

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications in Educational Administration

Educational Administration, Department of

Winter 2016

Left Unsaid: The Role of Work Expectations and Psychological Contracts in Faculty Careers and Departure

KerryAnn O'Meara

University of Maryland, komeara@umd.edu

Jessica Chalk Bennett

University of Maryland at College Park, bennettj@umd.edu

Elizabeth Niehaus

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, eniehaus@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

O'Meara, KerryAnn; Bennett, Jessica Chalk; and Niehaus, Elizabeth, "Left Unsaid: The Role of Work Expectations and Psychological Contracts in Faculty Careers and Departure" (2016). *Faculty Publications in Educational Administration*. 23.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/23>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications in Educational Administration by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

The Review of Higher Education

Winter 2016, Volume 39, No. 2, pp. 269–297

Copyright © 2015 Association for the Study of Higher Education

All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162–5748)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press. Used by permission.

Left Unsaid: The Role of Work Expectations and Psychological Contracts in Faculty Careers and Departure

*KerryAnn O’Meara, Jessica Chalk Bennett, and
Elizabeth Niehaus*

Faculty leave higher education institutions for many reasons, including higher salaries, more prestigious departments, lack of collegiality, a better geographic location, and to be closer to family (O’Meara, Lounder, & Campbell, 2014; Rosser, 2004; Smart, 1990; Xu, 2008). At the same time, research suggests that factors such as a higher salary and a more prestigious department are not really “pull” factors if faculty members are satisfied and thriving within their institution (Matier, 1990; O’Meara, 2014). Rather, faculty become predisposed to leave by virtue of dissatisfaction with certain aspects of their work environment (Daly & Dee, 2006; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004), which act as a “push” to either entertain offers or go looking for “greener pastures” (Daly & Dee, 2006). Embedded within these push and pull factors, and subsequent departure decisions, are expectations

KerryAnn O’Meara is Professor of Higher Education, Affiliate in Women’s Studies and Director of the University of Maryland ADVANCE Program.

Elizabeth Niehaus is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Jessica Bennett is a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at the University of Maryland—College Park.

and assumptions of what could have been, or should have been possible, in the institutions faculty members leave behind (Lawrence, Celis, & Ott, 2014; Trower, 2012).

Important research over the last decade has reinforced the role of work expectations and psychological contracts on advising relationships and faculty work lives (Benzoni, Rousseau, & Li, 2006; Darrah, Hougland, & Prince, 2014; Huston, Norman, & Ambrose, 2007). Early career faculty bring many expectations related to professional relationships, career advancement, and teaching to the door steps of their new academic homes (Lawrence et al., 2014; Trower, 2012). Regardless of whether these expectations are met, they are often left unsaid. Unfortunately, what is left unsaid can be a major factor in faculty departure.

This study makes a distinct contribution to the literature by examining the experiences of faculty who have actually left or are about to leave their university. It is rare in studies of faculty departure to have interviews with faculty who actually made the decision to leave, rather than those who simply desire to leave, because of the logistics and politics involved in gaining access to this group. Although intent to leave is a strong predictor of departure, more faculty intend to leave than actually do (Bluedorn, 1982; Daly & Dee, 2006; Rosser & Townshend, 2006; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004); thus understanding the factors that were pivotal in the departure decisions of those who actually left is important to understanding the phenomenon of faculty departure.

We focused our research on early-career faculty (i.e., assistant professors or associate professors within three years of tenure), the stage at which faculty expectations are perhaps most important. This is true for several reasons. First, research universities make significant investments in faculty recruitment and start-up packages. When faculty leave early in their career, the institution loses those investments without time to offset such expenditures with grants or other productivity gains (Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011; Trower, 2012). Second, advanced assistant and early career associate professors are often in a natural period of reflection regarding their relationship with their institution, considering whether they made a good decision to join a particular university (O'Meara, 2014; O'Meara et al., 2014). Additionally, faculty in research universities are often encouraged to obtain an outside offer the year they go up for tenure or as they negotiate a salary increase (see, for example, Kreuter, 2012). This can inspire consideration of other options, as part of the decision process is considering expectations met and unmet. Third, departments and colleges in research universities need early career faculty to stay responsive to trends and demands for new majors and areas of research. As the most recent hires, early career faculty reflect strategic decisions by departments about where they want to spend scarce resources to stay relevant and competitive in their field. Therefore, losing early career tenure track faculty means losing a critical department resource for achieving these goals.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We were guided by expectancy theory and its application to faculty careers (Daly & Dee, 2006; Lawler, 1994; Vroom, 1964) and the role of “psychological contracts” (Hart & Thompson, 2007; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1995) in how people behave in organizations. Expectancy theory posits that people “enter work organizations with expectations and values, and if these expectations and values are met, they will likely remain a member of their organization” (Kim, Price, Mueller, & Watson, 1996, p. 949). According to expectancy theory, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity will be influenced by the structural expectations faculty have for their work and whether those expectations are met (Iverson & Roy, 1994; Mueller, Boyer, Price, & Iverson, 1994). Faculty develop work expectations during their undergraduate and graduate education experiences, where they view faculty performing their jobs and are inculcated into the values and norms of both their disciplines and the academic profession (Austin, 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Nyquist et al., 1999; Rosch & Reich, 1996; Trowler & Knight, 2000). For example, Bieber & Worley (2006) interviewed 34 doctoral students and found that they fashioned a “script of the ideal” academic career through both undergraduate and graduate experiences with their faculty.

Many studies have found faculty hold expectations for collegial communication, equitable rewards, autonomy, and voice in organizational decision-making (Austin, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2014; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Daly and Dee (2006) found that when expectations for autonomy, communication and openness, and sense of fair rewards (e.g., distributive justice) were met, faculty were more likely to intend to stay at their institution. Alternatively, when structural work expectations were not met, faculty organizational commitment and satisfaction declined, and faculty were more likely to consider leaving their institution (Daly & Dee, 2006).

Expectations for procedural and distributive justice are particularly strong and relevant for tenure track faculty, who will be discouraged if they do not believe the tenure system at their institution is fair (Lawrence et al., 2014). Researchers have found there are a number of factors that can predict whether faculty members will feel their tenure system is fair, including number of years on campus, gender, the degree of feedback faculty receive from colleagues, and the sense of control and autonomy they feel in their work (Lawrence et al., 2014; Ponjuan et al., 2011). An additional factor in understanding faculty expectations is time. As faculty advance in their careers and spend more time on an individual campus, their expectations “adjust downward” (Lawrence et al., 2014, p. 177). Such findings suggest there may be a honeymoon phase that fades into the reality of everyday work constraints.

Organizational changes (e.g., changes in leadership, new vision/mission, new state level policies) also have an impact on faculty experience of met

and unmet expectations. For example, faculty experiences will be influenced by the degree to which their institution is “striving” or trying to move up in national and international ranking systems (O’Meara, 2007, 2011). When departments, colleges, and universities are striving for better rankings and prestige many “rules of the game” begin to shift. Faculty often find the expectations for tenure and promotion change, becoming more narrow (e.g., requiring faculty publish in only top 3 journals) and requiring more research, grant funding, and international awards (Gonzales & Nunez, 2014; O’Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011). If this shift occurs while faculty are on the tenure track or trying to advance to full professor, they can become disillusioned, as the expectations for their performance are not what they expected when they accepted the position. Faculty then have to decide whether to accommodate the new expectations and work toward them, ignore them, or leave (Gonzales & Nunez, 2014).

