Turning from Time to Space: Conceptualizing Faculty Work

Aaron M. Kuntz

The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at the moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein.

(Michel Foucault, 1986, Of other spaces p. 22)

Introduction

Since Foucault (1986) articulated the spatial turn in postmodern experience, scholars in the humanities and social sciences have developed a large body of literature based in spatial metaphors. This research assumes that individuals make meaning within multiple spheres, both locally and globally, within cultures of the immediate environment as well as in relation to larger sociohistorical trends. Some educational theorists have participated in this inquiry into the spatial dimension of education (e.g., Apple, 2000; Giroux and Giroux, 2004), and it is emergent in scholarship on higher education. More often, however, higher education research employs temporal frameworks: developmental models for students and faculty, narrative accounts of identity development, positivist characterizations of human behavior along fixed trajectories, and neoclassical economic analyses of efficiency.

Analytical frames affect our interpretations of key elements within the study of higher education – what it means to be a successful student, for example, or a productive faculty member – yet inform our scholarship in such subtle ways that they often escape critical scrutiny. Postmodern theories that turn to spatial metaphors assume that language overlays all experience and that the relational logic of definition can be used to understand social processes such as identity formation. Hence, identities are seen in context, juxtaposed against other identities – “near and far,” “side-by-side,” and “dispersed” – and, importantly, are always in process, recreated by and creating the dynamic “network that connects points and intersects with its

J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*,

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

own skein" (Foucault, 1986, p. 22). What these spatial frames offer the study of higher education is the perspective that change is integral to the very structure of educational institutions: a clear departure from the modernist premises by which colleges and universities traditionally operate (Bloland, 1995; Mourad, 1997).

Temporal structures abound in the modern institutions of higher education: learning happens in a set amount of time, resulting in a credential; faculty are often ranked according to their progress on the tenure track; and numerous policies are set against the academic calendar. Higher education research often absorbs the modernist frames of university structures without question; consequently, change seems impossible. The constitutive changes by which the university is continually institutionalized go unnoticed, and larger structural change appears unlikely. The study of the university as a complex and continual process of interrelation requires a shift of metaphors from the temporal to the spatial, and this is not simply a matter of semantics.

Earlier uses of postmodern theory critiqued as overly linguistic in their focus have lately given way to materialist revisions. Materialist analyses seek to understand and describe the influence of lived experience, embodiment, and daily practices on larger cultural structures, as well as the effect of culture on materiality. Important to a materialist focus is an understanding of language as not just conceptual, but also embodied (Feldman, 2008; Fleckenstein, 2003; Lakoff and Johnson, 2003). Accordingly, the shift I propose from time to space for research in higher education involves first a critical awareness of our metaphors and, second, an inquiry into the social spaces and material places from which these metaphors emerge.

To ground my discussion of analytical frames, I present the subject of faculty work as it is currently rendered in higher education research, that is, within a temporal frame, and as it may be reconceptualized through a critique of metaphors and an inquiry into daily practice within social space and material place. This approach finds precedent in the work of social theorists from multiple disciplines who have characterized embodiment as the integration of social processes and material practices within the lived experience of the individual (e.g., Cheville, 2005).

Although few studies within the field of higher education present materialist analyses that link embodied experience to physical place, or the social construction of identity in context, Green and Singleton (2006) tell us

> constructions of time and space are based not simply on the structural design of spaces, but also on feelings, fears, and anxieties depending upon where they are situated in particular localities; emotions that are embedded in local discourses and knowledge, and characterized by gender, "race" and relations of power. (p. 867)

Green and Singleton's (2006) study of young women's experiences of risk on and off university campuses in England is a strong reminder of the importance of both material and social context in our conceptualizations of time, space, and self. In their study the authors find that "risk is spatially and temporally situated and relates to the social and cultural identities of the embodied self" (p. 859). Embodied experience exists at the nexus of situated localities – the microgeographies of daily experience. In a similar vein, studies of faculty may interrogate the multiple locations that

engender faculty practices as well as the metaphors faculty use to describe and understand their professional identities and relationships. Conceptual awareness of space and spatial metaphors is a first step in a developing understanding of the social processes and institutionalizing structures of higher education. Here, I argue that such conceptual critique must be followed by materialist analyses that emphasize the dynamic interrelationship between place, daily practice, meaning-making, and professional identity. Embodied metaphor links these two levels of analysis by first highlighting our conceptual patterns and then pointing to the embodied experiences from which we draw and through which we enact these metaphors.

Like scholarship in other disciplines (e.g., Dale, 2005 in organizational studies; Dyck, 2005 in critical geography; Green and Singleton, 2006 in leisure studies; Holloway and Valentine, 2000 in childhood studies), this chapter attempts to make available to higher education researchers a critical perspective that, though experienced and embodied in everyday existence, remains largely unexamined within the research. Often, scholarship on tertiary education unduly privileges temporal experiences over spatial interactions, and this tendency has consequences for how we frame individual identities, experiences, and meaning within tertiary education. This happens despite the fact that our research studies are laden with spatial metaphors.

Conceptually, space and place have endured a long history of debate within multiple disciplines. Generally, it is difficult to separate the physical worlds we inhabit from the social meanings we develop within our environments; however, it does help provisionally to disaggregate the two for the benefit of more clearly understanding their dynamic interrelationship. Edward Soja (1989) notes the conditional nature of such division, understanding that *place* and *space* conceptually overlap and draw meaning from one another. For the purposes of clarity, I define *space* as the social meanings produced and interpreted in material environments, which I in turn define as *place*. In order to sustain that definition, I term space "social space" and place "material place."

Place frames the work we do, and we rely often on spatial metaphors to understand our work relationships. How do we represent the faculty workplace? What is the relationship between what faculty do and the places in which faculty work? Utilizing faculty work as an entry point for analysis, I assert the possibilities that emerge when we interpret faculty through a spatial frame, one that extends from our everyday experiences of the contemporary social world. Through an examination of recent research on faculty work within tertiary education, I present the many ways in which material place and social space contribute new frames for how we conceptualize faculty and their work practices. I draw on an interdisciplinary body of literature that has emerged within several fields of study, most prominently critical and postmodern geography, workplace studies, cultural studies, and education. In various ways, these fields make it possible to argue for a renewed emphasis on spatial and platial modes of meaning-making.

Beyond my call for examinations into the microgeographies of higher education, this chapter contributes to the growing body of research on space and place by detailing the use of embodied metaphor as a theoretical heuristic through which

conceptual interpretation and embodied experience are linked. Further, because this chapter emphasizes faculty work within the field of higher education, it offers an area of study that remains relatively untouched by spatial- and platial-based analyses. Finally, this chapter offers a series of methodological considerations for the practical application of the theoretical concepts that currently dominate research into space and place.

In the end, tertiary scholars of all kinds will benefit from an interrogation of social space and material place within higher education. Those researchers invested in studying identity formation within colleges and universities will find value in micro-level analyses of individual daily practices, the spaces in which such practices occur, and the collective meanings evoked by such practices. Scholars interested in articulations of academic scholarship would do well to inquire into the ways in which the material places where faculty work insinuate normalized definitions of legitimate scholarship within the academy. Individuals who call for changes to the academy itself will find value in addressing the ways institutional spaces recognize select changes even as they constrain the effect of others. Finally, administrators and faculty alike who are engaged in campus alterations will benefit from understanding the layered and dynamic meanings material place contributes. It is not, after all, the way we think about the university – it is the way we live the university on a daily basis that has consequences for how we frame our inquires into higher education. It is here, in the critical space of daily practices, that we may ask how postmodern scholarly practices have the potential to change the modernist institutions that are their subject matter.

This chapter is organized along the following lines: the next section involves an examination of the dynamic intersections of place, space, embodied practice, and professional identity within faculty work in tertiary education; I then examine interdisciplinary calls for a "spatial turn" in academic work and feature four key social theorists who have greatly influenced spatial analyses in multiple disciplines; finally, the concluding section presents embodied metaphor as a link between our conceptualizations and embodied practices as well as a reflection on how materialist research methodologies help us investigate the dynamic intersection of space, place, practice, and embodied experience in higher education.

Faculty Work: Placing Our Metaphors

Scholars in tertiary education have conceived of faculty and faculty work in a number of ways, often through spatial metaphors. Yet rarely do they articulate spatialized analyses of their findings. With the importance of studying faculty in mind, this section reviews scholarship within the field of higher education for its implications on the material places, social spaces, and embodied daily experiences of faculty. This section is ordered around the following frames through which scholars have articulated faculty work: organizational frames, economic frames, and new conceptualizations that seek to reframe faculty work within emerging

sociocultural contexts. As tertiary education strives to reconcile institutionalized practices with changing sociohistorical contexts, the role of faculty and their work is increasingly questioned and in need of critical investigation. As Austin and McDaniels (2006) note, "[a]s higher education institutions address a growing number of societal expectations and needs, the work of faculty is more important than ever – and the range of competencies they need grows as well" (p. 422).

The study of faculty careers is relatively new within historical discourse (Finkelstein, 2006). Perhaps because we have only recently turned a critical eye to the study of faculty, we have yet to fully explicate the many aspects of faculty life (Bieber, 1999). Yet, despite the relatively recent attention to faculty careers and faculty work, distinct analytic patterns shape how we research faculty within the field of higher education, and, consequently, what we know about faculty and their work. Even as Finkelstein categorizes research on faculty work within three distinct historical contexts, I suggest throughout this chapter that our understanding of faculty and faculty work would benefit from an analysis of the social spaces and material places in which such work occurs. Insights provided by scholars such as Finkelstein will prove even more powerful if framed alongside discussions of social space and material place. One might, for example, expand Finkelstein's temporal categorization of change within faculty work and identity by asking how such statistically significant changes intersect with alterations in the workplace. These questions are meant to enhance current scholarship, not replace or repudiate previous research on faculty.

