Professional Identity in Higher Education

Marie Clarke, Abbey Hyde and Jonathan Drennan

1 Introduction

Research in higher education has concentrated on a number of areas, which include the values and collective identities of academic faculty, their role in higher education governance, faculty norms and socialisation processes, and the impact of change in higher education on academic roles (Rhoades 2007). While many authors advocate the types of research methodology that should be used in such investigations, few question how academics come to possess the constructs and ideas that inform their professional identity. Academic identity generally relates to teaching and research activities that are subject or disciplined based (Deem 2006, p. 204). While the academic department (or a sub-unit of it) is usually the main one for academic staff, faculty members also operate within research, curriculum development, or teaching programme teams (Trowler and Knight 2000). Discipline-based cultures are the primary source of faculty members' identity and expertise and include assumptions about what is to be known and how tasks to be performed, standards for effective performance, patterns of publication, professional interaction, and social and political status (Becher 1989). Each discipline has its own concept of success as a vehicle for prestige. Despite these differences, the academic profession possesses a set of common values across disciplinary and institutional boundaries, such as "academic freedom, the community of scholars, scrutiny of accepted wisdom, truth seeking, collegial governance, individual autonomy, and service to society through the production of knowledge, the transmission of culture, and education of the young" (Kuh and Whitt 1986, p. 76). In the same vein, reward structures in the academic profession across disciplines are based on prestige and symbolic

M. Clarke (✉) · A. Hyde · J. Drennan
University College Dublin,
Dublin, Ireland
e-mail: marie.clarke@ucd.ie

recognitions such as publications and awards. Faculty members learn the academic culture according to their discipline and specific department through a socialisation process (Mendoza 2007, p. 75). However, changes in higher education have added a further complexity to identity formation within higher education.

Professional identity is not a stable entity; it is complex, personal, and shaped by contextual factors. Rhoades (2007) points to the fact that there is a lack of sufficient case studies to facilitate an understanding about the conditions and experiences of those working in the higher education system. The concept of professional identity is complicated by competing definitions. Rhoades (2007) suggests that in order to understand higher education, the relationships and interactions among the multiple professions within the organisation must be considered. A number of categories have been identified that seek to explain the various professional identities that exist within the higher education context. Whitchurch (2009a) suggests four: (1) bounded professionals who perform roles that are clear and prescribed; (2) cross boundary professionals who perform translational functions and contribute to institutional capacity building; (3) unbounded professionals who contribute to broad based projects across the university, and (4) blended professionals who straddle both professional and academic areas. Against this background, this chapter will explore the following areas: professional identity as a construct; the different ways in which professional identity is viewed; the relationship between identity and professional socialisation in higher education; and the role played by networks and their impact on identity formation. This chapter will also consider gender; midlife career academics; the emergence of mixed identities; and the development of new professional boundaries within higher education.

2   Professional Identity Formation

Identity formation is a process involving many knowledge sources, such as knowledge of affect, human relations, and subject matter (Beijaard et al. 2004). Gee et al. (1996) suggests that as people acquire discourses they form the social self in new ways. Given the complex interweaving of values, social forms, linguistic forms, beliefs, and roles which comprise a discourse in which people feel at home (Lundell and Collins 2001, p. 58) and without giving it much critical reflection people acquire values, world views, and perceptions of others. These perceptions are acquired within the same contexts as peoples' sense of what is right, what is wrong, and how the social world is modelled. In that way, people construct their social selves within the everyday realities that they inhabit (Lundell and Collins 2001).

Zizek (1989) uses the theoretical framework of symbolic and imaginary identification developed by the psychoanalyst Lacan (1977, 1979) to explore the manner in which identity is formed within the teaching profession. According to Zizek (1989), the theory of symbolic and imaginary identifications is central to professionals who require a mandate for the position that they occupy and the manner in which they carry out their prescribed tasks (Zizek 1989, p. 105). Symbolic identification within this theory concerns the way in which people perceive themselves

within and in relation to the 'symbolic order' of language, ritual, custom, and representation. Zizek (1989) argues that this symbolic identification is effectively an identification with the 'place' (within the symbolic order) from which people are observed. He suggests that the 'interplay' between these two forms of identification, 'constitutes the mechanism by means of which the subject is integrated in a given socio-symbolic field' (Zizek 1989, p. 110). Both Gee and Zizek map out, in a conceptual framework, the manner in which people create and embrace identities within which they feel comfortable and that have been influenced by many factors from their early socialisation experiences. Equally, the influence of the structural features of the social world (Bourdieu 1993) plays an important role in identity formation. Many struggle within the boundaries of those structures and struggle to legitimately enter that social world (Deem 2006). It is also within the social field that people struggle to accommodate and maximise symbolic capital (Deem 2006). Participation in this struggle also impacts upon the development of both academic and professional identity.

