WORKING PAPER SERIES

2021

Volume 4 | Issue 2

Navigating Careers in the Academy: Gender, Race, and Class

Contents

*Invited article.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Facilitating Faculty Success by Recognizing the Disparate Impacts of the Pandemic

Mangala Subramaniam[*]
Purdue University

At the time of writing this note, it is about 21 months since the March 2020 lockdown of Purdue's campus because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Since then, we shifted from all virtual interactions, classes, and events to the in-person mode with clear guidelines from Protect Purdue. While we continue to encounter the unknown, including dealing with the sparse details regarding the most recent COVID variant, Omicron, we are constantly adjusting our lives and navigating spaces. The ongoing uncertainty is taking a toll on people across the world. Yet, many of us are finding ways to connect with each other virtually, by practicing social distancing, or meeting in outside spaces (which is likely to become difficult in the winter).

At the Butler Center, we pivoted to a hybrid mode of delivery in fall 2020. While most events included live-streaming as an option with the typical in-person attendance, an exception was the conference for assistant professors in fall 2021. The conference combined in-person attendance and live virtual participation which required greater attention to detail, including monitoring the virtual platform. The conference theme, Institutional Resources to Soar to Promotion, was also well integrated into the keynote by Lynn Pasquerella, President, Association of American Colleges and Universities. Pasquerella wove her discussion of the rhetoric of overt, conscious sexism with the satirical dramedy, *The Chair*, the Netflix series which covers the trials and tribulations of Ji-Yoon Kim, a recently appointed chair of the English Department at the fictional Pembroke University. The series reveals the ways in which gendered norms of leadership are confounded with the stereotypes of Asian Americans as being "less vocal, less assertive, and lacking in social skills and leadership potential" (p. 8). As Pasquerella notes in her keynote address, which is included in this issue, "These prejudices work against those seeking leadership roles, inside and outside of the academy and foster the exclusion of Asian Americans from informal power networks tied to promotion into the leadership ranks" (p. 8).

In addition to pivoting to a hybrid mode for several events in fall 2021, the Butler Center's Support Circle that started as a pilot in 2020 continues in 2021-22 with the Women's Global Health Institute (WGHI) as a collaborator. The Support Circle was created in recognition of a need for supporting faculty by enabling spaces for sharing experiences and mitigating feelings of isolation. The Support Circle is the focus of a special section in this issue. In addition to tracing

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Mangala Subramaniam, Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence, 155 S. Grant Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907. Email: msubrama@purdue.edu.

the genesis of the Circle (Subramaniam and Zanotti), the section includes two articles developed from presentations made at the support circle sessions in 2020-21. The first article by Foli discusses the ways she used trauma-informed educational practices in her graduate nursing class and the implications this approach may have for other scholars/teachers. This is particularly relevant as nurses serve as frontline workers during the pandemic, but it also speaks to the challenges with peoples' mental fortitude. Sagar, in the second article, examines the approaches to mentoring and the pros and cons of the various models – hierarchically based mentoring, dyadic mentoring, group mentoring, and peer mentoring – particularly for foreign born and domestic underrepresented faculty.

Mentoring is one of many factors that influence the success of faculty of color and especially women of color faculty. The Butler Center has been attentive to mentoring beyond the conventional within unit approach by continuing to strengthen and expand the Coaching and Resource Network (CRN). The first phase of the expansion- addition of five new CRN members – will be completed by spring 2022. Additionally, faculty mentoring is one of the two topics that will be pursued by the Provost's Advisory Committee on Diversity and Inclusion (ACDI) in spring 2022. I am chairing this mentoring sub-group to discuss faculty mentoring and develop best practices. Coaching, supporting, and advocating for faculty of color is key for their success. It also means recognizing the varying life experiences of faculty.

Recognizing the need for incorporating the varying experiences of women of color in educational materials is central to the article by David and Coates. Relying on analysis of case studies used as part of business school pedagogy, David and Coates note that Black and Hispanic people are underrepresented in business school teaching cases, while White non-Hispanic people are overrepresented. Additionally, Asian people are overrepresented in cases featuring real protagonists, and underrepresented in those with fake or anonymized protagonists. Such representation of reality impacts students of both, underrepresented and dominant groups. Preparing students to lead in a multicultural environment is incumbent on institutions of higher education. This is relevant in a growing global labor market in which even academics have also been motivated to migrate across countries.

Focusing on the regional migration of academics – from Germany to the UK – Samarsky documents the motivations and experiences of German academics who moved to positions in UK institutions and finds that many have enjoyed systemic advantages and a privileged position within the British labor market. At the same time the study participants manage stressful situations, family-related responsibilities, and address unexpected challenges related to such academic mobility. This further shows that inequities existed in academic spaces even before the pandemic; they are now exacerbated.

Overall, as I mentioned above, this issue of the Working Paper Series is being finalized as we all continue to navigate the challenges and stress from the ongoing pandemic as well as the disparate effects on women and underrepresented groups. None of this changed substantially in the U.S. despite months into the pandemic and was confirmed again in a formal study. The productivity of faculty members, especially women, continues to decline due to shifting demands on faculty time, effort, and priorities. And without meaningful acknowledgement and interventions, the trend is likely to continue. Under these circumstances, equity must be

imperative in all our endeavors including review of faculty members (Riley and Subramaniam 2021).

References

Riley, Donna and Mangala Subramaniam. 2021. "Applying an Equity Lens to COVID Impact Statements." *Inside Higher Ed* Online. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/11/12/how-promotion-committees-should-assess-covid-impact-statements-opinion.

On "Kiddo," and Kiddos: Plagues, Permission Structures, and Women's Progress in Academic Leadership

Lynn Pasquerella[*]
Association of American Colleges and Universities

Last December, a month after President Biden's election as the 46th president of the United States, former *American Scholar* editor Joseph Epstein created a firestorm with his vitriolic opinion piece in the *Wall Street Journal* calling upon Dr. Jill Biden to jettison the use of her academic title. The now infamous column began:

> Madame First Lady -Mrs. Biden – Jill - kiddo: a bit of advice on what may seem like a small, but I think is a not unimportant matter. Any chance you might drop the 'Dr.' before your name? 'Dr. Jill Biden' sounds and feels fraudulent, not to say a touch comic. Your degree is, I believe, an Ed.D., a doctor of education, earned at the University of Delaware through a dissertation with the unpromising title 'Student Retention at the Community College Level: Meeting Students' Needs.' A wise man once said that no one should call himself 'Dr.' unless he has delivered a child. Think about it, Dr. Jill, and forthwith drop the doc (Epstein 2020).

Epstein's patronizing, misogynistic attack was infused with an elitism from academia's tweedy past - a time when the ivory tower, as a willful disconnect from the practical matters of everyday life, was reserved for White men of privilege, and the mark of excellence was how many students were turned away or fell victim to a prevailing sink or swim mentality.

It comes as no surprise, then, that Epstein's attribution of an erosion of standards in the academy and the subsequent diminishing of the prestige a Ph.D. once held coincides with the time when colleges and universities began opening their doors to women and students of color. The racial overtones of his sexist commentary are further evidenced in his lament that the prestige of an honorary doctorate, of which he is a recipient, has declined even further. According to Epstein, "Political correctness has put paid to any true honor an honorary doctorate may once have possessed. If you are ever looking for a simile to denote rarity, try 'rarer than a contemporary university honorary-degree list not containing an African-American woman'" (Epstein 2020).

When the *Wall Street Journal* was barraged with letters of complaint, including demands that Paul Gigot, the editorial page editor, issue a retraction of the piece, apologize to Jill Biden, and

resign, his response instead was to accuse the Biden team of launching a strategic identity politics campaign aimed at appealing to the "political censors in media and academe" and sending a "message to critics as it prepares to take power." Otherwise, he questions, "Why go to such lengths to highlight a single op-ed on a relatively minor issue?" (Gigot 2020).

Epstein's invective and the editor's unapologetic dismissal are emblematic of a new permission structure in contemporary society that dramatically undermines both women's leadership and their humanity while reinforcing racial hierarchies. Nowhere was this foundational societal change more apparent than during the 2016 presidential campaign. As President Obama's former political advisor David Simas observed at the time:

> Until recently, religious institutions, academia, and media set out the parameters of acceptable discourse, and it ranged from the unthinkable to the radical to the acceptable to policy. The continuum has changed. Had Donald Trump said the things he said during the campaign eight years ago - about banning Muslims, about Mexicans, about the disabled, about women - his Republican opponents, faith leaders, academia would have denounced him and there would be no way around those voices. Now, through Facebook and Twitter, you can get around them. There is social permission for this kind of discourse. Plus, through the same social media, you can find people who agree with you, who validate these thoughts and opinions. This creates …. a sense of social affirmation for what was once thought unthinkable (Remnick 2016).

Permission structures offer psychological and emotional gateways for people to adopt certain beliefs and justify specific behaviors. President Trump fostered social permission for overt sexism throughout his 2016 campaign, linking male dominance to political legitimacy by consistently making sexist comments, deriding women as sexual objects, insulting them based on their physical appearance or bodily functions, accusing them of being "nasty," and comparing them to dogs, pigs, and other "disgusting animals." Consider just two such comments: Referring to rival Republican presidential candidate Carly Fiorina, Trump remarked, "Look at that face. Would anybody vote for that? Can you imagine that, the face of our next president? I mean, she's a woman, and I'm not supposed to say bad things, but really, folks, come on. Are we serious?" And about his Democratic opponent Hillary Clinton, he asks, "If Hillary Clinton can't satisfy her husband, what makes her think she can satisfy America?" When challenged on the sexist nature of his comments, the former president responded by appealing to his populist base with the defense that he "doesn't have time for political correctness, neither does America." (Zimmerman 2015).

President Trump's attempts to repudiate charges of sexism as politically correct handwringing belies the fact that the impact of such comments extend well beyond psychic harm to the individuals at which they are directed. Indeed, studies show that women who are bystanders to sexist comments directed at other women report greater levels of anxiety, depression, and hostility as well as diminished self-esteem, measured by how well they evaluate their own performance and abilities following an incident (Chaudoir and Quinn 2010). And with the advent of the Internet, girls and women are bystanders to such rhetoric in larger numbers than ever before.

The consequence, as Michele Obama notes, has been "taking American women back to a much darker time that we thought we had left behind. A time when your body was much more important than your mind. And a far darker time still for women of color, many of whose roots in the US date back to a time when their ancestors were literally their masters' property (Slaughter 2016)." For New America Foundation's president Anne-Marie Slaughter, an additional downside of this return to the overt, conscious sexism of the past is that "it obscures the subconscious sexism of the present; the bias of men and women who think they know better (Slaughter 2016)." The salience of her insights is magnified when considered in relation to research conducted by Jolyn Dahlvig and Karen Longman (2020), which reveals that "the extent to which societies at large (macro-level) perpetuate gender stereotypes impacts how organizations (meso-level) enact gender norms, and ultimately shapes the ways women envision themselves as leaders (micro-level)."

These factors, as played out in academia, are showcased brilliantly in the first season of the Netflix series *The Chair*. Let me warn you that spoilers will follow. While this satirical dramedy has been criticized by some for representing the one percent in academia and reinscribing conservative portrayals of colleges and universities as bastions of liberal progressivism aimed at fostering the next generation of snowflakes - social justice warriors, who melt at the slightest abrasion of their sensibilities - it has received critical acclaim by many academics who recognize themselves in the story of Ji-Yoon Kim, recently appointed chair of the English Department at the fictional Pembroke University.

Played by Sandra Oh, the character of Ji-Yoon demonstrates, first and foremost, the gendered scrutiny centered on a likability test that female leaders at all levels and all types of institutions undergo - a test from which men are often exempt. Characterized as a lower-tier Ivy, like many colleges across the country, Pembroke University is suffering from budget constraints and the need to allocate scarce resources. Declining enrollments and decreased funding for the humanities have led the dean to ask the new chair to come in and solve both the financial and reputational problems of a floundering English department by pressuring senior faculty with high salaries and low enrollments to retire, while responding to donor pressure to hire someone from outside of the academy who brings star power for a distinguished lectureship. These leadership challenges, grounded in the dean's enjoinder to bring the department "into the twenty-first century" must be managed alongside Ji-Yoon's own desire to mentor and shepherd a young, dynamic African American female faculty member, Dr. Yasmin "Yaz" McKay, through the tenure process.

During her conversations with Yaz, Ji-Yoon confesses, "I feel like someone handed me a ticking time bomb because they wanted to make sure a woman was holding it when it explodes." Through this comment, Ji-Yoon offers the classic account of the glass cliff phenomenon in which, after a long line of men, women are given a chance at leadership only in moments of crisis, where the risk of failure is highest. In fact, not only are women more likely than men to accept and occupy positions that have a higher risk of failure, but women are also less likely to be given second chances after they fail.

From the outset, gendered norms of leadership are on display in *The Chair* as Ji-Yoon is referred to by her male colleagues at their first department meeting of the semester as "our first lady

chair" and instructed by them to sit at the head of the table rather take her place among them. Immediately, authoritarian, autocratic approaches to leadership are expected and Ji-Yoon's inclinations toward collaborative, authentic leadership are contested. Her sincere efforts to build relationships with others, listen to their experiences, and instill a sense of connectedness through compassionate, mission-driven leadership, founded on self-awareness and genuineness, are viewed as weaknesses to be overcome. Her senior colleagues want her to be tough-minded in advocating for their needs against the administration, of which she is now a part, eschewing the communal characteristics associated with women and women's leadership that have proven effective in achieving long-term goals.

The initial reactions of Ji-Yoon's colleagues to her leadership demonstrate the ways in which the masculine ideal of the good leader as a competitive agent - an ideal that reinforces sexism - creates a double bind for women. As Crystal Hoyt and Jim Blascovich (2007) have illustrated, the agentic qualities of confidence, control, assertiveness, emotional toughness, and achievement-oriented aggressiveness posited as necessary for effective leadership are considered incompatible with women's styles of leadership. Whereas male leaders are expected to focus on task achievement and performance outcomes, women leaders are expected to build consensus and focus on interpersonal relations and work satisfaction. When individuals act counter to these stereotypical expectations, they are judged to be less effective as leaders. Applying the theory of role congruity with respect to the appropriateness of male and female behavior, researchers have discovered that in cases of incongruity between group stereotypes and the social role in which members of the group are engaged, women in leadership roles are judged more harshly (Hoyt and Blascovich 2007).

This role incongruity around gender expectations regarding Sandra Oh's character is confounded with expectations arising from stereotypes around Asian Americans as the "model minority." The perception of Asian Americans as smart, competent, and hardworking is accompanied by the view that they are less vocal, less assertive, and lacking in social skills and leadership potential. These prejudices work against those seeking leadership roles, inside and outside of the academy and foster the exclusion of Asian Americans from informal power networks tied to promotion into the leadership ranks.

Dahlvig and Longman (2020) consider the detrimental impact of perceptions of role congruity on women's leadership in relation to Claude Steele's groundbreaking work on stereotype threat— "[a] social-psychological threat that arises when one is in a situation or doing something for which a negative stereotype about one's group applies. This predicament threatens one with being negatively stereotyped, with being judged or treated stereotypically, or with the prospect of conforming to the stereotype." The consequence, they uncover, is greater unwillingness of women, particularly women of color, to risk taking on leadership roles.

Still, Ji-Yoon is convinced that she can make a difference for the English faculty and their students, beginning with her two female departmental colleagues at opposite ends of their careers - alternately representing their field's imminent death by suicide and the possibility of resurrection through replacing the canon with current intellectual trends. While Yaz, a celebrated teacher and innovative scholar, who analyzes American literature through the lenses of both feminism and Critical Race Theory, is in the throes of her tenure application, Joan Hambling, a

professor of medieval literature and Chaucer is under pressure to retire. With a dormant scholarship program and poorly attended classes, Joan is first introduced to viewers in the aftermath of learning that her office has been moved to the basement of the student athletic center. Joan and Yaz's narratives, interwoven with Ji-Yoon's, foreground the persistent barriers for women leaders in the academy in a manner both comic and tragic.

On the first day of class, Yaz announces her office hours to a packed room of students with the proviso, "but you can come to see me any time because I practically live here." Her invitation signals the routineness of pre-tenured faculty (who are disproportionately women) carrying heavy teaching, grading, and advising loads, often for introductory or general education courses with large numbers of first-year students. Being new to college or operating outside of their preferred field of study, these students require the most faculty investment to succeed and may view pre-tenured faculty either as mother figures, as the only one available to mentor them, or as representing hoops they must to jump through to graduate (Park 1996).

Such work is considered the least prestigious at many institutions and has a significant impact on women's career advancement opportunities. Moreover, in their recent study on gendered and racialized perceptions of faculty workloads, Joya Misra and her team reveal that faculty workload inequities have important consequences for faculty diversity and inclusion. Examining responses from 947 faculty across 53 departments at 22 institutions, the researchers sought to gain insights into workload inequities as one of the primary barriers for promotion and advancement of women and faculty of color (Misra et al. 2021).

The study confirmed that while male faculty tend to focus on research and publications, female faculty balance research with broader attention to teaching, mentoring, and service. Because existing reward structures value research and securing grant funds above all else, White men have a greater chance of earning promotions. Under the circumstances, White women were more likely to view the workload distribution as inequitable compared to White men. Misra further emphasizes that the workload burden is more pronounced for faculty of color due to "identity taxes," which translate into greater participation in mentorship and community group work (Misra et al. 2021). Over the past year and a half, faculty of color on college campuses have been called upon to help students navigate the dual pandemics of COVID-19 and racism, which manifested in the disparately negative impact of the virus on Black, Latinx and Indigenous communities; a surge of high-profile acts of anti-Black violence by police officers; and anti-Asian sentiments and hate crimes. Black, Asian, and other faculty of color are being asked to speak to students, communities, and the media about these issues - work that takes time, is psychologically exhausting, and is undervalued in traditional tenure and promotion processes (McCoy and Lee 2021).

The invisibility of this work constitutes a form of microaggression, which has led to women of color feeling undervalued - a sentiment shared much less often by White men. Because workload inequities can impact retention rates and career development, as well as increase burnout among faculty members, institutional interventions to address them must be paramount. In *The Chair*, the microaggressions against Yaz are highlighted, not only with respect to workload inequities, but in the belittling comments and behavior of her senior White male colleague, Elliot Rentz. Elliot shares Yaz's specialization in American Literature, and he has been assigned to handle her

tenure case. Yet, Elliot is unable to see beyond his own narrow viewing point, attributing Professor McKay's stellar teaching evaluations to her pandering to students and her approach to research as inviting an evisceration of the very foundation upon which his career has been built. When Ji-Yoon enlists Yaz to team teach with Elliot as a way of bolstering his enrollment and allowing him to see Yaz in action, she correctly forecasts his treatment of her as a graduate assistant. Elliot refuses to engage with Yaz as a colleague. Instead, his most extensive conversation with her is around her dress at the departmental party.

After Yaz comes to realize, from a letter left behind in the copier, that Elliot is undermining her chances at tenure, she confronts him, disclosing that her presence in their class is at the request of the chair to help him retain his job and noting the short list for elimination he is on. Elliot immediately goes to the other two retirement-age professors on the list from his department, and it is through scrutinizing salary and enrollment numbers contained in the document that Joan discovers the wage gap impacting so many women in academia.

Though Joan and her male colleague have each been there for 32 years, she learns that her salary was $16,000 less than his when she was hired - a circumstance discussed by Lynne Ford (2016) in her article "Two Steps Forward, One Step Back? Strengthening the Foundations of Women's Leadership in Higher Education." Ford details the implications of replacing overt biases - frequently addressed by policy or law, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 - with subtler biases embedded in normative institutional rules and practices. Her analysis unveils the extent to which ostensibly gender-neutral, universally applicable rules regarding hiring, tenure, promotion, salary negotiation, and leadership opportunity are expressions of the gendered university, steeped in the anachronistic model of the male as the primary breadwinner supported by a full-time caregiver at home.

For instance, when determining initial salary offers, now as then, women are judged based on their actual accomplishments, while men's worth is assessed in relation to their potential. In addition, men are much more likely than women to seek another job offer as a means of jockeying for a pay increase. The resulting wage disparities from such gendered policies and practices continue to plague academia. According to the most recent report from the American Association of University Professors (2020), women, especially women of color, lag far behind men when it comes to earning power. Based on an analysis of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), researchers found that the salaries of full-time female faculty members are about 81.2% of those earned by their male counterparts', with women earning $79,368 and men earning $97,738 per year on average (American Associate of University Professors 2020).

When Joan visits the Title IX office to file a complaint, she conveys that the salary gap that existed from the time of her initial appointment was exacerbated by power dynamics within the department. As the sole female professor, she ended up doing twice the work, volunteering for service while her male colleagues concentrated on their research - a situation that led to her never going up for promotion to full professor. Because women's work enables their male colleagues to succeed in preferred tasks like research, there were incentives for Joan's colleagues to keep her in this lower-class, workhorse role because it freed them from the tasks they didn't want to do. The leaky pipeline within the academy, resulting from the circumstances Joan describes, is

well documented. Women are less likely than men to achieve the rank of full professor, which is often a requirement for service as department chair. The absence of leadership opportunities for women at the earliest stages of their careers contributes to what Kate Berheide has called the "sticky floor," miring women in low-paying jobs with limited opportunities for moving sideways or for upward mobility (Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017).

The sticky floor is certainly one component contributing to the fact that the proportion of women at the highest academic echelons is at odds with student demographics. According to research conducted by the American Council on Education, women have earned more than half of all baccalaureate degrees awarded since 1981 and half of all doctorates awarded since 2006. Nevertheless, while the percentage of female college presidents more than doubled between 1986 and 2006, increasing from 9.5% to 23%, it increased to just 26.4% by 2011. Since then, it has risen to 30%, with women of color making up a mere five percent. However, these increases are due primarily to a growth in female presidencies at community colleges, which now stands at 36% (American Council on Education 2017). Insofar as these variations in percentages among leadership at institutional types is perceived as correlating with power, money, and status, they are a reminder that cultural equity is not reducible solely to representation and that organizational and institutional cultures often destabilize policies and programs designed to foster diversity. The dearth of female role models in leadership positions at all levels is a significant contributing factor to women's slowed progress in attaining leadership roles in academia.

Another, of course, is the adjunctification of the faculty. Adrianna Kezar and Arely Acuña's research draws attention to the ways in which gender inequities among faculty have grown over the last several decades – even as women have attained more tenure-track positions – because the actual percentage of such positions has declined substantially and most of the growth of women in academia has been in non-tenure-track jobs, where such inequities are prominent. Women and faculty of color are underrepresented in academia's highest faculty positions, and overrepresented in its more precarious ones. Although women make up 46.7% of full-time faculty overall, among tenured and tenure-track professors, the higher the rank, the lower the percentage of women. Female faculty make up 50% of assistant professors, 45% of associate professors, and only 32.5% of full professors with tenure. In addition, the experience of non-tenure-track faculty women differs from men in similar roles. Meanwhile, people of color make up only 12.9% of full-time faculty members, despite making up 32.6% of the US population. A mere 5.2% of full-time faculty members self-identify as Hispanic or Latinx and 6% identify as Black or African American, even though they represent 17.5% and 12.7% of the country's population, respectively (Kezar and Acuña 2020).

Joan confronts these issues of pay equity against the backdrop of pressure from Ji-Yoon to pay attention to student teaching evaluations and make improvements. Since women and faculty of color are routinely rated lower by students on course evaluations, and assumptions about what constitutes good teaching, research, and service, as well as the relative importance of each to tenure and promotion processes, perpetuate masculine values and processes, these biases negatively affect rates of tenure and promotion for women and faculty of color (Park 1996). Despite demonstrated records of excellence, these biases also serve to undermine the confidence of women and faculty of color. In *The Chair*, Joan decides to burn her course evaluations but

subsequently enlists the help of a member of the IT staff to find out what her students are saying about her on RateMyProfessors.com. Consistent with the results of a research study that applied gender mapping to approximately 14 million reviews from the Internet site, Joan learns that the sexualized comments about her contained on RateMyProfessors focus on her personality traits and appearance (Schmidt 2015). Indeed, the study showed that gender is repeatedly constructed through language and, because the authority and historical contributions of men are normalized, women are more likely to be judged against male norms.

Ji-Yoon's attempts to advocate for Joan and lead the department are complicated, and at times thwarted, by her personal relationships. One of these is with Bill - a professor in her program. A recent widower whose only child has just left for college, Bill has lapsed into alcoholism and drug use. Yet soon after he starts pulling himself together, he becomes the center of a campus controversy around White supremacy. Although he is a popular professor, students call him out on his White privilege during a town forum in which he bungles an apology for satirically and performatively giving a Nazi salute in the classroom for pedagogical purposes. Placed on leave and barred from campus pending a hearing for dismissal, Bill spends his days babysitting Ji-Yoon's daughter, JuJu, who has been suspended from elementary school. Ji-Yoon worries about whether she will be taken as seriously if her growing romantic relationship with Bill is discovered. It is a concern amplified by an exchange between Bill and Ji-Yoon in which he says, "I love it when you act like my boss." Her exasperated response is "I am your boss" - something she needs to prove over again with every word and deed.

