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ABSTRACT

Academic culture has been described as the social or normative glue that holds organizations together and guides and shapes behavior. The majority of the research that has been conducted on this subject relates to predominantly White institutions and their predominant White male faculties. The purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth account of the workplace perceptions and experiences of seven tenure-track African American female faculty members at an historically Black college and university (HBCU).

This study was qualitative research in which subject data were obtained through a series of three consecutive interviews per study participant then coded and analyzed for themes. Institution-related data were collected through a review of institution and department policies and regulations, faculty statistics, and various other catalogs, guides, and handbooks. Subject interviews, institutional data, and previous data from earlier research on minorities and academic organizational culture were combined to produce the results of the study.

The findings of this study indicated that the bureaucratic culture of the study HBCU was seen as a significant professional barrier when it came to the participants fulfilling work-related expectations in an efficient and effective manner. Departments were characterized as fragmented and many faculty members were perceived to be indifferent to the needs of the students and the HBCU. Undesirable student attitudes and
behaviors, additional service responsibilities, aspects of racism and sexism, and a tenure process that did not seem to support female advancement were the issues identified as major concerns of the female professors in this study. In spite of these problems, the senior female professors in this study chose to remain at the HBCU. The junior female professors in this study, however, did not foresee themselves submitting to such circumstances.

Despite these challenges, that are not unfamiliar to the African American female professor in the academy, all of the participants in this study affirmed their continued commitment to the promotion and advancement of African American female professionals in the academy—for the sake of their students and for the sake of the African American female professionals who will follow them.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
American Women and Higher Education

In 17th century colonial America the accepted belief among the citizenry was that education was a privilege reserved for the cultured gentleman. Women were judged to be neither intellectually capable of benefiting from nor socially acceptable as potential candidates for education beyond the basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Whereas a man's education was viewed as a means to prepare him for future leadership positions in business, government, or religion, a woman's education was viewed only in terms of its ability to prepare her to be an acceptable companion to her career-bound husband (Chliwniak, 1997; Miller-Solomon, 1985; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Because women did not object to their intellectual competency being determined on the basis of its relevancy to men, women conceded to, and thereby gave credence to, the popular notion that a woman's place was in the home—not in the halls of academe. Hence, when Harvard College, the first American institution of higher learning, opened its doors in 1636, it was to the exclusion of women (Chliwniak, 1997). Despite the fact that seven years later the financial benevolence of a woman—Ann Radcliffe—would establish Harvard’s first scholarship fund, three centuries would pass before Harvard would allow female students into its classrooms, and an additional 20 years beyond that
before female students would be granted Harvard degrees (Bellas, Lenger, Murphy, & Solomita, 2001; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

For the next two centuries not much progress was realized in women’s education. Other than the common schools that were established during the early 1800s to bridge the illiteracy gap between men and women, the primary role of education in women’s lives remained essentially unchanged—to prepare them to become better wives, mothers, and homemakers (Aisenberg, 1988; Kaestle, 1983). Attempts by women to use President Lincoln’s affirmation of the importance of public higher education for everyone as justification to establish their right to attend college garnered limited success. Rather than being allowed to enroll at the already established higher education institutions patronized almost exclusively by men, women were diverted to newly created annexes of these institutions, or other female-oriented schools of learning such as normal schools and coordinated colleges. Even after public and private higher education institutions began the transition to co-education in the mid 1800s, women continued to be steered toward female-only colleges modeled after male universities and touted as being superior colleges for women (Chliwniak, 1997; Miller-Solomon, 1985).

Faulty assumptions and erroneous beliefs about a woman’s intellectual capability and her role in society, coupled with societal pressures placed on daughters to become wives and mothers, endured into the 20th century. There were some women who dared to challenge the system and move beyond the male-defined homemaker roles that women found themselves confined to, but in the end, embedded societal expectations continued to limit women to the accepted proper positions that kept them subordinate to men—male doctors, female nurses; male executives, female secretaries; male researchers, female
research assistants; male principals, female teachers; male business owners, female bookkeepers—up until the advent of the Civil Rights movement (Aisenberg, 1988; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

African Americans and Higher Education

For Negroes, higher education was not an issue or an option. In antebellum America, particularly in the southern states where 92% of the Negro population was enslaved (Foner, 1970; Roebuck & Murty, 1993), and, by law, identified as property rather than citizens (Dred Scott v. Sandford, 1857), strict laws were in force that prohibited the education of any Negro (Brown, Donahoo, & Bertrand, 2001). Minus the negligible few who were afforded the luxury of obtaining a rudimentary understanding of math and reading to perform duties connected to the plantations, the prospect of any Negro obtaining any semblance of education was virtually non-existent (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

For the free Negroes living in the northern states, the opportunity for education may have been available, but the financial means and social support for taking advantage of it was not. Accordingly, of the four million Negroes in the United States, only 28 received baccalaureate degrees from U.S. institutions of higher learning prior to the Civil War (Collins, 2001; Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

The Civil War brought to an end America's 200 year legacy of its endorsement of and participation in the enslavement of millions of foreign and American-born people of African descent. Ironically, these same millions of Negroes, who had been subjected to a lifetime of forced labor, illiteracy, and dependency, were now expected to abruptly change from an existence that had been totally controlled and supported by their slave
owners to one that would require them to become fully responsible for their own self-preservation and well-being (Foner, 1983).

The ban against educating slaves that had been in place prior to the Civil War left in its wake millions of former slaves who did not possess the basic skills to read, write, or perform simple math. It was clear that an initiative would be needed to put in place a program to begin educating the masses of illiterate former slaves. Plans and participation for this initiative came to fruition through the combined efforts of the federal government, Freedman's Bureau, philanthropic organizations, and the Negro community itself. Initial seed money to begin construction for the buildings that would house the students was secured via the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. While the Morrill Act did not specifically address the Negro plight, Morrill Act funds were distributed to the states with the intent that they would help cultivate the educational initiative needed to educate these former slaves (Hoffman, Snyder, & Sonnenberg, 1996).

Ideally, Negroes should have been free to attend the educational institutions that were already in place, however, the prospect of Negroes attending the same institutions of learning as their White counterparts did not bode well with some of America's ruling majority, especially in the South where Whites were still reeling from their defeat in the Civil War. Consequently, funds from the Morrill Act that were originally intended to benefit the construction and operation of schools for Negroes began to stream to institutions of learning offering exclusively all-White education. To restore financial balance, in 1890, Congress passed the Second Morrill Act, which required states with dual systems of higher education (all-White and non-White/Negro) to provide land grant institutions for both systems. It would be from the Morrill Act funds that the first of
America's quasi post-secondary institutions for Negroes would emerge, many of which would evolve into what are recognized today as America's historically Black colleges and universities, also known as HBCUs (Hoffman et al., 1996).

The Supreme Court legalized the practice of dual systems, which became known as "separate but equal," with its decision handed down in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896. The states used the Court's stamp of approval of "separate but equal" to launch their own efforts and legitimate their actions to revise state constitutions and enact state laws that prevented Black and White students from attending the same schools. From these federal decisions and state initiatives, Negroes experienced, firsthand, the by-products of government-sanctioned "separate but equal" practices and policies in the form of public schools and public and private HBCUs that were unequal, isolated, inadequate, and substandard—in other words, "separate and unequal." "Separate but equal" remained a viable practice throughout the American education system for 50 years until the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court case rendered it unconstitutional on May 24, 1954 (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

The Civil Rights Movement

Beginning in the 1950s and transitioning into the 1960s, the Civil Rights movement forced to the forefront of the American conscience the systematic unequal treatment that had defined the totality of the Black experience in America from the beginning of their forced introduction onto America's shores. Former civil rights movements, traceable as far back as the Reconstruction Era, had sought redress, but the outcomes of those initiatives never managed to succeed in exacting prolonged or permanent change (Foner, 1983). With the lessons of the past as a guide, the impetus of
the Civil Rights movement was to obtain the permanent change in American civil rights that had up until this initiative managed to remain elusive, and to secure the equality and fair treatment for Blacks (Negroes) that this country’s constitution had declared for all its citizens as stated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

In respect to higher education, civil rights era students and their attorneys fought lengthy legal battles, faced the constant threat of harassment and violence, and secured the protection of state and federal law enforcement for the right to have access to the same institutions of learning that had been made available to their White counterparts (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Victory came through the passage of Title VI and Title VII of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

- Title VI and VII expanded student access and faculty employment opportunity for minorities and women in higher education by prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

- Executive Order 11246, as mandated by Title VII, instituted equal treatment in employment by requiring federal contractors, including universities contracting with the federal government, to consider all applicants without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2003).

- The Higher Education Act of 1965 made basic education opportunity grants and a variety of other financial aid programs available to disadvantaged students (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).
Less than a decade later, in 1970 and 1971 respectively, the U.S. Department of Labor issued Order Number 4 and Revised Order Number 4 that required government contractors with 50 or more employees, and government contracts of $50,000 or more, to develop affirmative action plans with goals and timetables for hiring women and minorities (Turner & Myers, 2000). One year later, in 1972, Title IX was instituted, which banned sex discrimination in schools, whether in academics or athletics, under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid (U.S. Department of Labor, 2003).