Within the emerging field of higher education spatial metaphors abound. Scholars write of the "field" of study, of faculty mobility, enlarging one's sphere of influence, and erasing disciplinary boundaries. In 2006, the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) focused their annual conference on the theme of "Borderlands/Borderlines in Higher Education," two spatial metaphors with a history of provoking critical analyses (e.g., Anzaldua, 2007). However, despite the many ways in which we spatialize the field, scholars of tertiary education rarely pause to consider the implications of such spatial metaphors, often choosing instead to highlight the economic and temporal frames that give meaning to faculty and their work. Consequently, before considering the ways in which spatial and platial conceptualizations of faculty practices might alter existing interpretations of faculty work, it remains important to locate the conceptual frames commonly applied to the study of faculty and their work.

As my analysis of research on faculty shows, higher education scholars often render social space and material place as silent backdrops in the production of meaning. Consequently, my critique of scholarship on faculty parallels an emerging critique within the fields of critical and cultural geography. As Eyles (1989) claims, place "is not only an arena for everyday life – its geographical or spatial coordinates – it, in itself provides *meaning* to that life. … Places are thus conceived as profound centres of human existence" (p. 109). Other researchers echo such a perspective, critiquing scholarship that presents space as an "empty container in which history unfolds" (Wilson, 2000, p. 3); "a backcloth against which action takes place" (Clarke et al., 2002, p. 288); "an 'absolute container' for congeries of objects and naturally occurring processes" (Kostogriz, 2006, p. 177); an "inert territory awaiting

discovery and colonization" (Gruenewald, 2003, p. 628); "an empty code" (Edelman, 1978, p. 2); "a backdrop for history" (Knopp, 2004, p. 127). All these scholars strive to replace connotations of space and place that are fixed, static, and empty, and often posit definitions that include fluctuation, dynamic activity, and embodied experience. In the sections that follow, readers should take note of the many ways space and place are conceptualized as static and inert, rarely contributing to the meanings we make of faculty and their work.

Organizational Frames

Many scholars of higher education have sought to utilize organizational theory to make sense of the material places and social spaces of faculty work within institutions of tertiary education as well as the professional identities legitimated within the academy. Within these analyses, researchers insinuate spatial metaphors to make sense of faculty work, but do so without acknowledging the many ways such spatializations inform their analyses. This remains important because organizational theorists have historically noted two key characteristics of higher education. The first characteristic is a rendering of higher education, like other institutionalized fields, as marked by a striking amount of what Scott (2001) terms "structural isomorphism" or structural similarities across institutions. Second, organizational theorists often point out that campus organizations are slow to change and rely on normalizing symbolic values for legitimacy (Duderstadt, 2001; Levin, 2000).

Consequently, although American society has changed much over the past 100 years, and knowledge production has increased at exponential rates, educational organizations themselves are understood to have altered only slightly. Persistence continues as a result of the highly institutionalized interactions within the field of higher education. Alpert (1985), for example, extends the remarkable conformity of the organizational structures of tertiary education to the very ways in which individuals perform or enact their roles as faculty within tertiary education. Thus, we understand the activities of faculty *as* faculty, for example, through the uniformity and consistency of their daily practices. Consequently, the structural conformity that dominates the organizations of the academy implicates the daily practices of faculty even as the normative repetition of faculty practices ensures the maintenance of the institution. Stasis becomes the norm.

As organizational theorists strive to make sense of faculty identity and practices within university systems, they often utilize spatial metaphors, though do so without consciously pointing to how such spatializations affect their understanding of faculty and their work. Two important examples of this are found in seminal works by Alvin Gouldner and Daniel Alpert, scholars whose work has had a significant impact on scholarship concerning faculty work.

Gouldner (1957) begins his examination of "cosmopolitans" and "locals" among faculty by critiquing previous scholarship on role theory for relying on vague notions of spatial positioning to determine an individual's relation to a larger organization:

> A social role is commonly defined as a set of expectations oriented toward people who occupy a certain "position" in a social system or a group. It is a rare discussion of social role that does not at some point make reference to the "position" occupied by a group member. Despite its frequent use, however, the notion of a social "position" is obscure. … Often, it is used as little more than a geometrical metaphor. (p. 282)

Gouldner draws attention to the significance of "position" within role theory but emphasizes its emptiness as a defining term; position becomes "little more than a geometrical metaphor." Through his study of faculty Gouldner aims to draw new meaning to the term "position," offering further refinement through the concepts of "cosmopolitans" and "locals." Keeping with the spatial renderings of individuals within organizations offered by position, Gouldner asserts that cosmopolitan faculty "use an *outer* reference group orientation" while the locals "use an *inner* reference group orientation" (p. 290, emphasis added). In this sense, Gouldner brings increased meaning to faculty position through defining their spatial relation to the educational organization. Position is more than a geometrical metaphor, it gains meaning through a context-specific set of spatial relations. One no longer inhabits a vague *position*, but is instead *positioned* in relation to a larger organizational space – thus defining faculty as they orient themselves according to inside or outside reference points.

Although Gouldner critiques role theory for the emptiness of its "geometrical metaphors," he fails to fully examine the ramifications of his own spatializations. Inner and outer positions call forth the spatial metaphor of the container (in this case, the educational organization contains the orientation of locals, even as its boundaries mark the external orientation of faculty defined as cosmopolitans). Such a conceptualization is not without important consequences for how we are to interpret faculty and faculty work. As the following section shows, the metaphor of containment is especially important to the study of faculty in relation to the larger disciplinary and departmental organizations from which they draw meaning.

Alpert (1985) strives to makes sense of faculty orientation within the university differently, though still maintaining Gouldner's spatial emphasis on relation. In order to better represent the complex interrelations between professor, department, campus, and discipline, Alpert presents an organizational matrix, a spatial model that grants added dimensionality to traditional representations of university structure. Alpert's matrix spatially represents conflicts and tensions between two institutional spaces central to faculty work – the local campus and larger department – as they vie for more direct relation to faculty. In Alpert's model, disciplinary and campus communities show divergent goals, thus making it more difficult to pinpoint the location of faculty identity. Within scholarship on faculty, many researchers recognize such tensions; though do so without examining them in overtly spatialized models. Indeed, Alpert proclaims a need for his matrix model in order to counter the overemphasis of linear models utilized to understand the organization of the university or college; he seeks to bring added dimensionality to the organizational models through which faculty are known.

Many researchers seem particularly concerned to resolve the disciplinary and departmental tensions invoked by Gouldner and Alpert's models by asserting the

need for departments to contain the loyalties of faculty, thus affirming a reproduced belief in the academic department as the primary structural unit within the university. This remains especially important as campus departments increasingly fail to fully represent distinct academic disciplines *in toto* and are thus no longer able to fully contain faculty spatializations. In this sense scholars often depict departments as social spaces and material places that maintain a centrality to faculty practices and present strategies for foregrounding the department above other organizational entities.

Both Lewis (1993) and Spencer-Matthews (2001), for example, depict faculty loyalty to their disciplines as an organizational problem in need of resolution. Lewis (1993) writes that faculty remain responsible to themselves and professional associations as opposed to the university in which they work. A desire to change such an historical lineage of extra-departmental loyalty responds to previous scholarship which notes the academic discipline as the container more apt to hold faculty loyalty (e.g., Boyer, 1990). In the face of such research, scholars such as Lewis and Spencer-Matthews reaffirm the central importance of the department within the structural organization of the university and thereby present a need to shift academic culture away from emphasizing disciplinary affiliation over departmental membership.

Concerns over disciplinary affiliation and loyalty stem from a recognized centrality of the academic department to university operation. As Hearn and Anderson (2002) assert, "the academic department is the foundational unity of U.S. universities. Curricula, degree programs, grading practices, research initiatives, and faculty careers are shaped there" (p. 503). Clark (1998) notes that the university's "heartland is still found in the *traditional academic departments* formed around disciplines, new and old, and some interdisciplinary fields of study" (p. 7, emphasis added). Hobbs and Anderson (1971) maintain academic departments "constitute the fundamental elements" of campus organizational structures (p. B134). Such essentialized language – the department as the "foundational unity," "heartland," "fundamental element" of our universities – becomes problematic when the organizing structure can no longer encompass the knowledge it is meant to represent. Departments may no longer claim to represent or organize knowledge, but are seen to instead *manage* the material aspects of the campus: the material places and daily policies in which professors, students, and administrators operate.

Similarly, scholars such as Weber (2001) emphasize the central importance of the academic department to the university organization as well as the potential for disciplinary affiliations to interfere with the localized campus organization. Among other things, Weber notes that faculty should adhere to institutional goals over disciplinary goals even as they naturally draw their identity from their university rather than disciplinary affiliations. As the analysis that extends throughout this chapter indicates, the spontaneous allegiance to one's university that Weber so desires points to a necessary cultural shift within tertiary education; such seemingly unconscious affiliations cannot be mandated via policy implementation and must, instead, extend into the very social spaces and material places in which faculty operate. Faculty allegiance to departments or disciplines

– how they conceive of their role in the many spaces of higher education – is constituted in particular daily practices, as well as interpretations of social space and material place.

Weber (2001) later notes the benefits to the university of faculty's dual positionality, asserting that they are required to "alert the university authorities about recent developments and trends in their disciplines" (p. 91). Remarkably, such assertions maintain a focal point on the essentialized department as faculty pledge fealty to their university, operate within departments, and report the actions of the discipline to "university authorities." Like Weber, Walvoord et al. (2000) suggest administrators "strengthen institutional influence, in order to counterbalance disciplinary influence" on individual departments (p. 29). In order to achieve this, Walvoord et al. (2000) present a series of strategies for foregrounding the departmental unit over the academic discipline: increasing the number of faculty with less direct ties to specific disciplinary cultures (such as adjuncts), collaboration across disciplinary boundaries, and facilitating alternatives to discipline-based professional associations. Such strategies aim to increase the influence of the campus organization on individual professors through decentering the traditionally dominate social spaces of the academic discipline within tertiary education. All these strategies go out of their way to reinscribe departmental boundaries to create an academic workforce that finds identity and definition through its placement within the department. Within such a perspective departmental spatial boundaries are strengthened through the encouragement of interdisciplinary practices of faculty work; as disciplinary boundaries are overcome, departmental affiliation gains prominence. Here, we see a wide array of suggestions for ways to manage and control faculty work through a reframing of the social spaces that maintain key elements of faculty professional identity. Throughout, increasing the standing of the department within the professional culture of the campus organization remains an organizational response to a history of disciplinary influence over the professorate.