In sum, expectancy theory posits that all faculty will have work expectations. A general expectation that department chairs will treat faculty in the department fairly, or that there will be colleagues to collaborate with, are examples of work expectations. Faculty whose work expectations are met satisfactorily may be more likely to wish to remain at an institution than those who find them unfulfilled. Yet other factors, such as perception of job opportunities elsewhere will also influence intent to stay (Daly & Dee, 2006).

In contrast to a general set of work expectations, the concept of psychological contracts refers to “the perceived *mutual obligations* that characterize the employee’s relationship with his/her employer” (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994, p. 246). Psychological contract perspective is an outgrowth of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Hart & Thompson, 2007; Homans, 1974). Typically psychological contracts are unwritten and un verbalized; they can be focused on institutions more generally, but faculty are more likely to hold their departments accountable (Huston et al., 2007).

Psychological contracts are different from simple work expectations that new employees have of their employers. With work expectations, faculty have formed a general sense of the way they think things will be. When faculty form a psychological contract with their institution they believe an explicit or implicit promise was made and that the institution, department, or its representatives, have an obligation to fulfill it. The psychological contract is based in the idea that if they fulfill their side of the promise or relationship, the other side will fulfill theirs. Typically the faculty side of this mutual obligation is that they will perform well, in good faith, along the lines of their job description and what was discussed in entry. Faculty members who have formed psychological contracts with their departments have a stronger sense than someone with a general work expectation that their departments are obliged to meet their needs. They therefore have a greater sense of betrayal

when those needs are not met. Thus, a broken psychological contract is much more severe than an unmet work expectation. As Robinson and Rousseau (1994) described, broken psychological contracts are perceived as violations of trust—"broken promises produce anger and erode trust in the relationship and thus, are expected to have more significant repercussions than unmet expectations" (p. 247). Imagine, for example, that a junior faculty member is promised the opportunity to work closely with a top scholar in the field during his interview and subsequent offer. The scholar moves across the country to take this job because he feels he can learn from working with this academic. However, once he arrives and makes overtures to the senior colleague, he learns that the senior scholar does not wish to collaborate with him, and that there is not a culture of collaboration in the department. If this was the main reason he took the position, he may feel angry and resentful that an implicit or even explicit promise was not kept. This is harder to recover from than a general expectation that a department will be collegial and there may be opportunities to collaborate with colleagues.

Hart and Thompson (2007) outlined three kinds of psychological contracts that occur based on what the employee expects will be exchanged: transactional (when employees expect financial or other rewards for their time and efforts), relational (when employees expect job security, professional development, and membership in exchange for devotion and loyalty), and ideological (when employees expect that both they and their organization are committed to a noble cause). Researchers have found that relational contracts are more susceptible to damage by violations than transactional and ideological contracts (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). The categories are also not mutually exclusive; an employee can simultaneously form contracts expecting financial rewards, membership in a particular community, and that they and colleagues serve a specific cause (Hart & Thompson, 2007; Robinson et al., 1994).

The concept of psychological contracts has been applied to faculty careers before. Huston et al. (2007) studied psychological contracts among disengaged senior faculty. The authors found "contract violations" and unmet work expectations among disengaged faculty such as losing key colleagues, lack of collegiality, and gaps between policy and practice. Huston et al. (2007) found that "when implied promises have been broken disillusionment and disengagement ensue" (p. 506). Faculty members who experience a contract violation are more likely to be frustrated with their department or institution, and thereby may become more likely to leave (Bess, 1998; Turnley & Feldman, 2000).

The experience of broken psychological contracts can also differ based on the nature of the contract, how the contract was violated, whether it was violated for multiple faculty members, and why it was violated. In both work

expectations and psychological contracts, the comparisons that faculty make between themselves and others are important. Faculty will expect that if they are making appropriate investments and are taking appropriate steps, and others are as well, they will all be rewarded similarly. Alternatively, if faculty believe their outcomes are different than their colleagues for the same level of work or investment, they will likely feel relative deprivation (Darrah et al., 2014; Davis, 1959; Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Starr & Williams, 1949).

Graduate student experiences and social identities also influence new faculty expectations for their careers and appointments. Faculty who graduated from more prestigious doctoral programs tend to view their programs through a lens of prestige and are unsatisfied if the standards for students, time for research, and other resources of their doctoral program do not match their new institution's conditions (Morrison, Rudd, Picciano, & Nerad, 2011). Also, tenure track faculty bring their social identities (such as gender, race, sexual orientation) to their early career experiences, especially on the tenure track, and operate in specific cultures and disciplines. Each of these factors shape faculty experiences of the tenure process and their work environment either directly or indirectly (Lawrence et al., 2014; O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008).

This study builds on past research on faculty departure and careers by (a) examining the work expectations and psychological contracts of early career faculty who left and (b) considering influences on the formation of faculty work expectations and psychological contracts. The research questions that guided this study were:

- What work expectations and psychological contracts did leaving early career faculty hold for their careers at Land Grant University (LGU)?
- Were work expectations and psychological contracts fulfilled? If not, how and why were they unfulfilled or broken?
- What factors seemed to most influence the formation of work expectations, psychological contracts, and faculty sense of their fulfillment or violation?

METHODS

We were interested in the initial work expectations and psychological contracts of faculty members who left. We sought to understand if, from the faculty member's vantage point, those expectations were met and psychological contracts were fulfilled. A premise of our research questions is that knowledge and reality are the result of social construction and social exchange, and thus are always situated in layered contexts (Weick, 1995). Our goal was not to judge whether work expectations were realistic or objectively

fulfilled, but to understand from the participants' frame of reference what those work expectations and psychological contracts were, what influenced them, and how they factored into departure decisions.

Faculty experiences of work environments will be very much influenced by institutional context. Thus, we wanted to hold that context constant by choosing a single case study design (Yin, 2009). We chose a "typical" case (Yin, 2009), Land Grant University (LGU), which is in many ways typical of public research universities in the United States. It is highly selective in terms of admissions, serves approximately 40,000 students (roughly 70% undergraduate), and engages in extensive research activity, with over \$450 million in research expenditures. It is located close to a metropolitan area with a high cost of living but significant job opportunities for partners and spouses of faculty. In a five-year period (including three years before, and two years during this study), LGU lost on average about 2.6% of its faculty (with about 30–52 faculty leaving during any given year) due to resignation, not including retirement. These rates are comparable to those of other land-grant universities, such as the University of Illinois, which identified a 3% average annual departure rate over a seventeen-year period (Provost's Committee on Retention, 2009) and Virginia Tech, which noted a 2.3% average over six years (Amelink et al., 2003). The most recent administration of the National Survey of Post-secondary Faculty in 2004 identified a faculty and instructional staff attrition rate of 8% at public doctoral institutions, 70% of which were non-retirement departures, which is higher than LGU's average but includes a broader group of faculty (Neville, Bradburn, & Zimbler, 2006). LGU's institutional research suggests that, on average, 30% of those who resign are assistant professors, 29% are associate professors with tenure, and 41% are full professors. While the findings of this case are not generalizable to other institutions, there are many ways in which these findings may be transferable and have implications for other research universities.