One last watershed legal challenge that changed the direction of higher education during the decade of the seventies was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Educational Fund’s lawsuit against the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) for not enforcing Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The grounds for this action, as presented in the 1970 Adams v. Richardson lawsuit, stemmed from the segregated dual system of higher education and the egregiously low representation of minority faculty, staff, and students at White institutions in southern states. Subsequent investigations into the enrollment and hiring practices of colleges and universities outside the South revealed that the representation of minorities in institutions of northern and border states was just as inequitable as that of the South (Turner & Myers, 2000).

Adams v. Richardson resulted in the 1977 court decision that directed HEW’s Office of Civil Rights to develop guidelines that states with segregated systems would use when preparing desegregation plans required for compliance with Title VI. The court also stipulated that, in addition to achieving a better racial mix of students, faculty, and staff in public colleges, the states also had to increase the access and retention of
minorities at all levels of higher education, but not at the expense of or detriment to HBCUs (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

The preceding civil rights initiatives, court challenges, and judicial decisions, in their totality, resulted in the U.S. public higher education system experiencing its most profound and far-reaching changes in the areas of access, recruitment, enrollment, and employment for minorities and women since its inception.

The 21st Century

Today, female and minority enrollment at American colleges and universities across all racial categories is a testament to the attitudinal and institutional changes that have occurred throughout this nation’s higher education system. Proof of this transformation is documented in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that reported overall Fall 1999 public and private college enrollment for females at 14% higher than that of males. African American female enrollment was 26% greater than that of African American males, which is higher than any other racial or ethnic group reported in the study (“Almanac 2002-3,” 2002).

While changes in higher education practices and attitudes have resulted in positive gains for students, similar success cannot be credited to the ranks of the faculty. According to the 2000 U.S. census, 52% of the American population 18 years of age and older is female (all races and ethnic groups) (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002). According to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, in 1999, 57% of the American higher education student population was female. Yet, according to this same source, in 1999, females (excluding non-resident aliens and race unknown) represented only 21% of the full-time Full professor positions at colleges and universities in this country (“Almanac
Moreover, faculty statistical trends continue to substantiate that only at the faculty ranks of Assistant professor and lower does female faculty representation begin to come within range of that of their male counterparts.

American higher education institutions deserve high praise for the marked change in the faces that represent its knowledge seekers (the student body). However, much more work is on the horizon before higher education can be credited for similar changes in the faces of its knowledge bearers (the faculty). As documented by the recent 2000 U.S. census, the changing face of American society is becoming increasingly diverse. Clearly, the crucial challenge that still remains for America's educational institutions is how to accomplish the necessary revamping of the current image of higher education into a system that is representative of all who pass through its doors, reflected in its leaders, faculty, and staff; documented in its curriculum and activities; and chronicled in its organizational culture and institutional values.

Statement of the Issue

In 1862, Mary Jane Patterson garnered the distinction of becoming the first Negro female to graduate from college with a bachelor's degree (Collins, 2001). One year later, Fanny M. Jackson became the first Negro female professional chosen by Oberlin College (Ms. Jackson's alma mater) to teach in the college's Preparatory Department. In fact, Ms. Jackson was the only female among the nine Negro faculty hired to teach or work on White campuses before 1900. A condition of Fanny M. Jackson's employment stipulated that if the students rejected her, she would be removed from her teaching position. Other than the apparent surprise of students that a Negro was going to be their instructor, and of the faculty that a Negro was going to be a member of the teaching staff, no serious
problems resulted from Fanny M. Jackson’s appointment. Consequently, Fanny M. Jackson’s class became so popular it had to be divided into two sections, both of which she taught with success (Dorsey, 1990).

Other African American females have followed in Ms. Jackson’s footsteps to continue the effort to incorporate the African American female’s presence in the halls of academe. Notable pioneers have included Mary McLeod Bethune, Mary Church Terrell, Ida B. Wells, and Anna Julia Cooper (McKay, 1997). More recent path-makers include Angela Davis, Mae Jemison, Lani Guinier, Linda Darling-Hammond, and bell hooks. Nevertheless, even though a century and a half has passed since Ms. Jackson’s higher education academic professional debut, the past circumstances of Fanny M. Jackson continue to reflect the current predicament of many African American female faculty members on the personnel rosters of today’s colleges and universities: Their representation and visibility on America’s campuses continue to be few and far between (Collins, 2001).

Through executive mandates and the allocation of funds, government agencies at the federal and state levels have made significant in-roads to improving opportunity and expanding access for minorities and women (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). But unlike the successes achieved in the area of female and minority student enrollment, efforts at recruitment and promotion of minority and female faculty have progressed at a much slower pace.

Results of the 2000 U.S. census count revealed that African American females represented 6% of the U.S. population (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002). Statistics compiled for the Fall 1999 term on the percentages of African American females
attending degree-granting institutions indicated that, at the closing of the 20th century, African American females made up 7% of the total higher education student population. Statistics from the same source revealed that African American females represented only 3% of the full-time faculty at the Full, Associate, Assistant, and Instructor levels at America's colleges and universities. At the Full professor rank, African American female representation was barely 1% ("Almanac 2002-3," 2002). In academic subject areas such as the biological and physical sciences, economics, math, and engineering, statistics continued to substantiate the fact that African American female representation within these fields in academe continues to be the exception rather than the norm (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Higher education officials point to a lack of scholars in the pipeline and market forces as the primary reasons why more faculty of color are not represented among the nation's higher education faculty ranks. However, based on their own personal experiences in the academic labor market, scholars of color disagree (Turner & Myers, 2000). In a 1996 study conducted to investigate the reality of the experiences of the labor market for new faculty members, Smith, Wolf, and Busenberg identified six myths associated with faculty hiring. Of the six myths identified, four related directly to faculty of color:

1. Faculty of color who are in the pipeline are being sought out by numerous institutions that must choose from too small a pool of candidates.
2. The few select individuals who are in sought-after fields are in high demand.
3. The most prestigious and wealthiest institutions that can offer higher salaries and benefits are continually and vigorously recruiting individuals.
4. Faculty of color are leaving academia altogether for more lucrative positions in government and private industry (Smith et al., 1996).

The study revealed that what faculty of color experience in the academic labor market was not necessarily reflective of what higher education officials identified as barriers to hiring and retention. The study's findings concluded that

1. Supply and bidding arguments are grossly overstated. Labor market issues and limited options will affect any candidate, regardless of group affiliation.

2. Academic professionals of color in specialized fields are not pursued for faculty positions by academic institutions. In fact, many of these same candidates pursue postdoctoral study or accept positions outside academe specifically because they cannot find positions within it.

3. Faculty of color, just like any other professionals, change institutions due to a myriad of reasons. More so than the prospects for higher salaries and increased prestige, employment changes can be a consequence of unresolved issues with an institution, lack of administrative response to questions about appropriate fit, and better opportunities for advancement elsewhere.

4. Decisions to leave academia are as often a function of the problems of academe (institutional fit, work environment, career progression) as they are offers from external employers (Smith et al., 1996).

According to the research findings, for the most part, faculty members obtained their positions by the traditional means: attending well-known graduate institutions, presenting at conferences, publishing, and networking. Granted, while data collected
supported the fact that there were not significant numbers of faculty of color in the pipeline, evidence of bidding wars was not confirmed (Smith et al., 1996).

When the facts are assessed at face value, America’s own history reveals that the doors to academe have not been opened to minorities as a result of the propitious actions of educational institutions. Instead, citizen boycotts for equal rights, student sit-ins and demonstrations, Congress passing laws, presidents signing executive orders, and the courts’ enforcement of those orders have been the catalysts that have forced the hand of American higher education to institute change (Wilson, 1989).

For many African American females, once hired, they are confronted with hostile work environments that impede their professional advancement and deny them job satisfaction. According to several studies, the most visible, recurring, and seemingly institutionalized of these obstacles included


2. Acquiring teaching positions, but then becoming stagnated at the lower academic ranks of instructor, lecturer, or assistant professor with little or no prospects of attaining tenure or management positions within the institution (Hendricks & Caplow, 1998; Moses, 1989).

3. Contending with conflicting and excessive academic demands, being the designated representative on administrative committees that address minority issues, and serving as mentor and counselor to minority students even though
these responsibilities are not valued or evaluated during promotion considerations (Turner & Myers, 2000; Gregory, 1995).

4. Experiencing severe marginalization in environments characterized by alienation, exclusion, and devaluation by their peers, staff, administrators, and some students (Aguirre, 2000; Johnsrud, 1993).