Within the organizational distribution of departments and disciplines, unique frames emerge within the literature. Disciplines are depicted as more fluid than fixed, evolving relationally to knowledges produced and revised. Departments, on the other hand, remain static, an organizational structure that can no longer contain the disciplines they were meant to represent. Thus, as Bloland (1995) and Mourad (1997) infer, the department takes on the limits of modernism, a modernist institution vying to control more postmodern forms of knowledge and institutional identity.

Economic Frames

Increasingly, scholars have come to read faculty through an economic frame that gains meaning through its emphasis on the temporal at the consequence of the spatial meanings. Generally, an interpretation of faculty work through economic frames proves difficult because what faculty labor to produce cannot be easily quantified. As Martin (1998) notes, the work of faculty

> confounds received categorization. Knowledge, if that is what is being produced, is a slippery thing. It is at once local and in defiance of locality. Wages for thought jostle uneasily between what is paid for and what is not. Product, whether as successfully completed credit hour or publication, cannot straightforwardly be seen as containing the value attributed to it. Appropriation, which names learning as much as it does teaching, generates kinds of surplus that are not necessarily commensurate with one another. (p. 22)

Martin locates the difficulty of situating faculty work within an economic frame: the standard economic operations of production (knowledge production), labor value ("wages for thought"), product ("credit hour or publication"), and appropriation of product (learning and teaching). And yet, despite the difficulty of reading faculty work within an economic frame, policies surrounding faculty work persist, as faculty and administrators alike strive to make meaning of what faculty do within increasingly prevalent economic contexts. Further, because such economic frames depend on elements of production and efficiency, they inevitably invoke temporal associations. Faculty are evaluated based on their production on a set timeline, often rendered as the tenure track, which, in turn, defines some faculty as "junior" or "pretenure" and others as "senior" or "tenured."

Although the relation between faculty work and traditional economic assertions of productive value with set timelines are tenuous at best, researchers and policymakers alike have sought multiple ways through which to define faculty work within an economic frame. Indeed, as the economic market increasingly plays a role in the everyday operations of colleges and universities – dictating institutional responses to contemporary economic realities – faculty have been called upon to articulate the value of their work in economic terms. Often the connection between a faculty member's work – in this case his or her production – and economic value play a large role in promotion and tenure decisions. Increasingly, universities are buffeted by market forces and require faculty to justify their positions by promoting the commercial value of their work (Martin, 2005).

Such connotations of economic value have direct implications on not only the determination of faculty work, but also the assertion of particular faculty identities as "good" or "productive"; the economic frame privileges select academic practices while delegitimizing others, contributing to an emergent sketch of a successful faculty professional identity. Consequently, as Castree (2002) finds in the British context, "the 'successful' academic self is a figure who publishes not just a lot but in the 'right' journals; who wins pots of research money, preferably from blue-chip funding-bodies" (p. 105). Faculty identity draws meaning from the fulfillment of legitimized activities within legitimized spheres. Increasingly, economic spheres have determined the value and legitimacy of faculty work.

As practices and contexts increasingly become meaningful in economic notions of value, what faculty can and cannot do, their *work*, becomes increasingly disciplined. As Martin (2005) later asserts,

> with employment advancement increasingly tied to teaching and research that brings in the dollars, there is no tiptoeing around the fact that when the use-value orientation of academics is not directed toward surplus accumulation, the university rears its ugly multiplicity of heads, like Cerberus, the guard dog at the gates of Hades. (para 28)

Martin's representation of disciplinary action within the academy reinforces the strong pull for faculty to engage in activities recognized and valued in economic terms. This proves especially problematic for those faculty whose work is perhaps on the margins of mainstream acceptability, never fully in line with the values of economic production, causing critical scholars such as Apple (2000) to critique the "conservative modernization" of the academy.

Social critics like Giroux (2005), Apple (2000, 2006), Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), and Readings (1996), have rightly critiqued the influence of an increasingly normative neoliberal economic rendering of education or, as Gumport (2002) writes, the "logic of industry." Such theorists implicitly critique the economic frames that have come to dominate interpretations of tertiary education and, in turn, the material realities they infer. Certainly, a concerted attempt to reframe conceptual discourse surrounding faculty work in higher education may potentially change the social and material practices through which we have come to know faculty identity (Kuntz, 2007).

New Conceptualizations

Some scholars within the field of Higher Education have called for new interpretations of faculty and their work, invoking alternative frames and new metaphors in order to represent better daily faculty practices in newly developed social contexts. Bean (1998) specifically foregrounds the affect of language on our everyday conceptions of faculty roles, pointing to the constraints inherent in the language with which scholars have described faculty work. Bean presents a dynamic relationship between language and practice, beginning with the premise that new descriptions of faculty work make possible new faculty practices. How we frame faculty, their work and roles within the university, matters, because, as Bean points out, "the language we now use is poison" (p. 497). Although he does not directly refer to theories of embodied metaphor, Bean's argument is a call for a reframing of the conceptual system through which we make sense of faculty identity and daily work.

Like Bean (1998), Lee et al. (2005) argue for new conceptualizations for faculty and their work, though do so by pointing to the new political and economic contexts in which faculty operate. Lee et al. essentially offer a new conceptual metaphor – that of the professor as knowledge worker. As Lee et al. rightly recognize, the contemporary context of the new global economy alters the spatial properties in which faculty work is enacted: "[I]n the new economy, increasing amounts of work are being conducted at different times and work sites than has traditionally been the case" (p. 66). As the authors extend their review of previous scholarship on faculty work, they critique an overemphasis on studies of faculty time allocation that, in turn, reaffirms the separation of the traditional triad of teaching, research, and service as distinctly categorizable activities.

In light of the contemporary context of the "new economy," Lee et al. (2005) call for "the increasing fluidity of the boundaries between work and personal space"

that necessitates a newly critical review of faculty spatial practices (p. 83). The present-day context requires new metaphors for faculty work that highlight spatial analyses over strict temporal interpretations. So it is that the authors strive to merge traditionally temporal interpretations of faculty work with spatial analyses of daily faculty practices. Lee et al. argue that "with the increased use of technologies … there is reason to believe that increasing amounts of time are being allocated to work that take place off campus and outside of what would be regarded as normal working hours" (p. 83). Note the ease with which their analysis slips into the use of spatial metaphors in order to explain contemporary faculty work experiences in the new academy: faculty work in new spaces and newly spatialized time. These faculty work "*outside* normal working hours" even as they place their work outside of traditional faculty work spaces (i.e., faculty offices, campus libraries, etc.).

Although Lee et al. (2005) offer a new interpretation of faculty and their work – asserting new metaphors – they never overtly note their recommended shift to spatialize faculty work both in terms of what to study and the conceptual basis that frames the research for which they advocate. Instead, one might read the authors' attempts to align spatial considerations of faculty work alongside traditional interpretations that emphasize time allocation as a means to better reconcile a theoretical framework with the daily lived experiences in what Foucault (1986) calls, "the epoch of space" (p. 22) (hence Lee et al.'s insistence that faculty now work in a new context – the new knowledge economy – that demands an assertion of newly devised faculty professional identities). As the authors note, this reconceptualization of the metaphors through which we render faculty work causes researchers to ask new questions that merge previously bifurcated notions of time and space: "there is good reason to gather data on time allocation that concentrates on *when* and *where* work time is allocated" (p. 83, emphasis added).

Similarly, Erin Leahey (2007) articulates a reconfiguration of faculty away from traditional notions of "publish or perish" to an emphasis on visibility within her study on faculty in linguistics and sociology. Leahey implicitly calls for a new spatial metaphor – visibility – to replace traditional metaphors for faculty work that reify temporal renditions of faculty within the timeline of tenure. Through her study, Leahey produces a gendered analysis that merges spatial and economic frames, finding that women faculty tend to specialize less and, consequently, have a lower degree of visibility within the field, thereby reducing their economic potential within the academy.

Leahey (2007) emphasizes visibility as it relates to professional identity, examining publication rates, citation counts of published articles, book awards, and book reviews. As faculty generate increased publications and citation counts they generate a degree of visibility within their field, a representational identity within the social space of their discipline that has significant effects on salary and tenure potential. The end result of Leahey's shift toward a spatialized interpretation of faculty work is a more layered and multidimensional representation of faculty professional identities that incorporates both temporal and spatial considerations. Specific to Leahey's analysis, women faculty members in her sample earned less than their male counterparts in large part because they tended to specialize less and

were thus less visible within their field of study. The former conclusion has been documented in previous sociological analyses of faculty (e.g., Horning, 2003; Preston, 2004). However, Leahey's findings concerning visibility are relatively unexamined in previous scholarship, perhaps only made available through Leahey's incorporation of the spatialized metaphor of visibility.

Of course, one could extend Leahey's (2007) notion of visibility to yet another dimension, that of material visibility, evoking elements of faculty-embodied daily practices – this Leahey does not do. By conceiving of visibility only in the abstract sense, Leahey remains bound by discursive boundaries that are silent about the material activities of faculty. In Leahey's articulation, faculty visibility is an aftereffect of imagined or assumed practices (i.e., published articles as the result of the practices of scholarship, book awards as symbolic representations of the success of faculty work). Instead, a materialist analysis more directly links the daily embodied practices of faculty with their material visibility on campus, in department halls, or at disciplinary conferences, and to their embodied experiences of seeing or not being seen. These material practices affect a degree of visibility that is both material and symbolic. The consequence of such an analysis is an interpretation of faculty work that paints a more complete picture for the implications of gender and visibility that Leahey calls for, including the embodied experiences of gendered faculty members and the ramifications of their work in the academy.

Colbeck (1998) takes issue with the frames through which we read faculty identity and work, although she remains more invested in advocating for a particular conceptualization that resists the fragmentation typically proffered by previous scholarship on faculty. Generally, Colbeck argues that scholars have mistakenly assumed fragmented faculty roles, typically splintered between teaching and research. Most often, Colbeck claims, scholars assume a fragmentation of time, that faculty fail to integrate their time spent on teaching and time devoted to research. In response to such incessant reproductions of bifurcated faculty work, Colbeck points to many faculty who successfully integrate teaching with research (integration here is presented as an overlap of teaching and research time). However, there is no mention of the alignment between time and place within Colbeck's text; place remains absent within the framework of her analysis. This is done, of course, despite the spatial metaphors Colbeck uses throughout her study, claiming that "faculty members might *expand* available time and energy" by integrating teaching and research (p. 650, emphasis added).