Professional identity is viewed as an on-going process of interpretation and re-interpretation of experiences (Beijaard et al. 2004; Day 1999; Kerby 1991). It does not answer the question of whom I am at the moment but who I want to become (Beijaard et al. 2004). Henkel (2000) argues that key concepts of academic identity encompass the distinctive individual who has a unique history, who is located in a chosen moral and conceptual framework, and who is identified within a defined community or institution by the goods that she or he has achieved. These three elements of individual identity are what make an academic an effective professional. Kogan (2000, p. 210) argues that these elements are strengthened and matured through the processes of professional education and experience. He suggests that the distinctive individual is also an embedded individual and is a member of communities and institutions which have their own languages, conceptual structures, histories, traditions, myths, values, practices, and achieved goods. The individual has roles, which are strongly determined by the communities and institutions of which he or she is a member. Thus, Kogan (2000) asserts that the concept of professional identity, is both individual and social, so that people are not only stronger because of their expertise and their own moral and conceptual frameworks, but also performing a range of roles which are strongly determined by the communities and institutions of which they are members (Kogan 2000, p. 210). Interestingly professional identity is an area that has not been researched in any great depth among the professions let alone in higher education. Some studies exist in the teaching profession and these provide some interesting insights into the area of professional identity that serve as a useful starting point for understanding this area in higher education.

3 Professional Identity—How it is Viewed

Beijaard et al. (2004, p. 108) looking at professional identity in teaching, argue that the concept of professional identity is used in different ways. In the 22 studies reviewed by those authors in the period 1998–2000, the concept of professional

identity was defined differently or not defined at all (Beijaard et al. 2004). Three categories of study dominate this field of research: (1) studies that focused on teachers' professional identity formation, (2) studies which focused on the identification of characteristics of teachers' professional identity, and (3) studies where professional identity was represented by teachers' stories (Beijaard et al. 2004, p. 107). Goodson and Cole (1994), Coldron and Smith (1999), Dillabough (1999) and Samuel and Stephens (2000) presented some interesting findings in relation to teacher identity.

Goodson and Cole (1994) found in their study that the broader institutional context played an important role in facilitating the realisation of teachers' personal and professional potential (Beijaard et al. 2004, p. 110). Connelly and Clandinin (1999) found that institutional stories are crucial influences on professional identity, particularly, in the context of programme and curricula change, where teachers in their study experienced a loss of their sense of self. Their study also found that teachers responded differently to those institutional stories and matters of professional identity which were interwoven with the spatial and temporal borders of the professional landscape (Beijaard et al. 2004, p. 120).

Coldron and Smith (1999) found that the professional identity of teachers reflected the landscape that the teacher was a part of and that professional identity was manifested in classroom practice and was unique. They also found a tension between agency (the personal dimension in teaching) and structure (the socially given). Reynolds (1996) found that what surrounds a person, what others expect from the person, and what the person allows to impact on him or her greatly affected his or her identity as a teacher. She pointed out that teachers' workplace is a 'landscape' which can be very persuasive, very demanding, and, in most cases, very restrictive (Beijaard et al. 2004, p. 113). Dillabough (1999) suggests that the teaching self is also an 'embedded self' which makes professional identity a complex and multifaceted entity. The findings from the Samuel and Stephens (2000) study supported the view that there is a tension between hope and ambition about what the teacher can achieve. This is reflected in the many competing influences on teachers' roles and identities in a changing world context.

Bullough (1997) and Sugrue (1997) sought to identify the most formative personal and social influences on student teachers' professional identity by deconstructing their lay theories. These theories are the ones that student teachers brought with them prior to taking teacher education courses. Sugrue analysed interview transcripts of nine beginning student teachers for emerging themes. From his research, he found that lay theories begin with the student teachers' personalities, were significantly shaped by immediate family, significant others or extended family, apprenticeship of observation, atypical teaching episodes, policy context, teaching traditions, cultural archetypes, and tacitly acquired understandings. He argues that lay theories are tacit or unarticulated and lead to forms of professional identity formation that differ from forms of professional identity formation derived from research-based theories of teaching. What has emerged in Beijaard et al.'s (2004) study on teacher identity is that much of the research has concentrated on teachers' personal practical knowledge and few studies actually made explicit the relationship between this knowledge and professional identity. They suggest that future

research on teachers' professional identity should devote attention to the relationship between relevant concepts such as self and identity, the role of context in professional identity formation, and the employment of research perspectives other than those within the cognitive tradition (Beijaard et al. 2004, p. 107). This is a useful starting point in studying the area of professional identity and socialisation in higher education.