The focus of the data collection was qualitative as we were most interested in participant constructions of work expectations and psychological contracts. Interviews have been found to be a particularly effective way to understand how individuals make meaning of phenomena in their work environments (Mills, Bettis, Miller, & Nolan, 2005; O'Meara, 2014). Participants were identified in several ways. We used primary informants in the provost's office and associate deans inside colleges to identify an initial list of early career faculty who had recently left or were leaving the university. As the research team engaged in interviews, our initial primary contacts continued to send us names of faculty to invite as new leaving faculty cases emerged. Also, a few participants notified us of early career faculty who had recently decided to leave the university. This was helpful because often colleagues know before the Provost and Deans offices. Leaving faculty were interviewed

between two months and one year after they made a departure decision.

There were a number of factors that made purposeful (e.g., strategically selecting individuals with rich information) and snowball sampling (adding participants recommended from other participants) the best methods to recruit participants (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The timing and official notification of faculty departure decisions varied greatly and made using a single list produced by LGU's provost's office to contact leaving faculty impractical. Given that past research noted the difficulty of reaching faculty after they left for a new institution, there was an advantage to contacting faculty before they left, if possible.

There was a response rate of 58%; we invited 57 leaving faculty, and 33 said yes. Those who declined participation noted time commitments and some bad experiences in leaving LGU as reasons for declining interviews. However, participants who accepted the invitation also noted some bad experiences. Thus, both the participants and those who declined participation included faculty with negative experiences. There was no obvious demographic pattern among participants who did not respond or declined participation (e.g., they were not all women, faculty of color, or from STEM disciplines). Although there is the potential for bias in this sampling process, the fact that participants were identified from across the entire campus, formally through administrators and informally through participants, and the lack of a pattern in participant response to the invitation (either among those who accepted or declined) suggests that the sample was reflective of the range of perspectives found among leaving faculty.

We conducted 60–75 minute long, semi-structured interviews with 33 faculty who had accepted outside offers. Interview questions relevant to this study focused on what drew these faculty to work at LGU, the expectations that faculty had for their careers at the institution and whether they felt these expectations were met, and experiences at LGU more generally that may have contributed to their decision to leave the university. Specific questions relevant to this study included: "Tell me why you decided to come to LGU to be a faculty member here." "When you were recruited to this position, what were some of the expectations that you had for your career here?" We then asked: "Once you became faculty here, were these expectations met?" and finally, "You have decided to leave LGU, what were the most important reasons you decided to leave?"

Consistent with methodological norms of qualitative inquiry, data analysis was iterative and included multiple stages of coding. We began by reading and rereading all of the interview transcripts to identify and mark excerpts that related to faculty work expectations and psychological contracts (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). We then read the same interviews again and coded those excerpts to identify whether it was a psychological contract or an unmet work expectation (Merriam, 1998).

Each interview transcript included between 2 and 5 excerpts regarding faculty work expectations and/or psychological contracts. Drawing from our literature review, we identified faculty excerpts as work expectations if they were general assumptions and expectations faculty formed about the nature of their work, relationships and career advancement—that is, overall perceptions of the way faculty thought things would be (Daly & Dee, 2006; Kim et al., 1996; Vroom, 1964). For example, a participant said, “I definitely had an expectation that there would be a lot of collaboration.” She explained she formed this overall expectation because of doctoral experiences and she generally thought it would be present in her new department. This was marked as a general work expectation.

We likewise drew from our literature review to identify faculty excerpts as psychological contracts if the faculty members believed their expectations were (a) based on an implicit or explicit promise made to them by their organization (b) that the organization held an obligation to fulfill (Hart & Thompson, 2007; Huston et al., 2007; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Typically, faculty formed psychological contracts before starting their appointments based on information they were provided and/or explicit or implicit promises made during the interview and appointment process. However, a few psychological contracts formed through a negotiated relationship with the institution once embedded. In addition, we only classified a faculty experience as a psychological contract if it represented something meaningful to the participant, so that violations caused meaningful harm (Huston et al., 2007). Finally, the psychological contracts had to be constructed as mutual obligations and exchanges that could be classified as transactional, relational, or ideological (Hart & Thompson, 2007). For example, a participant said: “When I interviewed, a number of people told me that, ‘we all work together a lot, and we’re really interested in working with you.’” The participant went on to explain that because of this she thought that she would develop working relationships on projects with specific colleagues in her department if she approached them, and that this was important to her work. This excerpt was marked as a psychological contract.

Each excerpt was identified as either a work expectation or a transactional or relational psychological contract. We also found one example of an ideological psychological contract. In another round of analysis we identified three content-oriented ways of describing the nature of faculty work expectations and psychological contracts. Each work expectation or psychological contract either focused on issues of professional relationships, the nature of faculty work and career advancement, or resources. Given we found both work expectations and psychological contracts formed in these three content areas (e.g., relationships, work, resources), we present our findings by these headings, distinguishing between general work expectations, which we

describe first, and psychological contracts, which we present second, within each findings section.

Overall trustworthiness was strengthened by having three authors triangulate interpretations and analysis. We engaged in member checking by sharing transcripts with participants and giving them an opportunity to correct any part of their initial comments. All participants were provided anonymity, and we further masked the identity of participants by not noting their discipline next to their name in the text.

LIMITATIONS

As with all research there were limitations to our research design. Leaving faculty members were interviewed between two months and one year after they accepted an outside offer. We were therefore asking early career faculty to provide retrospective reflections on their early expectations of LGU and of their career several years after they began their positions. If we had interviewed them twice—once before they set foot on campus and another time 5 or 6 years later, we may have received a richer set of descriptions than we were able to retrieve retrospectively. It is also possible that participant work expectations and psychological contracts that were easily met did not come to mind as quickly as those that were unmet and violated, as the contrast of unmet expectations or psychological contracts and actual experiences were more memorable. Thus future research might consider conducting interviews at different points in people's careers, such as before they begin their appointments, around the third year review, and after tenure decisions to gain a more comprehensive sense of faculty expectations, psychological contracts, and how they change and are experienced over time. Second, by virtue of having outside offers, our participants likely held more social capital than some of their peers. It is possible participants thus had higher expectations. Future research might consider how work expectations and psychological contracts differ among faculty with different known levels of productivity and perceived job mobility. Finally, our data did not allow us to analyze work expectations and contracts met and unmet by gender or race, both of which we recommend be done in future research.

FINDINGS

All early career faculty in this study held work expectations and/or formed psychological contracts about their careers at LGU. Some were unmet and broken and some were fulfilled. All participants acknowledged that some of their expectations were, in hindsight, naïve, and that they had grown personally and professionally in their positions. However, many leaving faculty members were disillusioned and frustrated that their work expectations were

not met and their psychological contracts were broken, and this played a role in their departure decisions. Although the key focus of our inquiry were work expectations and psychological contracts when entering an institution in contrast to what participants experienced once in the position, we also found participants developed work expectations and psychological contracts several years into their positions that were subsequently met or violated, and these also influenced departure decisions.