Despite the demonstrably chilly climate on many college and university campuses, many African American female faculty members remain committed to their academic professions. Professional satisfaction and the belief that the good aspects of the profession outweigh the bad are the incentives that drive African American female faculty members’ resolve to stay and persevere (Moses, 1997). However, loyalty to career in and of itself cannot replace the need for acceptance, respect, and value. Ultimately, if workplace circumstances and conditions persist in undermining job performance, impeding professional development, and dampening any hopes of achieving job advancement or workplace satisfaction, the few that choose to stay will eventually decide to leave (Turner & Myers, 2000).

Conceptual Framework

Kuh and Whitt (1988a) defined academic culture as the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus. (pp. 12-13)

They likened academic culture to a social or normative glue that holds organizations together, and serves to impart a sense of identity, facilitate a commitment to the college
and peer group, enhance the stability of a group's social system, and guide and shape behavior.

Peterson and Spencer (1990) described academic culture's features as

1. Serving to emphasize an organization's unique or distinctive character, which provides a subordinate meaning to members.
2. Being deeply embedded and enduring.
3. Not being malleable.
4. And changed primarily by cataclysmic events or through slower, intensive, and long-term efforts. (p. 6)

Clark (1987) identified what he believed to be the three concepts that help shape the meaning and guide the direction of an organization's culture through the actions and achievements of its members: "belief" in what one is doing, "commitment" that is founded on that belief, and commitment to principles that create "common interests" on a large scale (p. 106).

Schein (1992) characterized the culture of the organization as

a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

Richardson (1994) accentuated the important role that faculty members play as cultural bearers within the academy by their telling of stories and repeating of incidents in that they help to transmit institutional culture and sustain it as a vibrant, dynamic, and evolving pattern of interaction between individuals and groups.

Culture is believed to be a major factor in faculty and departmental effectiveness. It remains a force throughout the academic life cycle via its integration in the processes that revolve around the recruitment of new faculty members; the acclimation of faculty members to their environments; individual and collective faculty development; faculty
retention; and the trio of teaching, research, and service by which faculty members find themselves being defined and evaluated by (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Yet, once a member of these academic organizations, what many faculty of color and women find themselves confronting are chilly climates created and fostered by these same organizational cultures and cultural bearers, and personified by isolation and disenfranchisement rather than collegiality and inclusion (Conley & Hyer, 1999).

Without regard to race, gender, changing times, or changing demographics, America's higher education institutions persist in adhering to its original White male-dominated blueprint. As noted by Chliwniak (1997),

The effect of patriarchal leadership (leadership that is male-dominated and normed on male standards) often results in masculine norms perpetuated throughout the institutional structure and culture. Faculty ranks, tenured full professorships, and the production and presentation of scholarship continue to present the "generic man" as being the norm while women's location is marginalized or even excluded. As a result, students receive patterns of information that perpetuate the continuation of the status quo, namely the generic male model in a male-dominated institution. Women, on the other hand, continue to hover on the fringe of the institution. (p. 13)

The changing face of the American populace cannot help but magnify the incongruity of higher education's original blueprint to that of the population it is currently charged to serve. The 21st century demands a bold new system of higher education that celebrates the talents of every group, makes available to all students the skills of those who harbor that rich talent, so that it can be experienced by all who pass through its doors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the workplace experiences and perceptions of African American female faculty members working within the boundaries
of an African American male-dominated HBCU organizational culture. In reference to the African American female faculty members who participated in this study, specific research questions included

1. What have been the career experiences that have shaped the study participants’ workplace perceptions and attitudes about their organizational culture?

2. What opportunities, if any, have there been for the study participants to contribute to the shaping and influencing of the values and beliefs in their institutional settings?

3. What actions or incidences have helped or hindered their acceptance, participation, and progress in the academic workplace?

4. To what extent have the study participants perceived that they have been recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their particular academic organizational cultures?

Need for the Study

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the significance of organizational culture and its impact on faculty members’ perceptions of their workplace environments. The lion’s share of this research has focused on predominantly White institutions of learning and their accompanying predominantly White male faculties. The minimal amount of attention that has been devoted to minority faculty in the academic literature has been the result of research conducted during the 1970s and mid 1980s when there was strong public support for diversifying the nation’s higher education faculties and student bodies (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998).
Some research has been conducted on the workplace perceptions of women and minority faculty, but primarily in the context of predominantly White academic settings, with minority and female faculty being portrayed as monolithic, and little or no recognition given to the differences that exist between and within these groups (Aguirre, 2000). For African American female faculty in particular, even though they have been participants in higher education for more than a century, they still continue to be almost totally absent from the research literature (Moses, 1989).

Research on other types of academic institutions that represent America's higher education system such as HBCUs has been even less forthcoming. HBCU faculty rosters represent a vast array of ethnic backgrounds, with Whites and other minorities accounting for almost half of their faculties (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). HBCUs constitute approximately 4% of the nation's 3000 plus colleges and universities (Hoffman et al., 1996), enroll 18% of the African American students pursuing higher education (Williams, 2003), and, up until 1991, produced approximately 70% of all African American college graduates (Hoffman et al., 1996). Though that percentage has fallen, HBCUs can still claim 23% of the African American students who receive degrees (Williams, 2003). Throughout America's higher education history, HBCUs have been the primary educators of African American college students, yet scant attention has been given to assessing or understanding the academic cultures and faculty that define these institutions (Brown et al., 2001).

The lack of more substantive documentation on HBCUs, to include their histories, academic cultures, and faculty staff, minimizes the fact that America's higher education system has moved beyond the traditional blueprint that previously defined its all-White,
all-male beginnings. In an effort to contribute to the literature and broaden the knowledge base that contributes to the understanding of other institutional types that represent the academic culture and faculty experience in the American higher education setting as it is today, this dissertation examined particular aspects of an HBCU’s organizational culture as revealed through the professional workplace experiences of a select group of African American female professors.

Definition of Terms

Black/African American/Negro: refers to people having origins in any of the Black race groups of Africa. It includes people who reported Black, African American, Afro American, Negro, Nigerian, or Haitian (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002).

Historically Black College and University (HBCU): higher education institution established to serve the educational needs of Black Americans who were generally denied admission to traditionally White institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

Organizational Culture:

the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus. (Kuh & Whitt, 1988a, pp. 12-13)

Delimitations

The scope of this study was confined to

1. One Carnegie-classified, doctoral/research-level HBCU.
2. Seven tenured/tenure-track African American female faculty with the earned doctoral degree.
3. The exclusion of traditionally recognized female-dominated disciplines (i.e., education, sociology, psychology, nursing, allied health).

4. Selected academic departments in the HBCU's College of Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, and School of Business.

5. Subject data collected during the Spring and Fall 2002 academic semesters.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I provides a brief chronological summary of the evolution of women and African Americans in America's higher education system, the purpose of and need for engaging in research on African American female faculty, the conceptual framework for the study, definitions and delimitations of the study, and a brief description of chapter contents.

Chapter II provides a literature review on academic culture, the circumstances (past and present) of African American female faculty members in higher education, and the history of HBCUs.

Chapter III provides a description of the methodology, research design, study parameters, research population, and the data collection/analysis/reporting processes.

Chapter IV provides a detailed presentation of the research findings.

Chapter V provides a discussion of the research findings, recommendations for future exploration of this topic, and closing remarks.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Culture, as a concept, has experienced a long and diverse history. Use of the term has ranged from the layperson's employment to imply sophistication to anthropologists' references to depict the customs and rituals that societies form over the course of their history (Schein, 1992). Within the field of anthropology where the concept of culture has been most extensively investigated, culture is defined as all aspects of a group's behavior and its social organization, regardless of the group under investigation or its setting (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989).

Introduction to the Literature on Organizational Culture

The term "organizational culture" has become a popular construct in studies undertaken by researchers from a variety of academic fields outside of anthropology to include business and management, communications, industrial psychology, and sociology. In fact, the eventual widespread interest that education researchers developed about the interplay of culture, organizations, and management, as it related to higher education, grew out of studies of organizational culture and management in the business sector. Examples of some of their works include Clark (1972) and his research on organizational sagas; Gaff and Wilson (1971) and Freedman (1979) and their studies of faculty cultures; Masland (1983) and his investigations of organizational culture; Chaffee (1984) and Tierney (1988b) and their probes into the links between leadership and
organizational culture; and Tierney (1988a) and his inquiries into concept and process as they relate to organizational culture.

Initially, some American higher education officials resisted having their organizational settings and practices equated with the organizational workings of business structures. Nevertheless, results of those studies revealed, characteristically, traditional administrative practices common in American colleges and universities are comparable to Japanese business management styles; shared governance and collegiality are forms of participatory management regularly practiced in the realm of business; academic departments, in seeking problem resolution, ensuring quality outcomes, and strategizing for future directions, function like quality circles (a product of the business world); and tenure mirrors the economic and psychological benefits of lifetime employment (Chait, 1982; Dill, 1982; Masland, 1983). These findings still hold true to this day.

Given the breadth of research that has been devoted to this topic, there should be no surprise over the number of competing descriptions and definitions that have evolved as a result of it (Owens & Steinhoff, 1989).