4 Identity and Professional Socialisation in Higher Education

Weidman et al. defined socialisation as "the process by which persons acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them more or less effective members of their society" (2001, p. 4). They argue that throughout the socialisation process, graduate students acquire necessary information by way of communication strategies to aid in their transition to an academic profession.

Authors including Austin and McDaniels (2006), Gardner (2007), Golde (1998), and Lovitts (2001) discussed the various stages of socialisation that occur at the doctoral level which prepare students for academic careers. Organisational socialisation has received substantial research attention as a means of understanding how organisational newcomers come to identify and understand the norms and expectations of their new environment and future profession (Austin and McDaniels 2006).

Tierney and Rhoads defined organisational socialisation as a "ritualized process that involves the transmission of culture" (1993, p. 21) through a mutually adaptive process between the organisation and individuals. In Tierney and Rhoads' framework, faculty socialisation consists of two stages: anticipatory and organisational. Anticipatory socialisation occurs during graduate school, where individuals learn attitudes, actions, and values about the faculty group in their discipline and the profession at large. During anticipatory socialisation, "[a]s young scholars work with professors, they observe and internalize the norms of behaviour for research as well as supporting mechanisms such as peer review and academic freedom" (Sweitzer 2009, p. 4; Anderson and Seashore Louis 1991, p. 63). The organisational stage occurs as faculty members embark upon their academic careers and build upon the anticipatory socialisation. During the organisational stage, faculty face extraordinary challenges to gain membership into the profession. However, this stage is usually framed by the experiences during anticipatory socialisation, because individuals learn during their training what it means to be a member of an organisation (Sweitzer 2009). This learning process might be at odds with what the individual ultimately finds at the chosen institution. Thus, the organisational socialisation stage might reaffirm what a new faculty member learned during anticipatory socialisation if his or her graduate school and entering setting hold similar cultures and structures; otherwise, the entering organisation will try to modify the new faculty member's qualities (Tierney and Rhoads 1993). It should also be remembered that individuals bring a multitude of experiences to work and academic contexts that are likely to

influence the ways they make sense of socialisation experiences (Trice 1993). Their development is also linked to their access to both professional and social networks.

5   Networks and Identity

Research has shown that individuals' networks influence career outcomes including job satisfaction and attainment (Podolny and Barron 1997), promotion and advancement (Burt 1992), and overall career success (Sweitzer 2009, p. 4; Guiffe 1999; Hansen 1999). Recently, social network scholars have begun to explore the possibility that individuals' social networks may serve as identity-construction mechanisms (Ibarra et al. 2005).

Operating under the assumption that individuals construct their identities through their developmental networks, Dobrow and Higgins (2005) studied the extent to which individuals' developmental relationships enhanced the clarity of their professional identity. They employed two developmental network characteristics: high and low developmental network range (social relationships from multiple contexts or from a single context) and density (access to redundant or non-redundant sources of information). Their research suggested that as developmental network density increased (i.e. less access to non-redundant sources of information), the clarity of one's professional identity decreased (Sweitzer 2009, p. 6). However, the authors noted that more longitudinal research is needed that examines the content and help-giving interactions of relationships and why and how developmental networks change over time (Sweitzer 2009, p. 6).

Resources that individuals invoke from networks of "weak ties" are forms of social capital important to success in professional labour markets. Such ties can provide information regarding perceptions of job candidates' social skills, personality, and ability to "fit in" with colleagues (Lin 1999). Having used informal methods to gain professional employment signals access to influential networks that can be beneficial to subsequent career success, including mobility opportunities (Burt 1992). The prestige of the undergraduate institution also captures the effect of family socio-economic background, the quality of training received at the institution and academic achievement, or some combination of these effects (Kay and Hagan 1998). Research conducted by McBrier (2003, p. 1212) concluded that the prestige of the undergraduate university or college has been found to have a positive effect on obtaining tenure-track law teaching positions at higher status law schools.