In this section we describe three key areas where participants entered their academic appointments with work expectations and psychological contracts: professional relationships, the nature of faculty work and terms of career advancement, and resources. In each area we describe the content of these expectations/contracts and whether participants felt they were met or violated. We also describe, when appropriate, expectations that grew once faculty were in their positions, and whether those were or were not met. Additionally, for each content area (e.g., professional relationships, nature of faculty work/advancement, resources) we identify influences on faculty expectations and contracts in an attempt to provide context for their formation.

Professional Relationships

Faculty in this study entered their institutions with the greatest work expectations regarding the professional relationships they would have with colleagues. Expectations regarding professional relationships fell into three categories. First, consistent with previous research, early career faculty entered their positions expecting to find a collegial workplace and strong intellectual community. Second, early career faculty expected to develop collaborative working relationships with colleagues and be able to go to those colleagues for advice. Often, they expected these relationships to occur with specific scholars they had met in interviews or knew worked in their new departments. Third, early career faculty expected to collaborate with department faculty colleagues, graduate students, and postdocs on research.

Early career faculty had strong expectations for a sort of learning community in their departments where faculty interacted often, collaborated, and sustained a strong intellectual and social, community-oriented academic life. For example, Amy said: "I imagined that I would collaborate heavily with all these [name of discipline] people. Here I felt that I should be able to interact in a very multidisciplinary way and expand." She explained she had found the kind of collaborative opportunities she expected, both with faculty and with doctoral students.

Robert also noted his expectations were high for collaboration, even a vibrant social life among peers, and that expectation was fulfilled. During his interview Robert learned his department had hired 16 junior faculty members in the last five years. He said:

It's just this amazing crew, so when I got here, it just felt like friends immediately. Yeah, so we went out to dinner, and killed a couple bottles of wine, and you know, making jokes, and you know when I was leaving, a bunch of the guys came down and actually gave me a receiving line, and shook my hand as I left, and I thought this is a warm faculty, with lots of junior faculty.

Robert described his hanging out on the weekends with other faculty, going out to dinner, and playing poker. He described a collaborative environment where everyone got along well.

A collaborative community was important for many of the participants and played a strong role in whether faculty felt that their expectations were met. For Robert and other leaving faculty though, the collaborative community was important but not sufficient to retain them when other violations of expectations occurred.

One aspect of the collaborative community that was not discussed much, except by one faculty member, was voice in decision-making. Vince observed that part of collaboration for him meant that he would have a voice in decision-making in his department. Vince said he found that his colleagues were quite friendly with him, but he did not feel included as a fully vested colleague who had a say in the future of his department. For example, he shared:

I think the thing that I wasn't involved in, for example, was hiring and recruitment. There was a hiring committee, but I was never involved in any way. My input was never asked. Certainly I felt that the department wasn't going out of their way to hire in my subject, and weren't, certainly, taking my input.

So, while friendliness and socializing may produce feelings of collaboration and collegiality for some faculty, others may also expect to be included in decision-making. Vince's expectation for voice into hiring was left unsaid, but emerged as very important as he grew professionally in the department. Likely, his vision of collegiality and collaboration had implicitly extended beyond research conversations; he also expected to be able to hire colleagues in the future that may be potential collaborators in his specific area of study.

In addition to a climate and atmosphere of collaboration, participants expected individual support and guidance from senior faculty in their departments. They expected other faculty, especially those more senior to them, to be available for consultations on where to send articles and look for funding for specific research areas. Many faculty participants observed that their expectations for collaborative cultures were not met. For example, Gilbert said he had high expectations for being able to interact with his new colleagues but was disappointed:

When I came to LGU I soon found out that it's a more of a very lonely environment that you have to sit in your office and.... you don't really interact with many people at all, so you're expected to do work on your own. And I've

talked with many folks at LGU but also in other universities and it seems to be a common way of going about your work which, I hadn't really thought about that much before I applied at LGU or I didn't really expect it to be that extreme.

Gilbert seemed to acknowledge that he did not anticipate the kind of pressures and environment that may be inherent in a research-focused, striving university culture. Gilbert's comments reflect not just a sense of disappointment with the departmental or institutional culture of LGU, but also in the role of a faculty member at a large research university.

Flora reflected on some of the reasons it was hard to establish the collaborative relationships she desired or receive feedback from senior colleagues:

I don't know how realistic some of [my expectations] were in terms of this, you know, some sort of philosophized thing "around the water cooler" type of interaction with my colleagues.So a lot of people are drawn to the university because of the location and get drawn into interesting research projects or affiliations that take them away from the university. So you have some very active and engaged and well-respected and interesting colleagues but they're not around very much, or at least that's how I felt sometimes, because they have an office some place "downtown" as people like to say. And so I often felt that I was sort of...making the trek to get to campus and once I got there I wouldn't really see anybody (laughs) except for the support staff who were wonderful, but I just felt like I didn't have anyone to interact with....and I think in general I had forgotten how isolating academic life could be and that wasn't a great fit with my personality.

Flora had hoped to find community among the other scholars in her department. Instead, she discovered an individualized culture that she felt did not match her personality or preferences in how to do work. Faculty like Gilbert and Flora found that the structure of the university, department, and surrounding community created multiple pulls away from close, highly interactive department cultures. These factors contributed to feelings of isolation and disconnection from colleagues.

Many participants came to LGU with a specific expectation that they would collaborate with colleagues on research. Naomi elaborated on where she developed this kind of expectation:

Because of what I had seen before, the department I came from, in my PhD and my post-doc the faculty were quite close, collaborated a lot, supported each other a lot, worked together a lot, so yeah, I definitely had an expectation that there would be a lot of collaboration....and that's what I had seen before and that's what I expected to see in the department I joined.

Many of the participants expected research collaboration within the department, in part based on previous experiences at other institutions. Yet they found that the culture of LGU and their particular departments emphasized

individual achievement and work. Whether due to social or intellectual isolation, these scholars felt a key expectation for their experiences was not met.

Bill held expectations that faculty colleagues would invite him to collaborate on grant projects, helping to launch his research. However, once he arrived there he realized this was not the norm. He said, “I think people don’t tend to add on new faculty to grants... Everyone sort of did their own thing research-wise, had their own labs, and I was expected to do the same.” Bill’s expectations seemed to move beyond wanting collaborative colleagues to wanting senior colleague investment in his success—which he framed as help obtaining grant funding.

Like Bill, Laura reported disappointment with the lack of research support and mentoring in her department. Laura said her college was very different than when she interviewed, noting “90% of the people I met with are gone,” which was indicative to her of the toxic environment for faculty in her college. Laura explained that most of her early career colleagues had left the institution—especially other women. She felt like the senior faculty only valued those junior faculty who were useful to them—and that they had unreasonable expectations of what to expect from her as a scholar due to her gender and international identity. Flora likewise noted that she met great senior faculty when she interviewed and had expectations that she would be able to work with them once she came to LGU. When she arrived, however, the senior faculty started retiring and leaving so there was “big wholesale change” in her department. This change prevented there being any real guidance for her development. Instead Flora learned the most by watching another junior colleague who knew how to “play the game.”