However, it is in Ji-Yoon's struggle to be a good mother while being a good leader that some of the most profound challenges for women seeking leadership positions are highlighted. After splitting with a long-time partner, Ji-Yoon tries for years to adopt a child. She is finally matched with a little girl who has Mexican heritage. In her efforts to ensure that JuJu is exposed to her birth culture, Ji-Yoon comes up against her father, Hiba, who complains that JuJu refuses to speak Korean and doesn't know what he is saying. Hiba also doesn't understand why, since her promotion, Ji-Yoon must work more, not less. His distress grows when he is increasingly called upon to provide care for JuJu while Ji-Yoon is at work, a situation common for women in the absence of adequate childcare facilities and the continued scheduling of meetings before and after school and daycare hours.

The interplay between Ji-Yoon and Hiba around his expectations regarding the time she will spend away from work are a stark reminder of the fact that caregiving is not just about "kiddos." Women spend more time than men caring for children and elders and getting involved in community service organizations. An estimated 66% of family caregivers for older persons are female. The average elder caregiver is a 49-year-old woman who works outside the home and provides 20 hours per week of unpaid care to her mother. And although men also assist, female caregivers spend as much as 50% more time providing care than male caregivers. In the end, elder caregiving reduces paid work hours for middle aged women by about 41% (Family Caregiver Alliance 2015).

In the academy, being married and having children tend to boost the careers of men and slow or stop those of women. From the start, women with children in academia pay a penalty given that women without children are 33% more likely than women with children to secure tenure-track

faculty positions. The same penalty is not paid by men. The fact is that men with young children are 35% more likely to secure tenure-track positions than women with young children after earning their Ph.D.s, and fathers surpass mothers by about 20% in securing tenure (Waxman and Ipsa-Landa 2016). In *The Chair*, there is a reference to these disparities in a bedroom conversation between Elliot and his wife, who reminds him that she was denied tenure because she was juggling her teaching and research responsibilities with raising a family - something he took for granted that she would do while he went up for tenure.

The writers of the show capture many of the real-life challenges around women's leadership in academia and gender inequities in work and parenting. However, what the show fails to address, despite its timing, is the extent to which the pandemic has profoundly altered academic work for all families and all faculty members, enhancing gender inequities at colleges and universities. Eighty-two percent of working women have said that their lives have been disrupted by the pandemic; and 70% of those are concerned that their career growth may be limited as a result (Deloitte 2020). In October of 2020, there were 2.2 million fewer women in the labor force than there were in the previous October, representing the lowest level since 1988 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2020). COVID-19 dramatically increased families' childcare responsibilities, disproportionately affecting mothers and undermining their careers and wellbeing. Pre-pandemic gendered structures of paid work led many families to lean on mothers by default when the pandemic hit. Gaps, within couples, in job types, pay, and work hours, led some mothers to do more childcare and at-home instruction to protect their partners' work as primary wage earners. Women were more likely to be the only parent able to work fully remotely, leading to even greater responsibilities. In addition, mothers were relied on more heavily even when both partners were home full-time (Calarco et al. 2021).

As in many other sectors, women on college and university campuses have been more negatively affected than their male counterparts. Throughout the pandemic, the majority of faculty, regardless of gender, spent more time on teaching and service. Those who had caregiving responsibilities at home decreased their research time markedly and reported amplified stress, whereas those who did not have caregiving responsibilities saw no change or even a slight increase in research productivity (Calarco et al. 2021). In addition, because women are more likely to be in pre-tenured faculty roles, spend more time in the classroom, are more likely to be engaged in the community, and are less likely to have protected time to work on research, they reported higher levels of stress and lower research productivity. This stress was intensified due to the emotional labor of supporting students during the transition to online learning and enhanced roles as caregivers to their students (Fulweiler et al. 2021).

A study released in March 2021 by Ithaka S+R (Skinner, Betancourt and Wolff-Eisenberg 2021) confirms that 63% of women caregivers experienced difficulties with time management, and 75% reported challenges balancing family, household, and work responsibilities. This compares to 48% of male caregivers having concerns about time management and 61% identifying difficulties balancing work, household, and family responsibilities. These results signal an imbalance in the amount of labor that caregivers are engaged in by gender.

One differential impact has been in research productivity. Women and those caring for children or other dependents spent less time than usual on research publications compared to men and

those without caregiving responsibilities. Indeed, there was a 15 percentage-point gap between caregivers and non-caregivers on a range of research products, with the largest gap between women and men and caregivers and non-caregivers seen in the social sciences. With respect to scholarly papers and draft manuscripts, there was a 14 percentage-point gender gap for social science faculty compared with a six-percentage point gap for science faculty, and a three-percentage point gap for arts and humanities faculty. Similarly, the gap between caregivers and non-caregivers is larger for social science faculty (15 percentage points) compared with science faculty (three percentage points) when it came to producing primary source material, including data, images, and media (Arora et al. 2021). Without mitigation, these gaps will have longstanding impact on the advancement of women faculty and a reverberating impact on the students they teach and advise.

Many universities have made good faith attempts to redress the impact of COVID-19 on research productivity by allowing candidates to pause the tenure clock and by providing an extra year or two to publish academic work. Nevertheless, some experts don't believe that these measures are sufficient and suggest instead that faculty be allowed to choose the years on which they want to be evaluated. As with parental leave, men use the extended time toward tenure to advance research even further, whereas women focus on managing parental obligations. Moreover, these policies do nothing to help the large number of women who are contingent faculty.

Finally, there has been a false sense of security regarding what vaccines can do to protect us, our families, and our children, leading to moral distress on the part of faculty with young children, especially in states that proscribe vaccine and mask mandates. While hundreds of universities across the country have required that all staff, faculty, and students be vaccinated for fall 2021, there are religious and health exemptions, and just now are children from the ages of 5 to 12 getting approval to be vaccinated, with those under 5 still ineligible. Caretakers for children are at risk of being carriers when they take public transportation to campus, teach in-person in the classroom, or send their kids to school or daycare. These risks are disproportionately borne by women and people of color (McCoy and Lee 2021).

The Chair touches on a multitude of challenges faced by women and faculty of color attempting to advance within academia. Ji-Yoon defies stereotypes by assuming the leadership of her department. Yet, in the end, she is pushed off the glass cliff, contesting the myth of "queen bee syndrome" on her way down. Unlike Madeline Albright, who is convinced that "there's a special place in hell for women who don't help each other," the queen bee pushes the ladder away just as other women are getting to the top (Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017). The notion that powerful women are the biggest enemy of other women seeking advancement has been debunked by a number of studies that show women in leadership roles engage in lower levels of discriminatory and harassing behavior, offer more personal support to female employees, and oversee offices with smaller pay gaps between men and women than those run by male bosses (Pasquerella and Clauss-Ehlers 2017). When Elliott leads a vote of no confidence in Ji-Yoon, simultaneously offering to serve a third term as chair, Ji-Yoon counters by nominating Joan as chair, a position that comes with an office.

Ji-Yoon's grand gesture communicates the need to begin reimagining and revolutionizing higher education in ways that reframe what it means to be a good leader, teacher, and practitioner, destabilizing existing norms and centering women's authentic leadership. It also calls upon women to actively pursue social efficacy, social modeling, and mentoring in order to attain leadership positions and serve as change agents. However, as Ford (2016) argues, this must be accompanied by structural changes that align the academy with the lived experience of a diversified faculty, as opposed to reward systems that privilege masculine behavior and reify the separation of the public and private spheres in which women continue to do the majority of unpaid domestic work.

In addition to improving access to childcare, parental leave, the creation of lactation centers on campuses, greater job flexibility, and the increased use of virtual meetings, procedural changes must be implemented to promote equity in hiring and promotion. This might involve awarding credit in the promotion and tenure process for engaging in High Impact Practices that position students for success in work, citizenship, and life, including teaching first-year seminars; facilitating undergraduate research and internships; offering writing intensive courses; participating in the informal mentoring and advising of students, meeting with them inside and outside of the classroom; supervising capstone or senior projects; and fostering community-based and service learning projects.

Further, now more than ever, as colleges and universities face burgeoning public skepticism around the value of a college degree, alongside the prospect of a lost generation of students due to COVID-19 and the ensuing financial crisis, they must serve as anchor institutions, demonstrating that their success is inextricably linked to the psychological, social, economic, health, and educational well-being of the communities in which they are located. This requires recognizing the work of public intellectuals and rewarding humanistic practices both inside and outside of the academy. Acknowledging these contributions, in addition to research and scholarship, and establishing systematic performance guidelines and benchmarks, are critical for ensuring fair and transparent workload assignments and practices.

As a means of confronting hidden biases, we also need to validate authentic forms of leadership that involve self-awareness, balanced processing, internalized moral perspective, and relational transparency. Rather than personalizing environmental assumptions, we must understand limitations that reflect hidden biases and promote organizational understanding from the viewpoint of structural, rather than internal, dynamics. We must also reinforce that validation is an individual as well as institutional responsibility, and those who are already privileged are the most empowered to enact it. Validation can include amplifying another's unheard perspective, recognizing and rewarding previously unaccounted for work, muting expressions of racism and sexism, mitigating permission structures that allow hateful speech, acknowledging that, in academia and elsewhere, both words and sticks and stones can have a negative impact.

In *A Leadership Guide for Women in Higher Education*, Council of Independent Colleges president Marjorie Hass (2021) outlines the ways in which women's leadership in the academy, despite the obstacles, is not only possible but essential to dismantling barriers and creating a more level playing field. Pointing to Mary L. Bucklin's essay, "Madame President: Gender's Impact in the Presidential Suite," Hass (2021) notes the reluctance on the part of women in

leadership roles to identify situations in which gender dynamics impacted their situations, instead turning to the challenges of other women presidents. Breaking the silence around everyday sexism and the unwritten rules in academia that perpetuate gender biases is an equity imperative. Paying attention to and reforming hidden biases embedded in language use as well as relaying our own stories matters, Hass (2021) reminds us that while sharing one's experiences may be seen as threatening one's credibility, "keeping our stories of sexism to ourselves reinforces the idea that they arise because of our individual failings. Sharing them gives them their rightful place as symptoms of broader patriarchal structures." I couldn't agree more. By telling the truth about the historical and contemporary barriers faced by women in academia, we can upend hidden biases by bringing them out into the open and begin to reframe the narrative in a way that creates news pathways for women's leadership into the future.

References

American Association of University Professors. 2020. Data Snapshot: Full-Time Women Faculty and Faculty of Color (Online). Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.aaup.org/news/data-snapshot-full-time-women-faculty-and-faculty-color).

American Council on Education. 2017. American College President Study (Online). Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Innovative-Leadership-Insights-from-the-ACPS-2017.pdf).

Arora, Vineet M., Charlie M. Wray, Avital Y. O'Glasser, Mark Shapiro, Shika Jain. 2021. "Leveling the Playing Field: Accounting for Academic Productivity During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Journal of Hospital Medicine* 2021(2): 120-123. doi:10.12788/jhm.3558.

Calarco, Jessica M., Emily Meanwell, Elizabeth Anderson, and Amelia Knopf. 2021. "By Default: How Mothers in Different-Sex Dual-Earner Couples Account for Inequalities in Pandemic Parenting," SOCArXiv. doi:10.1177/23780231211038783.

Chaudoir, Stephenie R. and Diane M. Quinn. 2010. "Bystander Sexism in the Intergroup Context: The Impact of Cat-Calls on Women's Reactions Towards Men." *Sex Roles* 62: 623-634. (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9735-0).

Dahlvig, Jolyn E. and Karen A. Longman. 2020 "Women's Leadership in Higher Education: Addressing Glass Ceilings and Sticky Floors." In *The Wiley Handbook of Gender Equity in Higher Education*, ed. Nancy S. Niemi and Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower, 29-52. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Deloitte. 2020. "Deloitte Global Research Highlights Impact of COVID-19 On Working Women and How Employers Can Prevent a Setback in Achieving Gender Parity." (https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/press-releases/deloitte-global-research-highlights-impact-of-covid-19-on-working-women-and-how-employers-can-prevent-setback-in-achieving-gender-parity.html).

Epstein, Joseph. 2020 "Is There a Doctor in the White House? Not if You Need an M.D." *Wall Street Journal* (Online). Retrieved November 15, 2021(https://www.wsj.com/articles/is-there-a-doctor-in-the-white-house-not-if-you-need-an-m-d-11607727380).

Family Caregiver Alliance. 2015. Women and Caregiving: Facts and Figures (Online). Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.caregiver.org/resource/women-and-caregiving-facts-and-figures/).

Ford, Lynne E. 2016. "Two Steps Forward, One Step Back? Strengthening the Foundations of Women's Leadership in Higher Education." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4(3): 499-512.

Fulweiler, Robinson, Sarah W. Davies, Jennifer F. Biddle, Amy J. Burgin, et al. 2021. "Rebuild the Academy: Supporting Academic Mothers During COVID-19 and Beyond." PLoS Biology 19(3): e3001100. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001100.

Gigot, Paul A. 2020. "The Biden Team Strikes Back." *Wall Street Journal* (Online). Retrieved November 15, 2021 (https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-biden-team-strikes-back-11607900812).

Hass, Marjorie. 2021 *A Leadership Guide for Women in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hoyt, Crystal L. and Jim Blascovich. 2007. "Leadership Efficacy and Women Leaders' Responses to Stereotype Activation." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 10(4): 595-616.

Kezar, Adrianna and Arley L. Acuña. 2020. "Gender Inequality and the New Faculty Majority." In *The Wiley Handbook of Gender Equity in Higher Education*, ed. Nancy S. Niemi and Marcus B. Weaver-Hightower, 105-124. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

McCoy, Henrika and Madeline Y. Lee. 2021. "Minority Academics Face Dual Pandemics of COVID-19 and Racism." *Times Higher Education* (Online) Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/minority-academics-face-dual-pandemics-covid-19-and-racism).

Misra, Joya, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Kerryann O'meara, Dawn Klyoe Culpepper, and Audrey Jaeger. 2021. "Gendered and Racialized Perceptions of Faculty Workloads." *Gender & Society* 35(3): 358-394. doi:10.1177/08912432211001387.

Park, Shelley M. 1996. "Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" *The Journal of Higher Education* 67(1): 46-84. https://doi.org/10.2307/2943903.

Pasquerella, Lynn and Caroline Clauss-Ehlers. 2017. "Glass Cliffs, Queen Bees, and the Snow-Woman Effect: Persistent Barriers to Women's Leadership in the Academy." *Liberal Education* 103(2).

Remnick, David. 2016. "Obama Reckons with a Trump Presidency." *The New Yorker* (Online). Retrieved November 15, 2021 (https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/28/obama-reckons-with-a-trump-presidency).

Schmidt, Benjamin. 2015. "Gender Bias Exists in Professor Evaluations." *New York Times* (Online). Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2015/12/16/is-it-fair-to-rate-professors-online/gender-bias-exists-in-professor-evaluations).

Skinner, Makala, Nicole Betancourt, and Christine Wolff-Eisenberg. 2021. "The Disproportionate Impact of the Pandemic on Women and Caregivers in Academia." *Ithaka S+R*. https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.315147.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 2016. "Trump's Overt Sexism Obscures a More Dangerous Bias." *Financial Times* (Online). Retrieved November 15, 2021 (https://www.ft.com/content/82e3989a-944e-11e6-a1dc-bdf38d484582).

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2020. Table A-1: Employment Status of the Civilian Population by Age and Sex (Online). Retrieved November 18, 2021 (https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t01.htm).

Waxman, Sandra and Simone Ipsa-Landa. 2016. "Academia's 'Baby Penalty.'" *US News* (Online). Retrieved November 16, 2021 (https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-

bank/articles/2016-02-11/academia-must-correct-systemic-discrimination-and-bias-against-mothers).

Zimmerman, Neetzan. 2015. "Trump Mocks Fiorina's Physical Appearance: 'Look at that face!'" *The Hill* (Online) Retrieved November 15, 2021 (https://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/253178-trump-insults-fiorinas-physical-appearance-look-at-that-face).

Genesis of the Support Circle

Mangala Subramaniam[*]
Laura Zanotti
Purdue University

In the midst of the multiple crises and calls for justice that emerged or intensified in 2020 – the COVID-19 pandemic and the ongoing protests for racial, economic, and environmental justice – there was much anxiety and stress among people across the world and which includes faculty, staff, and students on Purdue's campus. Many faculty members approached the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence (Butler Center) trying to seek clarity about what to do or how to plan to shift courses to an online mode and handle the uncertainties that were suddenly unfolding in everyone's lives. By the end of March 2020, Purdue, like many institutions of higher education, had in place remote work policies, including but not limited to guidance on finishing out the semester teaching online, how to ramp down and support lab spaces, and ways to conduct virtual meetings that accommodate for a wide range of work/life configurations. There was uncertainty and precarity all around. Hearing from faculty members constantly about their fears, anxiety, and stress, Mangala, assumed that someone else in administration would respond in some way – a committee or an intervention – and waited all through the summer of 2020. And then dawned the realization about why wait for someone else to do something, the Butler Center itself could take the initiative.

So, to respond to faculty experiences – their concerns about the uncertainty, the emotional labor they were engaging in, and the overall transformational experiences – and to mitigate stress, the Butler Center created the 'Support Circle' (or Circle) as a support and care network in August 2020.[1] The idea emerged from a conversation sparked by Corbera et al.'s (2020) article about care that Laura shared with Mangala. In this piece, Corbera and colleagues (2020) reflect on their experiences of confinement and the politics of transition during the pandemic – whether it was navigating poor internet connectivity, job loss, or donation of time to public health needs. Corbera et al. (2020) suggested that such a dramatic transition is an opening for higher education institutions to call for all to reconsider excellence in the academy. They further argue that faculty needs should be hinged upon an ethics of care. This article served as the foundation of a vital conversation of what care supports may look like at an institutional level. At the Butler Center, this led to discussions about the need to recognize the stress and upheaval that faculty were experiencing and ways to create space and community around the recognition of those experiences. As we exchanged thoughts, we also began to put together a draft note about what a care network could look like and how we can make sure diverse supports can be made available. The Support Circle began taking shape.

---

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Mangala Subramaniam, Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence, 155 S. Grant Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907. Email: msubrama@purdue.edu.
[1] We use the terms 'Support Circle' and 'Circle' interchangeably.

Importantly, the Circle was not conceived to duplicate or replace the formal counseling services, other mental health services, or other formal resources at Purdue. Instead, we were trying to create something different. Since faculty success is integral to an institution's responsibility, by extension, that responsibility should be to provide care and support to the whole community. It is about resilience and vulnerability and the myriad of experiences within and across this spectrum.

The Circle, aimed at faculty, connects, builds ties, and provides opportunities to share experiences about experiences, stresses, uncertainties, and coping in these times. The goal of the Support Circle is to promote a culture of care on campus and cultivate a space where faculty can share and discuss various aspects of their well-being. As the original moment the Support Circle was conceived during a period where time availability, level of commitments, and work-life burdens were volatile and accelerating; we aimed to create a space that had a consistent structure of support but where access to faculty allies or resources were informal, flexible, and with no burdensome time commitments needed from the faculty. Such a support mechanism is much needed for faculty, particularly in the wake of the pandemic and the strain and pressure being felt by all, especially faculty of color. It started as a one-year initiative and continues.

Structure of the Support Circle
The Support Circle has a loose but formalized structure. The Circle takes an integrated approach to care and support and seeks to provide channels for faculty to discuss emotional, career, social, intellectual, creative, and environmental wellness. It was intentionally created as an *informal* and *flexible* space in contrast to the formal initiatives and programs that often check boxes but do not facilitate sharing experiences, vulnerabilities, and fears. In this way, we aimed for the Support Circle to operate akin to processes of consciousness raising, which can contribute to a greater sense of belonging and courage for faculty to face the uncertainties that people across campuses and the world are encountering.

The Circle also was cultivated to foster diverse forms of support in the academy. In this way, the Circle complements the Coaching and Resource Network (CRN) started in 2019 and offers a peer support circle of faculty colleagues who will listen to and talk with faculty about their concerns. In complement to the CRN, the Support Circle is a network comprised of two co-chairs and six Faculty Allies from across campus of diverse positionalities, ranks, and disciplinary homes. Importantly, we intentionally decided to generate a circle of allies who were already tenured and who already had – either informally or formally – practiced diverse forms of support and care in their work/life balance. Recognizing that faculty in the pandemic may have questions or concerns they did not feel comfortable sharing in their department and/or were hesitant to ask in more official spaces of the open town hall question and answer sessions held by diverse university offices during the pandemic, the Circle was meant to serve as an alternative space where faculty could reach out, ask questions, and find support. Faculty Allies have completed Safe Zone Training and a short workshop on Bias or Inclusive Academic Workspaces offered by the Butler Center. Additionally, we asked Allies to attend the workshop, "How Can Professors Practice Resilience with Vulnerability in the Academic Context?" offered as part of the Butler Center Conference of Assistant Professors on Oct 7, 2020.

Faculty can engage the Circle in three ways: attending one of the monthly sessions, reaching out directly to a Faculty Ally, or asynchronously engaging the resources posted on the Support Circle website. In 2020-2021, the monthly offerings and dynamic drop-in sessions were open that faculty allies hosted for anyone who wanted to join. As the Circle was created in response to changing circumstances, the available sessions later incorporated different brownbag talks from the allies, who discussed different aspects of care and support through the pandemic. For example, Karen Foli hosted a discussion on trauma-informed educational practices (TIEP) and Aparajita Sagar on diverse forms of mentorship, both of which have been developed into papers, featured in this special issue.

Foli, for example, in her piece, highlights how her engagement with TIEP took on additional importance in the pandemic as she employed this framework to teach and support graduate frontline nursing students during a required class at the height of the initial months of the pandemic. Her piece beautifully charts how she prioritized providing psychological safety in her course planning and enactment through valuing trustworthiness and transparency, collaboration and mutuality, and attention to the culture of nursing, among others. Her article is packed with detailed information on how she enacted these principles in practice. For example, activities such as supportive weekly email messages, low-risk participation, and multiple choices and pathways to complete work are just a few of the many strategies that Foli discusses in her article. She concludes with an opening, rather than closing, noting how scholars and teachers can engage in such a practice.

Sagar focuses on examining diverse forms of mentoring in the academy, exploring hierarchical, dyadic mentoring, group mentoring, and peer mentoring. In so doing, Sagar draws attention to the limitations of one of the more common forms of mentoring offered at institutions of higher education – hierarchical, dyadic mentoring. This form of mentoring, she shows, can reproduce and amplify power differentials and cause more stress instead of the improved academic experience for the mentee. Drawing upon recent literature, Sagar also shows how dyadic forms of group mentoring and peer mentoring, although different and distinctive, can increase agency of the mentee and significantly reduce the gatekeeping facets of hierarchal mentoring, and provide faculty with alternative, more supportive mentoring experiences. Importantly, Sagar notes that peer mentoring is critical for faculty needs that are "routinely rendered invisible in the academy."

Since the initial format of open brownbag style sessions were met with success, we sought to expand the types of monthly offerings of the Support Circle in the 2021-2022 academic year. This took place in tandem with the Women's Global Health Initiative (WGHI), Purdue University. In the early summer of 2021, Professors Dorothy Teegarden and Ulrike Dydak, Director and Associate Director of the Women's Global Health Initiative - through Richard Kuhn, The Trent and Judith Anderson Distinguished Professor of Biological Sciences – approached the Butler Center to collaborate and partner. This new partnership, combined with the discussions amongst the initial faculty allies, led to planning for more specific topical sessions in 2021-22.

In fall 2021 (the current semester), the Support Circle series started with a formal announcement by Purdue's Provost, Jay Akridge, of WGHI joining as a collaborative partner for this (Support

Circle) initiative. In this first kick-off session, Support Circle Allies and WGHI partners shared how they prepare for the academic year. The panelists discussed questions such as, what are some of the resources you lean on heavily throughout the academic year that you always share out? What are your biggest challenges at the start of each semester, and how do you prepare for them? What are some of the ways you plan for supporting or acknowledging others? A recording of this session is available [here](#).

In October 2021, a panel of six faculty members serving in various leadership positions such as heads and directors of centers outlined their responsibilities and how those relate to understanding culture, colleagues, and support, and how they interface with other leaders. Two vignettes created by the Faculty Allies were discussed regarding realistic expectations of how their position functions and where additional support may reside. Additionally, a workshop, Amplify Women and Gender Initiative, was offered on a virtual platform. Recording of the session is available [here](#).