While an individual may be new to a particular organisation, that person may not be new to a given field or to being a professional (Wulff et al. 2004). Sweitzer (2009) argues that the expectations of the faculty career are changing in many fields and across institutional types. Pressures for promotion and tenure such as "A-level" (top-tier) publications in top academic journals, procurement of external funding, and earning a reputation for being the best among one's peers are becoming overwhelming (Sweitzer 2009, p. 21). Gender differences are important in relation

to access to networks. For women in academic life, professional networks have remained highly gendered, with women experiencing greater difficulty than their male colleagues in establishing and maintaining high-level network ties (Rogers 2000).

6 Identity and Gender in Higher Education

Waddoups and Assane (1993) suggest that, given current high levels of job segregation within traditionally male professions, women and men in the professions tend to be stratified by disparate placement across jobs with different mobility structures and opportunities, where women are more likely than men to be initially hired into secondary jobs within professions. In much of this research, sex differences in mobility are assumed to result primarily from women's over-representation in jobs that have fewer prospects of mobility for both women and men in such positions (McBrier 2003, p. 1203).

Geographic mobility is of paramount importance in many professional labour markets, especially in academia. Some argue that geographic mobility among academics signals commitment to career over personal life (Kauffman and Perry 1989). On average, academic women are more likely than academic men to place geographic limits on their careers, suggesting an indirect nature of the negative effect of geographic constraints on women's versus men's career mobility. Family responsibility or husbands' careers could constrain the geographic mobility of married academic women (Bielby and Bielby 1992), and unmarried women may be geographically constrained relative to men as well, preferring to stay in a particular location because of family or social ties (Rosenfeld and Jones 1987).

It has been argued that the norms which are assumed to operate in academia, suggest that promotion and mobility opportunities should accumulate more quickly for the most productive workers in terms of contribution to the discipline's body of knowledge, one of the most important measures being research productivity (Long et al. 1993). Although the gap appears to be closing, women have tended to publish less than their male colleagues (Zuckerman 1987). McBrier (2003) suggests that part of this publication gap could be due to women's heavier domestic responsibilities; to job segregation that disproportionately places women in jobs, such as skills-related teaching, with high teaching demand but fewer publishable topics; to more time spent by women than men on class preparation; and/or to female teachers' greater service-related labour for schools, including service on committees as well as in their capacity as unofficial counsellors to students (Apel 1997). It is also possible that although female academics produce fewer articles, these articles are published in higher status journals than those of male academics (Sonnert 1995). While many factors impact upon gendered patterns of identity within academia, age and length of service also contribute to issues of professional identity in higher education.

7   Identity and Midlife Career Academics

Baldwin et al. (2005) suggest that mid-career is the longest and, in most cases, the most productive phase of academic life; it covers as much as 15–25 years of one's professional career. During this period, most faculties teach a majority of their students, produce the bulk of their scholarship and publications, and serve their institution, disciplines, and society in a variety of expert and leadership roles. Furthermore, faculty in the middle years represent the largest segment of the academic profession. They argue that for these reasons alone, mid-career deserves the interest and attention of academic leaders, policymakers, and higher education researchers (Baldwin et al. 2005, p. 98). Issues of definition bedevil the mid-career phase of academic life. There are several ways to distinguish "faculty in the middle" from their colleagues. Levinson (1986) tentatively segments middle adulthood into the years between 40 and 65 with distinctive sub-stages and developmental tasks falling within this lengthy period. Cytynbaum and Crites (1982) define midlife faculty as "men and women in their late 30s to mid- or late-50s who are consciously or unconsciously confronting midlife tasks", such as revising career goals, seeking balance between personal and professional life. A second way to look at "faculty in the middle" is to separate faculty by total years of teaching in higher education. Williams and Fox (1995) report that another way to define mid-career is based on the duration of an occupation.

Hall defines mid-career as "the period during one's work in an occupational (career) role after one feels established and has achieved perceived mastery and prior to the commencement of the disengagement process" (1986, p. 127). According to this definition, mid-career is a variable phenomenon that arrives once a person advances beyond novice status and becomes a full-fledged member of his or her profession and institution. Mid-career continues until disengagement begins in anticipation of retirement or a major career transition. Most faculty need several years in the occupation to advance beyond novice status and become established professionals. Based on this perspective, mid-career faculty would be seasoned professionals past the probationary stage of their careers but not yet nearing retirement. Years of teaching at the same institution is another way to identify faculty in the middle. If mid-career is indeed a variable phenomenon, the perception of mid-career may be stronger for faculty who spend many years of their professional life in one institution, fulfilling essentially the same basic duties in the same environment than for faculty who have moved numerous times and had repeatedly learnt the procedures, mores, and cultures of new settings (Baldwin et al. 2005).