Origins and Evolution of Organizational Culture

The origins of the use of the term “organizational culture” are unclear, but it is likely that the term originated in the cultural anthropology of North America where its earliest use was traced back to Jacques’ 1951 study titled The Changing Culture of the Factory (Brown, 1995; Elsmore, 2001). In the context of the environment of his study, Jacques (1951) interpreted organizational culture to be the following:
The culture of the factory is its customary and traditional way of thinking and of doing things, which is shared to a greater or lesser degree by all its members, and which new members must learn and partially accept to be accepted into service in the firm. Culture in this sense covers a wide range of behavior: the methods of production; job skills and technical knowledge; attitudes towards discipline and punishment; the customs and habits of managerial behavior; the objectives of the concern; its way of doing business; the methods of payments; the values placed on different types of work; beliefs in democratic living and joint consultation; and the less conscious conventions and taboos. (p. 6)

Subsequent definitions and interpretations of organizational culture, ranging from the simple to the complex, represent how circular much of the intellectual development of the concept of organizational culture has evolved (Elsmore, 2001). Nevertheless, whether studied from an anthropological, business, sociological, psychological, or educational perspective, results of succeeding investigations into organizational culture continue to affirm the basic tenets of Jacques’ earlier findings: organizational culture as a system of values, a system of norms and myths, a system of routines, or as a set of basic assumptions (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). Examples of definitions that have evolved from Jacques’ original interpretation include

1. Pascale and Athos’s (1981) description of organizational culture as the glue that holds an organization together; a “bass clef” that conveys at a deep level what management really cares about.

2. Deal and Kennedy’s (1982) description of organizational culture as a stable collection of values, symbols, heroes, rituals, and stories that operates beneath the surface imparting a strong influence on individual and group behavior in the workplace.

3. Becher’s (1984) description of organizational culture as “the traditional and social heritage of a people; their customs and practices, their transmitted knowledge,
beliefs, law, and morals; their linguistic and symbolic forms and communication, and the meanings they share” (p. 167).

4. Kuh and Whitt’s (1988a) description of organizational culture as

the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus. (pp. 12-13)

5. Tierney’s (1988b) focus on the relevance of values to organizational culture in

that

the internal dynamic of institutions has its roots in the history of the organization and derives its force from the values, processes, and goals held by those most intimately involved in the organization’s workings. An organization’s culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. (p. 3)

6. Dennison’s (1990) focus on the link between management and values in

organizational culture in respect to culture denoting the underlying values, beliefs, and principles that act as a foundation for an organization’s management system as well as the set of management practices and behaviors that both exemplify and strengthen those basic principles.

7. Schein’s (1992) emphasis on

shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

Earlier studies of organizational culture characterized most definitions of culture as conveying one or more of the following: (a) observed behavioral regularities (i.e., work hours); (b) norms or specific guides to conduct; (c) the philosophy that guides an organization’s attitudes and actions toward employees or clients; and/or (d) rules for
getting along in the organization (Kuh & Whitt, 1988b). Later studies conducted by researchers and managers added the dimension of climate and practices that organizations establish around their handling of people (Schein, 1992). Today, the concept of culture is used to identify all of the above, which has become a standard for identifying an organization's traditional practices and modes of operation, as well as its climate and general organizational environment (Flint, 2000).

Culture is not automatic. A group must go through the stages that lead to having shared experiences and established assumptions for it to have a culture (Flint, 2000). This genesis, transmission, and maintenance process involves four interconnected domains (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985):

1. The physical territory, which is the primary catalyst for the culture's genesis, relates to the ecological context in which a group is embedded. This domain includes the identification of the physical setting, historical forces, and the expectations, demands, and social organization of those who enclose the group and lay claims on the group's conduct.

2. Differential interaction, otherwise known as the network of exchanges and communication links between people that eventually develop into a common frame of reference among the members of the collective. Only when the ratio of intra-group connections to extra-group connections is clearly differentiated will a common frame of reference relating to ecologically-based problems likely develop among the members of a collective.

3. The collective understanding of objects, events, and activities that has no meaning until they are acknowledged and interpreted by members of a collective.
Only when members of a group assign similar meanings to facets of their internal environment can collectives create, through interaction, distinctive responses to issues that later take on the characteristics of rule, ritual, and value.

4. Reproductive and adaptive capacity centers on the individual members who make up the group to which a culture is attributed. Just as a group is necessary to invent and sustain culture, it is necessary for individuals to repeatedly enact cultural patterns of behavior and interpretation as they respond to occurrences in their daily lives. Inevitably, cultures will endure only to the extent that their content is passed from one generation to the next.

Once established, organizational culture exerts a long-lasting impact on the inauguration and orientation of organizational members. It not only formulates people's behavior, perception, and understanding of events, it provides a blueprint for learning (Evans, 1996; Flint, 2000). Although it is fairly stable, culture is always evolving, continually recreating itself by ongoing internal and external patterns of interactions between individuals, groups, and the environment (Kuh & Whitt, 1988a). Thus, culture is about individuals interacting with each other in both traditional and innovative ways to devise new interpretations and plans of action. This is the only manner in which a group's organizational culture is able to remain true to its traditions yet open for growth and expansion of its content (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). It is within this realm of product and process that the power and importance of organizational culture is revealed and played out (Evans, 1996).
Characteristics of Organizational Culture

Culture, perceived as shared values and beliefs, has three key functions: (a) provides organizational members with a sense of meaning, identity, and connectedness; (b) shapes behavior, whereby group members act in particular ways because of the established boundaries of the culture; and (c) increases organizational stability, effectiveness, and cohesion (Tierney, 1988c). Added to these three key functions is culture's important role in reducing uncertainty for new members of the group (Flint, 2000). In this sense, culture implies some level of structural stability to the organized group (Schein, 1992).

Organizations, in principle, are independent cultural configurations that develop and preserve particular systems of values, beliefs, norms, and meanings exclusive to the specific group. These elements influence the myriad of behavior, routines, and practices that define a distinct way of organizational life. In this sense, culture seems to have something to do with the way group members organize their experiences in that it creates the avenues that develop a learned way to contend with experiences in their daily environment (Barley, 1983; Gregory, 1983; Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989).

In order for individuals to function within any given setting, they must have an ongoing sense of what that reality is all about in order to act and react. Organizational culture is the frame of reference of such publicly and collectively adopted meanings for a given group at a given time (Pettigrew, 1979). Culture focuses on those deeply rooted patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that group members have about their organization or its work (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Through organizational culture, participants willingly participate in a
common program of action and standards for self-examination and excellence. In return, group members gain a better understanding of and respect for the identity, beliefs, and purposes of their particular institution (Tierney, 1988a).

Culture helps to facilitate organizational processes of coordination and control and can be an important source of motivation for members (Flint, 2000). At the same time, an organization’s culture can also be a problem in that some cultures will resist change to new influences and be inclined to grow more conservative as time passes by. Culture, by definition, is based on enduring patterns of embedded values, beliefs, and the like (Peterson & Spencer, 1990), so people will rarely question their basic assumptions, and even if the organizational culture is dysfunctional, they will remain true to what makes them feel secure (Flint, 2000).

Components of Organizational Culture

Competing views abound about the components of organizational culture in terms of their position and importance as they relate to the establishment and maintenance of organizational culture. There is also a myriad of interpretations about the meaning and uses of these components, both individually and collectively. Nevertheless, there is overwhelming agreement that these components guide group members in interpreting and evaluating their own behavior as well as the behavior of others (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). The two components that share the starring role in the establishment and maintenance of what is referred to as organizational culture are values and assumptions.

All group learning ultimately reflects an individual’s basic values, defined as an individual’s notion of what ought to be as distinct from what is (Schein, 1992). An individual’s values are her/his own personal convictions, which have not been accepted
widely enough to be considered or accepted as valid alternatives to a group’s problems (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). Until a group takes some joint action, and has together observed the results of that action, a shared basis for determining what is real and factual has not yet been established (Schein, 1992). Thus, an individual’s values are still considered questionable, debatable, and up for challenge and rejection by the group (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989).

Values are developed and established within a group when that group comes to a decision about an issue at hand. If the solution resulting from the decision that was made is seen as reliable, the group takes it on board as the way it is to be done. Over time, that solution is transferred into an accepted reality and eventually transformed into a shared value or belief that is no longer questioned (Schein, 1992). Hence, values eventually come to represent the widely held beliefs about the relative importance of goals, activities, and relationships. Whether expressed as the “system of beliefs” of an organizational culture (i.e., beliefs about academic freedom based on the values of justice and liberty), or stated explicitly (i.e., mission statements, stated goals and strategies) (Richardson, 1994), values that become embodied in an ideology or organizational philosophy serve as a guide for behavior and as a way of dealing with the uncertainty that is brought about by unknown, uncertain, or unforeseen events (Schein, 1992).