In November, our WGHI collaborators set up a panel discussion on wellness by five faculty members. Focusing on mental health in academia, the conversation highlighted the stress and anxiety felt by women faculty in the hyper-competitive environment of academic research. The researchers offered their perspectives on the issues and shared practical tips for staying balanced to achieve work-life fulfillment. Theresa Mayer, Purdue's Executive Vice President for Research and Partnerships made remarks and attended the session. Recording of the session is available [here](#).

The final Support Circle event titled, Confronting Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Bias, is a session with Margo Monteith, Distinguished Professor of Social Psychology, College of Health & Human Services at Purdue University. The discussion focused on how to confront effectively and factors that influence both confrontation's effectiveness for reducing bias and the social costs of confronting.

We have plans to continue the Support Circle's topical sessions in Spring 2022. The lineup includes handling privilege, managing adversity, and possibly a workshop for mitigating stress. As the Support Circle continues to put on different events and resources, we hope that these various and dynamic offerings will provide faculty multiple pathways to find support and care when facing academic life today.

References
Corbera, Esteve, Isabelle Anguelovski, Jordi Honey-Rosés and Isabel Ruiz-Mallén. 2020. "Academia in the Time of COVID-19: Towards an Ethics of Care." *Planning Theory & Practice* 21(2): 191-99.

Caring for the Caregivers During COVID-19: Trauma-Informed Education Practices and Graduate Nursing Students

Karen J. Foli[*]
Purdue University

The evolution of trauma-informed education practices (TIEP) began in the K-12 grades about 20 years ago, in part because of educators' realization of how adverse childhood experiences (ACEs; Felitti et al. 1998) could translate into youths' psychological traumas and behaviors. An awareness of how past trauma affected children and adolescents naturally extended to how the brain, and ergo, learning was impacted. Attempting to mitigate the use of punitive approaches, a trauma-informed platform was adopted by many in K-12 educational settings, although practices and policies have varied (e.g., Berger and Martin 2021). In higher education, trauma-informed educational practices (TIEP) seeped into our consciousnesses a few years later, as college students' exposure to psychological trauma was realized: up to 84% of students report one or more traumatic events (Smyth et al. 2008).

Renewed interest arose as the COVID-19 pandemic created new platforms and challenges to the adult learner, with plenty of trauma to go around. In this paper, I describe how I employed TIEP in a graduate nursing course during Fall 2020 semester when the COVID-19 pandemic continued to surge. The duality of student roles – nurse as caregiver and as adult learner – shaped the TIEP, as did my roles as theorist, researcher, and expert in nurse-specific psychological traumas. Last, I present informal results of the TIEP and my recommendations for the future.

To fully grasp how TIEP can be implemented, the course itself and the fluid intersections of the lives of the adult students needs to be considered. In this specific instance, I was assigned a graduate nursing course that covered content related to nursing theory. Nursing theory is widely regarded as the basis of scientific knowledge within the discipline with synergistic ties to both research and practice. But make no mistake, nursing is a practice-oriented discipline. Therefore, in fall 2020, my 21 advanced practice students, sturdy bedside providers, were not particularly thrilled to be enrolled in this required course that covered what they considered to be esoteric and impractical information.

Second, the pandemic continued to provide a "marathon of crisis" (Foli et al. 2021), exhausting nurses who continued to see patients' suffering and, in many cases, their deaths. As an active researcher in this area, I simultaneously taught this course while in the throes of analyzing

qualitative data from a sample of nurses working in critical care areas during the pandemic. Therefore, the contexts were twofold: a fairly unpopular course required in the nursing graduate curriculum, and student enrollment of healthcare providers, many of whom were rendering care during the COVID-19 pandemic. Realization of both factors – potential resistance to learning and students extremely vulnerable to multiple ongoing traumas – enabled me to successfully implement trauma-informed actions that not only supported but facilitated learning.

My own background is also of note. I approached the class, which I have taught for seven years, from that of instructor, theorist, researcher, and expert in nurse-specific psychological trauma. Nurses are the largest workforce in the United States at approximately 3.8 million; women account for about 91% of this group (Smiley et al. 2018). I am a registered nurse, although not actively practicing. My practicing colleagues and most of my students are with patients 24 hours a day, seven days a week when hospitalized. Based upon my research, personal experiences, and ontological presence, that is, my sense of knowing and knowledge of psychological traumas, I have developed a theory that describes the unique types of nurse-specific trauma (Foli and Thompson 2019; Foli et al. 2020). In my work and as a foundation to understanding trauma, I use the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2014;7) description, which contains the three Es of trauma: Event, Experience, and Effect:

> Individual trauma results from an event, series of events, or set of circumstances that is experienced by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening and that has lasting adverse effects on the individual's functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being.

Some event or series of events takes place, and these are perceived or experienced by the individual in different ways. What may be traumatic for me may be experienced very differently by someone else. And how we are positioned in society also affects how we perceive traumatic events. In a similar fashion, the lingering effects of the event may be individualized and shaped by prior trauma. That is, what becomes posttraumatic stress disorder symptomology (e.g., intrusive thoughts, avoidance, etc.) for some individuals, may be processed without leaving lingering effects for others. To approach individuals in a trauma-informed way, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA 2014) forwards six principles of trauma-informed care (see Table 1). During the COVID-19 fall 2020 semester, I extrapolated trauma-informed educational practices (TIEP) into each of these principles. This semester was surely distinct because of the pandemic, but there was more. Students seemed to be dealing with significant stressors in addition to caring for patients with active COVID-19 infections. During virtual office hours or one-on-one meetings, one student described an extended family member whose substance use had reached a crisis state; another student described being assaulted while a bedside nurse; and a third student disclosed that a close family member had been recently diagnosed with cancer. All traumatic events that are layered within layers of societal roles: gender, age, nurse, family member, and student. To achieve learning, I couldn't ignore these perspectives, these layers of real and potential psychological trauma.

First, and to me, the critical piece to authentically providing TIEP is the provision of psychological safety, the first trauma-informed principle (SAMHSA 2014; see Table 1). I tried to

convey a sense of safety by engaging with students in low-risk participation. Despite students' hesitation, I enjoyed teaching the theory class for the advanced practice nursing students, which

Table 1
Trauma-Informed Care/Educational Practices

Trauma-Informed Care Principles[1]	Trauma-Informed Educational Practices
Safety	Low risk participation
	Clear about time to learn/time to evaluate
	Minimize risk of re-traumatization
	Approach students in non-hurried, calm, centered way
	Be aware of own ontological presence
	Know boundaries and resources
	Ensure cultural safety
Trustworthiness and Transparency	Be organized and available
	Prompt and accurate feedback
	Make syllabus a contract with students
	Clear expectations
	Set positive tone; communicate, communicate and then, communicate more
Peer Support	Online/on-site discourses and discussions: reward community civility
	Overtly encourage connections with peers
	Make classroom interactions meaningful and purposeful
Collaboration and Mutuality	Design projects that provide opportunities to complement strengths
	Provide clear expectations for group work
	Role model respect towards groups
	User-friendly technology for adult learners
	Flatten hierarchy when appropriate
Empowerment, Voice and Choice	Say "yes" whenever possible
	Acknowledge students' stress/symptoms when appropriate
	Be honest with student and allow them to orient themselves to the learning environment/be aware of adult learner roles
	Allow for student feedback in a non-defensive way
Cultural, Historical and Gender Issues	Honor differences and acceptance
	Promote DEI values
	Become knowledgeable about differences; ensure instructor cultural competency
	Foster student feelings of competency
	Use discourse that is culturally informed and promotes a sense of safety

[1] (SAMHSA 2014)

stimulates creative and wonderfully "gray" answers versus right/wrong responses driven by a logical empiricism approach. I was clear about providing a time to learn and a time to evaluate learning. As these were actively practicing nurses, I purposefully minimized the risk of re-traumatization by approaching the course with organization and adhering to the syllabus as a contract between me and students. No surprises. No hidden agendas.

To foster a sense of safety, I also created spaces to interact with them in a non-hurried, calm manner. Since the pandemic was affecting me, my research, and those around me in an intimate way, I had to use mindfulness to heighten my sense of awareness of my own behaviors and stress levels. For example, I had to stop at times to read my own levels of anxiety and purposefully invite awareness of my thoughts and actions. Last, to ensure safety for my students, I schooled myself on the available resources within my organization so that I could refer students to additional help. I had to know my limits and boundaries.

The second principle of trauma-informed care is trustworthiness and transparency (SAMHSA 2014). In the context of TIEP, on the first day of class, I set the tone for the semester, implementing several trauma-informed care principles from the start. I provided prompt feedback based on clear expectations. I was available, holding virtual office hours in the mornings and evenings to accommodate the students' shift schedules, which typically ran from 7 am to 7 pm (days) or 7 pm to 7 am (nights). I again, adhered to the syllabus; however, if quizzes were postponed or other adjustments were made, communications to those changes were sent timely. One of the most impactful TIEPs that I implemented was weekly email messages that served several purposes: reminders for upcoming assignments and quizzes, bringing attention to textbook readings, and other classwork tasks.

More importantly, I offered support in the email messages, cheering the students on to keep working, acknowledging that they were facing their professional roles in the midst of a disaster, with difficult choices and conditions. In parallel to the course, I was also analyzing data related to frontline nurses' trauma and substance use as the pandemic surged (Foli et al. 2021). Narratives of nurses' experiences were raw, unfiltered, and reflected horrific conditions. I felt secondary trauma from reading about the pain and suffering the nurses experienced. But the research findings gave me a better understanding of what some of my nurse-students were also experiencing. So, in reaction to those data, my weekly messages served as a proxy of what I wanted to say to the nurses in my study. I imagined what those nurses needed to hear: the pandemic would end one day. We would have normalcy again in our world, and yes, what they faced was more death and isolation than anyone should ever have to face. Several students contacted me after I sent those messages to tell me how much they meant to them and their mental well-being. They told me they looked forward to them and would keep them to re-read later.

Yet, the chronicity of the pandemic was evident. My study reflected how exhausted the nurses were and the waning of peer support due to fatigue and being emotionally spent. This is also reflected in the third trauma-informed care principle: Peer support (SAMHSA 2014). In educational practices, I transformed this to safe discussion boards, which were civil, and served to authentically communicate support for peers' thoughts and academic deliverables. Authenticity was derived from familiarity – that is, reading, processing, and reacting with knowledge and understanding of students' thoughts and emotions. When grading, I purposefully pointed out when a student had cheered a peer on or offered how their post had impacted their practice or generated new ideas. One assignment was to record a presentation focused on a nurse theorist. When the recorded student presentations were evaluated, I included peer reflections to create a sense of community. As an instructional designer, I tried to make the virtual classroom

interactions meaningful and with purpose. I also realized the students were tired and exercises without purpose would dilute their motivation.

The fourth trauma-informed principle is collaboration and mutuality (SAMHSA 2014). One of the ugliest characteristics of the pandemic was its forced isolation in many aspects of life, which negated or transformed what collaboration and mutuality looked like. For those in the healthcare system, either as a giver or receiver of care, solitude induced suffering, which was especially pronounced at the end of life when people passed away alone or with only the nurse at the bedside. Students flipped roles in a matter of minutes, from end-of-life provider to adult learner. They didn't need some instructor who wasn't there with them on the frontlines telling them what to do. Transforming from a hierarchical structure to a flatter distribution of power, lessening the power gradient, enforced this principle. In fact, what I tried to do was infuse a sense of empowerment to the students as they crafted presentations and wrote papers, which also implemented the fifth trauma-informed principle, empowerment, voice, and choice (SAMHSA 2014). The forced virtual course design did not lend readily to opportunities for student collaborations and several of the adult learners had grown tired of group work, openly expressing as much. Therefore, I assumed the role of advisor, mentor, one who was invested in their success. I received feedback in a non-defensive way; I voiced how difficult changing roles so dramatically must be, from student to end of life care provider; and I said, "yes" whenever I could. I owned my own guilt as a registered nurse in not being there with them, allowed to stay safely at home (Foli 2020).

Nurses, perhaps because we are an historically female-dominated profession, or perhaps because our genesis is rooted in uneducated, home care providers, our voices are often not heard. I offered choices whenever I could in response to student voices: some needed extensions on assignments, some were missing in action for quizzes, and some were struggling with the conceptual material. For the first time, I contacted students who had missed quizzes, genuinely worried about them. I allowed for make-up quizzes, following the syllabus for minor point penalty. I weighed fairness with compassion.

The sixth principle surrounds cultural, historical, and gender issues (SAMHSA 2014). I argue that nursing is a culture in itself. It's certainly more than a professional role as it seeps into your identity. You *are* a nurse. I know this culture well and could relate to this group of people in ways that extend beyond the classroom. Historically, we are female dominated, but men are slowly joining the discipline, and several males were enrolled in the class. I saw their suffering in my computer screen; in this instance, the pandemic was an equal-opportunity player. I was aware of minority students in the class and in important ways, the virtual environment supported inclusivity. Overall, however, I was sensitive to the fact that ethnic and racial minority students, sexual minority and LGBTQ+ students, veterans, and students with disabilities bring added layers of past trauma, microaggressions, and other violence that places them at risk for re-traumatization.

So how did all this turn out? The answer depends on what "all" means. If it means how satisfied I was as a teacher, then I think the answer is highly satisfied. I concentrated on learning, not the noise around me as a teacher, which can clutter our focus: to teach, to guide, to mentor, to role model ethical values. If it means how much learning occurred, the answer would be more than in

a typical semester. I found my students striving to do their best work. The concept analysis final papers, which requires advanced interpretive skills based on a review of literature, were strong. And if it means learner-consumer feedback, my evaluations were affirming with comments that reflected TIEP. One student example of the feedback I received was:

> Dr. Foli truly cares about all of us. I had a very emotionally difficult semester with things that were out of my control. Dr. Foli made me feel loved and cared for, she also supported me academically when I needed additional insight and guidance. She made herself available according to my schedule, which speaks volumes. This is a very tough course, but I feel like I learned so much and grew as a person and nurse because of the assignments in this course.

My TIEPs were intentional, purposeful, effective, and exhausting. By the end of the semester, I was experiencing several conflicting thoughts. The semester ranked highly in terms of job satisfaction; those activities related to teaching/learning. I also felt that my TIEP implementation had offered me the results I'd been hoping for: a rigorous course with authentic instructor compassion that positively impacted students as individuals and learners. My values as a person were also supported by the TIEPs, which align with my identity as a person and nurse. At the end of the semester, however, the isolation of the virtual world, necessitated by a pandemic with what seemed like no end in sight, left me feeling fatigued and experiencing the effects of secondary traumatic stress. I was relieved to have the winter break and news of a vaccine being developed.

Clarifications should be added. Teaching about trauma needs to be distinguished from TIEP, although some would include it as a trauma-informed approach to education, especially for the "helping professions" (Sanders 2021). In this instance, I did not incorporate overt discussions of trauma into the course, other than reviewing my theory (Foli 2021). I did not present potentially traumatizing content as such materials need to be treated very judiciously to avoid new traumatic experiences or re-traumatizing an individual (Carello and Butler 2014; Harrison et al. 2020). Best TIEPs are being discussed and differ based on subject areas, from literature to theology to service professionals (Carello and Butler 2015; Sanders 2021). Pedagogical practices need to be tested to determine evidence-based approaches for implementing TIEPs and should consider how adult learners' brains are affected by trauma (Perry 2006). There is much work to be done to add to our certainty of best practices, but rich conversations have begun (e.g., Davidson 2021; Sherwood et al. 2021).

A final note is that the TIEP that I implemented should be viewed as a beginning rather than an inclusive list. Further, these practices are not solely for the "helping disciplines," nor only during a pandemic. Rather, given the widespread nature of psychological trauma in our world, TIEP should be considered across the spectrum of professions and disciplines in higher education. Minorities, such as LGBTQ+, veterans, women, and racial/ethnic groups, who are located across major plans of study, may especially be vulnerable to trauma, and therefore, influenced by teachers who implement TIEPs. Despite the energies it entails, the results for both student and teacher are evident. As I begin to populate my online learning portal with materials, I thought this fall might be different. But with the ongoing threat of virus mutations, I believe TIEP are again needed. Then I stop and realize that for *every semester I teach*, TIEP are needed. Moving

forward, I will gladly take the TIEP approach in my courses and in my graduate student mentoring.

References

Berger, Emily, and Karen Martin. 2021. "Embedding trauma-informed practice within the education sector." *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 31: 223-227. doi: 10.1002/casp.2494.

Carello, Janice, and Lisa D. Butler. 2014. "Potentially Perilous Pedagogies: Teaching Trauma Is Not the Same as Trauma-Informed Teaching." *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation* 15(2): 153-168. doi: 10.1080/15299732.2014.867571.

Carello, Janice, and Lisa D. Butler. 2015. "Practicing What We Teach: Trauma-Informed Educational Practice." *Journal of Teaching in Social Work* 35(3): 262-278. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2015.1030059.

Davidson, Jennifer W. 2021. "Beyond trigger warnings: Toward a trauma-informed andragogy for the graduate theological classroom." *Teaching Theology & Religion* 24(1): 4-16.

Felitti, Vincent J., Robert F. Anda, Dale Nordenberg, David F. Williamson, Alison M. Spitz, Valerie Edwards, Mary P. Koss, and James S. Marks. 1998. "Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 14: 245-258. doi:10.1016/ S0749-3797(98)00017-8.

Foli, Karen J. 2021. "A Middle-Range Theory of Nurses' Psychological Trauma." *Advances in Nursing Science.* doi: 10.1097/ANS.0000000000000388.

Foli, Karen J., Anna Forster, Chang Cheng, Lingsong Zhang, and Yu-Chin Chiu. 2021. "Voices from the COVID-19 frontline: Nurses' trauma and coping." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 77(9): 3853-3866. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14988.

Foli, Karen. J. 2020. COVID-19 and Psychological Trauma (Online). Retrieved August 16, 2021 (https://nursology.net/2020/04/07/covid-19-and-psychological-trauma/).

Foli, Karen J., Blake Reddick, Lingsong Zhang, and Kathryn Krcelich. 2020. "Nurses' psychological trauma: 'They leave me lying awake at night'." *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* 34(3): 86-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2020.04.011.

Foli, Karen J. and John R. Thompson. 2019. *The Influence of Psychological Trauma in Nursing.* Sigma Theta Tau International.

Harrison, Neil, Jacqueline Burke, and Ivan Clarke. 2020. "Risky teaching: Developing a trauma-informed pedagogy for higher education." *Teaching in Higher Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1786046.

Perry, Bruce D. 2006. "Fear and Learning: Trauma-Related Factors in the Adult Education Process." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 110: 21-27. doi:10.1002/ace.215.

Sherwood, Dee, Karen VanDeusen, Bridget Weller, and Jessica Gladden. 2021. "Teaching Note – Teaching Trauma Content Online During COVID-19: A Trauma-Informed and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. *Journal of Social Work Education.* doi:10.1080/10437797.2021.1916665.

Sanders, Jane Elizabeth. 2021. "Teaching Note – Trauma-Informed Teaching in Social Work Education." *Journal of Social Work Education* 57(1): 197-204. doi:10.1080/10437797.2019.1661923.

Smiley, Richard A., Pamela Lauer, Cynthia Bienemy, Judith G. Berg, Emilie Shireman, Kyrani A. Reneau, and Maryann Alexander. 2018. "The 2017 National Nursing Workforce Survey." *Journal of Nursing Regulation* 9(3): supplement S1-S54. https://www.journalofnursingregulation.com/article/S2155-8256(18)30131-5/pdf.

Smyth, Joshua M. Jill R. Hockemeyer, Kristin E. Heron, Stephen A. Wonderlich, and James W. Pennebaker. 2008. "Prevalence, Type, Disclosure, and Severity of Adverse Life Events in College Students." *Journal of American College Health* 57(1): 69-76. doi:10.3200/JACH.57.1.69-76.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2014. "SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach." HHS Publication No. (SMA): 14-4884. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Reflections on Faculty to Faculty Mentoring

Aparajita Sagar[*]
Purdue University

This paper grew from a presentation[1] I made as a Faculty Ally of the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence's Support Circle (SBBCLE)[2] on February 26, 2021. The occasion was a drop-in session focused on mentoring as a gendered practice—what it meant to the faculty participating in the session, how it needed to adapt to evolving faculty needs, how it could best serve underrepresented minority (URM) faculty, and what potential minefields as well as best practices we had found in our own experiences as women faculty mentees and mentors. In this essay, I build on that presentation with the goal to contributing to a critical conversation on mentoring that the Butler Center has fostered in the last three years- and that it has used to excellent purpose to intervene and advocate for women and URM faculty at Purdue and beyond. While mentoring merits careful attention for many other groups in the academy, from staff to graduate students to administrators, in the interest of time I have confined the reflections below to faculty-to-faculty mentoring.

I begin with a brief consideration of three principles that promise success in a broad array of faculty mentoring practices, and then move on to consider in depth three specific models of mentoring that I addressed in my presentation. I conclude with some thought on how to address recurring questions and problems that surface around the issue of mentoring.

General Pathways to Success in Mentoring

Typical definitions of mentoring include the guidance, support, sponsorship and coaching that an established faculty member provides for a junior member. But I think what cuts to the heart matter is Lisa Beal's observation that to mentor is to commit and "exert oneself" for "the success of another" (Beal 2017:49). I would include under the rubric of such success not only the mentee's career advancement, but also her/his ability to maintain work-life balance, find

supportive and collegial relationships in the academy, and achieve physical, mental, emotional and intellectual well-being. The first pathway to success in mentoring is for the mentor to see themselves as those who expend time, energy and effort in working for the success of their mentees- and defining that success in multifaceted ways. But the benefits do not flow in just one direction.

The second pathway to success requires that we honor the inherent (though often unacknowledged) reciprocity that inheres in all effective mentoring. We sometimes wrongly conclude that the power differential between mentor and mentee leaves little room for reciprocity, and we assume that the support and help flows only one way, from mentor to mentee, and so too does the sense of obligation and gratitude (albeit in the opposite direction, from mentee to mentor). Here mentoring itself is seen as benevolence, or even a system of personal favors, from the mentor to the mentee. This worldview can potentially lead some mentors to consider their efforts thankless and leave some mentees reluctant to seek meaningful mentoring in the hope of avoiding a feeling of obligation. I argue that we need a more constructive framing of reciprocity. In accepting the role of mentors in the first place, faculty might on the face of it appear to exert themselves uni-directionally for their mentee's success, but, importantly, their exertions in the long run ensure the success and growth of their discipline, institution and the academy. Mentees can best reciprocate by paying forward and actively seeking the role of mentors in their turn. The power differential between mentor and mentee cannot hinder this powerful and ongoing pattern of reciprocity. In creating conditions in which mentor and mentee are always paying forward, we set up mentoring to perpetuate and renew itself across academic generations, ideally gaining greater reach and depth in each iteration.

The third pathway to success I will outline here is for all involved to regard mentoring as a time-bound arrangement that will very likely go through phases in which mentor and mentee would have greater or lesser need of each other. Further, honest and transparent communication is essential in each phase, and particularly when the relationship begins and ends. A mentoring relationship can end when external circumstances change: for example, when a stated goal of the mentoring is achieved, from the publication of an article to the granting of tenure. But closure at any point, for example, when the personal dynamic changes between mentor and mentee, should be smooth and free of reproach, guilt, or hurt. Most academic faculty mentoring arrangements last at least one semester and as much as several years, but whatever their span, we should acknowledge that mentee needs might change in a way that the mentors can no longer address, and other mentors might fulfill more effectively- or that mentors might find their efforts more productively employed with other mentees. No-fault exit clauses must be part of an open discussion around mentoring within the institution and academy, and must also be discussed formally or informally between each mentor and mentee. A healthy approach would be to see mentoring as a phase in a long collegial relationship, one that could change form and even direction over time (with mentor and mentee switching roles) and one that can conclude without bitterness, ideally after a thoughtful conversation about what the arrangement has already achieved. Communication will be key from beginning to end.

Idealistic though one or more of the three pathways might seem, I believe they are within reach of all mentoring. There are implicit considerations in each of the three forms of mentoring (with some overlap) that I will address in the remainder of this paper. The three forms are 1)

hierarchical, dyadic mentoring; 2) group mentoring; and 3) peer mentoring. I conclude with brief recommendations on what we can do to ensure that mentoring works to the benefit not only of very many individual faculty, but also of our disciplines and institutions as a whole.

Hierarchical Dyadic Mentoring
I begin with hierarchical dyadic mentoring, quite familiar in the academy, in which individual senior established mentors are assigned to work with individual junior mentees, usually at the local level of departments and institutions. I posit that this model situates mentors as coaches who bring superior knowledge and authority to guide the mentee, and the mentees as novices who at present lack the wherewithal—the experience, the knowhow, the institutional savvy—to achieve their full potential.