Hall's (1986) model of organisational career stages portrays mid-career as a complex phase where the career advancement or establishment stage (approximately ages 30–45 years) can lead to a less predictable stage of career maintenance, growth, or stagnation (approximately ages 45–65 years). Hence, mid-career can either be a stable phase of work life with adequate performance but not much change or, in contrast, a period marked by dramatic shifts in attitudes and work activities. Career routines, usually well established by mid-career, often inhibit experimentation

and career revision. However, Hall (1986) contends that various "triggers" in the individual, work environment, or organisation can disrupt the career routine and stimulate a new cycle of exploration, transition, and establishment. Whenever this occurs, mid-career becomes more dynamic and less predictable. Hall's organisational career model lends further support to the notion that mid-career deserves more empirical investigation in the context of the academic profession.

Baldwin et al. (2005) suggest that today's mid-career faculty are living through a period of unprecedented change in higher education. Greater student diversity, new educational applications of technology, for-profit education competitors, and increased use of part-time and term-contract appointments are some of the developments transforming faculty work and careers. In this changed context, it is important to know how the large middle component of the academic profession is adapting to changed work demands and performance expectations while, simultaneously, they are serving critical instructional, leadership, administrative, and mentoring roles within their programmes and institutions. Baldwin et al. (2005, p. 104) suggest that teaching and administration begin to take larger portions of faculty time while time devoted to research, service, and professional development decreases supporting the view that faculty work during midlife and beyond has a perceptibly different character than the work distribution of early-life faculty. The authors found in their study, the percentage of time faculty devoted to administration was highest in the middle years with lower levels of faculty engagement from the middle years onward in key roles and activities such as research, service, and professional development. This may result as faculty move into career maintenance or a career plateau where habitual patterns take hold and less new professional ground is broken. This is an area that requires more in-depth research and analysis.

While some forms of productivity (e.g. articles and presentations) peak in the early or middle years of faculty life, books and book chapters increase in a linear pattern across the career. It is logical that forms of scholarly productivity requiring longer gestation periods would be somewhat more common during the middle and later years of the faculty career. The findings from the Baldwin et al. (2005) study reveal that some forms of scholarly productivity (e.g., articles, presentations) follow a downward pattern from some point in the middle of the academic life cycle.

Baldwin et al. (2005) sought to measure levels of dissatisfaction by years at the institution. They found that a downward linear pattern of dissatisfaction emerged. When they employed life stage and total years of teaching as the metrics, early midlife and mid-career faculty exhibited slightly higher levels of dissatisfaction on several key variables than did their peers at other points in faculty life. They concluded that the added administrative burdens common among midlife and mid-career faculty may account for some of their dissatisfaction. The process of life and career re-examination that frequently characterises the midlife and mid-career periods may also contribute to the somewhat elevated dissatisfaction identified (Baldwin et al. 2005, p. 115). To understand the overlooked middle years of academic life, scholars need to design research focusing specifically on faculty in the middle years (Baldwin et al. 2005, p. 117). Linked to this is the issue of peer review and anonymity. Di Leo (2008, p. 64) suggests that dialogue in academe involves the free exchange

of ideas and opinions but that rarely happens. Differing ideas and differences of opinion make the academy a vibrant, living, organic entity. He argues that knowledge of the identity of the participants allows for proper and relevant questions to be asked—it also allows for questioners and answerers to be accountable for their dialogical acts. Di Leo (2008) argues that part of the problem with academia today is a fear and avoidance of critical judgment. He goes on to suggest that anonymity breaks down the critical dialogue that brings academics together into a unified profession in search of answers to questions—and questions to answers (Di Leo 2008, p. 72). Equally important to this discussion is the fact that higher education is now populated by many different types of professionals, which poses a number of challenges to the understanding of the complexity of identity within higher education.

8   Mixed Identities in Higher Education

Bourdieu (1988) has suggested that career routes for academics may be based on quite different attributes and dispositions depending on whether or not they pursue a scientific or academic or administration and management pathway. Whitchurch (2008) has addressed the complexity of identity in higher education by focussing on the mixed identities that have emerged within the sector. Traditionally, activity in higher education institutions has been viewed in binary terms: of an academic domain, and an administrative or management domain that supports this. While some academic staff retain a balanced teaching and research portfolio, others focus on one or the other (Whitchurch 2008). Although there has begun to be recognition in the literature of movements within and across academic and management domains (Rhoades and Sporn 2002; Gornitzka and Larsen 2004; Gornitzka et al. 2005), Whitchurch (2008) argues there has, hither to, been little empirical work on crossovers that are occurring. While considerable attention has been paid to the implications of a changing environment for academic identities (Henkel 2000, 2007; Becher and Trowler 2001; Barnett 2005; Kogan and Teichler 2007; Barnett and di Napoli 2008), there has been less recognition of the impact on professional staff or on the emergence of increasingly mixed identities (Whitchurch 2008, p. 378; Deem 2006, p. 204). Kehm (2006, p. 169) points to the development of a new environment within higher education, where new roles have emerged that focus on institutional development though this fact is not always acknowledged.