This conceptualization of the expansion of time and energy, alongside the very notions of fragmentation and coherence that are the basis of Colbeck's study, presents an argument for a newly spatialized conceptualization of faculty, faculty identity, and the daily practices of work. Consequently, Colbeck's study makes important arguments for a new conceptual frame within higher education scholarship yet never fully explicates the degree of change for which she advocates. Colbeck critiques a spatial metaphor of fragmentation for its misrepresentation of faculty practices, yet remains bound by a temporal scheme. As a result, even as she calls for newly imagined articulations of faculty identities and work, Colbeck limits her imaginative capacity, never fully realizing the extent of change and possibility inherent in her critique.

Although the previous discussion has insinuated that few studies critically examine the social spaces in which faculty operate overtly, even fewer have directly addressed the material places in which faculty work. As Thelin and Yankovich (1987) aptly describe in their research on faculty and architecture, "the flame flickers, but feebly" (p. 58). Thelin and Yankovich go on to ask researchers to "heed the reminder that higher education *does* include 'bricks and mortar' as the interesting setting in which the organizational drama of higher education is played out in a changing, complex, and unfinished script" (p. 80, emphasis in original). Interestingly, though the authors are intent on scholarship on the material architecture of tertiary education, they recognize the fluid nature of higher education and change as a continuous part of the process.

Similar to Thelin and Yankovich's work, Sturner (1973) seeks research perspectives on higher education that recognize the material properties of "the college environment," a term Sturner finds all too often has only social connotations. In line with the theoretical perspectives presented in this chapter – though certainly appearing earlier – Sturner critiques the "rational, visual and linear thrust of [faculty's] book-oriented lives" (p. 75), claiming they lend themselves to an insensitivity to material surroundings. Sturner's emphasis on rationality and a linear perspective of progression are both hallmarks of modernism. (Unfortunately, Sturner does not expound on the social and material significance of his own gendered metaphors.)

More recent scholarship by Jamieson et al. (2000) also links university architecture with learning practices. Looking specifically at Australian universities, Jamieson et al. remain concerned with how a lack of critical attention to the ways in which formal learning environments (i.e., the places of the classroom and lecture hall) implies normative pedagogical practices

> the idea that the formal teaching and learning process "takes place" somewhere needs to be acknowledged by university administrators, facility managers and architects, educational researchers and teachers, and be a primary consideration in the design of new buildings or the redevelopment of existing facilities. (p. 221)

Through a review of existing literature on teaching and learning in tertiary education, Jamieson et al. locate a distinct gap in the literature wherein material place is assumed a fixed variable and context is defined as absent the material places that give it its meaning. The consequence of isolating formal learning places from discussions of faculty pedagogical practice, the authors surmise, is that faculty take a leading role in the formation and development of the curriculum, yet rarely have a hand in shaping the material places in which such curricula are enacted. Consequently, Jamieson et al. recommend faculty achieve a degree of agency in shaping the material classrooms in which they teach in the same way they are asked to shape their curriculum. So it is that the authors encourage faculty to take an active role in facility management and planning on their campuses. The consequence for faculty who continue to divorce themselves from issues associated with the architectural places of the campus, the authors assert, is that buildings will continue to be designed by architects who reproduce traditional assumptions about how teachers teach and students learn. In the end, Jamieson et al. firmly recognize

the means through which material campus places encourage the reproduction of normative faculty pedagogical practices.

However, when considering the findings of Jamieson et al. (2000) in light of those by Thelin and Yankovich (1987) and Sturner (1973), difficulties emerge. If, as Sturner surmises, faculty are complacent about the environments in which they work and unconsciously accept the work norms such places encourage, then asking them to take an active role in the reformation of the material campus requires a simultaneous reimagining of what faculty do – no easy task. If faculty do take an active role in the architecture of the campuses on which they work, who is to say that they will advocate for new material places that open possibilities for new pedagogical practices? The concerns of Jamieson et al. regarding the reproduction of normative material structures and subsequent faculty practices within classrooms are important and very real. However, Jamieson et al. may not take seriously enough the very claims of architectural–pedagogical reproduction they themselves advance.

In my own work (Kuntz, 2007), I found that faculty often alter the material places in which they work – regardless of how new and potentially innovative – in order to bring them more in line with their learned normative practices. This finding remains in line with environmental-behavior approaches typified by Moos (1985), who claims that individuals "modify an incongruent environment to make it more congruent with the behavior they wish to enact" (p. 126). Thus, it is that faculty reproduce learned norms in their everyday practices and affect the material environment in such a way as to enhance those practices they recognize as legitimate and valued within the social spaces in which they work.

Other scholars have also sought to encourage change in faculty practices through investigations into the campus environment, though they have conceived of the campus as a social space primarily, disregarding the material places of the campus itself. An interesting example of this is Lindholm's (2003) analysis of organizational fit among faculty and the universities in which they work. In her article, Lindholm asserts a dynamic link between faculty behaviors and the environment in which they work, arguing that "faculty perceptions and behavior are known to affect, and to be affected by, their academic work environments" (p. 126). Clearly, throughout her text, Lindholm considers the social or discursive aspects of faculty work environments and not the material places in which they work. Thus, when Lindholm asserts the need to "understand more clearly how faculty define the associations between themselves and their academic workplaces" (p. 126), the "place" in "workplace" remains silent about the material manifestations of academic departments or faculty offices. Interestingly, Lindholm's recognition of the dynamic relationship among faculty and their campus environments is quite similar to Moos' (1985) examination of the dynacism involved in individual–environment interaction. However, whereas Moos remained invested in explications of the relationship between individuals and the material places in which they work, Lindholm emphasizes analyses which privilege the social spaces in which faculty work at the expense of the material environment.

Lindholm (2003) goes on to note that "faculty tend to relate to their institutions most extensively through subinstitutional units, primarily their academic department"

(p. 128). Here, Lindholm's analysis might benefit from a renewed emphasis on the material manifestations of academic departments, thereby bringing the social connections faculty feel into direct relation with the actual material places that give the department, for example, its meaning. Thus, when Lindholm presents her own study as an integrative conceptualization of faculty fit within the university – bringing together previous work on culture, climate, faculty expectations, and socialization – she neglects to see the material-discursive bifurcation that her own work sustains.

In the end, the actual material environment in which her faculty participants work remains on the periphery of Lindholm's (2003) study, given recognition only in a short discussion of the "sharing of facilities and space" (p. 141) as a necessary means for departmental expansion. Thus, when Lindholm discusses her research findings, notions of faculty "fit within a particular environment" (p. 142), or participants' expressed "need to establish a sense of space within the university that is distinctly their own" (p. 143), the material connotations of such terms – environment, space – are left by the wayside. What are the consequences of such a decidedly material-free conception of faculty workplaces? How might a study such as Lindholm's benefit from the recognition of the many ways in which social space and material place intersect and affect one another? Consequently, one might take the challenge Lindholm offers in her conclusion and reimagine it: "The challenge, then, within all types of college and university work environments, is to find ways to create the space for more open exchanges among colleagues" (p. 146). Obviously, such a challenge has both spatial and platial meanings. The challenge is rendered richer, more dynamic, and more layered when the multiple meanings of space and place are allowed for – when words like "environments" and "space" are understood as encompassing the very interrelation of both the social and the material.

Similar to Lindholm (2003), Kostogriz and Peeler (2007) remain keenly interested in educational work environments and practical change, although the authors begin with an examination of the powers of metaphorical representation. Those metaphors that strive to depoliticize the spatial or to represent workspace as simply an empty container should, according to Kostogriz and Peeler, be contested and reconsidered. Thus, similar to the ways in which Lindholm's work might benefit from a more layered interpretation of space and place, Kostogriz and Peeler offer scholars of tertiary education a multifaceted means through which to interpret faculty workplace. The work of Kostogriz and Peeler might lead tertiary scholars to investigate how faculty professional workplaces gain meaning through a confluence of historically produced, normative faculty practices, construction and enactments of disciplinary knowledge, and how the workplace is lived through everyday local practices inferred by more macro-level assumptions about faculty work. Faculty, new and old, must continually orient themselves – both materially and discursively – within the spaces and places of their workspace. When this orientation becomes commonsensical or a matter-of-course, faculty have most often taken on the norms of their spatialized profession.

Other scholars of tertiary education, such as Bauder (2006), examine the micropractices of the everyday within faculty work as a means to understand better the

interaction of daily meaning-making with the material environments faculty traverse on a daily basis. Specifically examining power relations as they play out on campus, Bauder presents a useful example of faculty and graduate student interactions in similar material places. Whereas graduate students "are expected to knock humbly on professors' doors and patiently wait their turn to speak … professors typically walk right into the students' offices and immediately demand undivided attention" (p. 676). Such actions occur within material places, often without thought, as professors and graduate students alike perform the activities which define them, intuitively recognizing the meanings of such practices and the social spaces which make them necessary, such as when the graduate student knocks on the professor's door as a matter-of-course, or when the professor walks into the graduate student office without stopping to acknowledge the implications of his or her absent knock. Bauder asserts that such material practices are learned over time, a product of socialization.

As a means for explaining the many ways in which faculty members have been conceptualized, Austin and McDaniels (2006) note that faculty work in multiple contexts simultaneously, each with their own guiding expectations and norms. While the authors locate several arenas through which socialization occurs and identity emerges – "the country, the various institutional types[,] the discipline that is their academic home, the professional role of the academic" (p. 419) – they neglect to include the impact of the material environment on such entities, thus removing the possibility of fully considering the embodied experiences of faculty socialization. Austin and McDaniels point out that faculty professional identity stems from attaining a degree of literacy in the multiple forms and structures of faculty work: "Part of assuming a professional identity as a scholar and faculty member is to know about the different forms that faculty work can take" (p. 422). As this chapter attempts to spell out, it is important to interpret such "different forms" in both social and material ways.