Literature on mentoring is replete with instances when the hierarchical dyadic model has led to inappropriate exercise of power. Gregory Diggs et al. caution that "Neither politically neutral nor free from power issues, mentoring programs and relationships may actually reflect the power and interests of the organization rather than the interests of the mentors and their protégés" (2009:316). I would add that in the hierarchical and dyadic model, problems emerge especially when the mentor serves as coach *and* gatekeeper to the discipline; in the latter role, mentors can exercise enormous institutional power over the careers of their mentees. To cite obvious instances of this: mentors are sometimes in a position to vote for and advocate for and against the mentee's tenure as well as other opportunities for advancement; outside the institution, as established faculty, they can potentially often network to promote (or obstruct) the mentee's progress with respect to publication, grants and funding. Assigning this dual role of coach and gatekeeper to mentors was common practice when I began my career three decades ago. I see fewer instances of it today in my own discipline of cultural and literary studies, but it persists in many fields. If we accept Beal's definition of mentoring I cited earlier—namely the act of committing and "exert[ing oneself]" for "the success of another" (Beal 2017:49)—then the gatekeeping function focuses explicitly on the success of the discipline/institution rather than the success of the mentee *entering and/or navigating* that discipline/institution. Not to put too fine a point on it, the gatekeeping function potentially undermines any claim that mentors foreground the mentees' needs and interests above all else. In instances when mentors in the hierarchical model do not commit even to confidentiality and either volunteer, or are obliged, to report on the mentee to their senior colleagues, we find ourselves dealing with something like a "spy system," or at least the perception of one (as quoted in Meschitti and Lawton-Smith 2017:184). Trust and reciprocity, the precise linchpins for meaningful and supportive mentoring, are at risk.

Moreover, the hierarchical dyadic model often requires the mentor to protect the status quo of the institution or discipline by molding junior faculty to "fit" the latter. As Anne-Marie Núñez, Elizabeth T Murakami, and Leslie D Gonzales put it, the dyadic model often draws on "a traditional hierarchical, compensatory (or deficit), and grooming approach to mentoring" (Núñez et al. 2015:93). In the case of URM faculty, if the deficit model requires the new faculty member to reshape themselves to fit a hitherto exclusionary dynamic, then the dynamic remains as exclusionary as before, even if a little room is made for (the now remolded) member. We witness a loss of potential when mentoring seeks not only to clone existing faculty but also to *assimilate* new faculty to the extant culture of the institution and discipline, rather than *transform* the latter so as to ensure that new mentees can leave their imprint on it.

All this said, however, the dyadic hierarchical model is here to stay, especially in disciplines in which sponsorship and patronage by mentors are indispensable in opening doors. The patronage system is structurally set up to replicate itself, in that one survives only by playing by, and thus further entrenching, the rules. Without institutionally-supported efforts to at least supplement hierarchical mentoring with more egalitarian options (some of which I will address later), inequities might conceivably stifle any positive impact of mentoring while also further consolidating inequities. For example, in the context of the mentoring of women in STEM, Viviana Meschitti and Helen Lawton Smith (2017) note that "white male mentors may be better networked" than others, and sought as mentors by women for that very reason—even though "the rationale of mentoring is to challenge existing structures of power and paternalistic relationships, and not to replicate them" (172). Until those structures *are* transformed, however, women faculty in STEM must work with the mentoring options available. Hence "the need to promote formal mentoring programs for women: because of the power of existing networks, men are more likely to benefit from informal opportunities, while women and minorities, in absence of formal programs, might not have any opportunity at all" (Meschitti and Lawton Smith 2017:172). In view of the gendered gatekeeping that has famously kept women as well as URM out of the loop or limited their advance in some fields, the dyadic model, for all its drawbacks, might be one of few mentoring options available and cannot simply be wished away.

It might take one or more academic generations to achieve much-needed meaningful and structural transformation of the dyadic hierarchical model. Until that point, however, all those presently bound to this model (but possibly now possessing, through seniority, some agency within it) must seek opportunities to push back so as to better serve the needs of mentees. Meaningful mentoring *within* the model usually requires both mentor and mentee to commit to self-training, careful listening, and a commitment to reciprocity. For an inspiring example of the dyadic model being put to excellent use, I would like to invoke Dr. Buffy Smith, a powerful voice and authority on academic mentoring for under-served populations. Her short reflection on her own experience as a mentee makes for especially compelling reading in this context. A self-described "Black, gay woman from a low income background" (Smith 2014:116), Smith worked with a faculty mentor from a very different and clearly more privileged demographic as she notes.

> I was assigned an extraordinary mentor in the department […] I believe we had a successful formal mentoring relationship because of the following reasons: (1) we had clear expectations of each other; (2) we respected each other as individuals with agency; (3) whenever there was a misunderstanding we would immediately address the issue; (4) we did not internalize critical feedback; (5) we trusted one another and were committed to developing our relationship. Overall, we were mindful of our different social identities but we did not allow those differences to prevent us from having conversations concerning race, social class, sexual orientation, and other sensitive topics. We were able to engage in honest and respectful discourse about any topic and that is why we are good friends today (Smith 2014:119).

I cite Smith here to suggest that reciprocity and collegial connections *can* emerge against the odds in even formal, hierarchical mentoring contexts and even when there isn't an "identity

match" between mentor and mentee. Gregory Diggs et al. similarly find that while such a match could be desirable, it is not "strictly necessary" for mentoring to succeed (Diggs et al. 2009:324). To return to the example offered by Smith, good communication protected the mentor and mentee from the destructive effects of unreal expectations on either side and it also ensured quick course correction when difficulties arose. I find Smith's use of the word "we" in item 4 significant: it implies that critical feedback between Smith and her mentor, when it emerged, flowed both ways, with not just her mentor but Smith herself free to offer it- a reciprocal dynamic that comes close to a peer exchange. Communication was obviously vital to this relationship and as the ending of the quote illustrates, the mentoring concluded without bitterness or resentment.

Group Mentoring
The second model of mentoring I will address here is group mentoring, sometimes also termed team mentoring and the multiple mentor model. I include the following arrangements under this rubric:
- When an individual faculty member is mentored by a collective of other faculty.
- When an individual faculty member serves as a mentor for a collective of mentees.
- When a collective of faculty serves as mentors to a collective of mentees.

Any of the three arrangements above could mitigate the unreal expectation that a single mentor needs to fulfil all the mentoring needs of a mentee. A wide range of activities, calling for equally wide-ranging expertise and knowhow, falls under the rubric of mentoring: for example, mentors can serve as sponsors, opening doors for the mentee when it comes to publishing, grants, and career networking. They can serve also as informants to those walking the strange halls of the academy for the first time as faculty. They help demystify protocols that are taken for granted by insiders but are often bewildering, if not entirely opaque, to new faculty (and especially to URM and/or first-generation, and/or foreign-born faculty). In addition, mentors can work actively to support the mentees' need for work/life balance, mental, emotional, and physical well-being and self-care. Each of these tasks is laudable and worth pursuing, but the sweeping and varied scope of mentoring work can easily overwhelm a single mentor. This is not to say that we do not hear of inspiring mentors forced into acting alone and still willing to do it all. For example, describing the extraordinary role of URM "mentors-at-a-distance," Richard Reddick singles out a senior scholar, whom he names Gia and describes as a "mentor magnet." A prolific and renowned scholar, Gia nonetheless made it a point to follow the work of and mentor "a multitude of junior faculty" at once, including many outside her own institution (2015:52). But though URM senior faculty such as Gia make herculean efforts to nurture the work of junior scholars who might lack access to same-identity mentoring in their own institutions, the academy must not be oblivious of the intense time-commitment made by these extraordinary mentors, nor continue to overburden them We frequently hear justifiable concerns over the dearth of mentors, particularly in fields with few or no URM faculty in senior positions, but it should not then fall to those who *do* mentor to take on every task at once. In fact, it might demoralize both mentor and mentee for the institution to expect any mentor to serve as first, last, and only recourse for the mentee. Group mentoring can provide some answers here.

But like all forms of mentoring, group mentoring also does not *guarantee* a perfect outcome. Importantly, it can follow either a hierarchical framework, or an egalitarian one, or a mix of the

two. The hierarchical version is open to the same issues as in the dyadic model. For example, in a hierarchical group mentoring model, a group of mentors can undertake an inappropriate exercise of power that is as, or more, pernicious than with a single mentor. The net effect of a group of misguided or unethical mentors acting in tandem is to inject greater toxicity into the system. To forestall this possibility, it is important to build into the group-mentoring process the same safety-valves needed for hierarchical dyadic mentoring: for example, the third pathway to success I outlined at the start of this essay, namely no-fault exits. With such guardrails in place, group mentoring at its best can move past the limitations of dyadic relationships. Most importantly, it can secure some agency for the mentee who now gets to choose additional mentors and even alternative mentoring practices. And finally, no-fault exits are likely to be smoother in a system where the mentoring is thought of as a group activity. The collective of group mentors can, in theory, stay flexible and expand or contract as needed, without needing to be surveilled by an official administrator.

Two notes of caution: first, it remains unlikely that demands on the time of BIPOC and URM faculty mentors will cease even in group mentoring situations; indeed, such mentors are likely to be engaged in less publicly-acknowledged forms of mentoring and still undertake forms of mentoring rendered invisible in the system. All stakeholders—and all who participate in mentoring activities—must therefore acknowledge and recognize the work that is being done by these mentors of whom so much is always asked in our academy. Second, if some mentors are selected specifically for their ability/willingness to guide on work/life balance and physical, mental and emotional well-being, care is needed not to replicate gendered or racialized divisions of labor. If the institution, field, or discipline routinely maintains a dismissive attitude toward ethics of care, some effort must be made on the part of administrators, and more broadly, the institution itself to ensure that that attitude does not manifest itself in the mentoring relationship by some process of osmosis. As long as the mentoring network is mindful of equity, recognition and reciprocity, however, one can be optimistic.

Group mentoring has another immediate and practical advantage: when significant numbers of faculty participate, they create a culture in which mentoring is seen as the concern of all, including mentors, mentees, department executives and upper administration. Such interaction can in itself win mentoring the wide recognition and exposure it deserves, and one can even hope that as multiple stakeholders enter the institution's conversation on mentoring, more strategizing and innovation follow.

An exemplary model for faculty group mentoring is the Coaching and Resource Network (or CRN) initiated in 2019 at the Butler Center at Purdue. The network invites assistant and associate professors to "seek advice and have an advocate or sponsor outside of their departments" (SBBCLE 2021) and facilitates long term relationships between mentors and mentees across departments and schools. Mentoring here does not focus exclusively on limited career goals such as reviewing grant applications, but instead promotes faculty wellness more broadly, including mental and emotional well-being, career satisfaction and work-life balance. While gendering is an explicit focus for the Center and for the CRN network, mentoring is not restricted by gender, and the mentoring of URM and BIPOC faculty is also foregrounded. The

network's success may be gauged by the fact that the University of Texas at Austin and Georgia State University have signed agreements to replicate it in their institutions.[3]

For a group-modeling model outside Purdue, we could consider Emory University's Center for Faculty Development and Excellence (CDFE) Faculty Mentorship Network. Noting that "no one person can provide all of the mentoring expertise" a faculty member might need, the homepage for the network describes its objective as follows:

> … to provide all Emory faculty confidential opportunities for support and conversation with colleagues, by providing access to multiple mentors. More than 180 Emory faculty from a wide range of schools and departments have volunteered to support their colleagues in areas such as teaching observations, guest lecturing, research, scholarship, university service, public scholarship, and general professional development (Emory 2019).

The description includes an important reminder that "mentoring is life-long" and faculty at any stage of their career are welcome to use the services of their network. It is difficult to fault this kind of group-mentoring, and I particularly appreciate the imperative that mentoring should be accessible to all faculty at any stage in their career, and further, that mentees can take active charge and initiate the process by selecting their own mentors.

On a smaller scale, Ohio State University's 2015 group mentoring initiative for women faculty in STEM also incorporated intriguing and innovative elements. In their account of the initiative, Nicole Thomas, Jill Bystydzienski, and Anand Desai (2015) note that mentor-circles comprised a mix of 12-15 mentors and mentees; significantly, participants did not always share a home department or even know each other. Each circle included "a professionally trained, non-STEM facilitator," who opened the meeting by laying out four rules:

> (1) What is said in circle stays in circle; confidentiality is critical. (2) We listen to each other with curiosity and compassion—we replace judgment with discernment and keep an open mind. (3) We ask for what we need and offer what we can. (4) When we are unsure how to proceed, we stop action, pause, and reflect (Thomas et al. 2015:150).

I wish to make two observations here: first, even when confidentiality is not guaranteed by the institution, it can nonetheless be an important ethical goal to which mentors and mentees can commit themselves. Second, pausing for reflection could forestall much unnecessary misunderstanding, for example when deciding when the mentoring relationship should end. Overall, the Ohio State model has in-built safety valves in its highlighting of confidentiality, reflection and communication, and careful engagement free from judgement.

Faculty at smaller institutions might lack the critical mass to sustain such versions of mentoring across departments, and the group mentoring models offered by SBBCLE, Purdue, Emory, or Ohio State might not lie within reach of every institution. Fortunately, however, group mentoring can function effectively *across* walls and borders: as I will highlight at the end of this essay, technology enables the model to evolve into ever-expanding networks across institutions.

---

[3] For more details, see https://www.purdue.edu/butler/crn-support-circle/crn/index.php.

Peer Mentoring
I turn now to the third and final mentoring model I will address, that of peer mentoring. The group mentoring discussed in the previous section can redress issues such as the dearth of mentors and the need to share and delegate mentoring roles; it can also accommodate some agency on the part of the mentee. But like its counterpart, hierarchical dyadic mentoring, it too can fail faculty when group mentors replicate oppressive power structures, and it can especially fail faculty whose mentoring needs are routinely rendered invisible in the academy. Three groups who stand to benefit significantly via peer mentoring are foreign-born faculty, URM faculty, and contingent faculty. All three have sometimes been especially ill-served by hierarchic mentoring models, whether group or dyadic, and in many instances, they have gone on to create their own exciting and dynamic models of peer mentoring. The best of such networks organize themselves not merely around social identity but also around shared academic and ethical commitments. All three groups I discuss below have evolved, or are in need of evolving, peer mentoring to encounter a form of invisibility that is specific to each. Worth noting here is that though they do all encounter invisibility, each does so for different time-spans and often at a different moment in a faculty career.

The first faculty group that I believe may particularly benefit from peer mentoring comprises those born and educated partly outside the U.S. Such faculty, particularly when they are BIPOC, might not have encountered invisibility, disregard and marginalization in academic institutions in their countries of origin and are often unaware of how crucial mentoring is as they begin their faculty careers. Admittedly, some foreign-born faculty may have been students in the U.S., and might thus have developed (perhaps painfully) a sense of how privilege and exclusion work in the U.S. But from my own experience as an international graduate student and now faculty, I believe not all in this group are prepared for the patterns of exclusion we could encounter as faculty or able to appreciate how much peer mentoring can help. I can cite many instances from my own experience and those of similarly-situated faculty colleagues and friends when we were shocked to see how much self-education we needed to read signs and signals, and understand default systems of exclusion and privilege that were specific to the U.S. (and did not echo systems of exclusion and privilege that we knew well from our countries of origin). In my case, it was through my affiliation with Purdue's then Women's Studies Program under the directorship of Berenice Carroll that I began to educate myself on the specific challenges likely to come my way. This was also the space outside my department where as I started out, I was welcomed, mentored, and made aware of opportunities to mentor others. In short, I was drawn into a peer-mentoring feminist network. Interacting with and being mentored by all my feminist colleagues, but especially U.S. born URM faculty who had greater experience of racism in the United States, was deeply restorative. The fact that I was able to find a peer network through Women's Studies is not surprising given the primacy given to mentoring within feminist work: some of the most intriguing and revelatory work on mentoring has come from feminist studies. I was particularly fortunate in being positioned as I was. But administrators, stakeholders, and foreign-born faculty themselves must be proactive in ensuring that such faculty seek and find opportunities to be mentored, and whenever opportunities come, to mentor in turn. Peer mentoring networks are vital for this group.[4]

---

[4] For a particularly inspiring instance of mutual peer mentoring by international faculty who began as dissertation advisor and advisee but transformed their relationship into a highly successful peer mentoring

Moreover, let me note a great need for research and first-hand accounts on intercultural and international mentoring, which tend to be rare (and foreign-born faculty are not unique in this regard; scholarly discussion remains sparse on the mentoring of other URM faculty and contingent faculty). Until this important scholarship comes along, we must guard against accounts that rely on shortcuts of any kind. I would caution potential mentors of foreign-born faculty in a hierarchical set up against assumptions about national or religious essence that might inform much spoken and unspoken understanding of non-U.S. cultures. In particular, I urge that mentors waste no time and resources learning the foreign origin mentee's culture in the abstract, or even from those who profess expertise in it. Even in peer mentoring networks, foreign-born faculty must be on guard against internalized stereotypes of themselves and each other. Platitudes and stereotypes passing themselves off as cultural literacy can intrude on and eventually drown out the kind of careful listening and delicate interpersonal navigating that all mentoring calls for. Mentors themselves must be persistent in opening and reopening the doors to conversation, listening carefully, and responding to the cues and feelers being put out by the mentee.

The second faculty group that is most likely to benefit from peer mentoring includes the other URM groups, namely, U.S. citizens who have encountered race-, gender-class-, heteronormativity- and ableist- based exclusions long preceding their entry into the academy. Their life experiences might have exposed such faculty more routinely to dismissal, invisibility, and worse for a longer period than foreign-born faculty. URM faculty are likely to have had their mentoring needs dismissed, and typically are well aware that hierarchical modeling (whether group or dyadic) ushers in problems that might be circumvented in a peer-mentoring situation.

In the academy, such URM faculty groups have been especially resourceful in drawing from anti-race and other civil rights activism to evolve alternative peer mentoring networks. An exemplary instance of URM peer mentoring is the collectivist model of "pedagogy with equity" developed by a collective of then junior Latina faculty, Anne-Marie Núñez, Elizabeth T Murakami and Leslie D Gonzales. Núñez et al. (2015) argue that to build genuine diversity, institutions must see past tokenist hires and stop making assimilationist demands of new URM hires; they must ensure also that this faculty has the space and freedom and resources to generate a "diversity in knowledge production" (2015:93). They identify four principles that could move us towards this transformative outcome. Three of these involve careful steps to ensure that the research generated is meaningful to the faculty member. To this end, they advocate building from "conversations and interests" to "writing projects"; working with each other to build "the practice of self-reflexivity"; and finding ways to "link together all facets of academic life: research, teaching, and service to the community" (2015:93). The fourth is particularly compelling. Núñez et al. propose that mentor groups should

> …focus energies around the principle that all individuals are legitimate creators and agents of knowledge. Each person's personal, cultural, professional, political, and disciplinary-based backgrounds can be viewed as assets. By building mentoring efforts

---

one, see Mullings and Mukherjee 2018. They note that beyond their racialized identities and immigrant status, "it was our shared intellectual and political commitment to a decolonial transnational feminist praxis that proved to be the most important element in our ability to help each other to thrive" (1417).

and relationships around this principle, a traditional hierarchical, compensatory (or deficit), and grooming approach to mentoring is displaced (2015:93).

Particularly impressive in this URM model of peer mentoring is that it not only defies the "deficit" approach to mentoring, it also organizes itself around a positive charge: the assets URM faculty bring to the academy. By welcoming a multiplicity of backgrounds and experiences as "assets," such models bring to fruition the promise of diversity. Successful URM peer-mentoring networks typically grow organically, as in the instance cited above, and by valuing and honoring each participant's potential to generate knowledge and learning, they powerfully celebrate a "diversity of knowledge production," to recall Núñez apt formulation (2015:93).

The third faculty group that benefits from peer-mentoring networks is one that is increasingly exploited today, namely that of contingent faculty, a term that includes all faculty who are not in the tenured/tenure track categories. The non-URM and non-international faculty in this group might not have encountered invisibility until they entered the university with far fewer benefits and typically reduced roles in governance than have other faculty but typically doing vital administrative, pedagogic and research work of the university (cf. Raghavan 2018). It is worth noting that there is a great deal of overlap between this group and URM and international faculty. Andrew Rosen and Jaime Lester (2020) point out that, "The steady march toward the Gig Academy –as Adrianna Kezar, the author and professor of higher education at the University of Southern California, titled her 2019 book—means that more than half of the faculty are now adjuncts, and three-quarters of all faculty positions are off the tenure track."

In her doctoral dissertation on mentoring for adjunct faculty who teach online, Kathy Beal (2017) pointed to the glaring lack of support available for contingent faculty. Nearly every analysis of contingent faculty emphasizes the objective of "professional development" but opportunities remain spare for many. Contingent faculty also highlight their need for connection and collegial contact with other university personnel, but yet "they are not included in any community-building activities" (Beal 2017:51). In short, both needs are largely unmet. A non-exploitative, humane and inclusive engagement with contingent faculty is ethical in itself. But if this is not seen as a pressing enough reason, the academy must acknowledge that it wins and undergraduate instruction improves dramatically if contingent faculty are able to seek professional development and meet their other needs. In the two-tier system of the increasingly shrinking groups on the tenure track and the growing ranks of contingent faculty, it is imperative that the relatively privileged tenure and tenure-track faculty do what they can to initiate meaningful collegial connections with contingent faculty and seek opportunities for collaboration, advocacy, and mentoring. But contingent faculty, like the other two groups, would also be well-served by generating its own support structure, for example a peer mentoring network.

Beal is also careful to point out that some among the online contingent faculty she interviewed had grown wary of peer mentoring, having found themselves in an "unsafe, unsupportive environment" with "no opportunities to engage in honest reflective dialogue with their peers": as some peers and "high control" leaders would dominate, other members would disengage (2017: 216). As this illustrates, in itself peer mentoring networks are not panaceas: they too can be

vulnerable to the tensions and schisms of the outside world and to the usual complications that can trip up any human interaction.

While peer mentoring holds out genuine promise of meeting the needs of faculty who might be rendered invisible in the current system, like other mentoring models, it is not immune to problems. The greatest might be that peer mentors do not always have access to institutional knowhow and strategies. For that reason, whenever possible, peer mentors must seek outside counsel from trustworthy sources if not in their own institution then in others. No-fault exits, communication, and continuing self-education could also function as safety valves for peer mentoring -as much as for other forms of mentoring.

Conclusion
Keeping in mind the three pathways I outlined at the start of this essay for successful mentoring, namely, exertion on behalf of the other, reciprocity, and communication particularly around no-fault exits, all three models of mentoring that I have explored here hold out some promise and manifest some limitations. In this conclusion I want to consider two ways in which we can best position ourselves to realize the former and work around the latter.

First, we must take advantage of technological innovation. Tech-supported remote group mentoring, or digital mentoring, can potentially make a particularly critical difference for URM faculty and faculty in under-resourced disciplines and fields, many of whom might be isolated in and thinly scattered across institutions. All forms of mentoring have much to offer faculty within single institutions, but they can make a particularly critical difference for faculty whose research focus, or URM status, isolates them in their institutions. Technology can forge collaboration across institutional and even national borders. Sometimes one fears that while it waits to find good mentoring options for URM faculty, foreign-born faculty, and contingent faculty, the institution has the luxury of moving at very slow speed. So it must be emphasized to all stakeholders that some of the most creative remedies happen to be relatively low-expense and *ad-hoc*. Institutions that cannot, at present, provide same-identity hierarchical mentoring for their faculty could still support ongoing remote peer mentoring for that faculty—for example, through the simple act of funding the network as a whole to attend professional meetings and retreats together. The sooner we all recognize the benefit to the institution and the academy of peer mentoring, the more pressing the case becomes to support faculty's effort to build sustaining co-mentoring networks with their peers.

Digital mentoring can operate cross-institutionally and even cross-nationally, connecting faculty (including same-identity URM mentors and mentees) who lack critical mass in their immediate location.[5] At regular intervals and as much as possible, face-to-face or voice-to-voice interaction can supplement such digital efforts. Moreover, digital mentoring networks open a step in the

---

[5] I thank Marcia Stephenson for pointing me to the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) mutual mentoring sessions of the Romance Language Chairs. Similar opportunities exist via BTAA for faculty in other fields as well. My thanks also to Nancy Peterson for informing me of the Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures, which directly lists the following as a mandate: "providing strong mentorship and professionalization opportunities for graduate students and junior scholars in the field." These are two of many inspiring ways in which professional societies have stepped forward to address a range of mentoring needs.

right direction not just for individual faculty mentees and mentors, but also for entire disciplines, departments and institutions that cannot provide meaningful local mentoring. Every mission of the academy- its scholarship, pedagogy, and engagement—benefits significantly today from multifold field- and discipline-specific mentoring networks, and from professional meetings in various disciplines that emphasize sessions on mentoring. The academy as a whole can and must reciprocate in kind. Consortiums of institutions (and not just individual faculty, disciplines or fields), should therefore enthusiastically initiate, fund, and offer meaningful support for these efforts.