Whitchurch (2008) contends that due to the blurred nature of professionalism within higher education rather than drawing their authority solely from established roles and structures, professionals in higher education increasingly build their credibility on a personal basis, via lateral relationships with colleagues inside and outside the university. In particular, new forms of blended professional are emerging, with mixed backgrounds and portfolios, dedicated to progressing activity comprising elements of both professional and academic domains. As professional staff who work across and beyond boundaries, they are re-defining the nature of their work (Whitchurch 2008, p. 394) and also contribute to the changes in working patterns

in higher education (Whitchurch 2009b, p. 417). They are expected to work with a range of colleagues, internal and external to the university, and to develop what Whitchurch (2009b, p. 417) describes as "new forms of professional space, knowledge, relationships and legitimacies associated with broadly based institutional projects such as student life, business development and community partnership". She concludes that both academic and professional staff "are adopting more project-oriented approaches to their roles, and that portfolio-type careers are becoming more common" (Whitchurch 2010, p. 630). This also impacts on the development of identity through the interface of multiple professional boundaries.

9 Identity and Professional Boundaries

Over the last 20 years, governments internationally have fostered cooperation between industries and universities in order to cope with funding gaps and global competitive markets by introducing a number of laws and programmes that allow universities to patent their research and to engage in collaborations with the private sector towards opportunities in the new economy (Slaughter et al. 2004). Under this scenario, research universities have become a source of national wealth development through applied research rather than primarily a means for liberal education of undergraduates and warfare research (Slaughter and Rhoades 2005). At the turn of the twenty-first century, Mendoza (2007) argues that these initiatives have fostered entrepreneurialism through a variety of interdisciplinary centres and partnerships with the private sector around new technologies derived from disciplines such as biotechnology, materials science, optical science, and cognitive science. This entrepreneurialism in certain fields is based on the premise that faculty have the primary responsibility for obtaining their own research funds and running their own laboratories (Mendoza 2007, p. 71).

Mendoza's (2007) study found that the scientists and engineers in the sample had a clear sense of changing boundaries. They thought the way industry was valued by the academic community had changed. In the past, involvement with industry was "dirty" or polluting; in the present, federal grants continued to be regarded highly, but funding was increasingly valued regardless of its source. Faculty members still saw basic research as important but no longer saw the basic/applied division as demarcating the boundary between academe and industry. Many thought that applied work on "interesting" and "broad" problems was commensurate with "basic" research (Slaughter et al. 2004, p. 160). The issues which professors faced at the boundaries between academe, industry, and universities focused on publishing versus patenting, secrecy versus openness, and contests over ownership of intellectual property. Faculty members generally resolved the publishing versus patenting problem by publishing and patenting, accommodating industry's concerns with protecting knowledge by sequencing their publications, but not giving up publishing. In the case of secrecy versus openness, professors sanitised data, thus, accommodating industry, but continued to publish.

At the same time that faculty members had to accommodate industrial requests for secrecy, they had to negotiate university administrators' increased pressures to patent, pressures, which reinforced accommodations such as sequencing and sanitising their research (Mendoza 2007). When faculty members entered the market directly through start-up companies, boundary negotiations and difficulties multiplied. They wrestled with issues surrounding the loss of control of their technology; the manner in which corporations represented the discoveries they had patented; the use of graduate student labour; conflicts of interest and commitment; and what they considered they owed the public. Most of the respondents in that study have resolved to continue to work with industry. Mendoza (2007) also found that institutional administrators were actively working to make the boundaries between academe and industry more permeable.

10 Summary

This chapter has considered a number of important and complex issues that inform academic and professional identity in higher education. This is an area that has been under-researched and is influenced by personal attributes, early socialisation experiences, and contextual factors at both doctoral and initial career level. Research has demonstrated that gendered patterns of identity exist within higher education and professional boundaries are becoming blurred between higher education and other areas of professional life. An overlooked aspect of this issue is the change that occurs in identity between the early and mid-career stages. The changes that have occurred in higher education entail multiple responsibilities and new job descriptions have also lead to new perceptions of professional identity within higher education. These are key areas that are fundamental to understanding how academics come to possess the constructs and ideas that inform their professional identity.