Similar to Austin and McDaniels (2006), Reybold (2003) examines processes of socialization within the professoriate as they stem from multiple contexts that inform faculty professional identities. Different from Austin and McDaniels, however, Reybold emphasizes the subtle means through which individuals learn how to act as faculty: "apprenticeship into the professorate is tacit, embedded in the everyday activities and practices of their professional training milieu" (p. 235). Through a qualitative study that explores the development of professional identity among faculty and graduate students, Reybold examines processes of socialization at the micro level of the everyday. As graduate students become junior faculty their daily experiences, the way in which they reproduce everyday practices, shape their emerging identity as faculty. Further, as junior faculty learn to perform their professional identities as faculty, they reproduce normative practices for faculty to come; "their socialization into the professorate will establish the norms and expectations for future professional behavior" (p. 236).

Reybold (2003) advances a critical interpretation of faculty socialization by examining the way in which graduate students emulate the daily practices of their mentors both within graduate school and later as faculty themselves. An extension

of this work, of course, includes the way in which professional identities are embodied and impacted by the material environments in which faculty work as well as the meanings we make of such spaces. Similarly, Bauder (2006) advocates critically confronting reproductive processes in academia and creating "the spaces in which problematic professional practices can be challenged and transformed" (p. 672). Inherent in Bauder's desire for new spaces for institutional critique is the notion that, as a social field, academia "defines the parameters of academic practice within which these activities are supposed to occur" (p. 672).

Faculty Practices

In line with Bauder's (2006) interrogation of academic practice, several scholars have advocated for a close analysis of individual material practices in order to understand better their role within social institutions. One may follow Southerton (2006), for example, who decenters the individual from the focus of study to examine daily practices as an entry point for her study of space and time within social institutions. Southerton writes that she remains "informed by a 'theory of practice', which takes practices rather than individuals as the primary unit of investigation" (p. 436). Faculty daily practices have material and spatial ramifications, such practices become embodied, re-practiced, as one learns to engage the material places and social spaces in which one is immersed as faculty. Thus, higher education scholars will benefit from examining the ways in which material and discursive environments contribute to faculty socialization as well as from how faculty enacted practices, in turn, contribute to practiced interpretations of these very environments. For example, examinations of faculty identity that scrutinize the processes through which faculty learn to encounter, interpret, and experience the places and spaces of higher education in particular ways are especially important. Faculty learn to interact with their campus offices and to engage in particular practices within them, while assigning other practices to different places and alternative spaces.

Following Bourdieu's (1988) claim that academia utilizes its own logic to define a social field, Bauder (2006) notes the mutually constitutive relation among accepted daily practices and professional identity among faculty: "we have been socialized into practices that we use to define our professional identity" (p. 673). Further, such socialization dissuades faculty from critically considering the everyday practices which communicate their professional identities; "rarely do we address the *reproduction* of academic practices and conventions through our everyday behavior and interaction with students and colleagues. We rarely ask how and why we convey 'the nature' of academic work to our students" (p. 673, emphasis in original). Bauder's analysis of professional identity through the recreation of normative practice proves especially potent when considered in relation to the material places in which such practices are enacted, thereby recognizing that such practices take place in material environments, drawing socially power-laden interpretations.

Within feminist geography, Dyck's (2005) insistence on recognizing the multiple scales of social processes – regional, national, and global – offers higher education scholarship on faculty a layered interpretation of the multiple social discourses within the spaces and places faculty occupy everyday. In the very offices faculty inhabit there exist disciplinary, departmental, and campus mechanisms that contribute to who faculty are and what their work entails. Further, often competing and contradictory definitions exist within a broader contemporary framework of globalization that "is attended by an ever-increasing stretching of social relations over time and space" (Dyck, 2005, p. 234). Such discourses are embodied by faculty members as they move through a series of material places and social spaces. So it is that the notions of faculty and faculty work are continually reconstituted through ongoing spatialities, sets of both global and local relations. Dyck offers higher education scholars the challenge of "making sense of an ongoing changing 'local'" (p. 242) that permeates our very conceptualizations of tertiary education, the practices we believe possible in material places and social spaces.

Additionally, as everyday practices are reproduced within institutions, in and through the production of space, they are also historically situated. That is, such practices are not objects or actions contained by the sociohistorical contexts in which they are enacted. As Smeyers and Burbules (2006a) argue, education itself is "a cluster of culturally and historically constituted *practices*" and, thus, not reducible to "a set of techniques or a simple means-end relation" (p. 364, emphasis in original). Smeyers and Burbules' notion of practices as "culturally and historically constituted" reveals more than the everyday activities of faculty; it also calls forth those social and historical contexts that make such practices possible.

Despite the fluid nature of daily practice, several scholars have noted that the institutions of higher education are slow to change (Duderstadt, 2001; Levin, 2000; Williams et al., 2005). New technologies may enhance elements of practice already in place, for example, but they never alter significantly the larger social structures. Computers might replace typewriters, or laptops might make faculty work more portable, but faculty must still produce scholarship often in isolation and through separating "their work" from teaching and service in order to attain legitimacy within the educational institution (Kuntz, 2008). In fact, newer technologies only reinforce entrenched patterns of identity formation in faculty practices. This relationship between technology and the reproduction of faculty practices has led scholars such as McGregor (2004) and Lawn and Grosvenor (2001) to juxtapose daily practices of teachers and faculty with those educational practices "designed into the technology" (McGregor, 2004, p. 358). Such research makes possible investigations into the ways in which faculty (mis)use technology to subvert the practices such technologies are designed to facilitate. Consequently, a useful examination of educational practices includes both the ways in which they reproduce normative activities and the interstices in such reproduction, those spaces where change on institutional and practiced levels may occur.

In addition to the recognizable repetition of daily practices within higher education, it remains important to recognize the potential for change within the institution and/or professional identities of faculty themselves. As Smeyers and Burbules (2006b)

note, “practices transform the self, but at the same time there may be subversions of a practice that give opportunities to the self” (p. 449). Here, the authors invoke the interrelationship between daily practices, the environments in which such practices occur, and the social identities invoked by such practices within material contexts. Consequently, scholarship that examines more than reenactments of practices, recognizing the many ways in which individuals counter normative patterns, opens a space for new interpretations of faculty and their work.

Boundary Work

One example of the multiple daily practices of faculty is found in what some scholars term “boundary work,” itself a spatialized metaphor that is meant to convey the ongoing process of disciplinary definition through one’s practices as a professor of history for example, or a faculty member in the College of Arts and Sciences (Amariglio et al., 1993; Fuller, 1991; Gieryn, 1983; Good, 2000; Klein, 1993; Messer-Davidow et al., 1993). “Boundary work” consists of a learned set of practices which differentiate one discipline from another along multiple lines (Gieryn, 1983; Klein, 1993). Disciplinary boundaries are always in the process of negotiation, a state of flux only given definition through the ongoing reproduction of disciplinary practices. As a result, authors such as Amariglio et al. (1993) note that incessant boundary work results in disciplinary agreements between contending discourses that serve to silence inferior disciplinary discourses and embolden others as more socially legitimate. Boundary work, then, exists as a series of activities that reinforce normative disciplinary practices, displacing and delegitimizing actions and actors deemed outside disciplinary boundaries. A logical answer, then, would seem to be the voicing of alternative activities, which would both make visible the silencing function of boundary work and disrupt the seemingly fixed categories that normalize faculty practices. However, the use of the metaphor “boundary” remains relatively silent about the material experiences in which it is embedded. As educational theorist Cheville (2005) notes, “the recurring physical experience of being ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ culturally codified boundaries shapes an individual’s abstract, or non-physical, understanding of herself as actor or audience, accepted or negated, insider or outsider” (p. 99). One’s material, situated, experience plays a key role in how one comes to understand one’s own subjectivity within higher education. Once again, the material and social exist in dynamic interrelation, while material place and social space continue to interact and implicate one another. Giving voice to alternative practices, then, would require an understanding of the physical places and situated social practices that perform silencing boundary work on a daily basis, including the physical boundaries of campus buildings, offices, and pathways, as well as the embodied micromovements that give them meaning.

As Cheville (2005) notes, “material, historical and interactional features constitute not only physical space but the bodies that inhabit it” (p. 90) within educational institutions. Cheville takes a Foucauldian approach to embodiment by examining

the ways embodied experiences are emergent within sociohistorical contexts, ultimately encouraging educational research that seeks “to explain how physical space ‘produces’ habits of body from which attitudinal dispositions emerge” (p. 91).

Cheville (2005) finds the metaphor of containment relevant to the study of education, arising “from concrete experiences of ‘in’ and ‘out’ and orients one to recognize and identify with distal and proximal conditions, even in an ideation realm” (p. 94). So it is that one’s everyday experience affects one’s metaphorical interpretations of the world, and vice versa. Cheville’s use of metaphor as a link between conceptual frames and material experience illustrates the importance of a materialist perspective to the study of identity and practice within space and place.

The metaphors we use to understand and convey our realities are based in our material experiences and have material effects. Cheville’s (2005) examination of containment, for example, evokes both conceptual understandings of containment and similar physical responses. As humans engage with the conceptualization of abstract containment they draw their understanding from their own physical experiences of being inside or outside material environments. In this way, nearly all of our discursive conceptual work is rooted in materiality. Faculty work entails processes that reaffirm disciplinary boundaries, a sense that one is happily ensconced within the discipline of history, for example, even as one recreates the material and social processes of the historian or the unease that might accompany scholarship that requires investigations beyond the traditional lines of one’s discipline. Yet our sense of discursive boundaries remains very much tied to our corporeal experience of material walls, giving us a sense of what it means to be “on the margins,” “in the center,” or at the “outer limits” of our disciplinary faculty work. How does a particular faculty member see his or her office within his or her particular academic building in relation to the larger campus? In order to begin to make sense of such issues, one might draw upon a lineage of research that posits material place and social space as central to its study.