Second, mentors, mentees, those who administer mentoring, and all stakeholders, will all benefit from lifelong self-education on mentoring. A rich body of scholarship, research, and first-person accounts of mentoring makes for engrossing, and often paradigm-shifting, reading. I believe we need this literature to grow exponentially and elicit more first-hand accounts from all involved, particularly URM faculty as mentors and mentees. Notably, we see a dearth of research on and first-hand accounts from all mentors, including non-URM mentors, perhaps because it would be difficult to convey an experience in which one is assumed to hold all the power, and in which one is more pressed to ensure confidentiality of others. Even if that is the case, however, those with mentoring experience could have a vital contribution to make to the field. We especially need accounts from URM faculty who mentor non-URM faculty. But hearing from all involved is the best practice; contributions from those with experience and views in faculty mentoring can not only serve as fine instances of a key pathway to success, namely communication, they might help forestall the awkwardness or difficulties in mentoring relationships by offering an array of examples and counter-examples. Finally, I believe that a proliferation of scholarship on mentoring is the best way to endorse the one simple but powerful principle that sets apart ethical, rewarding mentoring relationships from exploitative and toxic ones: namely, reciprocity. Those who have benefited from mentoring in our day can reciprocate by serving as mentors and by promoting a culture of mentoring by encouraging and producing scholarly research on mentoring. The *raison d'etre* of mentoring is to promote the success and well-being of others, and as such, it is an exemplary form of collegiality and responsibility to the other.

References
Beal, Kathy L. 2017. "Peer Mentoring Experiences among Female Adjunct University Faculty Who Teach Online." PhD Dissertation, Capella University, Ann Arbor, 2017.
Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence (SBBCLE). 2021. Coaching and Resource Network (Online). Retrieved November 30, 2021 (https://dev.www.purdue.edu/butler/crn-support-circle/crn/index.php).
Diggs, Gregory, Dorothy F. Garrison-Wade, Diane Estrada, and Rene Galindo. 2009. "Smiling Faces and Colored Spaces: The Experiences of Faculty of Color Pursing tenure in the Academy." *The Urban Review* 41(4): 312-333.
Emory University Center for Faculty Development and Excellence. 2019. "Faculty Mentorship Network." Retrieved September 9, 2021. (https://cfde.emory.edu/news-events/news/2019/march/faculty-mentorship-network.html).
Meschitti, Viviana and Helen Lawton-Smith. 2017. "Does Mentoring Make a Difference for Women Academics? Evidence from the Literature and a Guide for Future Research." *Journal of Research in Gender Studies* 7(1): 166-199.

Mullings, Beverley and Sanjukta Mukherjee. 2018. "Reflections on Mentoring as Decolonial, Transnational, Feminist Praxis." *Gender, Place & Culture* 25(10): 1405-1422.

Núñez, Anne-Marie, Elizabeth T. Murakami, and Leslie D. Gonzales. 2015. "Weaving Authenticity and Legitimacy: Latina Faculty Peer Mentoring." In *Mentoring as Transformative Practice: Supporting Student and Faculty Diversity* (New Directions for Higher Education, Number 171), ed. Caroline S. Turner, 87-96. San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.

Raghavan, Malathi. 2018. "Reflection: Late Entry into the Academic Workforce." *Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and ADVANCE Working Paper Series* 1(2):26-31.

Reddick, Richard J. 2015. "Of Feral Faculty and Magisterial Mowglis: The Domestication of Junior Faculty." In *Mentoring as Transformative Practice: Supporting Student and Faculty Diversity* (New Directions for Higher Education, Number 171), ed. Caroline S. Turner, 48-56. San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.

Rosen, Andrew and Jamie Lester. 2020. "Supporting Faculty Careers Amid Uncertainty." *Inside Higher Ed*. (https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/07/02/supporting-faculty-careers-amid-season-uncertainty-opinion?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=a9a082edcd-DNU_2020_COPY_02&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-a9a082edcd-227965869&mc_cid=a9a082edcd&mc_eid=e82702f68c).

Smith, Buffy. 2014. "Engaging Mentoring Relationships in Academia: Hard Lessons Learned." In *Black Faculty in the Academy: Narratives for Negotiating Identity and Achieving Career Success*, ed. Fred A. Bonner II, Aretha Faye Marbley, Frank Tuitt, Petra A. Robinson, Rosa M. Banda, and Robin L. Hughes, 115-22. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Subramaniam, Mangala. 2021. "Challenging the Stereotypes." *Higher Education Digest*. (https://www.highereducationdigest.com/challenging-the-stereotypes/).

Thomas, Nicole, Jill Bystydzienski, and Anand Desai. 2015. "Changing Institutional Culture through Peer Mentoring of Women STEM Faculty." *Innovative Higher Education* 40 (2): 143-57.

The Underrepresentation of Black and Hispanic People in Business School Teaching Cases

Amy David[*]
Victoria Coats
Purdue University

Introduction

In the context of business school pedagogy, a business school teaching case (or case study) is the narrative depiction of a real business problem that serves as the basis for student analysis and classroom discussion. Their defining feature is a business problem, expressed through the narrative lens of a specific protagonist, that asks students to choose a course of action (Anderson, Schiano, and Schiano 2014). Within this basic format, case studies can vary greatly in length, discipline, and the nature of their supplementary material (data tables, charts, etc.).

Proponents of business case studies assert that their first-person narrative structure is more practical and relevant than non-narrative texts (Hammond 1980), and that cases allow for higher-order learning goals compared to those allowed by standard textbooks (Mesny 2013). Cases are also viewed as valuable tools for teaching students how to deal with the ambiguity that likely surrounds real problems in the business world (Banning 2003; Rippin et al. 2002). For this reason, case studies make up a significant portion of the curricular materials at many top business schools (Bridgman, Cummings, and McLaughlin 2016). In fact, as detractors point out, the case method's popularity over time has far outpaced research into its effectiveness (Liang and Lin 2008; Smith 1987). Concerns that case studies privilege senior management's views (Chetkovich and Kirp 2001; Contardo and Wensly 2004; Dorn 1999), promote hard skills over soft skills (Dean and Fornaciari 2002), and are teacher-centered, rather than student-centered (Currie and Tempest 2008), have done little to slow their use as a pedagogical device. Harvard Business School, the institution that originated the case teaching method (Dewing 1931; Donham 1922), informs incoming students that they will read 500 case studies over the course of a two-year Master of Business Administration (MBA) program (Harvard Business School 2020). Cases from major publishers such as Harvard Business Publishing, Ivey Publishing, and Darden Case Publishing are used widely by instructors across institutions and make up a significant portion of the reading assigned in both undergraduate and graduate business school courses (Anteby 2013; McLaughlin and Prothero 2014).

Because of case studies' prominence in business schools, cases are positioned to influence students' perceptions of the real business landscape (Jackson 2003; Karns 2005). If certain demographic groups are underrepresented in these cases, students may normalize the idea that these groups are not and do not need to be represented in the business community. Students carry

such unconscious biases into their managerial careers (Banaji, Bhaskar, and Brownstein 2015), contributing to an environment where People of Color hold few corporate leadership roles (DeHaas, Akutagawa, and Spriggs 2019) and face substantial hiring discrimination in the white-collar sector (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Ford et al. 2004; Jowell and Prescott-Clarke 1970; Rubinstein and Brenner 2014). It is therefore incumbent upon business schools to examine and remedy racial and ethnic inequities in their curricula, an area where most fall short (Aguilar, Bracey, and Allen 2012). The goal of this work is to take a first step towards doing so, by quantifying the representation of People of Color and Hispanic people in business school case studies and investigating common themes in the cases in which they do appear.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we review the existing literature related to the representation of People of Color and Hispanic people in educational materials; by placing this into the larger context of racial and ethnic discrimination in the United States, we describe the motivation for our research and our novel contributions. We then lay out our methodology for this study before moving onto our results and discussion, including our recommendations for short-term steps towards increased equity. Our summary and conclusions finalize the paper.

Review of Literature
Representation of Minority Racial and Ethnic Groups in Teaching Materials
In the United States, investigations into the representation of minority racial and ethnic groups in school curricula date back as far as the 1960's, with initial surveys finding inequitable portrayals of minority ethnic groups in elementary and secondary textbooks (Gast 1967; Marcus 1961). For example, both Marcus (1961) and Carpenter and Rank (1968) found that the majority of American history textbooks portrayed Black people as either slaves or newly made freedmen, though it had been nearly a century since emancipation. These portrayals entirely ignored the societal contributions of Black people post-Reconstruction as well as their place in contemporary society, feeding into stereotypes of Black people as childlike or lacking agency. The demands of groups such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Black Panthers, and the Anti-Defamation League led to improvements throughout the 1960's and 1970's, as textbook publishers included more, and more contemporary, depictions of Black and Jewish people (FitzGerald 1979; McCarthy 1990; Zimmerman 2004). However, stereotyping and underrepresentation continued well beyond the Civil Rights Era, negatively impacting not only the minority racial groups (Charles 1989; Fordham and Ogbu 1986; Garcia 1999), but failing to prepare White students to live in a multicultural world (Wolf 1992).

More recently, authors have turned their attention to the representation of historically marginalized groups in textbooks at the university level. Across a number of disciplines, there is a disproportionately low number of women (Hardin, Dodd, and Lauffer 2006; Stevenson and Zlotnik 2018; Tietz,2007), People of Color (Foxman and Easterling 1999), and people with disabilities (Powers and Haller 2017) represented in teaching materials used in higher education. This lack of visibility contributes to the reproduction of gender, racial, and other social hierarchies within the higher education classroom; even in the confines of the most liberal institutions, groups other than White males experience marginalization (Ghosh 2008; Grier and Poole 2020; Margolis 2001; Minefee et.al 2018; Moshiri and Cardon 2019; Pawley 2017).

Racial and Ethnic Inequity in the Business World

Teaching materials are just one piece of a larger issue with institutional racism in management education. Business schools in the United States struggle to attract and retain students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups (Moshiri and Cardon 2019; Grier and Poole 2020), which Minefee et al. (2018) attribute to "discriminatory evaluation, knowledge- and -resource-hoarding, and the preservation of dominant group identities." In academia more generally, Bell, Berry, Leopold, and Nkomo (2021) relate specific experiences of Black women scholars in the context of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, and call for action from White people in the dismantling of White supremacy. Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, and Rivera (2009) find that microaggressions in the university classroom, and their subsequent poor handling by White professors, cause students of color to feel invalidated, insulted, and denigrated.

Generally, business schools hope that what they teach their students will be remembered and used in their careers post-graduation. Unfortunately, this can include not just the skills and knowledge they have gained, but any unconscious biases as well. While plenty of authors have written about the business case for racial equity (Blackwell et al. 2017; Richard, 2000; Slater, Weigand, and Zwirlein 2008; Turner 2016;), the United States business community remains a hostile environment for People of Color and Hispanic people (Dickens and Chavez 2018; Holloway-Friesen 2018; Sisco 2020; Smith et al. 2019). Black and Hispanic people are underrepresented in management, business, and financial operations occupations; and American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander people lack even enough representation to appear in recent reports from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (Bureau of Labor Statistics [USBLS] 2010). The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission received 32,003 complaints of discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in 2020 (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 2021). Black business owners consistently underperform as compared to their White counterparts (Bates 1989; Fairlie, Robb, and Robinson 2020; Köllinger and Minniti 2006), in spite of the fact that Black Americans are more likely to attempt to start a business. This is caused by barriers such as weak internal markets and lack of access to credit, a finding that Blanchflower (2004) also observes for women and Hispanic people.

Plenty of well-known American and multinational companies have tried to improve this climate by launching high-profile diversity initiatives (Stoller 2021; Wentling and Palma-Rivas 2000), but many are centered around diversity training or mentoring programs that substitute a general acknowledgement of cultural differences for meaningful change in policies on recruitment and advancement (Dobbin and Kalev 2019; Dobbin and Kelly 2007; Maiorescu and Wrigley 2016; Roberson 2019). Though training specifically focused on unconscious bias has been in vogue in the last decade, White people confronted with their own racial biases often react defensively. Research is therefore inconclusive about whether training that focuses foremost on "admitting" to bias can be effective (Emerson 2017; Noon 2018). Ultimately, the corporate diversity initiatives popular for the last twenty years have done little to reduce the dominance of White people in their organizations (Briscoe and Gupta 2016; Dennissen, Benschop, and van den Brink 2019; Ray 2019).

Motivation

Given the many barriers faced by People of Color and Hispanic people in the business

community, progress toward equity will require many solutions. Representation in business school teaching cases is one such solution, which we find promising in its practicality. There is evidence that biases may be unlearned through subtle exposure to counter-stereotypical examples of group members, and that this approach is likely to encounter little resistance from the dominant group (Devine, Forscher, Austin, and Cox 2012; Madva 2017; Tropp and Godsil 2015). Students may be especially susceptible to being influenced by to representation as presented in case studies, as compared to textbooks or fictional narratives, because of the cases' purported "realism." In general, business school instructors find value in case studies beyond the specific concepts being trained, because the use of specific details, such as a named protagonist and recreated dialogue, also socializes students into the norms of the business world (Ehrensal 2016; Stewart 1991). Taking a more critical view, Liang and Wang (2004) argue that case studies are presented to students as a depiction of reality, even when they take too narrow an approach to the people and organizations portrayed.

Previous studies that have looked at diversity in business school case studies have largely focused on the underrepresentation of women. Symons and Iberra (2014) found that fewer than 10% of the best-selling and award-winning cases from The Case Centre had female protagonists, while Sharen and McGowan (2019) found that when there were female protagonists, they were given cliched female traits, like being risk-averse and less decisive than their male counterparts. Soule, Drabkin, and Mackenzie (2019) investigate both gender and ethnic stereotypes found in case studies but focus largely on specific examples of stereotyping and how case authors can avoid them.

While there exists speculation that People of Color are underrepresented in business school case studies (Ethier 2017, our work is unique in that it empirically tests this hypothesis. Our contributions to the literature are as follows: 1) We develop a method for quantifying the number of case protagonists from each of the five United States Census-recognized racial groups and the Hispanic ethnic group; 2) We apply this system to the 2018 best-selling cases from a major case distributor; 3) We show that, as compared to the racial and ethnic composition of the United States population, Black and Hispanic people are underrepresented in business school teaching cases, while non-Hispanic White and Asian people are overrepresented; and 4) We conclude with suggestions for how authors, instructors, publishers, and distributors of case studies can take steps towards more equitable representation.

Methodology
We tested the following hypotheses:

> Hypothesis 1: The percentage of protagonists in case studies who are People of Color is less than the percentage of People of Color in the general population.
>
> Hypothesis 2: The percentage of protagonists in case studies who are Hispanic people is less than the percentage of Hispanic people in the general population.
>
> Hypothesis 3: The percentage of non-Hispanic White protagonists in case studies is greater than the percentage of non-Hispanic White people in the general population.

Sampling Frame

Mimicking the sampling methodology used by Symons and Iberra (2014), we used the 2018 best-selling cases in each business discipline from *The Case Centre*, a large distributor of cases from a variety of publishers, as our sample set. Best-sellers make sense as a sample set because they are, by definition, the cases that have the largest impact on business students. This gave us a broad cross-section of both business disciplines and case publishers, and by using best-selling cases, we focus our study on those most likely to be read by students. The ten disciplines represented were: Case Method and Specialist Management Disciplines; Economics, Politics, and Business Environment; Entrepreneurship; Ethics and Social Responsibility; Finance, Accounting, and Control; Human Resource Management/Organizational Behavior; Knowledge, Information, and Communication Systems Management; Marketing; Production and Operations Management; and Strategy and General Management. This gave us an initial set of 145 cases. We then checked the case for at least one protagonist, which we defined as the character challenged with solving the business problem in the case. Typically, business students are asked to assume this person's perspective as they complete their case analysis.

After removing those without at least one protagonist, 106 cases from 32 different case publishers remained, with the majority being from Harvard Business Publishing (41 cases), INSEAD (9 cases), Ivey Publishing (7 cases), and Stanford Business School (6 cases). A full list of publishers included in this sample set is given in Table 1. Of these 106 cases, 98 had a single protagonist, and 8 had two protagonists. We therefore had a total of 114 protagonists in our sample.

Table 1
Frequency of case publishers in sample of cases

Publisher	Number of Cases in Sample Set
Harvard Business Publishing	41
INSEAD	9
Ivey Publishing	7
Stanford Business School	6
Babson College	5
Darden Business Publishing	4
IMD Business School	4
London Business School	3
Columbia CaseWorks, Columbia Business School	2
ESMT European School of Management and Technology	2
Singapore Management University	2
IBS Center for Management Research	2
Other publishers with a single case in our sample	19

Because we are concerning ourselves with American business students and considering representation in relation to the United States population, we further divided our sample set by the country or countries in which it takes place; we report results for cases based both in and out of the United States. We classified a case as taking place in the United States if its setting was at least partially in the United States, regardless of if the case spanned multiple countries. For example, a case concerning a United States-based company seeking to expand its profile in Japan

was considered to be United States-based, because the focus was largely on the dilemma faced by United States-based executives, and would therefore contribute to students' perceptions of the United States business environment.

Methods of Racial Categorization

In defining "underrepresentation," we compared the percentage of case protagonists of a given race/ethnicity in our sample with the percentage of the general population that identifies with that specific race/ethnicity. This is consistent with how "underrepresented minority" is typically defined in graduate business education (Graduate Management Admissions Council [GMAC] 2018), and we consider representation in proportions equal to those of the general population to be the "ideal" case for which we should strive, even if that would mean People of Color and Hispanic people were overrepresented in case studies as compared to their representation in managerial positions. For example, Black people represent an estimated 12.8% of the population, but only 8% of students at AACSB-accredited MBA programs (Thomas 2020) 8.4% of the workers in management, professional, and related occupations (USBLS 2010). This is itself a problem that should be of concern to the business community, but is beyond the scope of this paper, and as such, we use the population percentage as our benchmark.

We divided protagonists into six categories of race and ethnicity based on the practices of the United States Census Bureau. We used the five racial categories from the United States Census: White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (United States Office of Management and Budget 1997), and additionally categorized protagonists as Hispanic or not Hispanic. Classifying people into both a racial group and by Hispanic or non-Hispanic presented a challenge, as people of Hispanic ethnicity may identify as any race. However, the vast majority of Hispanic people in the United States identify as White (United States Census Bureau 2010), and the percentage that identify as non-White Hispanic is too small to have an impact on our conclusions regarding representation.

A comparison of the percentage of people in each racial category in the 2010 census, those same percentages with Hispanic listed as a separate category, and the 2019 projections are given in Table 2. Note that the 2019 data are less precise, and therefore 2.2% of people are double-counted in both a non-White racial group and the Hispanic group. For precision, we use the 2010 United States Census data with Hispanic as a separate category for the remainder of this paper, and we have confirmed that our results are not sensitive to this choice.

Categorizing the protagonists by race is more challenging than the gender categorizations done by other authors, both because of the shifting definition of race itself (Helms, Jernigan, and Mascher 2005) and the lack of clear textual references to race analogous to gender-specific pronouns. Therefore, our categorization of "race" could more precisely be described as "students' most likely perception of the race of the protagonist" (cite: page #). For consistency with other research that has categorized race based on either last name (Fryer and Levitt 2004) or first name (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Jowell and Prescott-Clarke 1970), we included analyses of first and last names in our methods.

Another dilemma in categorizing case study protagonists by race is the difference between textual and visual cues. The case studies we examined exist as text, though some have

49

supplemental videos or pictures. Some students may read the case material and develop an image of the protagonist in their head based on textual cues alone. Others may do additional research to deepen their case understanding, and even the most minimal internet search will show pictures of the more famous case protagonists. Accounting for the differences in both student behavior and case formats required us to consider both textual and visual evidence of race and ethnicity present in how the narratives are stated, the supplementary materials, and readily-available external information.

Table 2
Racial makeup of people in the United States

Category	2010 United States Census Data		2019 Census Bureau Estimate
	Hispanic as a Separate Category	Hispanic Included in Racial Categories	Hispanic Included in Racial Categories Except White
Asian	5.2%	5.4%	5.9%
Black	12.6%	13.2%	13.4%
Hispanic	16.9%		18.5%
White, non-Hispanic	63.4%	72.6%	60.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1.3%	1.7%	1.30%
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%
Other	0.3%	6.8%	2.8%
Total	100.0%	100.1%[a]	102.2%[b]

[a]Totals more than 100% due to rounding.
[b]Totals more than 100% due to people double-counted as both Hispanic and a non-White racial category.

We therefore applied three methods of racial categorization to each case protagonist:
1) Last name categorization: We looked up the last name (family name) of each protagonist in the 2010 United States Census database provided by the federal government (U.S. Census Bureau 2011), currently the most recent data available. We then divided the percentage of census respondents of that name that belonged to a given racial and ethnic category by the overall percentage of census respondents in that racial and ethnic category to calculate a prevalence factor. We then categorized the protagonist as being a member of the racial or ethnic group with the highest prevalence factor.
For example, 94.9% of census respondents with the last name "Hernandez" are Hispanic, compared to 18.3% of all census respondents. This would give a prevalence factor of 5.2, higher than that of any other racial or ethnic group, and a strong indicator that someone with this last name is Hispanic. If a name was not found in the database, we listed it as "uncategorizable" by this method.
2) First name categorization: We looked up the first name (given name) of each protagonist in the database, Data Descriptor: Demographic aspects of first names (Tzioumis 2018). Using the same calculation used for last names, we calculated prevalence factors for first names and categorized the protagonist as a member of the racial group with the highest prevalence factor. If a name was not found in the database, we listed it as "uncategorizable" by this method. The use of first names as a signifier of race and ethnicity is consistent with guidelines published by Educational Testing Service (ETS),

administrator of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) for higher education. ETS considers it a best practice to carefully choose names used in the texts of questions to avoid negative feelings in test takers of any ethnic or racial group (ETS, 2016).

3) Subjective categorization: To account for other factors, such as the physical appearance of well-known protagonists, each of the two researchers independently categorized protagonists by race based on information both in the case and external to it. The first researcher is a second-generation American of Ashkenazi Jewish descent, and the second is an American of Black and Southeast Asian descent. The subjective categorization process included watching videos or any other supplementary material provided by the case publishers, as well as internet searches for the protagonist's image. We then compared any evidence of the protagonist's appearance to physical features characteristic of the various racial and ethnic groups, such as skin color, hair color, and eye shape. The researchers also considered textual clues such as surname prefixes. For example, the last name "MacCrain," while not found in the last name database, read to both researchers as White (specifically, Scottish or Irish) based on the "Mac" prefix. Though categorization of physical features and names is subject to difficulties that arise from the natural phenotypic variation within groups (Relethford 2009) the biases of the observer (Feliciano 2016), and the adoption of surnames via marriage, the Cohen's Kappa for interrater reliability was calculated as 0.971, indicating near-perfect agreement between raters (Cohen 1960; Landis and Koch 1977). If the two researchers were not in agreement, we listed it as "uncategorizable" by this method.

One example of a protagonist challenging to first/last name categorization but benefiting from subjective categorization is that of Elon Musk, protagonist of multiple cases in our sample. While neither his first name or his last name is common (Elon is not found in the first name database and Musk is found in the last name database as representing .00009% of the population), he is regularly featured in visual media in the United States and presents as a White man. We therefore assumed that students in American business schools would have a mental image of him as such.

After completing these analytical steps, if two of the three methods categorized a protagonist into the same racial group, we used that categorization in summarizing the results. We were able to categorize 105 out of 114 protagonists in this manner. We considered the remaining nine protagonists "uncategorizable." The latter was typically a result of names so uncommon in the United States that they were not found in either first name or last name databases.

Further Analysis Methods

We characterized each case protagonist as "real" or "fake" based on the information provided by the case authors in the teaching notes accompanying each case. For cases without teaching notes, or for which the protagonist's authenticity was unclear from the teaching note, we characterized cases based on their internet footprints. If an internet search for the protagonist based on their name and organization returned no results (except references to the case in which they were featured), we classified them as fake. In some cases, the entire company was fake; in others, the company was real but we could not find any profile of the case protagonist. In the latter situation, it's possible that the protagonist was based on a real person or was a composite of two or more people, so "anonymized" might be a more precise description than "fake." For our purposes, we

did not distinguish between anonymized or fake protagonists. In either instance, students reading the case would be limited to the case text for information about the protagonist. None of the cases labeled "fake" by this method had supplemental videos or other materials that would dispute this categorization.

Once the case protagonists were categorized, we counted the number of protagonists in our sample that fit each racial/ethnic category and calculated the percentage of all protagonists in our sample. Because our hypothesis specifies a specific direction in which the percentage of case studies will differ from the population percentage, we use a one-tailed test of proportion to determine the mathematical significance of our results (Ryan 1960). If the p-value for the test was less than 0.05, we concluded that the sample set provides evidence of either over- or under-representation.