Moving from work expectations to psychological contracts, there were some participants who felt as if they were promised, or at least led to believe, that they would get to collaborate on research with specific individuals in specific ways. In these cases there seemed to be relational contracts formed. There were specific people participants had come to the institution to work with, big names in the field or other scholars they admired. For example, Emily was excited about collaborating with a senior scholar who used similar research methodologies. However, upon starting her new position she discovered that the person with whom she had assumed she would work had left for another institution—leaving her feeling “not that I had been misled but that I had not seen sort of the forest for the trees during my interview.” Emily seemed to form her psychological contract with the department based on an unstated desire to collaborate on research with a colleague who shared her interests and methodologies, only to find that not only had that colleague moved on, but there was no longer someone to champion her research methods. Emily had anticipated that she would not be alone in the work she did, that “there’d be more of a team.” Emily said when she found

out the person who she was excited about working with had left for another institution, it started her "seesawing." This broken contract prompted Emily to make her own move when the opportunity arose.

While Emily's relational contract was broken when the faculty member she expected to work with left the university, Elinor's was broken when the faculty member she expected to work with treated her as less than an equal partner. As Elinor observed: "When I interviewed, a number of people told me that, 'we all work together a lot, and we're really interested in working with you.'" She went on to say:

It was the case that many of them had joint publications, and we had some overlapping research interest. So I had an expectation coming in that I would work as colleagues and that turned out really not to be the case. There's a really senior guy, he since retired from my area, who said he wanted to work with me, and we met a few times. But, it was clear that his idea of working together was, he's the intellectual, this is the project, and you're sort of a super doctoral student.

Elinor felt the opportunity for true research collaboration was foreclosed by his approach. Elinor's situation is striking in comparison to other cases because she did have the opportunity to collaborate, but not as an equal colleague, and thus felt her relational contract was violated.

Other participants formed psychological contracts with the institution regarding the types of colleagues they would have at LGU and the values of the institution around diversity and inclusion. Norm, a faculty member of color, chose LGU as an institution because of its "espoused value" of "caring deeply about diversity," forming a strong ideological and relational contract that he would value diversity and in exchange, his institution and college would value him and his faculty of color colleagues by working to retain them. In his words, "As much as I think LGU talks about the importance of diversity, it's really been troubling to me that there are very few faculty of color across campus and more specifically in [my college]." Instead, he observed that four faculty of color in his college had left, and that in general the diversity at LGU was not what he felt was promised and owed to its faculty or students of color. The experience of finding the rhetoric around diversity not matching the experience of faculty of color, and particularly seeing four faculty of color leave his own college, made Norm feel that LGU had not followed through on a major commitment. This led to his lack of trust in the university, the breaking of a relational contract with the institution in terms of the kinds of collegial support that would be provided, and a broken ideological contract in terms of his view of the institution's failed commitment to diversity.

Participants also held psychological contracts regarding having the opportunity to work with great doctoral students. For example, Elinor noted she had very specific expectations that she would get to work with good doctoral students. This relational contract was based on what she was told in her interview as well as the department's reputation for having excellent doctoral students. However, when she began her position she learned:

The way the system works here—I had two senior guys who basically would assign all of the first-year students to themselves. And, if a student was weak in the second or third year, they would get assigned to me. So, although I worked with several doctoral students, I always got the very weak doctoral students. And, they would say, 'Well, it's who the students want to work with. I'm a full professor and you are an associate professor, so of course they'd rather work with me. But, your time will come.' And, I always thought that was a very unfair system.

In this case, departmental politics that gave senior faculty first choice in advising left Elinor feeling unsupported and shut-out of quality student interactions and support. The relational contract she had formed felt violated, because she felt an implicit promise had been broken.

The origins of work expectations and relational contracts regarding professional relationships came from a variety of sources. Participants made implicit and explicit comparisons to the kinds of working relationships they saw in their graduate institutions. For those with relational psychological contract violations, their on-campus interview experiences indicated that they would get to have productive research relationships with colleagues. In their understanding, there were either implicit or explicit promises made for such collaboration at that time.

In sum, early career faculty members had great expectations for collaborative relationships in a robust intellectual community, colleagues to work with on research and ask for advice, good students to work with, and people "like them" in their departments or colleges. Although many factors influenced faculty departure, unmet work expectations and violated relational psychological contracts regarding colleagues played a leading role in participants' departure decisions.

The Nature of Faculty Work and Terms of Career Advancement

Participants in this study held expectations about the pace and nature of their work and were often surprised or disillusioned when their expectations clashed with direct experience. For example, Norm thought that he would be able to "do faculty life my own way." However, he found department and university colleague expectations were that he would engage in more publishing than he wanted. "I think I would have felt like the expectations of being at a place like this were never being met because no matter what

you do, your mentors around here are continually telling you to do more.” Norm expected to be able to engage in the kind of and amount of scholarly productivity that he found valuable as a faculty member, but kept receiving feedback to increase his productivity.

Participants also held expectations about the teaching parts of their career. Lisa said: “I thought I would also enjoy teaching a lot... I thought that would be very rewarding to sort of do more of that in the classroom and work with students and sort of mentor them and work on their professional development.” But then she did not find the experience as fulfilling as she had hoped. She said:

That was just kind of a wake-up call or a difference from what I was expecting and the parenting aspect of [teaching], that also was a challenge for me. I felt like I had to sort of enforce classroom order, not that it was disorderly, but it just wasn't something that I wanted to or felt comfortable doing.... students just felt young to me and it felt like I needed to remind them to turn in their assignments, stuff that I thought was basic about study skills or sort of expectations of quality work and that was very frustrating to me.

Like Lisa, Flora said she expected students would be “better” and noted “many of the students were confrontation-oriented and entitled” and it took her a long time to adjust to the student population and the institution. Despite being at a research university, LGU faculty members spent a good amount of time in teaching, and when expectations for student performance were not met, participants became disappointed and disenchanted with this aspect of their work.

Another work expectation seemed to grow in place, once participants were in their appointments. Participants expected to be given preemptive raises in some cases, or at minimum to have outside offers countered generously. For example, when Robert received an outside offer, he expected “something really big” because he had observed a colleague receiving a generous counter-offer the previous year. He was disappointed when this expectation was not met, and he decided to leave despite being quite happy with his professional relationships. As demonstrated by Robert's example, some expectations were formed by witnessing and learning about the experiences of others in faculty's departments or in the university more broadly.

Participants also noted transactional psychological contracts related to the kinds of work that would be rewarded. Such faculty felt an implicit entering agreement that their research area, interdisciplinary focus, chosen methodologies, or chosen publication venues would be rewarded when they accepted positions at LGU; yet their experiences within the reward systems in their departments and the university contradicted that promise.

Participants with violated transactional contracts made it clear that they knew that they would have to work hard to meet tenure requirements. LGU

is a top ranked school, with many department programs ranked in the top ten in *U.S. News and World Report*. Thus, participants expected the terms of career advancement to be high; they just did not expect those terms to change from point of entry to tenure decision year. Participants felt transactional contract violations regarding the number of publications required to advance (i.e., they increased) and the publication venues where they were supposed to submit journal articles (i.e., they changed). For example, Don said once he had worked at LGU for several years, “the requirements for tenure started to shift” in the direction of requiring primarily “A” journals for tenure and promotion. Don said, “so they said, we just care about the top three [journals]. And that certainly was very different from what it was when I entered the school.” He decided to leave, noting, “I didn’t want to be in a place where I had to only publish in the biggest three journals.” Don explained that his department colleagues were supportive of his desire to publish in a broader list of journals, particularly ones that were more receptive to his sub-discipline’s research. However, because tenure and promotion decisions were made at the college level, he knew he would have to follow those terms for advancement or leave. Don said he asked himself: “Do I want to be in a place where that’s the kind of thing that they expect of me? Maybe not. I want to do my own things.”