Values are characterized by being highly conscious and explicitly articulated due to their normative and/or moral function to guide members of the group in how to manage particular matters and behave in certain instances. They may be based on prior cultural learning and be in line with the basic assumptions, but they may also be what is referred to as espoused values (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). Espoused values reflect
what people will say in a variety of situations but which may not be consistent with what they will actually do in instances where those values should, in fact, be in effect. Thus, a college or university may say that it values its students and the level of quality of its academic programs, but its reputation in those areas may tell another story (Argyris & Schon, 1974; Schein, 1992).

At the deepest level of culture is the organization’s basic assumptions, which can be defined as the unconscious, taken for granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and underlying convictions that guide behavior (Evans, 1996; Schein, 1992). Assumptions, which lie underneath the behavioral norms, represent the bedrock beliefs on which norms, values, actions, and all other aspects of culture are built (Owens & Steinhoff, 1989). That is, from a given value you can derive or deduce some presumptions on which a value is founded (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). In fact, if a basic assumption is strongly held in a group, members will find behavior based on any other premise inconceivable (Schein, 1992).

Assumptions concern the relationship of individuals to the environment, the nature of reality, time and space, the nature of human activity, the nature of human nature, and the nature of human relationships. Cultural assumptions are tacit, unconsciously taken for granted, rarely considered or talked about, and accepted as true and non-negotiable (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). These unseen assumptions, of which the organization’s members are generally unaware, form patterns, but they remain implicit unless they are called to the surface by some process of inquiry (Evans, 1996; Schein, 1992).
Basic assumptions tend to be those that are neither confronted nor challenged and are, therefore, extremely difficult to change. To learn something new in this realm requires the individual and the group to resurrect, reexamine, and possibly change some of the more stable portions of its cognitive structure. Such learning is intrinsically difficult because the reexamination of basic assumptions temporarily destabilizes the individual’s and the group’s cognitive and interpersonal environment, which can lead to the onset of anxiety and the triggering of defense mechanisms. In this sense, the shared basic assumptions that make up the culture of a group can be thought of at both the individual and group levels as psychological cognitive defense mechanisms that permit the group to continue to function (Schein, 1992).

Assumptions typically deal with fundamental aspects of life (i.e., human nature and human activities); the nature of truth and its discovery; appropriate individual and group interactions and relationships; the relative importance of work, family, and self-development; and the proper role of men and women. When an individual joins a new group, that individual does not develop new assumptions about each of these areas, but as the new group develops its own shared history, it will develop modified assumptions in critical areas of its experience, which will come to represent the culture of that particular group (Schein, 1992).

In the collective, assumptions are generally learned responses to threats that challenge the institution’s survival (Richardson, 1994). Once a group has developed an integrated set of such assumptions, the group will be at a maximum comfort level with others who share the same set of assumptions and very uncomfortable and vulnerable in situations where different assumptions operate, either because the group will not
understand what is going on, or misperceive and misinterpret the actions of others (Douglas, 1986; Schein, 1992).

Other components of organizational culture—norms and standards, sagas, heroes, symbols, ideologies—play a crucial role in the continuous process of establishing and maintaining what is legitimate and that which is labeled unacceptable in an organizational culture (Pettigrew, 1979). Similar to values and assumptions, these components also provide valuable insight into the nature of the cohesiveness and explanation for the enduring nature of many of America's higher education institutions of learning.

An important way in which organizational culture influences behavior is through the institutionalization and enforcement of norms and standards. Driven by the assumptions that underlie norms (Flint, 2000), these written and unwritten rules express the shared beliefs of a group’s members about what behavior is appropriate and accepted as legitimate in order for one to be a member in good standing (Cohen, 1984; Owens & Steinhoff, 1989). Cultural norms represent what the people in the organization accept as true in the world and what is false, what is sensible and what is absurd, what is possible and what is impossible. The cultural norms in the organization—informal, unwritten, but highly explicit and powerful in influencing behavior—arise directly from the underlying assumptions (Owens & Steinhoff, 1989).

Saga, usually having its roots in an organization’s history, describes a unique accomplishment of the organization (Clark, 1972; Masland, 1983). The institutional memory serves as the connective thread between an institution’s past and present, and, to a certain degree, shapes how future events will be interpreted (Kuh & Whitt, 1988a). The saga serves as the vehicle that preserves that institutional memory. An institution’s saga
codifies what sets an institution apart from others. Elements such as key faculty members, students, alumni, unique academic programs, and images about the school usually support an institution’s saga (Masland, 1983).

Organizational heroes are important to an organization because they often represent ideals and values in human form. They play an important role in an institution’s saga in that they are people who have made crucial decisions or who exemplify the proper way to act. Heroes can act as role models, set standards, or preserve what makes the organization special. Individuals and groups tell stories about heroes and the contributions they have made to their institutions. These stories are passed down to newcomers as models of inspiration that helped lay the foundation for the institution’s future successes (Masland, 1983).

A symbol is something that represents something else, making tangible an implicit value or belief. Individuals and groups make use of a symbol as a concrete example much in the same way that they use a hero to personify cultural values. Whereas sagas and heroes may only be familiar to those individuals and groups that have established a relationship with the institution, a symbol can serve an important function by way of serving as a vehicle to convey an important message or element about the institution to those individuals and groups external to the institution (Masland, 1983).

An ideology is a set of beliefs about the social world and how it operates, containing statements about the correctness of certain social arrangements and what action would be undertaken in light of those statements. Ideologies play a major role in the processes of organizational creation because they have the potential to link attitude and action by connecting social burdens with general ethical principles. The outcome is
that commitment is provided to accomplish daily organizational tasks on the way to some
grand scheme of things. The potency of organizational ideologies will rely not only on
the social context in which they function and how they are created and by whom, but also
how they are maintained and kept alive (Pettigrew, 1979).

Schein grouped all the elements he identified as important for the understanding
of a particular organizational culture into what he referred to as artifacts, which he
defined as all the phenomena that are seen, heard, and felt when one encounters a new
group with an unfamiliar culture. With the exceptions of values and assumptions,
Schein's artifacts represent the physical and social environment of an organization: the
stories about the organization (sagas, legends, anecdotes, etc.), the architecture of its
physical environment, published lists of values, the norms of behavior, its technology and
products, the style of dress, traditions (rituals, rites, and ceremonies), customs, and
language (Flint, 2000; Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989).

Schein believes that, while artifacts are the most easily observed and readily
visible, they are often the most difficult to interpret in that they are symbolic of the
culture itself; also, things may not mean what a viewer may think they mean. Because
artifacts have become habitual and a part of the group's daily existence, and for the most
part unnoticed, outside observers cannot ask about artifacts due to the fact that members
of the organizational culture are not always conscious of them (Pedersen & Sorensen,
1989). In other words, the observer may be able to describe what s/he sees and feels but
may not be able to reconstruct from that observation alone what those things mean in the
given group, or whether they even reflect significant underlying assumptions (Schein,
All of the components of organization culture are to varying degrees interdependent, and sometimes used interchangeably (depending on the interpretation of the researcher or the context in which the researcher chooses to use the particular component), in that there is some convergence in the way they relate to functional problems of integration, control, and commitment. These components emphasize the mobilization of consciousness and purpose, the codification of meaning, the emergence of normative patterns, the success or failure of systems of leadership, and strategies of legitimization. It is through such mechanisms and processes that culture exists, and, indeed, the ever changing state which we describe as an organizational culture that acts as a determinant or constraint on the way further attempts to handle issues of purpose, integration, and commitment are managed (Pettigrew, 1979).

Conceptual Frameworks of Organizational Culture

Researchers agree to a large extent upon the existence of “culture” but a good deal of conceptual confusion and variation still exists within the field (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). According to Peterson and Spencer (1990), much of this conceptual confusion stems from “the many diverse and often nitpicking definitions and distinctions for culture and models of how to conceptualize it” (p. 9). Nevertheless, it still is possible to identify the more popular descriptive frameworks from which many researchers often conceptualize their studies.

Peterson and Spencer’s (1990) four broad content-driven groups highlight the geospatial; traditions, myths, and artifacts; behavioral patterns and processes; and shared values and beliefs:
1. Geospatial focuses on tangible and visible physical elements that have shared meaning within the culture (buildings, sculptures, traffic patterns, etc.). These campus structures, styles, and patterns have often served as visible manifestations of deeper institutional beliefs or as signals of future institutional directions. Since these elements are relatively permanent, the role they play within the campus culture, the shared meaning they convey, and the sense of historical context and present status can make them critical elements in shaping or perpetuating cultural meaning. Descriptive studies of these elements are straightforward, but what they mean is a matter of interpretation, judgment, or opinion.

2. Traditions, myths, and artifacts found within the organization—graduation ceremonies, major campus events, the heroes and villains of the institution, the major sagas of the institution’s successes and failures, and the language and jargon used to describe them—are all forms of institutional culture that can provide great insight into the past and current ideologies and assumptions that members hold important and that guide their actions. As symbols, these elements illustrate the idealized view of the institution, highlighting values and beliefs that are avowed but not necessarily practiced.

