their research areas, their lack of involvement with RPT and other decisions at key transition points can be experienced by junior colleagues as a violation of their own implicit psychological contracts, potentially leading to a sense of disillusionment or even betrayal. This, in turn, may perpetuate the cycle of disengagement, leading junior colleagues to withdraw from departmental processes or simply to exit the institution.

Withdrawing from Mentoring Relationships or Giving Cynical Advice

The importance of mentoring junior faculty has received considerable study (Bilimoria et al., 2006; Boice, 1992; Menges & Associates, 1999;

Zachary, 2000). Our own research clearly indicates the need for junior faculty members to establish a diverse set of mentoring relationships to address different facets of their professional lives (Ambrose et al., 2005). When senior faculty members disengage from their departments, they eliminate themselves as a possible source of advice, encouragement, and feedback for younger colleagues. Because all of the senior faculty members in question have professional connections and experience with funding agencies that would benefit junior colleagues, their unavailability as a resource is particularly unfortunate.

Even when disaffected senior faculty members do *not* withdraw from mentoring relationships, their influence can be problematic. A senior faculty member who advises junior female colleagues not to stay in academia because of sexism or who tells his protégés to cultivate their own careers but not to invest in the institution might be giving considered, heartfelt advice based on his own experiences, but it comes at the cost of discouraging or frightening younger colleagues. If the effect of such advice is that female faculty members leave the academy or junior faculty members focus on their own careers exclusively and ignore the community, there are clearly negative implications for everyone concerned, but particularly for the junior faculty members who inherit a pessimistic perception of the institutional environment.

This is a problem that cannot be addressed by blaming or attempting to censor senior faculty members. If senior faculty members are to mentor junior colleagues effectively, they must be free to give honest advice. An institution's task is not to extract a false loyalty from these individuals but rather to actively combat potential sources of senior faculty dissatisfaction and to foster a sense of inclusion, empowerment, and investment in the institution.

Withdrawing from Social Activity

Social activities (e.g., going to lunch, Friday afternoon wine receptions, the department ski trip) are a significant aspect of collegial relations, helping to facilitate the intellectual exchanges and mentoring discussed above and fostering relationships that create a sense of community. When senior faculty members withdraw from the social life of the department, this critical sense of community is undermined.

Senior faculty members who disengage in the ways discussed here do not do so with any intention of eroding collegiality or denying younger colleagues a full and satisfying professional life. In fact, in many cases it is only after numerous frustrating or disillusioning experiences that senior faculty members withdraw from collaborative or mentoring relationships, departmental decision-making, or social opportunities. Our purpose here is not to blame disengaged senior faculty but to suggest

ways that institutions can understand the sources of senior faculty dissatisfaction and their implications for the wider community. Until an institution identifies why its senior faculty members are disengaged and how the local university culture contributes to that dissatisfaction, institutions cannot take steps to remedy the situation.

What, then, can institutions do? Given the subjective and typically unspoken nature of psychological contracts, it is impossible for a department or institution to avoid contract violations altogether (Rousseau, 1995). By the same token, it may not be possible for a department or institution to ensure that faculty will move through key transitions smoothly and painlessly. In fact, it might not even be desirable, as individual and professional growth can result from challenging transitions. However, both departments and institutions can take measures to reduce the likelihood of contract violations and negative transformational experiences, or, if they are unable to prevent them, they can at least minimize their long-term effects.

Department administrators can, for instance, work to prevent psychological contract violations by encouraging faculty to clearly identify their own expectations, while articulating departmental expectations as explicitly and realistically as possible. Because departments and individuals change over time, department heads can establish processes to re-examine both sets of expectations periodically to ensure that they continue to be clear and to bring emerging discrepancies to light while they can still be discussed productively. Department administrators can also help see faculty through potentially difficult transitions and transformations. They can, for example, devote more resources to making new faculty feel welcome and informed and to making their initial experiences positive ones. Likewise, when a department chair is aware that a new hire has had a particularly difficult transition into the department, it would be worth the time and energy for that chair to talk with the new faculty member about these difficulties. In the lead-up to tenure and promotion decisions, department administrators can work toward increasing the feedback that faculty receive in order to prevent unpleasant surprises, and they can ensure that the RPT process is more transparent in order to alleviate suspicions and fears that might otherwise taint professional experiences. More generally, departments and institutions can work to re-engage senior faculty by designating time and space for intellectual exchange, recognizing and celebrating faculty achievements, and empowering dissatisfied faculty to respond to problems via voice rather than exit, silence, neglect, or destruction. How particular colleges and universities choose to address these problems will depend on their own resources, culture, and circumstances and will require institution-specific investigations.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Investigating how and why productive senior faculty members become disengaged from their departments has taken us into both familiar and unfamiliar literature, and it has led to several conclusions that we hope influence future research on faculty vitality and satisfaction.