Also, given faculty have to present their research trajectories to great scrutiny before being offered a faculty position, participants expected the institution to “know” who they were in terms of the kinds of scholarship they did. Faculty did not expect to be encouraged to do less interdisciplinary, engaged, or different topical work, especially when they had clearly presented their lines of inquiry in their interview process and then were hired. For example, Gilbert was trained in a different disciplinary area than the majority of his departmental colleagues. This was clear during his hiring process, but his early colleague reviews suggested that:

No matter what my training was, I was expected to be in a hard-core [subfield A] and the only journals which were accepted as publications to count for tenure were top-tier [subfield A] journals and that created a, a huge challenge for me and also I didn’t really feel that I could live up to those expectations compared to a trained [subfield A] who’s been brought up in that way of thinking and way of writing and thinking about [subfield A] outlets for their work.

Gilbert’s experience suggested that he expected that the department would value his alternative disciplinary approach to their common topical focus, since his background training was obvious from his application and hiring. Instead, once it came time to evaluate the quality of his work for promotion and tenure, the department identified its more traditional views of quality as the benchmark for Gilbert to meet.

In a similar way, Emily felt she had been very honest with the interview panel that chose her regarding the kind of work she did and methodologies she used. Yet when Emily arrived she did not find support for her work. She felt “pretty angry” and “confused” as to why they brought her there if she was clearly not a good fit with what their programs prioritized. She said she even remembered saying to a colleague she was co-teaching with, “Why in the hell would you all hire me if my—who I am is in such conflict with what you all do here on a daily basis?” Emily’s experience of feeling like an outsider who did not belong was confirmed by learning more about other people “like her” who were not successful. She was angry her college had brought her into the department given a lack of investment in these research interests and methods choices.

Work expectations and psychological contracts regarding the nature of faculty work and advancement at LGU formed from a variety of sources. Although the faculty in this group mostly understood the intensity of publication and productivity required of faculty at LGU, some found that meeting those expectations was more difficult than they thought—either due to lack of resources expected (see below) or changing standards for quantity and quality of work. Some participants formed expectations within their doctoral institutions. For example, they had observed faculty in their first two years being protected from teaching and service activities, giving them time to develop their research agendas—a practice not enacted for them at LGU. Others moved from a less pressured environment for publication, and realized that being at a higher ranked institution required a higher level of productivity than they had anticipated. In addition, the nature of that productivity would have to fit a particular form—publishing in particular venues and using particular kinds of methods. Faculty with violated transactional contracts had made an implicit assumption that because their research agenda and methods were clear in the hiring process, being hired by the faculty in their departments was an endorsement of their methodology and style of research. They were surprised and felt a contract had been violated when they were told that their current activities were not sufficient to move them towards tenure.

Resources

Resource expectations and contracts differed based on discipline, but all came down to the university providing some tool that was important to participants’ research or affected their teaching and mentoring. Examples included access to certain technology, such as a new laser; use of staff hours for administrative support; a good budget reporting system for grants; and access to research sites. Faculty frustration when resource expectations or contracts were not met depended in part on whether faculty felt there were reasonable explanations for why these resources did not appear and whether

resource expectations were unmet for only them or for their colleagues as well.

When resources were not provided, some participants sought solutions from senior administrators (department chairs and deans) and found that the responses were lacking or slow to proceed. Given there was a strong emphasis on obtaining and running external grants at LGU and many of the resource problems inhibited faculty ability to apply for and operate grants, such failure to respond adequately to repeated requests to correct lacking resources created frustration for participants and contributed to their decisions to leave.

Shifting from general resource expectations to transactional psychological contracts, there were participants in STEM fields who noted both explicit and implicit resource promises related to technology and labs. Naomi explained that her faculty contract promised her that her lab space and all of the resources for her lab would be in place when she started her position. However, this became delayed, and the promised date when it would be completed kept getting pushed back. Naomi understood this was common; she knew of other faculty whose labs were not ready in time. Naomi noted there was not much she could do about it:

So that was one example of how resources took pushing to get what I needed and what had been agreed on. And it's hard when you're a new faculty member, you've been brought in, you know, you move there, you bought a house, and things aren't happening as quickly as possible or as quickly as they said they would, you don't have much leverage in getting things to move because you're there, you know, what can you do to, to get what you need? I guess you could threaten to leave, but that's not easy to do, so it's a hard position to be in.

Naomi's frustration was tempered by a sense that this was not a problem just for her, but one that was common across the institution. However, given the intensity of the pre-tenure period, not having the resources necessary to complete her research was frustrating—and she did not want to go on the market just to leverage what had been promised to her. However, the fact that these resources did not materialize when promised became a factor in her decision to leave.

Amy experienced a similar challenge in securing the facilities she needed to do her research. As she explained, “so I came in, and the lab facilities were not fantastic, but I assumed that things would grow and if I was successful — if I could maintain my grant funding, that the university would respond and so on.” She found that although she continued to bring in funding, the facilities were not forthcoming from the institution until she sought an outside offer. For Amy, a clear transactional contract existed in her mind that if she kept bringing in funding, the institution would reward her with space and resources, and this was broken by her subsequent experiences. Seeing the kind of administrative support and lab space she would receive at another institution prompted her to change institutions.

TABLE 1.
DEMOGRAPHICS OF LEAVING FACULTY PARTICIPANTS

		<i>Leaving Faculty Participants</i>	
		N	%
Total		33	100
Gender	Men	11	33.0
	Women	22	67.0
Race	Am. Indian/Alaska Native	0	0
	Asian/Pacific Islander	9	27.0
	Black/African American	3	9.0
	Hispanic	2	6.0
	White/Caucasian	19	58.0
	Other	0	0
# of disciplines represented (incl. STEM and non-STEM)		18	
Discipline	Agriculture	2	6.1
	Architecture	2	6.1
	Biology	0	0
	Business	3	9.1
	Chemistry & Biochemistry	0	0
	Communication	1	3.0
	Criminology & Criminal Justice	1	3.0
	Education	8	24.2
	Engineering	2	6.1
	English	0	0
	Hearing & Speech	2	6.1
	History	2	6.1
	Human Development	1	3.0
	Information Studies	1	3.0
	Journalism	0	0
	Mathematics	1	3.0
	Psychology	2	6.1
	Public Health	3	9.1
	Public Policy	1	3.0
	Sociology	0	0
Urban Studies	0	0	
Women's Studies	1	3.0	
Career Stage	Assistant Professor	25	76.0
	Associate Professor	8	24.0

Marcie expected that her college at LGU would have developed good working relationships with community partners that would allow her access to do her research, but when she arrived she experienced frustration that there were no pathways developed for her in this way. Given the applied nature of her field, Marcie had expected her department and college to have already

put these relationships in place and never thought to vocalize this expectation to her colleagues through the interview process. Once she realized the challenges, she had to do extra work to begin to build those collaborative relationships. In addition, Marcie had been told she would have access to five hours a week of support staff time but when she arrived: “[I] found that whenever I asked for that help [from support staff], it never came through.” Marcie felt her trust was violated and felt more deprived because this latter expectation was actually in a contract. No one provided an explanation of why the administrative support was not provided.