3. Behavioral patterns and processes encompass the manifest patterns of behavior that are present in the organization’s operations, and that have been referred to as the “social architecture” of the organization. These elements involve behavioral activities with relatively standard content and form, sustained and repeated over time, formally defined by the organization or
informally developed and supported by members within the organization.

Though studies of these elements can be relatively simple to execute, determining the cultural impact of these elements requires careful consideration of the manifested impact of these processes, the subsequent reactions to them, and their meanings within the organization.

4. Values and beliefs that the members share about their organization—explicitly stated such as those found in mission statements and organizational charters, or implicitly held and revealed only through members' actions. While the espoused values and beliefs are often those that are widely communicated and form the institutional identity, they often present the organization in its ideal, rather than actual, form. The implicit or embedded values and beliefs are those that members carry with them, provide a real sense of the meaning of their organizational reality, and guide their daily actions. Because these cultural values and beliefs often function in the unconscious of the individual, where they go unchallenged and unrecognized, studies of values and beliefs, while critical in determining the shared meanings that guide member and organizational behavior, are also the most difficult and time-consuming to conduct and discern (pp. 9-11).

Tierney's (1988a) three basic dimensions emphasize structure, environment, and values:

1. The structural dimension refers to the manifold ways in which the organization accomplishes its activities (formal and informal). Important in this dimension are not only the roles and relationships one sees on a
formalized organizational chart and the processes by which tasks are executed, but also the roles of specific individuals and the lines of communication and information that the array of these roles create.

2. The environmental dimension includes the objective context of people, events, demands, and constraints in which an institution finds itself. Also referred to as the “enacted” environment, this dimension concerns the understanding organizational members develop about the nature of the boundaries of the organization and the way the institution perceives itself, as created through its members’ own selective attention and interpretation. By noting that organizations respond to and help define their environment through selective attention and interpretation, one can observe that organizations are less a matter of objective fact and more an ongoing process of cultural definition.

3. Values refer to the beliefs, norms, and priorities held by members of the institution. Of special interest are values that pertain to the organization itself and the extent to which values are congruent among individuals and subgroups. Values as perceived in this context are most apparent in the institution’s mission and the quality and direction of its leadership (pp. 13-18).

Schein (1992) focuses on three levels of organizational culture—artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions—ranging from the very tangible, overt, and visible to the deeply embedded and unconscious:

1. Artifacts represent the visible products of the group such as the architecture, language, technology and products, artistic creations, and its style as embodied in clothing, emotional displays, myths and stories, observable
rituals and ceremonies, and so on. When studying cultural artifacts, Schein notes that different observers choose to report on different sorts of artifacts, leading to non-comparable descriptions.

2. Espoused values represent what an individual will say, but not necessarily what that individual will actually do. If the espoused values are reasonably congruent with the underlying assumptions, then the articulation of those values into a philosophy of operating can be helpful in bringing the group together, serving as a source of identity and core mission. If not, the espoused values are interpreted as either rationalizations or only aspirations for the future.

3. Basic assumptions represent the implicit assumptions that actually guide behavior, that tell group members how to perceive, think about, and feel about things. Schein believes that the essence of a culture lies in the pattern of basic underlying assumptions, and once the researcher understands those, s/he can easily understand the other more surface levels and deal appropriately with them.

Around these conceptual frameworks, two competing theories about how a researcher can best uncover organizational culture have developed: (a) the functional perspective, which perceives culture as a product of the organization; (b) the interpretist perspective, which perceives organization as the culture (Tierney, 1988a, 1988c).

A functional approach to organizational culture posits that organizational culture is a "real" entity that can be broken down into knowable elements (Tierney, 1988a),
whereby the organization is seen as the “organism” and culture as the “glue” that holds the organism together (Tierney, 1988c).

Functionalists are guided by four basic assumptions: (a) Culture is cognitive and can be understood, (b) all participants interpret cultural artifacts similarly, (c) it is possible to codify abstract realities, and (d) culture can be predictive and generalizable. The functionalist rationalizes that since culture influences components such as social structure, technology, and the environment, and those variables also influence organizational culture (Tierney, 1988c), then the way to understand culture is to be able to understand the functional value of particular elements of the organizational culture (Tierney, 1988a).

Functionalists believe that culture can be counted (i.e., culture equals objects, acts, and events). Working from this premise, researchers enter organizations with a specific inventory of cultural artifacts to uncover, and, from that starting point, attempt to expose culture by investigating how an organization expresses itself in its symbols, rites, stories, or other similar cultural artifacts (Tierney, 1988c).

An interpretive approach to organizational culture posits that organizational reality is far too abstruse for a precise definition. Culture is perceived as a “root metaphor” in that the culture of an organization constitutes human existence to such a degree that the ability to reduce organizational meaning to predefined elements is not feasible or useful (Tierney, 1988a).

Interpretists are guided by four basic assumptions: (a) Culture is not necessarily understandable since what one observes and interprets will vary among individuals, (b) the construction of meaning does not mean that all individuals interpret reality
similarly, (c) it is impossible to codify abstract reality, and (d) culture is a constant process of negotiation. Interpretists believe that the researcher's task is to uncover the conceptual structures that inform the participants' acts and to construct a system of analysis that interprets those acts (Tierney, 1988c).

Interpretists posit that all knowledge and meaning is rooted in the subjective views of the organizational participants. Working from this premise, researchers still examine the components of organizational culture, but they also gather information from the organizational participants, both of which results in a holistic and lifelike description of organizational culture (Tierney, 1988c).

Researchers who posit the paramount importance of structure for the collective understandings held by members of a group disregard the potential autonomy of cultures formed through interaction and interpretation. Mechanically connecting structure to meaning discounts the active, ongoing, and ever problematic character of interaction, as well as the conflict and ambiguity that attend any sense-making process. Likewise, theories that view meaning as pure social construction fail to appreciate the fact that people's actions and interactions are formed by circumstances often beyond their control and outside their immediate present. It is in this sense that culture mediates between the structural and individual realms (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985).

Summary of the Literature on Organizational Culture

Culture implies that, in part, human behavior is piloted by a collectively created and sustained way of life that is shared by a diverse group of people. Culture can be viewed as a set of solutions developed by a group of people to tackle specific problems brought on by the situations they face in common. Cultural manifestations, therefore,
evolve as group members confront similar problems and create and implement strategies that are remembered and passed on to future members (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985).

The most constructive way to think about culture is to view it as the accumulated shared learning of a given group, encompassing behavioral, emotional, and cognitive aspects of the group members' total psychological functioning. For shared learning to take place, there must be a history of shared experience, which, in turn, denotes some stability and longevity of being a part of the group. Taking into consideration such stability and a shared history, the human need for parsimony, consistency, and meaning will cause the various shared elements to form into patterns that eventually can be understood as organizational culture (Schein, 1992).

Introduction to the Literature on African American Female Faculty Members

According to Sneirl (1997), in the early 1970s, for African Americans and other minorities, it appeared that campuses were finally making the right moves toward tolerance, respect, and acceptance. Even with the history of elitism and exclusion and its tradition of upholding and perpetuating the "good ol' boy" (p. 125) system, student activism and political/social unrest on campuses proffered hopes for possible redemption for this nation's higher education system. However, campuses returned to business-as-usual in the 1980s, when most college and university administrators and leaders, as well as the country itself, reverted to its previous ways of operating. By the 1990s, college campuses still had not yet become "the communities that had been envisioned for future generations" (p. 12).
American higher education has now entered into the 21st century. Nevertheless, Snearl’s (1997) earlier characterization of the plight of African American women in roles and positions of leadership within academe as a “tragedy” (p. 126) that has become “a theater of absurdity” (p. 126) still seems to be relevant in that the current circumstances of African American female professors remain strikingly similar to the past. It is these similar circumstances that contribute to their invisibility, powerlessness, and exclusion in academe.

A search of the literature to frame the discussion for this study uncovered a very limited resource of research specific to African American women faculty in American higher education. Among the limited number of studies about African American professionals, the experiences of African American women have received fleeting reference (Allen, 1995). Most conventional research tends to incorporate African American women into the larger, undifferentiated categories of women and/or African Americans (Johnsrud, 1993). Other studies generalize findings, without modification, to all other populations (including African American women) regardless of ethnic or racial background. Needless to say, both approaches fail to consider African American women as a unique group, and thus they severely limit the applicability of their findings (Etter-Lewis, 1997). Aguirre (2000) attributes this lack of information about the status and experiences of other than White groups to the White male’s exclusive control of the validation and distribution of what is considered “good” scholarship since the inception of American higher education.