Examining Space and Place

In many ways spatial and palatial studies are not new. For example, Casey’s (1997) *The Fate of Place* traces the philosophical history of place from the time of Plato to the postmodern theorizations of the contemporary era. A key premise of Casey’s text claims that although philosophical conceptualizations of place stretch back “more than two millennia,” this history remains virtually unknown:

> Unknown in that it has been hidden from view. Not deliberately or for the sake of being obscure … just because place is so much with us, and we with it, it has been taken for granted, deemed not worthy of separate treatment. (p. x)

So it is that scholars offer interpretations of place, perspectives that implicitly assume the presence of place and the valence of space without consciousness.

Often, as Casey (1997) asserts, platial and spatial analyses have been disciplined by temporal determinism, subjugated in an “era of temporo-centrism (i.e., a belief

in the hegemony of time) that has dominated the last two hundred years of philosophy" (p. x). Accordingly, as the previous sections have shown, although the theoretical interrogations of tertiary education may give nod to conceptualizations of space and place, they do so within an overarching interpretive framework that privileges temporally based meanings. Further, many contemporary critical scholars refute the centrality of the temporal frame by asserting the interconnection of the social and the material, social space, and material place.

More recent studies that make use of space and place as categories for analysis draw from earlier seminal works by philosophers who have grappled with the phenomenon of material places, social and cultural understandings of space, as well as the relationship between the conceptual and the material. To further make available the categories of space and place to higher education researchers, I now provide a brief review of this philosophical history.

The theoretical perspectives of four key scholars have become known as foundational by interdisciplinary scholars of social space and material place. Each perspective asserts particular assumptions concerning the relationship among space, place, embodied experience, and identity. Two of these, Tuan (1977) and Lefebvre (1991), are perhaps best known for producing seminal texts from which space-based research has been extended, although each author provides dramatically different readings of space and place. Tuan was heavily influenced by humanist geography, while Lefebvre offers a Marxist interpretation of the production of space.

Tuan's (1977) *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* advocates for the centrality of spatial and platial interactions in human experience. Tuan's interpretation of space and place distinguishes between human experience and the material environment: humans interpret the environments in which they live and generate meaning from their interactions with a material world that is separate from them. In this way, abstract space becomes concrete place through processes of meaning-making.

Two key aspects of Tuan's (1977) explication of space and place stem from his assertions that (1) there remains a distinctly material experience of space and place, and (2) our experiences of space and place occur on extremely subtle, often unconscious levels. The material or physical aspect of experience leads one to more thoroughly consider the embodied experiences of individuals, and to understand the meanings we make of space and place as intimately tied to our embodied experiences within such environments. In this sense, Tuan (1977) anticipates Lakoff and Johnson's (2003) link between conceptual metaphor and embodiment:

> "Empty" and "full" are visceral experiences of lasting importance to the human being. The infant knows them and responds with crying or smiling. To the adult, such commonplace experiences take on an extra metaphorical meaning, as in the expressions … "an empty feeling" and "a full life" suggest. (Tuan, 1977, p. 21)

The embodied experience of the infant feeling hungry or full develops into a metaphorical expression in adulthood that, importantly, is never absent its material meaning. Contemporary scholars from a variety of disciplines followed Tuan's theoretical link between space, embodied experience, and conceptualization (e.g., Dyck, 2005), which is examined more closely in the section on embodied metaphor below.

Although Tuan's (1977) work is often cited by contemporary scholars for the intimate connection he establishes between humans and the world in which they live, Tuan creates a theoretical distance between individuals and the environments which surround them. The consequence is a privileging of the individual as a defined entity that typifies the philosophical positioning of humanism. Other scholars interested in the intersection of lived experience and space strive to understand the larger macro and institutional implications of space and human experience are more apt to draw upon the work of Henri Lefebvre.

Scholars from a variety of disciplines, such as Taylor and Spicer (2007) in management, Dale (2005) in organizational studies, Soja (1989) in cultural studies, and Kostogriz and Peeler (2007) in education, point to Lefebvre's (1991) insistence on the social production of space as a valuable means through which to understand the complex interactions of individuals, social institutions, and power-laden constructions of space. Additionally, Lefebvre's Marxist influences draw him to envision a radical reformation of spatialized relations within contemporary society, paving the way for social transformation at the level of material structures. Lefebvre's spatial analysis makes way for new possibilities, new thought, and new material practices (Harvey, 1991).

Lefebvre (1991) is perhaps best known for his spatial triad, consisting of "spatial practice" (or observable practices, such as walking), "representations of space" (such as architectural diagrams and maps), and "representational spaces" (the social meanings given to particular physical spaces) (pp. 38–39). A superficial yet practical example of how the triad comes together would be a new faculty member who is given a campus map (representation of space), setting out on a walk to the library (spatial practice), and comparing the campus to others she or he has known (representational space). Each element of the triad continually influences the other. As the campus map asserts a sense of possible direction and orientation, the actual walking gives the map newly concretized and experiential meaning, and memories of past campuses fill the landscape with referential meaning. Thus, it is that the three elements of the spatial triad merge in an ongoing production of social space. Of course, the example of the new faculty member walking through campus is inevitably simplistic. We rarely walk with actual maps in hand, relying instead on internalized, often unconscious, normative representations of space to add meaning to the production of space in specific contexts.

Lefebvre's spatial triad has been referenced in a variety of disciplines, particularly within the field of organizational studies (e.g., Watkins, 2005). However, it remains important to note that Lefebvre's triad hinges on a vision of an observable reality and the social meanings that represent it. In this sense, Lefebvre's epistemological assumptions reveal the modernist moment in which his spatial triad operates, a perspective that more postmodern spatial scholars have sought to complicate (e.g., Massey, 1996; Soja, 1989).

Soja (1989, 1996, 2000) and Massey (1994, 2005) build on the spatial analyses of Lefebvre and Tuan as a means for interpreting space and place through a postmodern lens of cultural and gender theory. Soja claims that he follows in the theoretical footsteps of earlier theorists by focusing "on the space in which we actually live, where history grates on us and erodes our lives, a space of complete

experience, of the unseen and incomprehensible as well as the tangible and everyday" (Blake, 2002, p. 141).

Beyond a desire to shift our collective critical gaze to our lived experiences within space and place, Soja (1989) offers scholars "a materialist interpretation of spatiality … the recognition that spatiality is socially produced and, like society itself, exists in both substantial forms (concrete spatialities) and as a set of relations between individuals and groups, an 'embodiment' and medium of social life itself" (p. 120). Soja's concept of spatiality is developed as a means to recognize the ongoing interplay between space and place – the material and the social – within lived human experience and meaning-making.

As Soja (1989) goes on to note, the concept of spatiality is itself imbued with a sense of change and potential transformation, what he terms a "transformative dynamic": "Spatiality exists ontologically as a product of a transformation process, but always remains open to further transformation in the contexts of material life. It is never primordially given or permanently fixed" (p. 122). Consequently, researchers invested in understanding change both on the level of the material and the social will find use in Soja's incorporation of the two together in a dynamic relationship.

However, although Soja (1989) emphasizes his theory of spatiality as a "praxis," some researchers might find his theoretical excavations of space and place cumbersome to incorporate into their own studies on faculty. As a critical geographer, Doreen Massey often incorporates her own theorizations into a direct analysis of empirical data. Consequently, though Soja and Massey operate within strikingly similar theoretical paradigms, Massey's data analysis often provides a concrete example of the theory's applicability. As a result, researchers who are new to the study of space and place might gravitate to Massey's work.

Like Soja, Massey (1994) begins her investigations into space and place with the assumption that "social relations are never still; they are inherently dynamic" (p. 2), and that the lived world exists as "a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces" (p. 3). Additionally, while recognizing the historical privileging of temporal ways of knowing over spatialized perspectives, Massey recognizes "that space must be conceptualized integrally with time; indeed that the aim should be to think always in terms of space-time" (p. 2).

Within her concept of space–time, Massey (1994) links spatial, platial, and temporal experiences to identity formation in more direct ways than Soja, Lefebvre, or Tuan. In doing so, Massey analyzes the spatiality of power-laden identities, emphasizing gender as a particularly important arena for critical investigations into lived experiences of space–time. In this sense, Massey emphasizes that social groups and identities occupy different spatial locations within the microgeographies of everyday life. This placing of identities within space–time has particular consequences for identity formation, embodied experiences, and the ongoing reproduction of normative daily practices. Thus, in an article examining the workplaces of faculty scientists, Massey (1996) details the way in which the labs and offices of faculty scientists assert particularly gendered meanings and practices that are repeated in the material places of the scientists' homes. Gendered practices, through their repetition in multiple places – the workplace,

the home – encourage embodied experiences that are interpreted in important and power-laden ways, becoming normative. Thus, it is that Massey conveys the articulation and presentation of space as an inherently political project: “we make the spaces and places through which we live our lives; the making of such spaces and places is thoroughly ‘political,’ in the widest sense of that word” (p. 123).

Together, then, both Soja and Massey offer scholars a means to recognize their political role in the making (and potential unmaking) of social spaces and material places. What are the microgeographies inherent in the production of faculty identity as a viable space within higher education? How might such spatialized identities interact with the local places of the campus, projecting meanings on the very material environments in which faculty work? In this way, both Soja and Massey present the incorporation of the spatial into our collective worldview as a political project, one that strives to decenter an overreliance on temporal frames for identity and context. Such a project remains particularly important for the study of faculty in tertiary education, particularly if one seeks to effect change on both micro and macro levels, through both the everyday practices of faculty and the larger institutionalized social systems in which faculty operate. In order to make such a project a reality, scholars of higher education would do well to examine the spatial language that already informs their research. Such analysis remains important because of the key link between our metaphorical framing and actual experience, a relationship posited by Lakoff and Johnson (1999, 2003) in their use of embodied metaphor.

Embodied Metaphor and Methodology

In this concluding section I present embodied metaphor as a useful heuristic for examining our conceptualizations of faculty identities and work practices, as well as the embodied experiences of faculty within spatial and platial contexts. I end with a series of methodological considerations for how an examination of social space and material place might be realized in our research practices.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) explain that “metaphor is based on cross-domain correlations in our experience, which give rise to the perceived similarities between the two domains within the metaphor” (p. 245). For example, within tertiary education, disciplines are represented as departments, which are represented by the buildings on a given campus that physically divide and order, in effect disciplining the bodies of faculty who move daily between particular offices and classrooms.