First, because institutional cultures differ markedly and influence the experiences of faculty members in distinct ways, we have come to recognize the need for more extensive institution-specific research on faculty vitality. Among other things, research at other institutions would reveal whether the explanatory concepts considered here (psychological contracts and transformational experiences) are equally applicable in other institutional settings. Second, our findings indicate the importance of broadening the operational definition of faculty vitality beyond research productivity and teaching performance to include subtler forms of engagement and disengagement. We urge fellow researchers to delve into other unexplored aspects of faculty vitality. Finally, we have discovered useful theoretical concepts from outside educational research that explain sources of senior faculty disengagement and that suggest ways in which institutions might prevent such disengagement, through both targeted interventions and efforts to build stronger university communities. Our hope is that ongoing research at this and other academic institutions will put forward still more "paths of thought" (Talburt, 2004, p. 81) that will further illuminate senior faculty vitality and will generate constructive institutional responses.

Notes

[1]It is worth noting that 33 of the 61 faculty members who left the institution were individuals the university had wanted to retain. In other words, the institution was not simply shedding unwanted faculty but was losing individuals it had hoped to keep.

[2]Seventeen of the former faculty interviewed and 21 of the current faculty were women and/or minorities. Although one original goal of the study was to reveal issues affecting job satisfaction and retention among women and minorities, we were not able to conclude anything definitive regarding these two groups.

[3]The questions used in the interview were these: When did you come to [the university]? What attracted you? What were your expectations before arriving, and were they met? Please describe your experiences at [the university]. Have there been any critical incidents, positive or negative, that have particularly impacted your experience here? Have there been any other issues, personal or professional, that particularly affected your experience? Who or what have you found helpful? Who or what do you believe has hindered your success? What could the university do to create a more positive experience for you? Is there anything else you think would be useful for us to know?

[4]We did not think it would be useful to operationalize the definition of "productive" numerically (for example, by counting peer-refereed articles, grants, books, and so on) because standards of productivity differ so widely in engineering, science, the humanities, the arts, computer science, business, and public policy.

References

Ambrose, S. A., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 803–830.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). Merit pay, market conditions, equity, and faculty compensation. *The NEA 2002 Almanac of Higher Education,* 21–32.

Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university: Extending a contextual concept. *Journal of Higher Education, 61,* 161–180.

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 52,* 598–614.

Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39,* 457–469.

Bensimon, E. M., Polkinghorne, D. E., Bauman, G., & Vallejo, E. (2004). Doing research that makes a difference. *Journal of Higher Education, 75,* 23–41.

Bess, J. L. (1998). Contract systems, bureaucracies, and faculty motivation. *Journal of Higher Education, 69,* 1–22.

Bilimoria, D., Perry, S. R., Liang, X., Stoller, E. P., Higgins, P., & Taylor, C. (2006). How do female and male faculty members construct job satisfaction? The roles of perceived institutional leadership and mentoring and their mediating processes. *Journal of Technology Transfer, 31,* 355–365.

Bland, C. J., & Bergquist, W. H. (1997). *The vitality of senior faculty members: Snow on the roof—fire in the furnace* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 25-7). Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Bland, C. J., Risbey, K. R., Berberet, J., & Brown, B. E. (2004, November). *Perspectives, perceptions, & practices of senior academic faculty.* Paper presented at annual conference of the Association of the Study for Higher Education, Kansas City, MO.

Bland, C. J., & Schmitz, C. C. (1988). Faculty vitality on review: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Higher Education, 59,* 190–224.

Bland, C. J., Seaquist, E. Pacala, J. T., Center, B., & Finstad, D. (2002). One school's strategy to assess and improve the vitality of its faculty. *Academic Medicine, 77,* 368–376.

Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boice, R. (1993). Primal origins and later correctives for mid-career disillusionment. In M. J. Finkelstein & M. W. LaCelle-Peterson (Eds.), *Developing senior faculty as teachers* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 55, pp. 33–41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, A. L. (1996, May). *Bridges and barriers to faculty vitality: The Grossmont College project, 1995–1996.* Paper presented at the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development Conference on Teaching and Leadership Excellence, Austin, TX.

Campbell, L. (2005). Overcoming obstacles to interdisciplinary research. *Conservation Biology, 19,* 574–577.

Chilcott, J. H. (1987). Where are you coming from and where are you going? The reporting of ethnographic research. *American Educational Research Journal, 24*(2), 199–218.