African American women have been longtime participants in American higher education on all levels, from the first Negro woman to graduate from college, Mary Jane
Patterson (Oberlin, 1862), to the first Negro Ph.D. degree holders in 1921: Georgina Simpson, University of Chicago; Sadie Tanner Mossell, University of Pennsylvania; and Eva B. Dykes, Radcliffe (Etter-Lewis, 1997). Even with this long record of participation, African American women still continue to be not much written about or referred to in the research literature. Thus, though African American women have made some gains in higher education, they still struggle for their voice to be heard in the chilly environment of academe (Collins, 2001; Moses, 1989).

According to Moses (1997), a number of misconceptions surround the status of African American women on the nation’s college and university campuses, primarily because there is very limited research specifically related to African American women in academe, how they are faring, and what issues are of concern to them. Research conducted by Tierney and Rhoads (1993) notes that the challenges that women of color face are unique to their own experience and bare no resemblance to that of male faculty. They attribute this uniqueness, in large part, to an overriding organizational culture founded on historical and social patterns that are both White and male. Moses further states that studies on African American women, in particular, often ignore these unique experiences, and, in her words, “the result is that Black women are virtually invisible” (p. 23).

Historical Overview

As noted in Chapter I, prior to the Civil War, there was no structured education system—K-12 or post-secondary—in place for slaves to pursue a formal education. In many states, especially those in the South, public policy and certain statutory provisions outright prohibited the education of slaves, thereby making it illegal even to teach Negro
slaves the basics of reading and writing (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). Some slaves managed to acquire the bare basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic through secret lessons taught by someone in the main plantation house, or by other slaves who had taught themselves through a process of "education by imitation." Negro women, many of whom served in the "main house," had as much opportunity as Negro men to share in this imitative form of education (Collins, 2001).

After the Civil War—which ended in 1865 and brought to an end over 200 years of Negro slavery—religious organizations and the newly established Freedman’s Bureau (an agency created by the federal government to provide life-skills assistance to the recently emancipated slaves) set out on a mission to educate and evangelize the newly freed Negroes, who were characterized as an illiterate, ignorant, and uneducated group of people who had been ravaged by the institution of slavery. Under these conditions, education for the emancipated slave was viewed not only as a tool of socialization and liberation, but also as a reasonable explanation for the necessity of assisting freed slaves in becoming productive members of society (Collins, 2001).

White missionaries, who oversaw every aspect of the Negro woman’s education, saw Negro women as the key components to uplifting the Negro race out of its dire circumstances. The value system of the White women missionaries was significantly influenced by their acceptance of what a White woman’s role was characterized by during this time period (i.e., piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity). Accordingly, the curriculum taught to Negro women tended to focus on moral development and home economics (millinery, sewing, cooking, and other activities involved in domestic servitude) and literacy, because reading was important for reading
the Bible and teaching the children. This curriculum agenda boded well with many White southerners who envisioned Negro women as well-trained domestic servants (Collins, 2001). Even for the Negro women who had obtained a college degree, there were few occupations open to them other than teaching, home demonstration, or cleaning of White women’s homes (Etter-Lewis, 1997).

By the end of the 19th century, education was familiar ground for Negro women, since it had become one of the few respectable and available professions open to them. Middle-class Negro women served as schoolteachers among free Negroes, and a few even held teaching positions in Negro elementary and secondary schools. But even with these gains, racism remanded Negro women to HBCUs, and Negro male sexism consigned the handful of Negro women in the HBCUs to activities associated with the female arts, such as teaching and home economics, or performing specific duties closely linked to the interests of women students (McKay, 1997).

Transitioning into the 20th century, the Negro community recognized the need to train Negro women for other roles in the community beyond teaching, and Negro women, like most White women, began to be encouraged to seek education in “helping” fields, such as nursing and social work (Gregory, 1995). But, as the century progressed, and more opportunities for education beyond the “helping fields” were made available, a shift in the Black academic community occurred for African American women. Emphasis was no longer simply placed on home economics, teaching, and nursing, but also on liberal arts and the social sciences (Coleman-Burns, 1989; Gregory, 1995). With these opportunities waiting at the helm, the 20th century unleashed a new breed of Black women onto the academic scene who envisioned themselves becoming scholars, leaders
of their race, builders of their communities, self-defined, and self-sufficient (Collins, 2001).

Workplace Issues of African American Female Faculty

The exclusion of African American scholars from full participation in the academy is virtually non-existent in the standard histories of the United States and American education. White academia sanctioned this exclusion by its refusal to consider eminent African American male scholars such as Carter G. Woodson, Horace Mann Bond, and W.E.B. DuBois for faculty positions; its exclusion of minority scholars from academic discourse altogether; and its failure to include important contributions from minority scholars in their works. These exclusionary hiring practices, adhered to by both private and public institutions of higher education, continued well into the mid-20th century. Even now, as this nation moves forward into the 21st century, the paucity of African American male and female faculty members and administrators on college and university personnel rosters continues to be a major problem area for higher education. In this respect, it should not be surprising that many faculty of color, to include African American female faculty members, indicate lack of respect, lack of publication opportunities, and lack of recognition for their scholarship as major barriers to their career progression in higher education (Hendricks & Caplow, 1998; Turner & Myers, 2000).

As far back as 1942, when education researchers began to show interest in research on educational organizations and their faculties, the abundance of their research focused on White male faculties (Turner & Myers, 2000). Scholarly interest in minority
faculties did not surface until the late 1970s, due in large part to the activities of the Civil Rights movement and the resulting laws that mandated higher education to open its doors so that minorities and women could compete for slots as students, faculty members, and administrators (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998). However, African American scholars learned firsthand that the gains of the Civil Rights movement did not constitute a complete reform of racial attitudes toward African American people. Few White institutions were interested in African Americans other than for the calm they could bring to troubled campuses by teaching the Black Studies classes that were offered to satisfy the demands of obstreperous African American undergraduates. Only a small number of African American professionals obtained appointments in Black Studies departments, and an even smaller number were hired solely in their traditional disciplines (McKay, 1997).

The status and experiences of African American women in the academy vary, depending on the academic professional career field one is engaged in, and type of institution one is assigned to. The characteristics of African American female faculty may differ at the various institutions they serve; however, the major issues of representation, teaching/research/service, career progression, collegiality, and racism/sexism are a function of organizational culture and a common concern for all involved (Gregory, 1995; Moses, 1997).

**Representation**

African American women have never been well-represented in the faculty ranks throughout the full spectrum of institutions of higher education (Gregory, 1995). In 1995, nationally, slightly more than 4.7% of the faculty in higher education was African American, and only 2% were African American females (Alfred, 2001; Atwater, 1995b).
Fall 1998 figures compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics reported that African American women made up barely 3% of the full-time faculty employees at the Full professor, Assistant professor, and Associate professor ranks in America’s colleges and universities, and less than 1% of the full-time Full professors in this nation’s higher education system ("Almanac 2002-3," 2002).

African American women are disproportionately overly represented at two-year institutions and HBCUs (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998, p. 4) and tend to be concentrated in the non-tenured, lower-level faculty ranks (Graves, 1990; Gregory, 1995; Turner, 2002). Glazer-Raymo (1999) attributes these patterns to three recommendations made by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education shortly after passage of the Equal Employment Act and Title IX: the appointment of women as “qualified lecturers” who met institutional standards but had less substantial records of achievement in research and publication; the appointment of women as part-time and non-tenure-track teachers and administrators; and provisions for granting tenure and fringe benefits (or compensation in lieu thereof) for women hired as part-time faculty. Though the Council’s motives may have been well-intended, in Glazer-Raymo’s view, the implementation of these recommendations resulted in the development of a dual hiring track for men and women faculty, which solidified women’s lower status in academe.

African American female faculty representation is concentrated in fields such as education, social work, and nursing. Their presence is practically invisible in fields such as engineering and science (Gregory, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Being clustered in humanities and social sciences disciplines that are more likely to be oriented
toward practice, and with rewards that are not associated with research and scholarship, can be one explanation for a low record for publishing (Tack & Patitu, 1992).

Jones (1998) attributes the lack of minority representation in the sciences to the subjective and value-laden practices of the science community’s majority members. Jones asserts that scientists select their protégés as students, nurture their growth and academic development through the various stages of post-secondary education, and eventually assist them in moving to the professional level. Preferential treatment increases these individuals’ chances of survival, and once they become established scientists, they perpetuate the representation by following precedent practices that ensure the status quo.

**Teaching, Service, and Research**

As explained by Farley (1990), universities in the United States have three purposes: (a) to transmit the culture by teaching undergraduates and graduate students at the institution, (b) to push back the frontiers of knowledge by conducting research and disseminating the results in scholarly publications, and (c) to serve the public (pp. 194-195). Teaching, research, and service are typically the job responsibilities for most faculty members at four-year American colleges and universities. Typically, the type of institution where one is employed determines which responsibilities are given priority and emphasized in promotion and tenure decisions. In their investigations of work distribution among faculty members at four-year colleges and universities, Turner and Myers (2000), Moses (1997), and Gregory (1995) found that the primary work activity pattern of most African American faculty at four-year institutions is teaching and service, rather than engaging in original research.
Davis's (1997) observation of the large number of female teachers in elementary and secondary education, compared to the very small number of female professors in higher education, led her to pose the question: Why is it that women are qualified to train the unformed minds of the young and vulnerable, but not the developing minds of young and developing adults? In retrospect, the manner in which Davis posed the question of the female's role in teaching at the higher education level may not be entirely correct since it is well documented that women are often assigned heavier teaching loads, bear a disproportionate share of undergraduate instruction, and are less likely to be provided with teaching assistants than their male counterparts (Burgess, 1997; Gregory, 1995; Johnsrud, 1993; Menges & Exum, 1983; Moses, 1997; Tack & Patitu, 1992; Turner & Myers, 2000).