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (2003) establish that metaphor is not just about the way we talk, it is about the way we conceptualize and reason, hence the term *conceptual metaphor*. Saying, “I’m on my way to a meeting over in history,” for example, shows that rather than inhabiting a physical building, faculty seem to inhabit the history department or field. At the same time, one’s understanding of a given field takes some meaning from the building one knows as “history” and the faces one meets along its halls. Lakoff and Johnson point out that nearly all

abstract thought is metaphorical, but that we most often fail to recognize the metaphors we use because they have become such an integral part of our everyday practices. In *Philosophy in the Flesh* (1999), Lakoff and Johnson use the term *embodied metaphor* to highlight the way body and brain shape our concepts and reasoning. This later text begins with three premises: "The mind is inherently embodied. Thought is mostly unconscious. Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical" (p. 3). The thought that interdisciplinary work, for example, "takes away from my work" is based in the physical structure of buildings that require a body to travel between departments, institutional policies, and daily faculty practices that support isolation as opposed to collaboration (Kuntz, 2008). And the largely unconscious way identities are (re)produced through interaction with such processes of institutionalization.

Metaphors We Live By (2003) has changed the way in which scholars across academic disciplines understand the complex interactions between our thoughts and material activities. Lakoff and Johnson assert that conceptual metaphors are ubiquitous within our social world and

> govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. (p. 3)

Because conceptual metaphors play such an intimate role in our lives – "down to the most mundane details" – it remains important to examine how they reveal our underlying assumptions.

Lakoff and Johnson's work on embodied metaphor counters key epistemological assumptions that govern traditionally Western philosophical positions, typified by contemporary American philosophers such as Davidson and Harman (1977) and Searle (1979), that claim a separation of the conceptual realm from the material realm. Within such a theoretical orientation, concepts are distinctly disembodied abstractions that remain unchanged by interactions between the body and brain. Instead, more recent work on conceptual metaphor (e.g., Cheville, 2005; Feldman, 2008; Lakoff, 2006) emphasizes the ways in which metaphor structures how we think, what thoughts are permitted, and how we conceive of our material actions and physical bodies. In short, embodied metaphor points to a dynamic and intertwined relationship between our concepts, the language we use to communicate and understand such concepts, and our material realities in the physical world.

As Lakoff and Johnson point out (2003), there are always material connections to metaphor. If I ask you to "grasp" the idea of conceptual metaphor, for example, your brain enacts a motor response – grasping – in order to understand what I am saying; the embodied experience lends meaning to the conceptualization of grasping an idea. More specific to the study of higher education, faculty who articulate a need to "keep up" with research in their field and not "fall behind" in their tenure trajectory invoke embodied metaphors that are decidedly spatial and draw meaning from the embodied experience of keeping up and falling behind. Perhaps one envisions a particular path on which people move toward tenure. Another's heart rate may begin to quicken, or, through a spatialized conception of time (e.g., feeling the

"pressure of the tenure clock"), someone else may imagine increasingly smaller office space. Each metaphoric use contributes to particular social and material practices that must be studied to understand the effects of thought and language on our embodied experience. Interpretations of faculty work within the literature on higher education are layered with spatial metaphors, often unexamined but no less connected to the material practices of faculty themselves.

Yet embodied metaphors are far from neutral links between the material and the conceptual. Because it is the nature of metaphor to incompletely represent a reality (a metaphor cannot fully render an experience, otherwise it would be that experience), a given metaphor necessarily shades or elides some aspects of reality while invoking others. Thus, even as metaphor accentuates some aspects of embodied experience, it simultaneously masks others. As a result, as specific metaphors gain legitimacy through their repetition, and become our experience, they structure our understanding of the world in which we live.

Lakoff and Johnson's (1999, 2003) work has spread throughout a variety of disciplines as scholars have begun to incorporate the centrality of embodied metaphor into their own research. Such interdisciplinary examinations serve as valuable examples for what metaphor might offer scholars of tertiary education. For example, Gibbs (1994) has examined the role of embodied metaphor in cognitive psychology, Fauconnier and Sweetser (1996) and Cheville (2005) have done so in cognitive linguistics, and Winter (2001) has used it in law. Lakoff (1996, 2002, 2006) himself has demonstrated the use of embodied metaphor in the field of politics. Finally, Lakoff and Johnson's *Philosophy in the Flesh* (1999) is an extended attempt to more elaborately document the intimate connection between embodied metaphor, our perceptions and actions within the world, and the material places we inhabit through philosophy. Lakoff and Johnson (1999, 2003) repeatedly call for additional empirical scholarship on the manifestations of embodied metaphor within our daily lives.

Methodological Considerations

I would like to end with suggestions for how these theoretical conceptualizations of faculty and faculty work might be operationalized within specific research methodologies. In a sense, this chapter follows Lakoff and Johnson's (1999, 2003) request for continued empirical scholarship that examines the intersection of language, conceptual systems, and embodied practices. Investigations into faculty work within tertiary education may be represented by beginning with a focus on metaphorical framing. Of importance are faculty descriptions of what they do in the classroom and beyond, and how such descriptions resonate with or contradict larger cultural metaphors.

Myers (2006), for example, finds elements of place distinctly aligned with identity formation, but in more complex ways than a revelation of where participants are "from." Instead, placing oneself or locating one's place, might be read as

a means for constructing one's identity within a larger world. In order to interrogate the role of place within our research, Myers (2006) asks that researchers "look at *how* people talk about place before they try to categorise *what* participants say about it. This shift in perspective has implications both for social research on place and for the study of talk in place" (p. 321; original emphasis). Researchers continually ask participants

> where they are from, and they answer. That's that. But if we attend more closely to the relevance of place in their talk, we see that we keep asking this question, in one way or another, and they keep answering, in different and complex ways. (p. 340)

Myers examines focus group data for the way in which meanings of place are inferred, represented, and enacted. Thus, Myers offers researchers the importance of allowing place to remain flexible, never predetermined or assumed.

The link between identity and conceptualizations of place is particularly relevant for scholarship on faculty within tertiary education. A number of scholars have previously identified the difficulties inherent in analyzing a faculty member's identification with various workplaces, questioning whether faculty most identify with their discipline, campus, or department (Alpert, 1985; Fuller, 1991; Gouldner, 1957, 1958; Hearn and Anderson, 2002; Spencer-Mathews, 2001; Weber, 2001). Myers' analysis asks scholars of tertiary education to consider the ways in which faculty members place themselves within the academy and how such placings correspond or deviate from their institutional emplacement. If we continue to ask faculty about the places they inhabit – within departments, disciplines, campuses, and fields of study – we will learn from the many ways in which they "keep answering, in different and complex ways" (p. 340). Determinedly interrogating the multiple placings involved in faculty work casts a useful interpretation on organizational analyses of faculty professional identities by, for example, altering the ways in which scholars interpret the tensions between departmental and disciplinary affiliation discussed earlier.

Descriptions of space, place, and practice will be metaphorical and imply material and spatial relationships. The way in which these metaphors interact with other institutionalized metaphors provides for the possibility of restructuring larger cultural metaphors. In this scenario, conceptual change will have social and material effects, since conceptual frames become material in faculty workplaces and bodies. Also, changes at the level of daily practice may work their way up to alter larger cultural metaphors. For this reason, it is important to incorporate materialist methodologies that focus on practice.

Because practices occur within material and discursive contexts (we operate within material environments and, at the same time, make sense of such operations with language), practices offer an important avenue into the critical explication of social and material contexts. It is important to remember that context is itself a spatial metaphor that points to material place through practice. Thus, historicity that calls on the microgeographies of Massey's (1996) space–time revolutionizes contextualization. Context involves the dynamic interplay of practicing identities in the production of space and place.

With an eye toward generating methodologies that incorporate examinations of daily practices, Dyck (2005) calls for scholars to examine "the routine, taken-for-granted activity of everyday life [and] how the 'local' is structured by wider processes and relations of power" (p. 234). Dyck thus extends her analysis to consider investigations of the local as a "methodological entry point to theorizing the operation of processes at various scales – from the body to the global" (p. 234).

As a means of generating a methodology to examine conceptions of place within university settings, Clarke et al. (2002) asked participants in their study to draw or diagram their association to work and study. Based on their analysis of interview transcripts and participant maps, the authors conclude that universities are primarily represented as enclosed spaces and there exists a "tension between the notion of flexibility as a liberation from constraint and the desire to be inside a place, to be contained however dangerous that might be" (p. 296). Thus, the authors call for research that addresses the question of "what forms of assemblage and effect of power are being manifested" in the design, manifestation, and experience of educational spaces (p. 296).

Materialist methodologies can begin by studying the places that make up the university campus. Further, Elwood and Martin (2000) posit the interview site as a geography warranting further research and reflection:

> while the critical methodological literature explicitly recognizes power and positionality as crucial elements of research interactions to be examined, it has paid less attention to the ways that research sites – the microgeographies of the interview – can be interrogated to illuminate substantive research material about the power relations and social identities of the people participating in these interviews". (p. 652)

Moving from the body to the global, as Dyck (2005) suggests, may begin by gathering data on the researchers and participants' embodiment in the research site, relating the metaphors that emerge to larger cultural metaphors within the university and other social contexts.

In the end, materialist methodologies can never study materiality without the effect of conceptualizations. There is no way of thinking about or representing materiality except through language and culture. However, attention to the body, daily practice, and environment, as well as the embodiment of metaphor bring material-discursive interactivity to the fore. From this focus new research strategies emerge. Crucial to this focus for the research of higher education is a shift in metaphors from time to space. A shift in metaphors will have social, as well as material, effects on faculty and the space of the university.