References

Anderson, M. S., & Seashore Louis, K. (1991). The changing locus of control over faculty research: from self-regulation to dispersed influence. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 7, pp. 57–101). New York: Agathon.

Apel, S. B. (1997). Gender and invisible work: musings of a woman law professor. *University of San Francisco Law Review, 31,* 993–1016.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: handbook of theory and research* (pp. 397–496). The Netherlands: Springer.

Baldwin, R. G., Lunceford, C. J., & Vanderlinden, K. E. (2005). Faculty in the middle years: illuminating an overlooked phase of academic life. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(1), 97–118.

Barnett, R. (2005). Re-opening research: new amateurs or new professionals? In R. Finnegan (Ed.), *Participating in the knowledge society* (pp. 263–278). New York: Macmillan.

Barnett, R., & Napoli, R. di. (2008). *Changing identities in higher education: voicing perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Bristol: SRHE/Open University Press.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20,* 107–128.

Bielby, D. D., & Bielby, W. T. (1992). I will follow him: family ties, gender role beliefs, and reluctance to relocate for a better job. *American Journal of Sociology, 97,* 1241–1267.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus* (trans: Collier, P.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bullough, R. V. (1997). Becoming a teacher: self and the social location of teacher education. In B. J. Biddle, T. L. Good, & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *The international handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 79–134). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: the social structure of competition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*(6), 711–726.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: stories of education practice*. London: Althouse.

Cytynbaum, S., & Crites, J. O. (1982). The utility of adult development theory in understanding career adjustment process. In M. Arthur, D. Hall, & B. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 66–88). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers, the challenge of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer.

Deem, R. (2006). Changing research perspectives on the management of higher education: can research permeate the activities of manager-academics? *Higher Education Quarterly, 60*(3), 203–228.

Di Leo, J. R. (2008). Anonymity, dialogue and the academic. *Symploke, 16*(2), 61–73.

Dillabough, J. A. (1999). Gender politics and conceptions of the modern teacher: women, identity and professionalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20*(3), 373–394.

Dobrow, S. R., & Higgins, M. C. (2005). Developmental networks and professional identity: a longitudinal study. *Career Development International, 10*(6/7), 567–583.

Gardner, S. K. (2007). I heard it through the grapevine: doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education, 54,* 723–740.

Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lanshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: behind the language of the new capitalism*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: explaining first-year doctoral attrition. In M. S. Anderson (Ed.), *The experience of being in graduate school: an exploration* (pp. 55–64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodson, I. F., & Cole, A. L. (1994). Exploring the teacher's professional knowledge: constructing identity and community. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 21*(1), 83–105.

Gornitzka, A., & Larsen, I. M. (2004). Towards professionalisation? Restructuring of administrative workforce in universities. *Higher Education, 47*(4), 455–471.

Gornitzka, A., Kyvik, S., & Stensaker, B. (2005). Implementation analysis in higher education. reform and change in higher education. In A. Gornitzka, M. Kogan, & A. Amaral (Eds.), *Analysing policy implementation* (pp. 35–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

Guiffe, K. A. (1999). Sand piles of opportunity: success in the art world. *Social Forces, 77,* 815–832.

Hall, D. T. (1986). Breaking career routines: midcareer choice and identity development. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), *Career development in organizations* (pp. 20–59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: the role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 82–111.

Henkel, M. (2000). *Academic identities and policy change in higher education*. London: Kingsley.

Henkel, M. (2007). Shifting boundaries and the academic profession. In M. Kogan & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession* (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65, pp. 191–204). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel) and UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

Ibarra, H., Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2005). Zooming in and out: connecting individuals and collectivities at the frontiers of organizational network research. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 359–371.

Kauffman, D. R., & Perry, F. J. (1989). Institutionalized sexism in universities: the case of geographically bound academic women. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 1,* 644–659.

Kay, F. M., & Hagan, J. (1998). Raising the bar: the sex stratification of law-firm capital. *American Sociological Review, 63,* 728–743.

Kehm, B. M. (2006). Strengthening quality through qualifying mid-level management. In M. Fremerey & M. Pletsch-Betancourt (Eds.), *Prospects of change in higher education. Towards new qualities and relevance: Festschrift for Matthias Wesseler* (pp. 161–171). Frankfurt a. M.: IKO-Verlag.

Kerby, A. (1991). *Narrative and the self*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kogan, M. (2000). Higher education communities and academic identity. *Higher Education Quarterly, 54*(3), 207–216.