Norm observed that he expected there would be “pots of money that faculty of color can get every semester” to work on research projects, particularly given LGU’s dual rhetoric around supporting faculty of color and emphasizing the importance of research. He said:

My thing is like you [LGU], you continually say that you care about the success of assistant professors of color, you care about diversity, and we all know that research is important. One of the ways in which you can help us be successful is by providing money so that we can actually engage in research because it’s so difficult in this climate, I think, to, to get resources in which to engage in research.

Such pots of money did not materialize, which led Norm to question LGU’s commitment to supporting the advancement of faculty of color. This enhanced the concerns Norm had about the representational diversity of the faculty, and led him to seek another position at an institution more congruent with his values and the pace he preferred for his research.

As with professional relationships and promotion and tenure expectations, work expectations around resources came from a variety of sources, including what participants had experienced in prior employment as graduate students and postdocs at other universities and what resources they understood peers to have in similar positions at other research universities. For many participants, these contract violations went beyond the psychological to include the institution’s failure to provide resources included in written hiring contracts.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

What, then, can institutions do? Given the subjective and typically unspoken nature of psychological contracts, it is impossible for a department or institution to avoid contract violations altogether. . . . However, both departments and institutions can take measures to reduce the likelihood of contract violations. (Huston et al., 2007, p. 517)

Our findings echo over 25 years of previous studies showing early career faculty members enter their careers wanting and expecting some degree of

community, collaboration, mentors, and colleagues to work with inside their departments (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Boice, 1992; Daly & Dee, 2006; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Menges & Associates, 1999; Ponjuan et al., 2011; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Trower, 2012). Regarding collaboration, faculty described the greatest expectations and most contracts regarding research. This is likely because of the institutional type and career stage we studied, a research university and early career. Early career faculty need to focus on and be prolific in their research. Early career participants expected help to obtain research grants, learn new research techniques, and publish articles, and in some cases felt their colleagues were obliged to provide it. We also found, as have other scholars (see Daly & Dee, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2014), that faculty members entered their academic appointments with strong expectations for fairness in how their work would be evaluated. Participants did not expect or think it was fair for standards to change while on the tenure track. Finally, we found a continuum of expectations regarding resources, from the very general sense that faculty members of color would be given additional research funding, to transactional psychological contracts regarding funding for labs in exchange for hard work. Unmet expectations and broken contracts shaped the departure decisions of leaving faculty.

Our findings suggest several implications for practice and are particularly relevant for doctoral advisers counseling their students on the job market, for early career faculty, and for administrators hiring and supporting new faculty. The central principle guiding implications for all three groups is to leave less unsaid. It is impossible to create organizations where all work expectations and psychological contracts are known by all, and completely fulfilled in all cases. Changes in leadership, the economy, institutional finances, department colleagues, and organizing practices are natural in the life of any organization. Thus, as the Huston et al. (2007) quote that begins this section suggests, the issue should not be trying to eliminate the existence of unmet work expectations or broken psychological contracts. Rather, the issue for those on the market and hiring faculty is to make expectations and contracts more realistic, visible, and transparent.

We begin with implications for doctoral advisers mentoring their students who are on the job market. Doctoral student advisers can provide more information and advice to graduating doctorate holders on the faculty market. As the recent case of a rescinded offer from a philosophy department at Nazareth College illustrates (Flaherty, 2014), a lack of understanding of diverse institutional and departmental contexts can give birth to unrealistic expectations and miscommunications between institution and applicant. Given that the majority of graduate students are educated at research universities, but most will hold faculty appointments at other types of institutions, it is important for graduate programs to offer workshops on

different institutional types and the economic and political constraints on institutional missions and operations. Preparing Future Faculty programs were developed to address some of these issues (Gaff, 2002; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004), and NSF funded AGEP-Promise programs also play this mentoring role for under-represented minority STEM students. However, more such efforts are needed across disciplines. It is important for advisors to help equip their advisees with specific questions about resources, likely research collaborations, norms for collaborative work, junior faculty voice in hiring, workload, and tenure expectations. If prospective faculty members do not feel comfortable asking these questions during interviews because they are in a vulnerable position, they can wait until they have an offer. However, it is important that prospective faculty understand in more detail, and more explicitly, what is and is not being offered so they can negotiate sound contracts and begin their careers with realistic expectations.

At the same time, it is important for faculty mentors to help their doctoral advisees understand that organizational cultures are fluid, changing, and not stable. Much like moving water, the department culture where they interviewed will shift. It could become a very different place within 4 years if a new dean comes in or there are budget cuts or retirements. Such changes can confound expectations or psychological contracts despite the best intentions of many organizational actors. Doctoral mentors need to help their mentees become comfortable with and alert to the fact that universities are organizations in flux; part of charting a successful career is having high expectations but then being resilient in the face of inevitable change.

Once faculty have been hired, department chairs and colleagues might consider adding “entrance” interviews to the existing practice of “exit” interviews. In such entrance interviews, both faculty and their department colleagues might be explicit about expectations and identify how and in what ways each party might fulfill needed roles to achieve agreed upon goals. In cases where the expectations are explicit, they might be written down in a memorandum of understanding that becomes part of the candidate’s tenure files. Examples of items that might go into such an agreed upon memorandum of understanding are (a) the kinds of research the faculty member will engage in, intended publishing outlets, and funding sources; (b) the kind of mentorship and research collaborations faculty wish for with colleagues in the department; and (c) resources they have been promised or expect as support for their research. Such memoranda would be agreed upon with a department chair and core group of department colleagues so these work agreements become a collective roadmap or mentoring plan. This mentoring plan could be revisited annually as part of an annual review process.

The findings of this study also show how important it is for department chairs to check in with faculty members periodically regarding the arrange-

ments they have made. We found, as Schaupp (2012) did, that the negative effects of violated contracts were worse if faculty members felt they were the only ones whose expectations or contracts were broken. For example, the faculty member whose promised lab facilities were delayed along with everyone else's in her department experienced this violation as less severe than the person who felt she was told she could work with good doctoral students, but then was "organized" out of this opportunity by colleagues. Participants felt greater or less deprivation depending on comparisons with peers and local circumstances. Faculty members whose psychological contract felt broken, who did not have other positive conditions to offset this disappointment, were more likely to consider competing offers from outside institutions. In this way, the outside offers became the solution to deprivation, and the faculty members' attempts to obtain what they felt had been promised to them (e.g., good colleagues, good fit between reward system and research, resources for lab). Thus, part of supporting early career faculty is ongoing communication. Department chairs that are transparent and clear with faculty about any constraints preventing them from living up to agreements and are clearly trying to be fair to all faculty in the department will likely receive more patience, resilience, and understanding from early career faculty than those who do not follow up and seem to be playing favorites.