The study of social space and material place in higher education scholarship is increasingly important due to its pervasiveness within contemporary theoretical conceptualizations of lived experiences and meaning-making in local and global contexts. Yet it remains critically absent in our research on faculty and faculty work. Studies that incorporate spatial and platial analyses highlight the dynamic interactions among language, conceptual frames, and material lived experience. Such studies ultimately offer a perspective on change that counters modernist representations of tertiary education which make institutional change seem impossible. We see that change happens continuously at the level of daily practices within

social space and material place. Such practices (re)produce those educational institutions in which faculty situate their identities, in turn, institutionalizing normative notions of what it means to be a faculty member engaged in faculty work, for example. Alternative practices, alternative identities, and alternative metaphors may be found in our embodied experiences in our daily lives. However, change at the local level of everyday practices cannot be seen through logical, linguistically based modes of inquiry; in short it cannot be "read." Thus, it remains important to maintain a materialist focus that attempts to understand the level of embodied experiences and their relation to larger conceptual and organizational structures. Such postmodern perspectives may provide a new, more generative space for the study of higher education.

References

Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 56*, 241–281.

Amariglio, J., Resnick, S., & Wolff, R. (1993). Division and difference in the "discipline" of economics. In E. Messer-Davidow, D. Shumway, & D. Sylvan (Eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity* (pp. 150–184). Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Anzaldua, G. (2007). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: LuteBooks.

Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules, & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professorate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 21, pp. 397–456). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bauder, H. (2006). Learning to become a geographer: Reproduction and transformation in academia. *Antipode, 38*, 671–679.

Bean, J. (1998). Alternative models of professorial roles: New language to re-imagine faculty work. *Higher Education, 69*, 496–512.

Bieber, J. P. (1999). Cultural capital as an interpretive framework for faculty life. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 14, pp. 367–397). New York: Agathon Press.

Blake, E. C. (2002). Spatiality past and present: An interview with Edward Soja. *Social Archaeology, 2*, 139–158.

Bloland, H. (1995). Whatever happened to postmodernism in higher education? No requiem in the new millennium. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 121–150.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of Teaching.

Casey, E. S. (1997). *The fate of place: A philosophical history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Castree, N. (2002). Border geography. *Area, 34*, 103–112.

Cheville, J. (2005). Confronting the problem of embodiment. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Educaiton, 18*, 85–107.

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Clarke, J., Harrison, R., Reeve, F., & Edwards, R. (2002). Assembling spaces: the question of 'place' in further education. *Discourse, 23*(3), 285–297.

Colbeck, C. L. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *Higher Education, 69*, 647–671.

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. *Organization, 12*, 649–678.

Davidson, D., & Harman, G. (1977). *Semantics of natural language* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: D. Reidel.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2001). Fire, ready, aim! University decision-making during an era of rapid change. In W. Z. Hirsch, & L. E. Weber (Eds.), *Governance in higher education: The university in a state of flux* (pp. 6–51). London: Economica.

Dyck, I. (2005). Suzanne Mackenzie Memorial Lecture: Feminist geography, the 'everyday', and local-global relations: Hidden spaces of place-making. *The Canadian Geographer, 4*9, 233–243.

Edelman, M. (1978). Space and the social order. *Architectural Education, 32*(2), 2–7.

Elwood, S., & Martin, D. (2000). Placing interviews: Location and scales of power in qualitative research. *Professional Geographer, 52*, 649–657.

Eyles, J. (1989). The geography of everyday life. In D. Gregory, & R. Walford (Eds.), *Horizons in human geography* (pp. 102–117). London: Macmillan.

Fauconnier, G., & Sweetser, E. (1996). *Spaces, worlds, and grammar*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Feldman, J. (2008). *From molecule to metaphor: A neural theory of language*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). The study of academic careers: Looking back, looking forward. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 21, pp. 159–212). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Fleckenstein, K. (2003). *Embodied literacies: Imageword and a poetics of teaching*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces. *Diacritics, 16*(1), 22–27.

Fuller, S. (1991). Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences. *Poetics Today, 12*, 301–325.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gieryn, T. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: Strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 781–795.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Academic entrepreneurs: The corporate takeover of higher education. *Tikkun, 20*(2), 18–23.

Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Good, J. (2000). Disciplining social psychology: A case study of boundary relations in the history of the human sciences. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 36*, 383–403.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles – I. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 2*, 281–306.

Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles—II. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 3*. 444–480.

Green, E., & Singleton, C. (2006). Risky bodies at leisure: Young women negotiating space and place. *Sociology, 40*, 853–871.

Gruenewald, D. (2003). Place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*, 619–654.

Gumport, P. (2002). Universities and knowledge: Restructuring the city of intellect. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 47–81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Harvey, D. (1991). Afterward. In H. Lefebvre (Ed.), *The production of space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hearn, J., & Anderson, M. (2002). Conflict in academic departments: An analysis of disputes over faculty promotion and tenure. *Research in Higher Education, 43*, 503–520.

Hobbs, W., & Anderson, L. (1971). The operation of academic departments. *Management Science, 18*(4), B134–B144.

Holloway, S. L., & Valentine, G. (2000). Spatiality and the new social studies of childhood. *Sociology, 34*, 763–783.

Horning, L. S. (2003). *Equal rites, unequal outcomes: Women in American research universities*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum Press.

Jamieson, P., Fisher, K., Gilding, T., Taylor, P., & Trevitt, A. C. (2000). Place and space in the design of new learning environments. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19*, 221–236.

Klein, J. (1993). Blurring, cracking, and crossing: Permeation and the fracturing of discipline. In E. Messer-Davidow, D. Shumway, & D. Sylvan (Eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity* (pp. 185-214). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Klein, J. (1993). Blurring, cracking, and crossing: Permeation and the fracturing of discipline. In E. Messer-Davidow, D. Shumway, & D. Sylvan (Eds.), Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity (pp. 185-214). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Klein, J. (1996). *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarities, and interdisciplinarities*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Knopp, L. (2004). Ontologies of place, placelessness, and movement: Queer quests for identity and their impacts on contemporary geographic thought. *Gender, Place and Culture, 11*, 122–134.

Kostogriz, A. (2006). Putting “space” on the agenda of sociocultural research in education. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 13*, 176–190.

Kostogriz, A., & Peeler, E. (2007). Professional identity and pedagogical space: Negotiating difference in teacher workplaces. *Teaching Education, 18*, 107–122.

Kuntz, A. (2007). *Placing academic activism: Constraints and possibilities of faculty work*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Kuntz, A. (2008). *Place and practice: Faculty work in material places*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don’t*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (2006). *Whose freedom? The battle over America’s most important idea*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lawn, M., & Grosvenor, I. (2001). Imagining a project: Networks, discourses and spaces – towards a new archaeology of urban education. *Paedagogica Historica, 35*, 381–393.

Leahey, E. (2007). Not by productivity alone: How visibility and specialization contribute to academic earnings. *American Sociological Review, 72*, 533–561.

Lee, J. J., Cheslock, J., Maldonado, A. M., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Professors as knowledge workers in the new, global economy. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 20, pp. 55–132). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Levin, J. S. (2000). The practitioner’s dilemma: Understanding and managing change in the academic institution. In A. M. Hoffman, & R. W. Summers (Eds.), *Managing colleges and universities: Issues for leadership* (pp. 29–42). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Lewis, E. (1993). University teaching: A professional model for quality. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Quality assurance for university teaching*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*, 125–149.
Martin, G. (2005). You can't be neutral on a moving bus: Critical pedagogy as community of praxis. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *3*(2). Retrieved August 8, 2007, from http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID = article&articleID = 47
Martin, R. (1998). *Chalk lines: The politics of work in the managed university*. Durham, N.C: Duke University Press.
Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Minneapolis, MA: University of Minnesota Press
Massey, D. (1996). Politicising space and place. *Scottish Geographica Journal, 112*, 117–123.
Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Williams, D. A., Berger, J. B., & McClendon, S. (2005). *Towards A Model of Inclusive Excellence & Change in Post-Secondary Institutions*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
McGregor, J. (2004). Spatiality and the place of the material in schools. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 12*, 347–372.
Messer-Davidow, E., Shumway, D., & Sylvan, D. (1993). Introduction. In E. Messer-Davidow, D. Shumway, & D. Sylvan (Eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity* (pp. 1–21). Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
Moos, R. (1985). *The human context: Environmental determinants of behavior*. Melbourne, FL: Krieger.
Mourad, R. P. (1997). Postmodern inter-disciplinarity. *Review of Higher Education, 20*, 13–140.
Myers, G. (2006). Where are you from? Identifying place. *Sociolinguistics, 10*, 320–343.
Preston, A. E. (2004). *Leaving science: Occupational exits from scientific careers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Reybold, L. E. (2003). Pathways to the professorate: The development of faculty identity in education. *Innovative Higher Education, 27*, 235–252.
Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Smeyers, P., & Burbules, N. C. (2006a). The changing practices and social relations of education. *Educational Theory, 56*, 363–369.
Smeyers, P., & Burbules, N. C. (2006b). Education as initiation to practices. *Educational Theory, 56*, 439–449.
Soja, E. (1989). *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. New York: Verso.
Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Soja, E. (2000). *Postmetropolis: Critical studies of cities and regions*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Southerton, D. (2006). Analysing the temporal organisation of daily life: Social constraints, practices and their allocation. *Sociology, 40*, 435–454.
Spencer-Mathews, S. (2001). Enforced cultural change in academe. A practical case study: Implementing quality management systems in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation, 26*, 50–59.
Sturner, W. F. (1973). The college environment. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.), *The future in the making* (pp. 71–86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Taylor, S., & Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. *International Journal of Management Review, 9*, 325–346.

Thelin, J. R., & Yankovich, J. (1987). Bricks and mortar: Architecture and the study of higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 3, pp. 57–83). New York: Agathon Press.

Tuan, Y. F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Walvoord, B., Carey, A., Pool, K., Smith, H., Soled, P, Way, P., et al. (2000). *Academic departments: How they work, how they change*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 27(8). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. *Culture and Organization, 11*, 209–220.

Weber, L. (2001). Critical university decisions and their appropriate makers: Some lessons from the economic theory of federalism. In W. Hirsch, & L. Weber (Eds.), *Governance in higher education: The university in a state of flux* (pp. 79–93). London: Economica.

Wilson, A. L. (2000). Place matters: Producing power and identity. *Proceedings of the Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 502–506). Vancouver, Canada, Retrieved August 12, 2007, from http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2000/wilsona1-final.PDF.

Winter, S. L. (2001). *A clearing in the forest: Law, life, and mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.