Kogan, M., & Teichler, U. (Eds.). (2007). *Key challenges to the academic profession*. (Werkstattberichte, Vol. 65). Kassel: International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel (INCHER-Kassel) and UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1986). *The invisible tapestry: culture in American colleges and universities* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1). Washington: The George Washington University.

Lacan, J. (1977). *Ecrits*. London: Tavistock.

Lacan, J. (1979). *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. London: Penguin.

Levinson, D. J. (1986). A conception of adult development. *American Psychologist, 41,* 3–13.

Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25,* 467–487.

Long, J. S., Allison, P. D., & McGinnis, R. (1993). Rank advancement in academic careers: sex differences and the effects of productivity. *American Sociological Review, 58,* 703–722.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: the causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lundell, D., & Collins, T. G. (2001). Towards a theory developmental education: the centrality of discourse. In D. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Theoretical perspectives in developmental education* (pp. 3–20). Minneapolis: Centre for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

McBrier, D. B. (2003). Gender and career dynamics within a segmented professional labor market: the case of law academia. *Social Forces, 81*(4), 1201–1266.

Mendoza, P. (2007). Academic capitalism and doctoral student socialization: a case study. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(1), 71–96.

Podolny, J. M., & Barron, J. N. (1997). Relationships and resources: social networks and mobility in the workplace. *American Sociological Review, 16,* 18–21.

Reynolds, C. (1996). Cultural scripts for teachers: identities and their relation to workplace landscapes. In M. Kompf, W. R. Bond, D. Dworet, & R. T. Boak (Eds.), *Changing research and practice: teachers' professionalism, identities and knowledge* (pp. 69–77). London: Falmer.

Rhoades, G. (2007). The study of the academic profession. In P. J. Gumport (Ed.), *Sociology of higher education. Contributions and their contexts* (pp. 113–146). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States. *Tertiary Education and Management, 81,* 3–28.

Rogers, J. K. (2000). *Temps: the many faces of the changing workplace*. New York: ILR.

Rosenfeld, R. A., & Jones, J. A. (1987). Patterns and effects of geographic mobility for academic women and men. *Journal of Higher Education, 58,* 493–515.

Samuel, M., & Stephens, D. (2000). Critical dialogues with self: developing teacher identities and roles—a case study of South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Research, 33*(5), 475–491.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Markets in higher education: students in the seventies, patents in the eighties, copyrights in the nineties. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political, and economic challenge* (pp. 486–516). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., Archerd, C. J., & Campbell, T. I. D. (2004). Boundaries and quandaries: how professors negotiate market relations. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*(1), 129–165.

Sonnert, G. (1995). What makes a good scientist? Determinants of peer evaluation among biologists. *Social Studies of Science, 25,* 35–55.

Sugrue, C. (1997). Student teachers' lay theories and teaching identities: their implications for professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 20*(3), 213–225.

Sweitzer, V. (2009). Towards a theory of doctoral student professional identity development: a developmental networks approach. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 2–30.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: faculty socialization as a cultural process*. Washington: The George Washington University.

Trice, H. M. (1993). *Occupational subcultures in the workplace*. New York: IRL.

Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (2000). Coming to know in higher education: theorising faculty entry into New Work contexts. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19*(1), 27–42.

Waddoups, J., & Assane, D. (1993). Mobility and sex in a segmented labor market: a closer look. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 52,* 399–412.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: a perilous passage* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 28(3)). Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: the emergence of third space professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 377–396.

Whitchurch, C. (2009a). The rise of the blended professional in higher education: a comparison between the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education, 58,* 407–418.

Whitchurch, C. (2009b). Progressing professional careers in UK higher education. *Perspectives, 13*(1), 2–9.

Whitchurch, C. (2010). Some implications of 'public/private' space for professional identities in higher education. *Higher Education, 60,* 627–640.

Williams, S. L., & Fox, C. J. (1995). Organizational approaches for managing mid-career personnel. *Public Personnel Management, 24,* 351–363.

Wulff, D. H., Austin, A. E., Nyquist, J. D., & Sprague, J. (2004). The development of graduate students as teaching scholars: a four-year longitudinal study. In D. Wulff & A. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the professoriate: strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zizek, S. (1989). *The sublime object of ideology*. London: Verso.

Zuckerman, H. (1987). Persistence and change in the careers of men and women scientists and engineers. In L. S. Dix (Ed.), *Women: their underrepresentation and career differentials in science and engineering* (pp. 127–156). Washington: National Academy Press.