Clark, S. M., Corcoran, M., & Lewis, D. R. (1986). The case for an institutional perspective on faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education, 57,* 176–195.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive biography.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ehrenberg, R. G., Rizzo, M. R., & Jakubson, G. H. (2003). Who bears the growing cost of science at universities? (Cornell Higher Education Research Institute, Working Paper 35). Ithaca: Cornell University.

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 596–607.

Fetterman, D. M. (1990). *Ethnographic auditing: A new approach to evaluating management* (New Directions for Institutional Research No. 68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hamrick, F. A. (2003). "I have work to do": Work roles and affirming or marginalizing experiences among women at professor rank. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, 1*(2), 127–143.

Harrigan, M. N. (1999, May–June). *An analysis of faculty turnover at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.* Paper presented at the 39th Annual AIR Forum, Seattle, WA.

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice.* Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.

Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers* (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73,* 518–541.

Kanter, R. M. (1979). *Changing the shape of work: Reform in academe.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC.

Karpiak, I. E. (1997). University professors at mid-life: Being a part of . . . but feeling apart. In D. Dezure (Ed.), *To improve the academy:* Vol. 16. Resources for faculty, instructional and organizational development (pp. 21–40). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Kramer, R. M. (1993). *The sinister attribution error: Antecedents and consequences of collective paranoia.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.

Kramer, R. M. (1994). The sinister attribution error: Paranoid cognition and collective distrust in organizations. *Motivation and Emotion, 18*(2), 199–230.

Kramer, R. M. (1995). In dubious battle: Heightened accountability, dysphoric cognition, and self-defeating bargaining behavior. In R. M. Kramer & D. M. Messick (Eds.), *Negotiation as social process* (pp. 95–120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Stalking the sinister attribution error: Paranoia inside the lab and out. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 7,* 59–91.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (2003). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Malley, J. E., Rainwater, K., & Stewart, A. (2005). *Summary of analyses of the Survey of the Climate for Women Scientists and Engineers in 2001 and 2005.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan NSF Advance Project.

Manger, T., & Eikeland, O. J. (1990). Factors predicting staff's intentions to leave the university. *Higher Education, 19,* 281–291.

Matier, M. W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(1), 30–60.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (Applied Social Research Methods Series No. 41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McAdams, D. P., Josselson, R., & Lieblich, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Turns in the road: Narrative studies of lives in transition.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Menges, R. J., & Associates (1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established and building institutional support.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Associates (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussions and analysis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mills, N. (2000). Now that I'm tenured, where do I go from here?: The vitality of mid-career faculty. *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly, 20,* 181–183.

Newsom, J., Nishishiba, M., Morgan, D. L., & Rook, K. S. (2003). The relative importance of three domains of positive and negative social exchanges: A longitudinal model with comparable measures. *Psychology and Aging, 18,* 746–754.

Norman, M., Ambrose, S. A., & Huston, T. (2006). Assessing and addressing faculty morale: Cultivating consciousness, empathy and empowerment. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 347–379.

Olsen, D., Maple, S. A., & Stage, F. K. (1995). Women and minority faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(3), 267–293.

Palmer, J. (1998). *Enhancing faculty productivity: A state perspective* (Center for Community College Policy No. 98-4). Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 245–259.

Rook, K. S., & Pietromonaco, P. (1987). Close relationships: Ties that heal or ties that bind? In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–35). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(5), 405–424.

Solomon, L. C., & Fagnano, C. L. (1993). The cost of hiring. In R. H. H. Stein & S. J. Trachtenberg (Eds.), *The art of hiring in America's colleges and universities* (pp. 85–100). New York: Prometheus.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (1992). *Developing new and junior faculty* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Steers, R. M. & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and post-decision accommodation processes. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Straw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 235–281). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Talburt, S. (2004). Ethnographic responsibility without the "real." *Journal of Higher Education, 75,* 80–103.

Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: The concerns and needs of new faculty. In J. Kurfiss, L. Hilsen, L. Mortensen, & R. Wadworth (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 6. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 41–47). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Watson, T. J. (1995). *Sociology, work, and industry* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Weiler, W. C. (1985). Why do faculty members leave a university? *Research in Higher Education, 23*(3), 270–278.

Wood, M., & Johnsrud, L. (2005). Post-tenure review: What matters to faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(3), 393–420.

Woods, S. E., Reid, A., Arndt, J. E., Curtis, P., & Stritter, F. T. (1997). Collegial networking and faculty vitality. *Family Medicine, 29*(1), 45–49.

Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.