Results and Discussion

A summary of our results is given in Table 3 as the percentage of cases with protagonists from each racial group alongside that group's representation in the United States population. For case narratives taking place both in and out of the United States, we see that Black people make up 12.6% of the population, but only 0.9% of case protagonists, while the percentages for Hispanic people are 16.9% and 3.5%, respectively. The statistical significance of the one-tailed test for underrepresentation of Black and Hispanic people are both $p < .001$, indicating it is highly unlikely that the true representation in case studies matches that of the general population, given what we've found in our sample. We found zero case protagonists in the American Indian and Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander racial groups. We cannot calculate

Table 3
Racial makeup of primary protagonists in best-selling business teaching cases as compared to racial makeup of the United States population, 2010

Category	2010 US Census Data with Hispanic as a Separate Category	Total Number of Case Protagonists	Percentage of Case Protagonists in Sample	99% Confidence Interval for Percentage of Case Protagonists	z-statistic	p-value
Asian	5.2%	12	10.5%	N/A[a]	N/A[a]	N/A[a]
Black	12.6%	1	0.9%	[0%, 2.9%][b]	3.77	<.001
Hispanic	16.9%	4	3.5%	[0%, 7.5%][b]	3.70	<.001
White, non-Hispanic	63.4%	88	77.2%	[68.04%,86.35%]	3.00	.001
American Indian and Alaska Native	1.3%	-	0%	N/A[a]	N/A[a]	N/A[a]
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0.3%	-	0%	N/A[a]	N/A[a]	N/A[a]
Other	0.3%	-	0%	N/A[a]	N/A[a]	N/A[a]
Uncategorizable	N/A	9	7.9%			
Total	100.0%	114	100.0%			

[a]Population percentage is too low to calculate a valid z-statistic
[b]Interval is truncated at a lower bound of zero

a statistically valid p-value or demonstrate statistical significance because of their very small percentages in the total population, but we still consider it salient that people from these groups appear in zero cases. This is consistent with the literature from adjacent disciplines suggesting that these groups are underrepresented in teaching materials (Carter 2002; Pewewardy 1998; Takeda 2016).

As shown in Table 4, if we only consider cases that take place in the United States, Black people are 1.7% of case protagonists, while Hispanic people are 3.3%. These again result in p-values of less than .001. The same is true for any combination of cases set inside/outside of the United States and real/fake protagonist groupings. In all cases Black and Hispanic protagonists are underrepresented in our sample to a degree that supports Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 with respect to these groups.

Table 4
Racial makeup of primary protagonists in best-selling business teaching cases broken down by setting and authenticity of protagonist

Category	Cases Set in the United States			Cases Not Set in the United States		
	Fake Protagonists	Real Protagonists	All Protagonists	Fake Protagonists	Real Protagonists	All Protagonists
Asian	0%	12.2%	8.3%	5.0%	17.6%	13.0%
Black	5.3%	0%	1.7%	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic	5.3%	2.4%	3.3%	5.0%	2.9%	3.7%
White, non-Hispanic	84.2%	82.9%	83.3%	85.0%	61.8%	70.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Uncategorizable	5.3%	2.4%	3.3%	5.0%	17.6%	13.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Asian and Pacific Islanders are overrepresented among case protagonists, with 10.5% of case protagonists coming from this group that makes up only 5.9% of the United States population. The small percentage of the United States population prevents us from calculating a reliable p-value, but it is clear that our hypothesis that all non-White racial groups would be underrepresented is not supported by the data. However, given that Asian students are overrepresented among business school students (GMAC 2018), and Asian people are overrepresented in managerial/professional occupations in the United States (USBLS 2010) and in business school faculty (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business [AACSB] 2020), it is unsurprising that they are overrepresented in business school case studies. This is also likely the racial group least vulnerable to exclusion from the modern business world, due perhaps to the rise in Asian economic power (Chen 2016) or the common stereotyping of East Asians as a "model minority" (Chou and Feagin 2015; Gardner 1992) in the United States.

Non-Hispanic White protagonists are substantially overrepresented, making up 77.2% of case

protagonists in our sample, but only 63.4% of the United States population. A statistical test of proportions returns a p-value of .001, indicating a degree of statistical significance that supports hypothesis 3: White representation in case studies is larger than that of the general population. The percentage of non-Hispanic White protagonists is even larger, 83.3%, for cases set inside the United States. Further, if we consider the protagonists that are uncategorizable, it is likely that students reading these cases will picture them as White (Ferguson 1994), given that White people comprise both the majority and the dominant group in the United States. If we combine "White" and "uncategorizable," the total is 85.1% of all protagonists and 89.5% of protagonists in the United States.

The degree of disproportionate representation is even greater if we look only at the cases in which the protagonist is not a real person. Table 5 shows the breakdown of racial groups for the 39 "fake" protagonists. White people are a larger percentage of this subset than of the entire sample, and every other racial or ethnic category, including Asians, is underrepresented. Hispanic people are better represented in this subset, with 5.1% of the fake protagonists having Hispanic names, but even this is less than half of the 16.9% of the general population that identifies as Hispanic. This is illuminating, given that a case author creating a fake protagonist (or anonymizing a real one) has the option of choosing any name they want. Increasing representation of non-White groups in cases that do not profile a real person would be as simple as choosing names that are more common in other racial groups.

Table 5
Racial makeup of primary protagonists in best-selling business teaching cases broken down by authenticity of protagonist

Category	Number of Fake Protagonists	Percentage of Fake Protagonists
Asian	1	2.6%
Black	1	2.6%
Hispanic	2	5.1%
White, non-Hispanic	33	84.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native	-	0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	-	0%
Other	-	0%
Uncategorizable	2	5.1%
Total	39	100.0%

In summary, our analysis show that Black people are underrepresented (hypothesis 1), but data for Asian, Native American and Alaska Native, and Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander is too scarce to draw clear and valid conclusions. We also have significant evidence that Hispanic people are underrepresented (hypothesis 2) and that White non-Hispanic people are overrepresented (hypothesis 3) in business school teaching cases.

The implication is that case studies are one way that business schools are failing to illustrate a multicultural business environment for their students. Very few Black and Hispanic people are depicted as case study protagonists, and some groups may not be depicted at all. Because case

studies are presented to students as accurate portrayals of the business world, the underrepresentation or absence of numerous racial groups as case protagonists implies members of those groups are out of place in the business world, and more specifically, in managerial roles. This, in turn, puts unnecessary stress on students from the underrepresented racial groups. This type of covert discrimination, or "microaggression," has been shown to cause low self-esteem and feelings of alienation for these students (Franklin 2016; Nadal et al. 2014; Sue et al. 2009). Research from STEM curricula shows that underrepresented groups experience "curriculum trauma" (Hancock and Pass 2020) that leads to apathy, academic fatigue, and internalized inferiority, and develop passive resistance mechanisms, including evasiveness and manipulation (Aikenhead and Jegede 1999).

The effects on White and Asian students are likely to be more benign, such as feelings of superiority and more active engagement with the reading material. However, a lack of diversity among case study protagonists may reinforce unconscious biases that will later lead to adverse actions against coworkers or potential employees from underrepresented groups. Ultimately, the effect on students of both underrepresented and overrepresented racial groups will be a reinforcement of the status quo in which People of Color are at a disadvantage in the business world.

Recommendations for Case Study Authors
Our results suggest that it is necessary for authors to be very intentional in either locating or creating non-White case protagonists. We recommend case authors do the following to improve the representation of Black, American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and Hispanic people (hereafter referred to as underrepresented groups) in case materials:
1) Consciously seek out people from the underrepresented groups to profile in case studies, rather than defaulting to protagonists already in their professional networks. According to the AACSB (2020), White non-Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Islander people make up 81% of business school faculty in the United States, more than 11 times the combined 7% total for Black, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian/Alaska Native faculty (another 11.9% are categorized as "unknown"). Given that White people tend to have the fewest People of Color in their professional networks (Ibarra 1995; McGuire 2000), choosing protagonists from among those with whom they have existing relationships will continue to be an exclusionary practice. One approach would be to intentionally network with Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) focused on racial or ethnic diversity. Many large companies have ERGs aimed at improving the experience of underrepresented groups (DiversityInc. 2018), and case authors could volunteer their time and expertise in the service of the ERG in order to diversify their own professional network. In addition to locating protagonists from the underrepresented groups, authors must listen to their input and accept their feedback without defensiveness to ensure they are properly representing their stories and voices.
2) Explicitly discuss race and ethnicity in teaching notes for cases where they are salient. Though controversies currently rage about how race and ethnicity should be discussed in the classroom (Flaherty 2021), authors cannot adopt a "color-blind" ideology without harming students (Annamma, Jackson, and Morrison 2017; Lewis 2001; Williams and Land 2009). Race and ethnicity have an impact on virtually any case that features an

interpersonal partnership, conflict, or negotiation between people from two different groups (Hernandez et al. 2019; Toosi et al. 2019). The teaching notes should therefore include an examination of power differentials and other challenges based on group identity in the recommended teaching plan.

3) Choose protagonists from underrepresented groups who are in ordinary managerial positions in organizations that do not have a racial or ethnic component to their business. Avoid stereotyping these protagonists as either wunderkinds or failures, as either portrayal has the effect of distancing these protagonists from the student readers.

4) When choosing a name for a fake or anonymized protagonist, choose a first name and last name most common among people of an underrepresented group. Symons and Ibarra (2014) note several case authors who changed the gender of the protagonist from male to female, as an attempt to provide more representation of women, and a similar approach could be taken to increase the representation of People of Color and Hispanic people.

Other Recommendations

It is also incumbent upon business school instructors to choose cases where People of Color and Hispanic people are represented as an integral part of the business community. While instructors are typically choosing cases to illustrate a specific idea related to their course goals, the Case Centre boasts of 61,700 cases in their library; the sheer number of cases available give instructors flexibility in their choices in any discipline. Having chosen cases with protagonists from underrepresented groups, instructors need to engage with the racial or ethnic subtext during case discussions, ideally guided by teaching notes that provide them with suggestions for doing so. While discussing race in the classroom may be challenging, a number of authors (Sue et al. 2009; Smith et al. 2019; Smith 2020) provide guidance to instructors willing to learn best practices.

Finally, the case publishers and case distributors should work to highlight cases that center around protagonists from underrepresented groups. This could include prominent positioning on the website, inclusion in communications to registered instructors, and creation of topic "tags" that make it easy to search for such cases. Further, case publishers should consider diversity when giving special recognition to cases or their authors, such as the awards given annually by The Case Centre. Others in a position to influence publishers should encourage and recognize diversity in case writing, as the dean of Harvard Business School has done in pledging to double the percentage of female protagonists in Harvard case studies (Patel 2014).

Conclusion

In the preceding sections, we have found that Black and Hispanic people are underrepresented in business school teaching cases, while White non-Hispanic people are overrepresented. We have also shown that Asian people are overrepresented in cases featuring real protagonists, and underrepresented in those with fake or anonymized protagonists. These results mirror analyses of textbooks in business and related disciplines, and, given the prominence of case studies and their claim to represent reality, case studies may be that much more significant in shaping business students' perception of the world. The negative effects of these perceptions can affect both the achievement and mental health of students from underrepresented groups, and instill feelings of superiority in students from the dominant groups.

Because we expect business school students to ultimately become members of the business community, inequitable representation in teaching cases can ultimately influence beliefs among business professionals of all racial groups. The belief that People of Color and Hispanic people do not belong in the business world can materialize in a myriad of decisions, from hiring and promotion to job assignments and compensation. Therefore, continued exclusion of People of Color and Hispanic people from teaching materials therefore reinforces a status quo in which these groups are excluded from lucrative career paths, face discrimination from employers, and lack access to the financial and social capital that enables successful entrepreneurs.

It is therefore incumbent upon everyone who writes, publishes, or uses cases in their classroom to rectify this disparity. Case authors should seek out and write about protagonists from the underrepresented groups. Those who use cases should choose those with protagonists from underrepresented groups. Publishers should encourage diverse case protagonists by highlighting such cases in their outreach to instructors and their awards.

As more and more organizations recognize the true importance of diversity and inclusion, it is critical that we prepare business students to lead in a multicultural environment. Appropriately representing all groups as protagonists in business school teaching cases is one opportunity for business school educators to develop our students to their fullest potential and contribute to a more racially just society.

References

Aguilar, Mariya Gavrilova, Pamela Bracey, and Jeff Allen. 2012. "Examining the diversity curriculum of leading executive MBA programs in the United States." In *Handbook of research on workforce diversity in a global society: Technologies and concepts,* ed. Chaunda L. Scott and Marilyn Y. Byrd, 18-37. Hershey, P.A.: IGI Global.

Aikenhead, Glen S., and Olugbemiro J. Jegede. 1999. "Cross-cultural science education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 36(3): 269-287.

Anderson, Espen, and William Thomas Schiano. 2014. *Teaching with cases: A practical guide*. Boston, M.A.: Harvard Business School.

Annamma, Subini Ancy, Darrell D. Jackson, and Deb Morrison. 2017. "Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 20(2): 147-162.

Anteby, Michel. 2013. *Manufacturing morals: The values of silence in business school education*. Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago Press.

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. 2020. Business School Data Guide (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.aacsb.edu/-/media/aacsb/publications/data-trends-booklet/2020.ashx).

Banaji, Mahzarin R., R. Bhaskar, and Michael Brownstein. 2015. "When bias is implicit, how might we think about repairing harm?" *Current Opinion in Psychology* 6: 183-188.

Banning, Kevin C. 2003. "The effect of the case method on tolerance for ambiguity." *Journal of Management Education* 27(5): 556-567.

Bates, Timothy. 1989. "The changing nature of minority business: a comparative analysis of Asian, nonminority, and black-owned businesses." *The Review of Black Political Economy* 18(2): 25-42.

Bell, Myrtle P., Daphne Berry, Joy Leopold, and Stella Nkomo. 2021. "Making Black Lives Matter in academia: a black feminist call for collective action against anti-blackness in the academy." *Gender, Work and Organization* 28: 39-57.

Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal?" A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review* 94(4): 991-1013.

Blackwell, Angela Glover, Mark Kramer, Lalitha Vaidyanathan, Lakshmi Iyer, and Josh Kirschenbaum. 2017. The competitive advantage of racial equity (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.uwwashtenaw.org/sites/uwwashtenaw.org/files/The%20Competitive%20Advantage%20of%20Racial%20Equity-final_0.pdf).

Blanchflower, David G. 2004. "Self-employment: More may not be better." *Swedish Economic Policy Review* 11(2): 15-74.

Bridgman, Todd, Stephen Cummings, and Colm McLaughlin. 2016. "Restating the case: How revisiting the development of the case method can help us think differently about the future of the business school." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 15(4): 724-741.

Briscoe, Forrest, and Abhinav Gupta. 2016. "Social activism in and around organizations." *Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 671-727.

Carpenter, L. P., and Dinah Rank 1968. *The treatment of minorities: A survey of textbooks used in Missouri high schools*. Jefferson City, M.O.: Missouri Commission on Human Rights.

Carter, Nancy Carol. 2002. "American Indians and law libraries: Acknowledging the third sovereign." *Law Library Journal* 94:7.

Charles, James P. 1989. "The need for textbook reform: An American Indian example." *Journal of American Indian Education* 28(3) 1-13.

Chen, Shaofeng 2016. "Rise of China and India and Implications on the global governance system." *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 9: 351-355.

Chetkovich, Carol, and David L. Kirp. 2001. "Cases and controversies: How novitiates are trained to be masters of the public policy universe." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management: The Journal of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management* 20(2): 283-314.

Chou, Rosalind S., and Joe R. Feagin. 2015. *Myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism*. New York City, N.Y.: Routledge.

Cohen, Jacob. 1960. "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales." *Educational and psychological measurement* 20(1): 37-46.

Contardo, Ianna, and Robin Wensley. 2004. "The Harvard Business School story: Avoiding knowledge by being relevant." *Organization* 11(2): 211-231.

Currie, Graeme, and Sue Tempest. 2008. "Moving towards reflexive use of teaching cases within the MBA." *International Journal of Management Education* 7(1): 41-50.

Dean, Kathy Lund, and Charles J. Fornaciari. 2002. "How to create and use experiential case-based exercises in a management classroom." *Journal of Management Education* 26(5): 586-603.

Dennissen, Marjolein, Yvonne Benschop, and Marieke van den Brink. 2019. "Diversity networks: networking for equality?" *British Journal of Management* 30(4): 966-980.

DeHaas, Deb, Linda Akutagawa, and Skip Spriggs. 2019. Missing pieces report: The 2018 board diversity census of women and minorities on fortune 500 boards (Online). Retrieved

October 29, 2021 (https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2019/02/05/missing-pieces-report-the-2018-board-diversity-census-of-women-and-minorities-on-fortune-500-boards/).

Devine, Patricia G., Patrick S. Forscher, Anthony J. Austin, and William TL Cox. 2012. "Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48(6): 1267-1278.

Dewing, Arthur Stone. 1931. "An introduction to the use of cases." In *A case method of instruction*, ed. C. E. Fraser, 1-5. New York City, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Donham, Wallace B. 1922. "Business teaching by the case system." *The American Economic Review* 12(1), 53-65.

Dickens, Danielle D., and Ernest L. Chavez. 2018. "Navigating the workplace: The costs and benefits of shifting identities at work among early career US Black women." *Sex Roles* 78(11), 760-774.

DiversityInc. 2018. The DiversityInc Top Companies for Employee Resource Groups (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.diversityinc.com/diversityinc-top-companies-for-employee-resource-groups/).

Dobbin, Frank, and Alexandra Kalev. 2019. "Are diversity programs merely ceremonial? Evidence-free institutionalization." In *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, eds. Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Thomas B. Lawrence, and Renate E. Meyer, 808-828. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: SAGE Publishing.

Dobbin, Dobbin, Frank, Alexandra Kalev, and Erin Kelly. 2007. "Diversity management in corporate America." *Contexts* 6(4): 21-27.

Dorn, Elizabeth M. 1999. "Case method instruction in the business writing classroom." *Business Communication Quarterly* 62(1): 41-60.

Educational Testing Service. 2016. ETS guidelines for fair tests and communications (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.ets.org/s/about/pdf/ets_guidelines_for_fair_tests_and_communications.pdf).

Ehrensal, Kenneth N. 2016. "Making managers: Towards an understanding of how textbooks, lectures and management case studies interact to inculcate linguistic and managerial habitus in undergraduate business students." *Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry* 14(2): 65-73.

Emerson, Joelle. 2017. "Don't give up on unconscious bias training—Make it better." *Harvard Business Review* 28(4).

Ethier, Marc. 2017. Hbs prof: Case studies need diversity now. *Poets and Quants* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://poetsandquants.com/2017/04/27/hbs-prof-case-studies-need-diversity-now/?pq-category=business-school-news/).

Fairlie, Robert W., Alicia Robb and David T. Robinson. 2020. "Black and white: Access to capital among minority-owned startups." *National Bureau of Economic Research* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (http://www.nber.org/papers/w28154).

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2016. "Shades of race: How phenotype and observer characteristics shape racial classification." *American Behavioral Scientist* 60(4): 390-419.

Ferguson, Kathy E. 1994. "On bringing more theory, more voices and more politics to the study of organization." *Organization* 1(1): 81-99.

FitzGerald, Frances 1979. *America revised: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century*. Boston, M.A.: Little, Brown, and Company.

Flaherty, Colleen 2021. "Nebraska's Critical Race Theory Debate." *Inside Higher Ed*. (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021

(https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/07/28/nebraskas-critical-race-theory-debate).

Ford, Thomas E., Frank Gambino, Hanjoon Lee, Edward Mayo, and Mark A. Ferguson. 2004. "The role of accountability in suppressing managers' preinterview bias against African-American sales job applicants." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* 24(2): 113-124.

Fordham, Signithia, and John U. Ogbu. 1986. "Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of acting white." *The Urban Review* 18(3): 176-206.

Foxman, Ellen, and Debbie Easterling. 1999. "The representation of diversity in marketing principles texts: An exploratory analysis." *Journal of Education for Business* 74(5): 285-288.

Franklin, Jeremy. 2016. "Racial microaggressions, racial battle fatigue, and racism-related stress in higher education." *Journal of Student Affairs at New York University* 12(44): 44-55.

Fryer Jr, Roland G., and Steven D. Levitt. 2004. "The causes and consequences of distinctively black names." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119(3): 767- 805.

Garcia, Jesus. 1999. "The changing image of ethnic groups in textbooks." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 75(1): 285-288.

Gardner, Robert W. 1992. "Asian immigration: the view from the United States." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 1(1): 64-99.

Gast, David K. 1967. "Minority Americans in children's literature." *Elementary English* 44(1): 12-23.

Ghosh, Ratna. 2008. "Racism: A hidden curriculum." *Education Canada* 48(4): 26- 29.

Graduate Management Admissions Council. 2018. Understanding underrepresented populations in the business school pipeline (Online) Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.gmac.com/~/media/Files/gmac/Research/research-report-series/rr-16-02-underrepresented-populations-v2.pdf).

Grier, Sonya A. and Sonja Martin Poole. 2020. "Reproducing inequity: the role of race in the business school faculty search." *Journal of Marketing Management* 36(13-14): 1190-1222.

Hancock, Stephen D. and Michelle B. Pass. 2020. "Combatting curriculum trauma in African American students." In *Seeing The HiddEn Minority: Increasing the talent pool through identity, socialization, and mentoring constructs*, ed. Andrea L. Tyler, Stephen Hancock, and Sonyia C. Richardson, 121 – 132. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Hammond, John S. 1980. *Learning by the case method*. Boston, M.A.: Harvard Business Publishing.

Hardin, Marie, Julie E. Dodd, and Kimberly Lauffer. 2006. "Passing it on: The reinforcement of male hegemony in sports journalism textbooks." *Mass Communication and Society* 9(4): 429-446.

Harvard Business School. 2020. The academic experience (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.hbs.edu/mba/academic-experience/Pages/the-hbs-case-method.aspx).

Helms, Janet E., Maryam Jernigan, and Jackquelyn Mascher. 2005. "The meaning of race in psychology and how to change it: A methodological perspective." *American Psychologist* 60(1): 27.

Hernandez, Morela, Derek R. Avery, Sabrina D. Volpone, and Cheryl R. Kaiser. 2019. "Bargaining while Black: The role of race in salary negotiations." *Journal of Applied*

Psychology 104(4): 581.

Holloway-Friesen, Holly. 2018. "Acculturation, enculturation, gender, and college environment on perceived career barriers among Latino/a college students." *Journal of Career Development* 45(2); 117-131.

Ibarra, Herminia. 1995. "Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(3): 673-703.

Jackson, Jane. 2003. "Case-based learning and reticence in a bilingual context: perceptions of business students in Hong Kong." *System* 31(4): 457-469.

Jowell, Roger and Patricia Prescott-Clarke. 1970. "Racial discrimination and white-collar workers in Britain." *Race* 11(4): 397-417.

Karns, Gary L. 2005. "An update of marketing student perceptions of learning activities: Structure, preferences, and effectiveness." *Journal of Marketing Education* 27(2): 163-171.

Köllinger, Philipp and Maria Minniti. 2006. "Not for lack of trying: American entrepreneurship in black and white." *Small Business Economics* 27(1): 59-79.

Landis, J. Richard, and Gary G. Koch. 1977. "The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data." *Biometrics* 33(1): 159-174.

Lewis, Amanda E. 2001. "There is no "race" in the schoolyard: Color-blind ideology in an (almost) all-white school." *American Educational Research Journal* 38(4): 781-811.

Liang, Neng and Shu Lin. 2008. "Erroneous learning from the West? A narrative analysis of Chinese MBA cases published in 1992, 1999 and 2003." *Management International Review* 48(5): 603-638.

Liang, Neng and Jiaqian Wang. 2004. "Implicit mental models in teaching cases: An empirical study of popular MBA cases in the United States and China." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 3(4): 397-413.

Madva, Alex. 2017. "Biased against debiasing: On the role of (institutionally sponsored) self-transformation in the struggle against prejudice." *Ergo: An Open Access Journal of Philosophy* 4(6).

Maiorescu, Roxana and Brenda Wrigley. 2016. *Diversity in Multinational Corporations*. New York City, N.Y.: Routledge.

Marcus, Lloyd. 1961. *The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary Schools Textbooks*. New York City, N.Y.: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Margolis, Eric. 2001. *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*. Hove, East Sussex, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.

McCarthy, Cameron. 1990. "Multicultural education, minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform." *Journal of Education* 172(2): 118-129.

McGuire, Gail M. 2000. "Gender, race, ethnicity, and networks: The factors affecting the status of employees' network members." *Work and Occupations* 27(4): 501-524.

McLaughlin, Colm and Andrea Prothero. 2014. "Embedding a societal view of business among first year undergraduates." In *Inspirational Guide for the Implementation of PRME*, ed. Alan Murray, Denise Baden, Paul Cashian, Alec Wersun, and Kathryn Hayne. New York City, N.Y.: Routledge.

Mesny, Anne. 2013. "Taking stock of the century-long utilization of the case method in management education." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences De l'Administration* 30(1): 56-66.