Early faculty themselves must play a leading role in clarifying their work expectations and psychological contracts, amending them as circumstances evolve, and taking actions to fulfill them (Campbell & O'Meara, 2013). As participants described their work expectations and psychological contracts in this study, they provided fuzzy descriptions of exactly what their individual role was in the process of making professional relationships or reward system "fit" work out. No doubt if we had an aerial view of each of these situations we would see multiple ways in which departmental colleagues and early career faculty let each other down, as well as fulfilled their roles and responsibilities inside these relationships and reward systems. Although it is incumbent upon departments to help faculty candidates understand the cultures, values, and requirements of their units, incoming faculty also share a responsibility to express those expectations to their faculty peers and take concrete steps to make them happen. For example, faculty members who say they expected to collaborate with colleagues on research, but always work at home when senior colleagues work in the office, never suggest joint research projects to colleagues, or offer to read their work, are not acting to make this goal happen. In sum, faculty members should not position themselves as victims of work environments that do not come through for them unless they have stepped forward to complete their part of the bargain.

This study adds to the literature on factors that influence faculty departure by considering the role of expectations and psychological contracts in the

career experiences and departure decisions of leaving faculty. Further studies are needed to examine the relationships between unmet work expectations, psychological contracts and departure, and how factors such as discipline, mobility, social identity, and prior training experiences shape expectations and contracts. Given the investment institutions make in their early career faculty, and the significant stake early career faculty have in success on the tenure track, there are clear benefits to leaving very little “unsaid” between faculty and their new academic home.

Acknowledgments: We gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments provided by the anonymous reviewers on an earlier draft of this manuscript. We further recognize this article is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. HRD-1008117.

REFERENCES

- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 803–830.
- Amelink, C. T., Hyer, P., Willis-Walton, S., Team, A. A., Creamer, E., & Glass, V. (2003). *Voluntary departures among tenured and tenure-track faculty at Virginia Tech: A gender perspective*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94–122.
- Benzoni, K. A., Rousseau, D. M. & Li, M. (2006). Managing relationships across generations of academics: Psychological contracts in faculty-doctoral student collaborations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 17(1), 4–33.
- Bess, J. L. (1998). Contract systems, bureaucracies, and faculty motivation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 1–22.
- Bieber, J. P., & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students’ perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1009–1035.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Power and exchange in social life*. New York, NY: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35(2), 135–153.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, C., & O’Meara, K. (2013). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(4), 49–74.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daly, C. & Dee, J. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 776–803.
- Darrah, M., Houglund, J., & Prince, B. (2014, April). Salary, space, and satisfaction: an examination of gender differences in the sciences. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 26. Retrieved from <http://aabri.comwww.aabri.com/manuscripts/131688.pdf>

- Davis, J. A. (1959). A formal interpretation of the theory of relative deprivation. *Sociometry*, 22, 280–296.
- Flaherty, C. (2014, March 13). Negotiated out of a job. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/03/13/lost-faculty-job-offer-raises-questions-about-negotiation-strategy>.
- Gaff, J. G. (2002). Preparing future faculty and doctoral education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 34(6), 63–66.
- Gonzales, L.D. & Nunez, A.M. (2014). The Ranking regime and the production of knowledge: Implications for academia. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 22, 31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n31.2014>
- Hart, D. W., & Thompson, J. A. (2007). Untangling employee loyalty. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 17(2), 297–323.
- Homans, G. C. (1974). *Elementary forms of social behavior*. New York, NY: Harcourt-Brace.
- Huston, T. A., Norman, M., & Ambrose, S. A. (2007). Expanding the discussion of faculty vitality to include productive but disengaged senior faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 493–522.
- Iverson, R. D., & Roy, P. (1994). A causal model of behavioral commitment: Evidence from a study of Australian blue-collar employees. *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 15–41.
- Johnsrud, L. K. & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518–542.
- Kim, S. W., Price, J. L., Mueller, C. W., & Watson, T. W. (1996). The determinants of career intent among physicians at a US Air Force hospital. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 947–976.
- Kreuter, E. (2012). *Fostering resilience for loss and irrelevance*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Lawler, E. E. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawrence, J. H., Celis, S. & Ott, M. (2014). Is the tenure process fair? What faculty think. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(2), 155–192.
- Matier, M. W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, 31, 39–61.
- Menges, R. J. & Associates. (1999) *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mills, M., Bettis, P., Miller, J. W., & Nolan, R. (2005). Experiences of academic unit reorganization: Organizational identity and identification in organizational change. *Review of Higher Education*, 28(4), 597–619.
- Morrison, E., Rudd, E., Picciano, J. & Nerad, M. (2011). Are you satisfied? Ph.D. education and faculty taste for prestige: Limits of the prestige value system. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 24–46.

- Mueller, C. W., Boyer, E. M., Price, J. L., & Iverson, R. D. (1994). Employee attachment and non-coercive conditions of work the case of dental hygienists. *Work and Occupations, 21*(2), 179–212.
- Neville, S. C., Bradburn, E. M., Zimble, L. (2006). *Institutional policies and practices regarding postsecondary faculty: Fall 2003 First Look*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Nyquist, J. D., Manning, L., Wulff, D. H., Austin, A. E., Sprague, J., Fraser, P. K., . . . Woodford, B. (1999). On the road to becoming a professor: The graduate student experience. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 31*(3), 18–27.
- O'Meara, K. (2007). Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 22* (pp. 121–179). New York, NY: Springer.
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 26* (pp. 161–220). New York, NY: Springer.
- O'Meara, K. (2014). Half-way out: How requiring outside offers to raise salaries influences faculty retention and organizational commitment. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(4), 1–22.
- O'Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A. (2011). The pursuit of prestige: The experience of institutional striving from a faculty perspective. *Journal of the Professoriate, 4*(1), 39–73.
- O'Meara, K., Lounder, A., & Campbell, C. (2014). To heaven or hell: Sensemaking about why faculty leave. *Journal of Higher Education, 85*(5), 603–632.
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L. & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 34(3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(3), 319–346.
- Provost's Committee on Retention. (2009). *Report on faculty retention*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Pruitt-Logan, A., & Gaff, J. (2004). Preparing future faculty. In D. H. Wulff & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the professoriate* (pp. 177–193). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rice, E., Sorcinelli, M. D. & Austin, A. E. (2000). Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. *New Pathways Working Papers Series, Inquiry No. 7*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(1), 137–152.
- Robinson, S. L. & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(3), 245–259.
- Rosch, T. A., & Reich, J. N. (1996). The enculturation of new faculty in higher education: A comparative investigation of three academic departments. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(1), 115–131.

- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A National Study on their work-life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285–309.
- Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 124–147.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schaupp, G. L. (2012). *An experimental study of psychological contract breach: The effects of exchange congruence in the employer-employee relationship*. Unpublished dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
- Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(5), 405–424.
- Stouffer, S. A., Suchman, E. A., DeVinney, L. C., Starr, S. A., & Williams, R. M. (1949). *The American soldier: Adjustment during army life (Vol. 1)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trowler, P., & Knight, P. (2000). Coming to know in higher education: Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts. *Higher Education Research & Development, 19*(1), 27–42.
- Turnley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(1), 25–42.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Xu, Y. J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention in warranted. *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 40–61.
- Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, J. F. (2004). Examining the influences on faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus nontenured faculty at research universities using NSOPF-99. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 139–176.