Minefee, Ishva, Verónica Caridad Rabelo, Oscar Jerome C. Stewart IV, and Nicole C. Jones

Young. 2018. "Repairing leaks in the pipeline: A social closure perspective on underrepresented racial/ethnic minority recruitment and retention in business schools." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 17(1): 79-95.

Moshiri, Farrokh, and Peter W. Cardon. 2019. "Best practices to increase racial diversity in business schools: What actually works according to a nationwide survey of business schools." *Journal of Education for Business* 94(2): 113-124.

Nadal, Kevin L., Yinglee Wong, Katie E. Griffin, Kristin Davidoff, and Julie Sriken. 2014. "The adverse impact of racial microaggressions on college students' self-esteem." *Journal of College Student Development* 55(5): 461-474.

Noon, Mike. 2018. "Pointless diversity training: Unconscious bias, new racism and agency." *Work, Employment and Society* 32(1): 198-209.

Office of Management and Budget.1997. "Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity." *Federal Register* 62(210): 58782-58790.

Patel, Alexander H. 2014. "HBS Dean pledges to double female protagonists in school's case studies." *The Harvard Crimson* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2014/1/31/HBS-women-case-studies/).

Pawley, Alice L. 2017. "Shifting the "default": The case for making diversity the expected condition for engineering education and making whiteness and maleness visible." *Journal of Engineering Education* 106(4): 531-533.

Pewewardy, Cornel. 1998. "Fluff and feathers: Treatment of American Indians in the literature and the classroom." *Equity and Excellence* 31(1): 69-76.

Powers, Elia M. and Beth Haller. 2017. "Journalism and mass communication textbook representations of verbal media skills: Implications for students with speech disabilities." *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 9(2): 58-75.

Ray, Victor. 2019. A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review* 84(1): 26-53.

Relethford, John H. 2009. "Race and global patterns of phenotypic variation." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 139(1): 16-22.

Richard, Orlando C. 2000. "Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view." *Academy of Management Journal* 43(2): 164-177.

Rippin, Ann, Charles Booth, Stuart Bowie, and Judith Jordan. 2002. "A complex case: Using the case study method to explore uncertainty and ambiguity in undergraduate business education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 7(4): 429-441.

Roberson, Quinetta M. 2019. "Diversity in the workplace: A review, synthesis, and future research agenda." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 6: 69-88.

Rubinstein, Yona, and Dror Brenner. 2014. "Pride and prejudice: Using ethnic-sounding names and inter-ethnic marriages to identify labour market dis-crimination." *Review of Economic Studies* 81(1): 389-425.

Ryan, Thomas H. 1960. "Significance tests for multiple comparison of proportions, variances, and other statistics." *Psychological Bulletin* 57(4): 318.

Sharen, Colleen M. and Rosemary A. McGowan. 2019. "Invisible or cliched: How are women represented in business cases?" *Journal of Management Education* 43(2): 129-173.

Slater, Stanley F., Robert A. Weigand, and Thomas J. Zwirlein. 2008. "The business case for commitment to diversity." *Business Horizons* 51(3): 201-209.

Smith, Gareth. 1987. "The use and effectiveness of the case study method in management

Young. 2018. "Repairing leaks in the pipeline: A social closure perspective on underrepresented racial/ethnic minority recruitment and retention in business schools." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 17(1): 79-95.

Moshiri, Farrokh, and Peter W. Cardon. 2019. "Best practices to increase racial diversity in business schools: What actually works according to a nationwide survey of business schools." *Journal of Education for Business* 94(2): 113-124.

Nadal, Kevin L., Yinglee Wong, Katie E. Griffin, Kristin Davidoff, and Julie Sriken. 2014. "The adverse impact of racial microaggressions on college students' self-esteem." *Journal of College Student Development* 55(5): 461-474.

Noon, Mike. 2018. "Pointless diversity training: Unconscious bias, new racism and agency." *Work, Employment and Society* 32(1): 198-209.

Office of Management and Budget.1997. "Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity." *Federal Register* 62(210): 58782-58790.

Patel, Alexander H. 2014. "HBS Dean pledges to double female protagonists in school's case studies." *The Harvard Crimson* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2014/1/31/HBS-women-case-studies/).

Pawley, Alice L. 2017. "Shifting the "default": The case for making diversity the expected condition for engineering education and making whiteness and maleness visible." *Journal of Engineering Education* 106(4): 531-533.

Pewewardy, Cornel. 1998. "Fluff and feathers: Treatment of American Indians in the literature and the classroom." *Equity and Excellence* 31(1): 69-76.

Powers, Elia M. and Beth Haller. 2017. "Journalism and mass communication textbook representations of verbal media skills: Implications for students with speech disabilities." *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 9(2): 58-75.

Ray, Victor. 2019. A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review* 84(1): 26-53.

Relethford, John H. 2009. "Race and global patterns of phenotypic variation." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 139(1): 16-22.

Richard, Orlando C. 2000. "Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view." *Academy of Management Journal* 43(2): 164-177.

Rippin, Ann, Charles Booth, Stuart Bowie, and Judith Jordan. 2002. "A complex case: Using the case study method to explore uncertainty and ambiguity in undergraduate business education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 7(4): 429-441.

Roberson, Quinetta M. 2019. "Diversity in the workplace: A review, synthesis, and future research agenda." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 6: 69-88.

Rubinstein, Yona, and Dror Brenner. 2014. "Pride and prejudice: Using ethnic-sounding names and inter-ethnic marriages to identify labour market dis-crimination." *Review of Economic Studies* 81(1): 389-425.

Ryan, Thomas H. 1960. "Significance tests for multiple comparison of proportions, variances, and other statistics." *Psychological Bulletin* 57(4): 318.

Sharen, Colleen M. and Rosemary A. McGowan. 2019. "Invisible or cliched: How are women represented in business cases?" *Journal of Management Education* 43(2): 129-173.

Slater, Stanley F., Robert A. Weigand, and Thomas J. Zwirlein. 2008. "The business case for commitment to diversity." *Business Horizons* 51(3): 201-209.

Smith, Gareth. 1987. "The use and effectiveness of the case study method in management

education-A critical review." *Management Education and Development* 18(1): 51-61.

Smith, Alexis Nicole, Marla Baskerville Watkins, Jamie J. Ladge, and Pamela Carlton. 2019. "Making the invisible visible: Paradoxical effects of intersectional invisibility on the career experiences of executive Black women." *Academy of Management Journal* 62(6): 1705-1734.

Sisco, Stephanie. 2020. "Race-conscious career development: Exploring self-preservation and coping strategies of Black professionals in corporate America." *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 22(4): 419-436.

Soule, Sarah A., Davina Drabkin, and Lori Nishiura Mackenzie. 2019. The stereotypes in MBA case studies. *Harvard Business Review* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://hbr.org/2019/06/the-stereotypes-in-mba-case-studies).

Stevenson, Betsey, and Hanna Zlotnik. 2018. "Representations of men and women in introductory economics textbooks." *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 108: 180-185.

Stewart, Ann Harleman. 1991. "The role of narrative structure in the transfer of ideas: The case study and management theory." In *Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities,* ed Charles Bazerman, James G. Paradis, and James Paradis, 120-144. Madison, W.I.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stoller, Kristin. 2021. "America's best employers for diversity 2021." Forbes (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.forbes.com/best-employers-diversity/#11ca98319b9e)

Sue, Derald Wing, Annie I. Lin, Gina C. Torino, Christina M. Capodilupo, and David P. Rivera. 2009. "Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 15(2): 183.

Symons, Lesley and Herminia Ibarra. 2014. What the scarcity of women in business case studies really looks like. *Harvard Business Review* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://hbr.org/2014/04/what-the-scarcity-of-women-in-business-case-studies-really-looks-like).

Takeda, Okiyoshi. 2016. "A model minority? The misrepresentation and underrepresentation of Asian Pacific Americans in introductory American government textbooks". *Journal of Political Science Education* 12(4): 387-402.

Thomas, Patrick. 2020. A decade-long stall for black enrollment in MBA programs. *Wall Street Journal* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.wsj.com/articles/a-decade-long-stall-for-black-enrollment-in-m-b-a-programs-11592393431).

Tietz, Wendy M. 2007. "Women and men in accounting textbooks: Exploring the hidden curriculum." *Issues in Accounting Education* 22(3): 459-480.

Toosi, Negin R., Shira Mor, Zhaleh Semnani-Azad, Katherine W. Phillips, and Emily T. Amanatullah. 2019. "Who can lean in? The intersecting role of race and gender in negotiations." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 43(1): 7-21.

Tropp, Linda R. and Rachel D. Godsil. 2015. "Overcoming implicit bias and racial anxiety." *Psychology Today* (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/sound-science-sound-policy/201501/overcoming-implicit-bias-and-racial-anxiety).

Turner, Ani. 2016. "The business case for racial equity." *National Civic Review* 105(1): 21-29.

Tzioumis, Konstantinos. 2018. Demographic aspects of first names. *Scientific Data* 5(1).

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Labor Force Characteristics by Race and Ethnicity (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/race-

and-ethnicity/archive/race_ethnicity_2010.pdf).

United States Census Bureau. 2011. "Frequently occurring surnames from the 2010 census" (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.census.gov/topics/population/genealogy/data.html).

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 2021. "EEOC releases fiscal year 2020 enforcement and litigation data" (Online). Retrieved October 29, 2021 (https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/eeoc-releases-fiscal-year-2020-enforcement-and-litigation-data).

Wentling, Rose Mary, and Nilda Palma-Riva. 2000. "Current status of diversity initiatives in selected multinational corporations." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 11(1): 35-60.

Wolf, Alvin. 1992. "Minorities in US history textbooks, 1945-1985." *The Clearing House* 65(5): 291-297.

Zimmerman, Jonathan. 2004. "Brown-ing the American textbook: History, psychology, and the origins of modern multiculturalism." *History of Education Quarterly* 44(1): 46-69.

Navigating Academic Mobility within the EU:
The Case of German Academics in the UK

Elena Samarsky[*]
University of Oxford

Introduction

The EU has a long tradition of supporting scientific mobility by establishing programs and initiatives to promote scientific exchange and by putting mobility and cooperation of researchers as a key issue within the European Research Area (Marimon, Lietaert, and Grigolo 2009; Ivancheva and Gourova 2011; Leemann 2018). Operating within the legal framework of the EU, and in particular the Freedom of Movement and recognition of qualifications (Heinz and Ward-Warmedinger 2006; Favell 2008, 2013; Koikkalainen 2014; Young, Humphrey, and Rafferty, 2014; Recchi 2015) contributes to academic mobility within the EU and to the internationalization of higher education.

With mobility becoming a more common experience among academics, scholars put forward questions regarding motivations, migratory experiences, and outcomes of such mobility. According to empirical research, career development is one of the main reasons for pursuing academic mobility (Guthrie et al. 2017; Kim 2017). A common narrative portrays academic mobility as a marker of career success, an integral part in obtaining permanent and tenure track positions, and – in some cases – a precondition for an academic career (Ackers 2005; Kim 2009; Guthrie et al. 2017; Herschberg, Benschop, and van den Brink 2018, Nikunen and Lempiäinen 2020). Other research shows that such mobility provides an opportunity to gain new knowledge and experience (Enders and Musselin 2008; Bauder, Hannan, and Lujan 2017; Cañibano et al. 2020) or to work for a specific institution or research team (Ivancheva and Gourova 2011; Gargiulo and Carletti, 2014). However, in addition to career-related factors, academic mobility might be facilitated by personal motivations or preferences. Richardson (2012) found that for some academics, mobility is associated with the desire to experience a new culture, or to have their children exposed to new cultures.

Critical research suggests examining academic mobility within the wider context of academic labor market. Accordingly, due to the neoliberalization of universities, reliance on external funding, and a growing number of project-based research, academics find themselves in precarious situations, such as lack of financial support, the prevalence of fixed-term contacts, and limited opportunities for promotion (Åkerlind 2005; Cantwell 2009, 2011; Ylijoki 2016; Herschberg et al. 2018). As a result, academic mobility can be viewed not as a personal preference, but rather as a way to manage these structural shortfalls of the academic labor

market. Shortage of permanent positions in the country of origin has been long identified as one of the facilitators of mobility (Musselin 2004; Ackers 2005, 2008). EU-level research shows that the number of post-docs that are employed in temporary contracts without prospects for permanent positions is only increasing (Åkerlind 2005; Cantwell 2009). Taking into account these developments, Ackers (2005) and Karaulova (2016) suggest using the term "forced mobility" to highlight the imposed nature of mobility among academics. I seek to contribute to this literature through further examination of academic mobility within the spectrum of voluntary (personal-preference) and involuntary (necessary) mobility in the context of the specific case of German academics in the UK.

When examining the overall experience of mobile academics, scholars demonstrate how gender and marital status may present additional challenges (Ackers 2004; Vohlídalová 2014; Başak and Van Mol 2017; Toader and Dahinden 2018; Nikunen and Lempiäinen 2020). In her research, Henderson and Moreau (2020) found that "family responsibility" — namely, providing care to family members — has a crucial impact on migratory experiences of academics. She suggests that using the framework of care helps us explain gender inequality in the mobility of academics and highlight the challenges associated with it. In a similar manner, in their empirical research, Leemann (2018) and Toader and Dahinden (2018) demonstrate the challenges in combining academic mobility with responsibilities of family life, and how mobility can lead to a financial and psychological burden. In this paper, I seek to add to this discussion and document the mechanisms through which family obligations impact experiences of mobile academics.

The review of the literature brings to light the importance of emotions in migration. In their book *Mobility Turn*, Elliott and Urry (2010) tackle some of the myths of mobility, suggesting that a mobile lifestyle entails high levels of anxiety, stress, and emotional hardship. Indeed, migration literature has long demonstrated that migration can be a destabilizing endeavor (Svašek, and Skrbiš 2007; Skrbiš 2008; Svašek 2010). Accordingly, relocating to a new country, adjusting to a new culture, reorganizing family life, and providing transnational care to the family left behind all contribute to emotional challenges (Ryan 2008; Butcher 2010; Fitzgerald and Howe-Walsh 2008; Ryan and Sales 2013; Baldassar et al. 2014). By incorporating emotions into a discussion on mobile academics, I seek to contribute to our understating of the factors that are particularly emotionally challenging.

Finally, using a specific case of German academics in the UK allows interrogating the impact of a particular national context on migration experience. The complex historical relationship between Germany and the UK is what makes this case particularly intriguing. The two countries have a rich history strengthened by trade, migration, and intermarriage of royals, and weakened by conflicting political agendas and wars (Panayi 1995; Manz, Beerbühl and Davis 2007; Steinert and Weber-Newth 2008; Duxbury-Neumann 2017). Most recently, and until Brexit, the two countries operated within the framework of the EU, which allowed visa-free migration of Germans to the UK. Despite being one of the top destinations for German academics (BMF 2015, 2019) and their large number within the British academia, motivations and migratory experiences of German academics in the UK remain under-researched. I seek to address this gap and contribute to the growing body of literature on the experiences of foreign academics in the UK (Åkerlind 2005; Cantwell 2009, 2011; Kim 2009, 2017; Antoschyuk 2019; Nikunen and Lempiäinen 2020; Pustelnikovaite 2021).

Data and Methods

The paper draws on data from a qualitative study of 35 in-depth interviews with German academics in the UK conducted during 2015-2016. In this study, a "German" refers to a national who spent most socialization years and obtained a degree in Germany and relocated following a job offer. To reach the target population, I posted adverts on university mailing lists and German societies' sites, contacted individuals directly, and attended German society meetings. Using a variety of points of entry, I was able to interview 35 participants, of whom 14 were female and 21 were male. The group varies in the field of expertise and consists of five language tutors, nine post-docs, seven lecturers, eight associate professors, and six professors. At the time of relocation, the average age of participants was the mid-30s, 20 of the participants were married and ten in a relationship, five were single. They had spent five years on average in the country.

Interviews were organized around the following topics: life before the relocation, reasons to leave and relocate to the UK, relocation practices, current situation, and future plans. Such a discussion examined migration not as an isolated event, but as a project in the context of the life course. I have conducted, coded, and analyzed all the interviews, and used Nvivo to simplify the organization of the data. Coding the interviews involved re-reading each transcript several times. The first reading was based on a preliminary coding scheme informed by the literature; themes that did not fit were coded separately. This flexible strategy helped to identify themes that were not considered at the beginning of the project, such as the role of transnational care. During the second and third cycles of reading, preliminary codes were subdivided into more specific codes, while new codes were organized into code clusters and themes. Reconstructing the data helped to examine the relationship between and within codes, and identify themes and subthemes. Each cycle was complemented with a literature review which was extended to include new themes uncovered in the analysis and helped to identify unique aspects and contributions of this research to the existing body of knowledge.

Between Voluntary and Necessary Move

"Because of the EU, it was easy to move here. It felt so natural." Such accounts were mentioned time and again during the interviews and were oftentimes the opening sentence to the discussion of how participants came to the UK. Such storylines portrayed migratory decisions as a personal preference, voluntary decision, and depicted mobility as cost-free, frictionless, natural and un-bureaucratic. The legal framework of the EU, and in particular the Freedom of Movement were mentioned as the main factors in simplifying mobility and employability in the UK. However, incorporating the wider historical approach, and in particular, the role of Germany within the EU, can add to our understanding. Germany was one of the core countries that contributed to the development of contemporary EU institutions, and one of the first countries to participate in the Freedom of Movement. Furthermore, German citizens, especially the highly skilled, are among the most mobile EU citizens within the EU (Eurobarometer 2018). Growing up in such an environment may have led some of my participants to internalize intra-EU mobility and hence view it as a voluntary, cost-free, natural, and rewarding experience.

All the participants in the sample relocated following a job offer from in the UK, which reflected their career stage and did not need to undergo additional training. Andreas, a researcher in his late-30s, was typical of many participants, who portrayed his relocation as an easy decision. While he did not intend to leave Germany, he accidentally came across an advert for the position

and because the job had matched his profile and research interest so well, he decided to apply. Once offered the position, he terminated his contract in Germany and moved to the UK:

> I came across this job posting for this project here. It matched my profile so well that I basically had to try and apply. I got the job and I could postpone the starting date a little bit (Andreas).

In a similar manner to Andreas, some participants articulated their mobility in terms of accidental opportunity, namely responding to a job advert or a job offer circulated via professional networks. Access to these professional networks was oftentimes associated with previous academic mobility and seemed to simplify the transition between labor markets. All of the participants had some experience of short-term academic mobility such as conferences and research visits. Consider the case of Bernhard, a lecturer in his early-30s. During his Ph.D., he attended a conference in Britain and here he met his future employer:

> I met people from this university at conferences, they contacted me about whether I wanted to apply for a post-doc. That was in February, and in October I started (Bernhard).

Such accounts were typical among both male and female participants, and are exemplary in regard to how previous mobility, and established professional networks facilitated academic mobility. Such data stands in line with what was observed by other scholars (Richardson, McKenna, and Dickie 2014; Herschberg et al. 2018; Antoschyuk 2019) who have long noticed the impact of social networks on job seeking and career attainment abroad.

Mobility of academics, as such, can be viewed as normalization of professional life (Ackers 2005; Kim 2009; Cantwell 2011). However, a deeper examination of participants' motivations showed that many of the stories were more complex moving on the spectrum from a voluntary accidental decision towards a necessity. In some cases, mobility was a necessity, imposed by employment structure and prerequisite for career success. Angelika was one of those participants who linked academic mobility to career development. A researcher in her late-20s, Angelika was intentionally searching for a post-doc abroad even though it meant she would be leaving her partner in Germany and engaging in a long-distance relationship for a while. She moved to Oxbridge following a three-year post-doc:

> First of all, I wanted to go abroad. Going abroad means broaden your horizons. But the second reason is if you want to develop a career in academia you should have international experience. You want to be good in your system, in your field, but also need to understand how it compares to other systems (Angelika).

This rich quote highlights the complex web of factors that impact academic mobility: desire for international experience as well as career development tactics. For Angelika and a few others, mobility was not an accidental event, but a thought-through, rational decision, necessary for an academic career both in Germany and elsewhere. Several studies in Germany found that the desire for international experience was the main motivator for academic mobility (Stahl, Miller, and Tung 2002; Ognyanova et al. 2014; Bauder et al. 2017). In their comparative study, Bauder

and colleagues (2017) found that academics in Germany or academics of German origin put a higher value on international experience than their colleagues from other counties. While this evidence is anecdotal, the benefit of temporary mobility for academics has some empirical support from the German national data. Accordingly, highly skilled, including academics, who have worked abroad for several years comprise the largest group of returnees and enjoy higher returns in the labor market (Ette and Sauer 2010; Seidler, Mau and Verwiebe 2010; Pantenburg et al. 2018; BMF 2019).

While participants like Angelica considered academic mobility as an investment, others perceived it as a way to escape the unfavorable conditions of the German academic labor market. Alex, a lecturer in his mid-30s put it this way: "Everybody knows that the academic job market in Germany is an absolute catastrophe." The main dissatisfaction stems from the hierarchical nature of German academia and the impact of interpersonal relations on professorial appointments. Those who did not have a strong personal affiliation or those who were uninterested in participating in the complex webs of intradepartmental relationships, saw academic mobility as a necessity, the only way of becoming a team leader or a professor. While Remhof (2008) identified the "road to professorship" among the main reasons for the emigration of German academics back in 2008, I find that this aspect is still relevant and may partially explain why some German academics pursue academic mobility.

For early-career academics, dissatisfaction with the German system was associated with an absence of early-career positions, high teaching load, lack of autonomy, and prevalence of fixed-term contracts. For those participants in my sample, academic mobility was seen as a necessity, a way to bypass fixed-term contracts imposed by the system. Echoing these remarks is Mathias, a lecturer in his mid-30s. While he initially wanted to stay in Germany, the lack of permanent positions has led him to seek employment elsewhere. As a result, he moved to the UK:

> In Germany, between PhD and full professor position there are no permanent positions. Basically, you do a PhD with 27 and you do not have any guarantee that you will have a permanent position before you are 40. I decided I would try the UK. The UK system is different, as an academic you can start at a lower level as a lecturer; this position is already permanent and quite independent (Mathias).

In their narratives, Mathias and others spoke about mobility as a necessity, a way to reshape employment and improve working conditions, rather than a voluntary decision associated with international experience. Observing how German researchers used academic mobility as a way to mitigate lack of professional opportunities was also found in other studies; Knerr (2007), Remhof (2008), and more recently Pantenburg and colleagues (2018), showed that dissatisfaction with overall working conditions and blocking careers in Germany was among the reasons for academics and physicians to leave the country.

According to my analysis, however, a permanent contract provided not only financial security, but also a sense of empowerment, freedom, and control, as well security for family life. For some academics in my sample, years of working under fixed-term contracts have interfered with their desire to start a family, raise children, and buy property. Theo's account is exemplary in this regard. Before relocating to London, Theo, a professor in his mid-40s, had a six-year fixed-term

contract where he worked as a team leader. Despite having a very productive career, once his contract ran out, he had no option to renew it or stay in the same institution. The necessity to move again together with his desire to start a family had led him to prioritize a permanent contract. As he could not find a position in Germany, once he obtained it in the UK, he moved:

> Because it is difficult to have this insecurity. Before you have a permanent position, you are under the pressure all the time that you might have to move to another city or to another country. This insecurity makes it very difficult to have kids. The security is for family, if you want to buy a house for example, you need a position where you can rely on a job for long-term, otherwise you don't get a loan (Theo).

Theo's account provides a complex insight into the consequences of fixed-term employment such as financial insecurity and delay in family formation and childbearing. For participants, like Theo, engaging in academic mobility not only had a clear career justification, but also a personal one as it provided a more secure environment for family life. While various bodies of literature show the negative impact of temporariness of employment on financial well-being of academics (Åkerlind 2005; Cantwell 2009, 2011; Giorgi and Raffini 2015; Carrozza, Giorgi, and Raffini 2017; Herschberg et al. 2018), my findings demonstrate the impact of short-term employment on a life course, such as postponing family formation and childbearing.

Being German in the British Academic System
Examination of the overall experiences of German academics in the British academic labor market has revealed a common trait: some participants have experienced occasional favoritism and positive stereotyping at the workplace. Claus, a post-doc researcher in his early-30s, noted the influence of his nationality on the workplace dynamics:

> I think a lot of the discrimination you get is positive: when people have the prejudice that you are hardworking, honest and punctual it's kind of boring but it's actually quite good. It's better than the stereotypes of being lazy and criminal. This has happened tons and tons (Claus).

Similar accounts of systemic advantage and favoritism within British systems was also registered by Wlasny's (2020) in her study on the everyday experiences of German nationals living in England. This relatively privileged position of German academics in the British labor market was accentuated in the case of dual-career academic couples of mixed nationalities. To illustrate the topic, consider the case of Sebastian. Sebastian, a lecturer in his late-30s, was offered a position in London where he relocated together with his wife, Philippa. Although they are both early-career academics, Sebastian, received his education in Germany, while Philippa obtained her degree in Portugal. During the interview, Sebastian reflected on the effect of gender and nationality on their mobility:

> It's true that a man has more opportunities, and it's also true that a German academic is better considered than a Portuguese academic. Just positive prejudice or negative, it's my feeling (Sebastian).

The topic of inequality, inclusion and exclusion of some categories of mobile academics is not new. In a wider context, scholars argue that inequality among mobile academics is due to old hierarchies of national institutions and historical systems of prejudices (Başak and Van Mol 2017; Kim 2017). Understanding such phenomenon of systemic advantage for German academics can benefit from applying national and historical lenses. Accordingly, until the 20th century, German emigrants enjoyed a relatively positive image with a specific admiration for German science and scientists (Ellis and Panayi 1994; Manz et al. 2007; Duxbury-Neumann 2017). Furthermore, despite the complex relations in the wake of the World Wars, historical analysis of official documents demonstrates a clear preference for German and Scandinavian foreign workers in the UK since the 40s (Steinert and Weber-Newth 2008; Salt 2009). Rare newspaper reports that focus explicitly on German migrants describe them as well integrated and occupying highly skilled positions. Taking into account these historical developments as well as positive media coverage of the German emigrants may partially explain the systemic advantage experienced by some of German academics in my sample.

Academic Mobility from a Family Context
One of the main findings of my study is documenting how participants reconciled their family responsibility and obligations with academic mobility. Indeed, migration doesn't take place in a social vacuum. It takes place within a wider social web of partners, children, core and extended family, and the impact on these relationships may be both emotionally and financially challenging. In my sample, transnational care namely addressing responsibilities towards parents in Germany was mentioned oftentimes. In her interview, Alissa, a lecturer in her late 20s, spoke at length about her experience. Alissa was offered a teaching job at Oxbridge; however, a few months after the relocation, her mother suddenly passed away. She tried to help her father and commuted between the countries weekly for a period of six months. Such travel interfered with her performance at work, and led to adverse emotional and financial consequences:

> It is very difficult to talk about Oxbridge as an experience. It was connected [to the death of my mother] and my father sold the house and we sort of lost our father because he found a new partner (Alissa).

Allissa's account was not unique or uncommon both among male and female participants, as many of the participants had elderly parents and had to address family emergencies. In a few cases, managing these obligations resulted in severe emotional stress, feelings of guilt due to a gap between what they were able to do under these circumstances and what was expected of them. In a similar manner to Alissa, several participants had to engage in extensive travelling which has led to financial burdens due to relatively modest salaries. Following the analysis, I suggest that more attention needs to be given to the role of transnational care and its impact on experiences of mobile academics.

Although the relocation within the EU provided legal opportunity to relocate together with partners and ensured that partners had similar rights, the reality of post-migration was more complex. Academics who relocated together with their partners faced another set of challenges, primarily associated with reconstructing the accompanying partner's social and professional life. Irrespective of the gender and professional portfolio of the accompanying partner, finding employment was both financially and emotionally challenging. The pattern is illustrated by the

case of Samuel and Sabine, both lecturers in their mid-40s. The couple relocated to London after Samuel was offered a position. Seeing Samuel's fast and seemingly frictionless transition between the German and British academic labor markets, Sabine decided to terminate her contract in Germany. Despite having similar qualifications and employment history, it took Sabine almost two years to find a job:

> We were very naïve in terms of thinking that there are so many opportunities and she is going to wander into the next office and get a job offer. But [there] were so many jobs and so much competition that she really struggled. She really did struggle (Samuel).

The experience of Samuel and Sabine brings the importance of emotions in academic mobility to light. While the majority experienced a relatively easy transition employment-wise, the impact of mobility on the wider social and family context was more complicated and problematic at times. As a result, anxiety, stress, and emotional challenges were common migratory experiences for both male and female participants. Challenges in combining academic mobility and family life have been addressed by some scholars (Vohlídalová 2014; Leemann 2018; Toader and Dahinden 2018). However, more attention should be paid to the topic in order to fully understand the emotional aspect of academic mobility.

Migratory experiences of the academics with children were even more complex. In this study, a third of participants had at least one child, predominantly toddlers and/or pre-school age, and all except one have moved together with their children. Participants with older children have inquired about the school system and have secured a place in a school of their preference prior to the move. However, those who relocated with younger children reported to have done little research before the relocation and found rearranging their child's life to be unexpectedly challenging. The most common challenges encountered were lack of familiarity with the local school systems and costs of nurseries and pre-school facilities. These concerns were echoed by Jens, a professor in his mid-40s, who moved to the UK with his wife and a child. Like many others, he attributed the lack of research on schooling to the assumed similarity between the British and German systems, common European history, and the perceived prestige of the British education system. Upon reflecting on the point, Jens acknowledged that knowing about this difference would have altered his relocation strategies and dwelling preference:

> I think we should've discussed schooling. If you come from Germany, you take for granted good schools. And here, you have to make sure you're in the right neighborhood. We chose the place to live purely on logistical reasons, like how close it is to the center, and did not consider schooling. We should have. We didn't know (Jens).

The growing research examines the influence of having children on migration (Bailey Blake, and Cooke 2004; Ryan and Sales 2013; Ryan and Mulholand 2014). However, research on the role of children in mobility of academics is still relatively scarce (Vohlídalová 2014, Henderson and Moreau 2020). My analysis contributes to this literature and shows that incorporating the wider family context of parents, partners, and children provides a better understanding of the spectrum of migratory experiences of mobile academics.

Brexit - Unexpected challenges

Although many participants have initially chosen to relocate within the EU to minimize the costs associated with legal barriers, they found themselves in the exact situation they had tried to avoid due to Brexit. Namely, insecurity over their legal and social status as well as labor rights. Unexpected events such as Brexit remind us that migration takes place within a specific national context and shows how fragile migration systems can be.

For many German participants, ensuring access to their pension deposits in the UK after they leave the country was the most common concern associated with Brexit. This was the case for both those who came for short-term employment as well as those who spent several years in the country. Steffan, a researcher in his late-30s, moved to the UK a few years ago with his girlfriend, and although both were employed, he was not sure if they would stay for longer. However, when reflecting on future mobility he expressed his concern about how Brexit and pension schemes might impact his decision to stay or leave:

> Again, the conditions are what scared us the most. My pension was essentially made in the UK — we do not know how the negotiations are going to develop (Steffan).

Oftentimes, the discussion of Brexit involved an emotional response articulated in terms of frustration and feeling unwelcome. Incorporating a historical and national lens helps to understand the observed emotional response. Indeed, growing up in Germany and enjoying intra-EU mobility for years have resulted in internalization of mobility, and collision between these experiences and opinions and the anti-EU sentiments expressed in Britain has led to this response. Mark, a professor in his early-40s, was one of such participants. After having several short-term contracts in Germany, he was happy to find permanent employment in the UK. Originally, he intended to stay in the UK until retirement, and as a result, he moved together with his girlfriend and planned to start a family. However, Brexit has interfered with his plan and left him frustrated and insecure about his future:

> It was really meant to be until retirement. Brexit can be frustrating for foreigners and adds to insecurities. We are not the biggest fans of the UK politics and that is why we would also accept something back in Germany or Switzerland (Mark).

Similar to Mark, other participants have contemplated returning to Germany or relocating elsewhere earlier than anticipated. Such findings stand in line with other research on Brexit (Ryan 2015; Lulle, Moroşanu, and King 2018; D'Angelo and Kofman 2018; Owen 2018; McCarthy 2019). However, according to my analysis, such an opinion was prevalent among those who arrived more recently, while those participants who spent years in the country, had enrolled children in school, or had employed partners, were more hesitant. Overall, this analysis highlights the complexities of response to Brexit. For instance, working at well-renowned universities, such as Oxbridge, and securing permanent contracts might outweigh the negative impact of Brexit for some academics. For others, however, legal preconditions and financial requirements associated with it, insecurity over pension as well as anti-EU sentiments reduce the attractiveness of the UK academic system and may redirect their migratory plans.

Conclusion

Using data from a qualitative study of German academics in the UK, I aimed to interrogate and document the motivations and migratory experience of mobile academics. According to the analysis while some participants articulated mobility as a voluntary decision, others saw it as a necessity, a way to overcome lack of professional opportunities and dissatisfaction with the German academic labor market. Following relocation, I found that many have enjoyed systemic advantages and a privileged position within the British labor market. This phenomenon can be attributed to historical relationships between the two countries and shows how the national context impacts systems of inclusion and exclusion of academics within the local labor market. However, even in the case of a seemingly frictionless transition between the two academic labor markets, participants had to manage stressful situations, family-related responsibilities and address unexpected challenges. By incorporating the wider context, I demonstrate the costs and challenges as well as the emotional burdens associated with pursuing academic mobility. For example, managing emergencies in Germany, securing employment of accompanying partners and childcare posed additional challenges for mobile academics. Finally, unexpected events like Brexit also contributed to stress and added insecurity about the future.

References

Ackers, Louise. 2004. "Managing Relationships in Peripatetic Careers: Scientific Mobility in the European Union". *Women's Studies International Forum* 27(3): 189-201.

Ackers, Louise. 2005. "Moving people and knowledge: Scientific mobility in the European Union." *International migration* 43(5): 99-131.

Ackers, Louise. 2008. "Internationalisation, mobility and metrics: A new form of indirect discrimination?" *Minerva* 46(4): 411-435.

Åkerlind, Gerlese. 2005. "Postdoctoral researchers: roles, functions and career prospects." *Higher Education Research & Development* 24(1): 21-40.

Antoschyuk, Irina. 2019. "Migrating Step by Step. Russian Computer Scientists in the UK." In *From Russia with Code: Programming Migrations in Post-Soviet Times,* ed. Mario Biagioli, and Vincent Lépinay, 269-296. Durham, USA: Duke University Press.

Baldassar, Loretta, Majella Kilkey, Laura Merla, and Raelene Wilding. 2014. "Transnational Families." In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families,* ed. Judith Treas, Jacqueline Scott, and Martin Richard, 431-443. UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Başak, Bilecen and Christof Van Mol. 2017. "Introduction: international academic mobility and inequalities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43(8): 1241-1255.

Bauder, Harald, Charity-Ann Hannan, and Omar Lujan. 2017. "International experience in the academic field: knowledge production, symbolic capital, and mobility fetishism." *Population, Space and Place* 23(6).

BMF. 2015. Migrationsbericht des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge im Auftrag der Bundesregierung (Migrationsbericht 2013). Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge

BMF. 2019. Migrationsbericht des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge im Auftrag der Bundesregierung (Migrationsbericht 2016/2017). Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.

Butcher, Melissa. 2010. "From 'Fish out of Water'to 'Fitting In': The Challenge of Re-placing Home in a Mobile World." *Population, Space and Place* 16(1): 23-36.

Cañibano, Carolina, Pablo D'Este, Javier Otamendi, and Richard Woolley. 2020. "Scientific careers and the mobility of European researchers: an analysis of international mobility by career stage." *Higher Education* 80(6): 1175-1193.

Cantwell, Brendan. 2009. "International postdocs: Educational migration and academic production in a global market." Ph.D. Thesis. The University of Arizona.

Cantwell, Brendan. 2011. "Transnational mobility and international academic employment: Gatekeeping in an academic competition arena." *Minerva* 49(4): 425-445.

Carrozza, Chiara, Alberta Giorgi, and Luca Raffini. 2017. "Brains and Bodies on the Move. A Research Agenda on Precarious Researchers' Mobility". In T*ransnational Scientific Mobility Perspectives from the North and the South*, ed. França Thais and Beatriz Padilla, 57-90. Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT).

D'Angelo, Alessio, and Eleonore Kofman. 2018. "From Mobile Workers to Fellow Citizens and Back Again? The Future Status of EU Citizens in the UK." *Social Policy and Society* 17(2): 331-343.

Duxbury-Neumann, Susan. 2017. *What Have the Germans Ever Done for Us? A History of the German Population of Great Britain*. Gloucestershire: Amberley Publishing Limited.

Enders, Jürgen, and Christine Musselin. 2008. "Back to the future? The academic professions in the 21st century." *Higher Education* 2030(1): 125-150.

Elliott, Anthony, and John Urry. (2010). *Mobile Lives*. England, UK: Routledge.

Ellis, Mark, and Panikos Panayi. 1994. "German Minorities in World War I: A Comparative Study of Britain and the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17(2): 238-259.

Ette, Andreas, and Lenore Sauer. 2010. *Auswanderung aus Deutschland: Daten und Analysen zur internationalen Migration deutscher Staatsbürger*. Germany: Springer.

Eurobarometer. 2018. European Citizenship. European Union.

Favell, Adrian. 2008. "The New Face of East–West Migration in Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(5): 701-716.

Favell, Adrian. 2013. "The Changing Face of 'Integration' in a Mobile Europe." *Council For European Studies Newsletter* 43(1): 53-58.

Fitzgerald, Ceili, and Liza Howe-Walsh. 2008. "Self-Initiated Expatriates: An Interpretative Phenomenological Aanalysis of Professional Female Expatriates." *International Journal of Business and Management* 3(10): 156-175.

Gargiulo, Floriana, and Timoteo Carletti. 2014. "Driving forces of researchers mobility." *Scientific Reports* 4(1): 1-10.

Giorgi, Alberta, and Luca Raffini. 2015. "Love and Ryanair: Academic Researchers' Mobility". *Forum Sociológico*. Série II. 27: 43-52.

Guthrie, Susan, Catherine Lichten, Emma Harte, Sarah Parks, and Steven Wooding. 2017. "International mobility of researchers. A survey of researchers in the UK". RAND EUROPE.

Heinz, Ferdinand, and Melanie Ward-Warmedinger. 2006. "Cross-Border Labour Mobility within an Enlarged EU." *Occasional Paper Series 52*. European Central Bank.

Henderson, Emily and Marie-Pierre Moreau. 2020. "Carefree conferences? Academics with caring responsibilities performing mobile academic subjectivities." *Gender and Education* 32 (1): 70-85.

Herschberg, Channah, Yvonne Benschop, and Marieke van den Brink. 2018. "Precarious postdocs: A comparative study on recruitment and selection of early-career researchers." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 34(4): 303-310.

Ivancheva, Ludmila, and Elissaveta Gourova. 2011. "Challenges for career and mobility of researchers in Europe." *Science and Public Policy* 38(3): 185-198.

Karaulova, Maria. 2016. Nanoscience on the Move the Impact of Global Scientific Mobility on Academic Research and Career Development. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester.

Kim, Terri. 2009. "Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education." *Intercultural Education* 20(5): 395-405.

Kim, Terri. 2017. "Academic mobility, transnational identity capital, and stratification under conditions of academic capitalism." *Higher Education* 73(6): 981-997.

Koikkalainen, Saara. 2014. "Strategies for Transferring Cultural Capital: The Case of Highly Skilled Finns in Europe." *Journal of Finnish Studies* 17: 155-179.

Knerr, Béatrice. 2007. "Economic Crisis and International Labour Migration: Costs and Benefits in Germany." *Migración Y Desarrollo* 8: 24-47.

Leemann, Julia 2018. "Free movement of people and capital and the standard of transnational academic mobility: Principles of governance in the European Research Area." *European Educational Research Journal* 17(6): 857-876.

Lulle, Aija, Laura Moroşanu, and Russell King. 2018. "And then Came Brexit: Experiences and Future Plans of Young EU Migrants in the London Region." *Population, Space and Place* 24(1).

Manz, Stefan, Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, and John Davis. 2007. *Migration and Transfer from Germany to Britain, 1660-1914 (Vol. 3)*. Walter de Gruyter.

Marimon, Ramon, Matthieu Lietaert, and Michele Grigolo. 2009. "Towards the 'fifth freedom': Increasing the mobility of researchers in the European Union." *Higher Education in Europe* 34(1): 25-37.

McCarthy, Helen. 2019. "Spanish Nationals' Future Plans in the Context of Brexit." *Population, Space and Place* 25(1).

Musselin, Christine. 2004. "Towards a European academic labour market? Some lessons drawn from empirical studies on academic mobility." *Higher Education* 48(1): 55-78.

Nikunen, Minna, and Kirsti Lempiäinen. 2020. "Gendered strategies of mobility and academic career." *Gender and Education* 32(4): 554-571.

Ognyanova, Diana, Ruth Young, Claudia Maier, and Reinhard Busse. 2014. "Why Do Health Professionals Leave Germany and What Attracts Foreigners? A Qualitative Study". In *Health professional mobility in a changing Europe: new dynamics, mobile individuals and diverse responses,* ed. James Buchan, Matthias Wismar, Irene Glinos, and Jeni Bremner, 203-232. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe.

Owen, Calypso. 2018. "Brexit as Rupture? Voices, Opinions and Reflections of EU Nationals from the Liminal Space of Brexit Britain". *Sussex Centre for Migration Research*.

Pantenburg, Birte, Katharina Kitze, Melanie Luppa, Hans-Helmut König, and Steffi Riedel-Heller. 2018. "Physician Emigration from Germany: Insights from a Survey in Saxony, Germany." *BMC Health Services Research* 18(1): 341.

Panayi, Panikos. 1995. *German Immigrants in Britain During the 19th Century, 1815-1914*. Berg Pub Limited.

Pustelnikovaite, Toma. 2021. "Locked out, locked in and stuck: exploring migrant academics' experiences of moving to the UK." *Higher Education* 82(4): 783-797.

Recchi, Ettore. 2015. *Mobile Europe: The Theory and Practice of Free movement in the EU*. Germany: Springer.

Remhof, Stefan. 2008. Auswanderung von Akademikern aus Deutschland. Grunde, Auswirkungen und Gegenmaßnahmen. Tectum Verlag. Marburg.

Richardson, Julia. 2012. "Self-initiated expatriation in Academia: A bounded and boundaryless career?" In *Self-Initiated Expatriation,* ed. Andresen Maike, Akram Al Ariss, Matthias Walther, 219-234. England, UK: Routledge.

Richardson, Julia, Steve McKenna, and Carolyn Dickie. 2014. "They Always Look at You a Bit Oddly: Women Developing Career Capital Through International Mobility in the Mining Industry". In R*esearch Handbook on Women in International Management*, ed. Kate Hutchings and Snejina Michailova, 367-394. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ryan, Louise. 2008. "Navigating the Emotional Terrain of Families "Here" and "There": Women, Migration and the Management of Emotions." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29(3): 299-313.

Ryan, Louise. 2015. *EU Citizens in the UK: After the Shock Comes the Strategy to Secure Status*. London School of Economics.

Ryan, Louise, and Jon Mulholland. 2014. "Wives are the Route to Social Life': An Analysis of Family Life and Networking Amongst Highly Skilled Migrants in London." *Sociology* 48(2): 251-267.

Ryan, Louise, and Rosemary Sales. 2013. "Family Migration: The Role of Children and Education in Family Decision-Making Strategies of Polish Migrants in London." *International Migration* 51(2): 90-103.

Salt, John. 2009. "International Migration and the United Kingdom Report of the United Kingdom." *SOPEMI Correspondent to the OECD*, 2009.

Seidel, Nana, Steffen Mau, and Roland Verwiebe. 2010. "Die Wanderung von Deutschen mit Mittleren Qualifikationen in Europa". *Hamburg Review of Social Sciences* 4(3): 171-192.

Skrbiš, Zlatko. 2008. "Transnational Families: Theorising Migration, Emotions and Belonging." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29(3): 231-246.

Stahl, Günter, Edwin Miller, and Rosalie Tung. 2002. "Toward the Boundaryless Career: A Closer Look at the Expatriate Career Concept and the Perceived Implications of an International Assignment." *Journal of World Business* 37(3): 216-227.

Steinert, Johannes-Dieter, and Inge Weber-Newth. 2008. "German Migrants in Postwar Britain Immigration Policy, Recruitment." In *German Diasporic Experiences: Identity, Migration, and Loss*, ed. Mathias Schulze, James Skidmore, David John, Grit Liebscher, and Sebastian Siebel-Achenbach, 217 -229. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Svašek, Maruška, and Zlatko Skrbiš. 2007. "Passions and Powers: Emotions and Globalisation". *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 14(4): 367-383.

Svašek, Maruška. 2010. "On the Move: Emotions and Human Mobility." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(6): 865-880.

Toader, Alina, and Janine Dahinden. 2018. "Family Configurations and Arrangements in the Transnational Mobility of Early-Career Academics: Does Gender Make Twice the Difference?" *Migration Letters Transnational Press London, UK* 15(1): 67-84.

Vohlídalová, Marta. 2014. "Academic mobility in the context of linked lives." *Human Affairs* 24(1): 89-102.

Wlasny, Miriam. 2020. "Intra-European Migration and Identity - the Case Study of Germans living in the South-East of England." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Surrey.

Ylijoki, Oili-Helena. 2016. "Projectification and conflicting temporalities in academic knowledge production." *Teorie vědy/Theory of Science* 38(1): 7-26.

Young, Ruth, Charlotte Humphrey, and Anne Rafferty. 2014. "Motivations and Experience of Health Professionals who Migrate to the United Kingdom from other EU Countries." In H*ealth Professional Mobility in a Changing Europe: New Dynamics, Mobile Individuals and Diverse Response,* ed. James Buchan, Matthias Wismar, Irene Glinos, and Jeni Bremner, 177-203 European Observatory Study Series 32.

Biographies of Authors

Amy David is a Clinical Associate Professor at the Krannert School of Management, Purdue University. She teaches experiential learning in operations management, as well as undergraduate and graduate courses in project management, production planning and control and supply chain management. Previously, Dr. David worked as Logistics Planning and Process Development Manager at USG and a Logistics Analyst at Medline Industries. She holds a Ph.D. in Industrial Engineering and Operations Research from the University of Illinois at Chicago, an MBA from Lake Forest Graduate School of Management, and a B.S. in General Engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Victoria Coats is an undergraduate student at the Krannert School of Management, Purdue University. With ties to business and medicine and a passion for diversity, she hopes to one day practice medicine.

Karen J. Foli, PhD, RN, FAAN. Foli's work is bound together by the lens of psychological trauma. With this theme, she has received funding to support investigations surrounding trauma-informed parenting for kinship parents, relationships between trauma and substance use in nurses, and nurses' trauma and cognitive control. As a nurse theorist, Dr. Foli conceptualized and disseminated a Middle Range Theory of Nurses' Psychological Trauma. She is also the recipient of numerous research and teaching awards and is co-author of *The Influence of Psychological Trauma in Nursing* (2019), an award-winning book for psychiatric/mental health nursing and nursing education. Dr. Foli is a fellow in the American Academy of Nursing and an associate professor in the School of Nursing, Purdue University, West Lafayette Campus.

Lynn Pasquerella was appointed president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in 2016, after serving as the eighteenth president of Mount Holyoke College. She has held positions as provost at the University of Hartford and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Rhode Island. A philosopher whose work has combined teaching and scholarship with local and global engagement, Pasquerella has written extensively on medical ethics, metaphysics, public policy, and the philosophy of law. Named by *Diverse Issue* as one of higher education's top 35 leaders, Pasquerella is a graduate of Quinebaug Valley Community College, Mount Holyoke College and Brown University.

Aparajita Sagar is Associate Professor of English at Purdue, specializing in postcolonial studies, cultural studies, and feminist theories and literatures. Her research and teaching focus on the Global South, and include Caribbean, South Asian and Asian American literatures.

Elena Samarsky holds a PhD in Sociology from the University of Oxford. Her research interest lies in understanding mobility of professionals using interdisciplinary approach and interlinking sociology of professions, industrial relations, and sociology of migration. Dr. Samarsky is currently a grant holder of Yuste foundation, Spain, working on her project "Understanding the role of the Freedom of Movement through the lens of Brexit". Before that she held several visiting scholar positions in Austria and Germany and was awarded several individual grants and awards for her work on EU migration and exclusion of migrants by trade unions. She received her BA and MA from Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.

Mangala Subramaniam is Professor and Butler Chair and Director of the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence at Purdue University. In her current administrative role, she focuses on providing opportunities to enhance leadership skills and professional development for faculty. She is the current State Co-Director of the American Council on Education (ACE) Women's Network of Indiana. Her forthcoming book (co-edited with Cristina Alcalde), *Dismantling Institutional Whiteness: Emerging Forms of Leadership in Higher Education*, is forthcoming 2022.

Laura Zanotti is Professor of Anthropology, College of Liberal Arts, at Purdue University. Dr. Zanotti is a feminist political ecologist and social scientist who partners with communities to support how Indigenous Peoples, Traditional Peoples, and Local Communities' livelihoods can be sustained and to identify the pathways that shape just futures. She is committed to feminist and decolonizing scholarship, and specializes in collaborative projects. She is an affiliate faculty at the Center for the Environment, American Studies, Native American and Indigenous Studies, and Latin American and Latino Studies programs.