Studies indicate that, in the classroom, problems of authority, competency, and respect are not unusual. Some of the more common problems include students assuming that an African American female professor is not as academically demanding as a male professor; students displaying nonverbal hostility or particular physical mannerisms to communicate disdain for an African American female professor; students seeking validation from another faculty member of the class material that was presented by the African American female professor; and students questioning the African American female professor's authority, implying some lack of knowledge on the part of the professor (Sutherland, 1990). In reference to the experiences of two professors at two different predominantly White universities,

Regarding interaction with students, there's a different expectation for us when we walk in as a minority; they automatically assume that we know less than our colleagues in the same department...it doesn’t matter whether it’s undergraduate
level or graduate level. They challenge females more. (Turner & Myers, 2000, p. 110)

If a White male professor says something that's wrong in class, my observation is that even if the students perceive that it's wrong, they may say something outside of class, but they hesitate to challenge a 50-plus White male professor. They feel quite comfortable challenging an African American woman in class. (Turner, 2002, p. 80)

Conflict can also arise from the assumptions by students of their expectations of special treatment (Burgess, 1997). As noted by one African American female professor,

On several occasions, I have had Black students become upset when they expected special treatment from me in class and they did not get it. I told them I would work with them one-on-one but that there would be no special favors. (p. 32)

According to Burgess, biases and actions such as these can oftentimes result in negative student evaluations for the faculty member that will, more than likely, be included in the professor’s overall performance reviews.

Despite their heavy teaching schedules, African American women do pursue and engage in research, oftentimes the most weighted area in the tenure review process (Burgess, 1997; Menges & Exum, 1983). However, the way in which African American female professors’ efforts, or lack thereof, are perceived and evaluated in this critical area can have the potential to severely undermine their research and publication efforts, as well as their chances for promotion and tenure. In this sense, the issues of opportunity, availability, and cooperation play major roles in the African American female’s success or failure in this area (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Turner & Myers, 2000).

African American women tend to be excluded from collaborative research projects with their peers, primarily as a result of their colleagues (mostly male) not wanting or not volunteering to work with, sponsor, or mentor them. This predicament
can result in a significant reduction in the number and quality of sources at their disposal for research (Moses, 1997). Singh, Robinson, and Williams-Green (1995) conducted a study on African American faculty members' perceptions about the availability of opportunities for collaborative research at their institutions and found that African American women overwhelmingly perceived that significantly fewer opportunities for collaborative research existed in their academic divisions than for men.

African American women's scholarly work is often not given the same credit as their male colleagues'. Their choices of research may be ignored, devalued, or subjected to an extra amount of scrutiny (Moses, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). African American females' research is often described as having no substance or theoretical value, and publication is deemed acceptable only when it is in a recognized White-mainstream journal (Johnsrud, 1993).

Scholarly work oriented toward social change or women's issues and interdisciplinary areas such as women's studies and ethnic studies is often discounted during tenure review, with the result that African American women, who tend to investigate these areas more than their male and White colleagues, lose out on opportunities to gain tenure status (Burgess, 1997; Hendricks & Caplow, 1998; Johnsrud, 1993). As noted by one African American female professor,

It's the fact that what we do is not valued.... For example, at my university, White faculty can write and publish whatever they want, because generally they are going to publish what people are going to perceive as important issues. For African Americans and other ethnic groups, if you write about something that is important to you, one or two things will happen: the old notion about brown on brown or black on black research will come to the forefront; that type of research is undervalued and not encouraged. If I published my work in the *Journal of Negro Education*, it would not be valued. (Hendricks & Caplow, 1998, p. 9)
The devaluation of scholarly contributions on the premise that the standards for academic scholarship cannot be met if the scholarly contributions are focused on racial differences, gender orientation, or issues of diversity can lead to feelings of resentment and unfairness. Under any other circumstances, such pressure for an individual to compromise her/his research interests in order to conform to the values linked to some specific culture's mainstream research would be interpreted by the intellectual community as an infringement on that individual's intellectual freedom (Hendricks & Caplow, 1998).

Underrepresented faculty members, particularly faculty of color, are often expected, and sometimes explicitly asked, to take on a role of community involvement in a way that is typically not asked of majority faculty members (Graves, 1990; Gubitosi, 1996). Faculty of color are not only expected to be involved in "mainstream activities" such as being counselors, advocates, consolers, and role models for students of color, but they are also expected to be very much involved in "minority service work," such as those involving affirmative action, ethnic-related activities, the recruitment and retention of ethnic students, and counseling of minority students having academic or social problems (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Turner & Myers, 2000). In Alexander-Snow and Johnson's (1998) investigation into the issues and pressures that new and junior faculty of color experienced at predominantly White colleges and universities, one African American female noted,

One of the first things my department chair told me was that I would be teaching a multicultural course. Can you believe that? My research interests have nothing to do with multiculturalism and here I am not only having to teach multiculturalism, but also having to design the course. When I asked, "Why me?" I was told that
there was no other person qualified to teach the course. Umm, I guess my race qualifies me. (p. 13)

Similarly, an African American female faculty member at the University of Colorado stated,

Because I’m Black, female, and accessible, a rare combination on my campus, I’m called upon in ways that my counterparts probably are not. I spend a lot of time in one-on-one interaction with a variety of students, who often discuss personal problems. Students of color who are not in my classes seek me out to discuss their concerns. White faculty members and graduate students often consult me about how to deal with Black students in their classes. (Allen, 1995, p. 11)

At the least, too much minority service can have a negative impact on minority faculty by indirectly distracting the minority scholar from more weighted scholarly activities (teaching, research, and publishing), and engaging in activity that is itself negatively evaluated and/or is seen by others as impeding true scholarship (Garza, 1993).

Teaching, research, and service are the hallmarks of a faculty member’s career in academe. These elements determine the prospects for a faculty member’s potential and eligibility for promotion. As continues to be the case, heavy teaching loads, lack of time to pursue scholarly work, and expectations to engage in service activities, both internal and external to the institution, continue to be the major concerns of faculty members at colleges and universities across the higher education spectrum (Johnson, 2000; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

Collegiality

“Lest we look for utopia, let it be understood that no department, however supportive, can insulate women and other minority faculty from bias” (Williams, 1994, p. 91). However true this statement may be, one cannot deny that one of the best sources
of support that faculty members can receive is the respect and validation of their peers.

As noted by one African American female faculty member,

I was treated most graciously when I came to campus; many people in my
department breathed a sigh of relief that they had “gotten one.” So the pressure
was off. But on the other hand, I have been insulted, treated with arrogance and a
sense that I “spoiled the party.” (Moses, 1989, p. 15)

Collegiality fosters a sense of community as well as an atmosphere of creativity, in which
people can exchange ideas, collaborate, and generally benefit from working as a team.

But, for many African American female faculty members, to have this essential
ingredient missing from their professional experience is usually the norm, not the
exception (Moses, 1997).

Despite the scant amount of research on racial/ethnic issues affecting faculty of
color (of which African American women are a component), it is well documented that
faculty of color experience severe marginalization (Aguirre, 2000; Turner, 2002). Some
researchers attribute the lack of inclusion of faculty of color to their social and cultural
alienation by colleagues, or to being perceived as threats to the “status quo” by their
colleagues. Consequently, many faculty of color have a difficult time learning the
political and informal norms governing culture, and when they do, it is often too late to
be of any benefit (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998). One African female noted,

I have to think about the fact that Black females or any female in the field of
[name] that has been predominantly a White male profession has a problem.
Many [White] females in the college complain about the fact that up until
recently...we had never had a full professor in [department name]. It’s changing,
but it’s not changing fast. And then you add to that being the Black female who
has to be superwoman. (Turner, 2002, p. 78)
In the context of higher education, Styles-Hughes (1996) defined isolation as the result of feeling as if one is the only person experiencing a given phenomenon. Feeling isolated increases the odds that one can objectify a mainstream reality, but the possibility remains that one may internalize and personalize the negative experience. Both gender and ethnicity isolate minority women. They are without the support system of like-ethnic professionals and without the possibility of mentors or role models who share their ethnic or cultural heritage. (pp. 3-4)

Many women and minority members (to include African American females, who are members of both groups) indicate that the lack of collegiality in their departments isolates them from professional networks, research grants, and publishers (Moses, 1997; Singh et al., 1995). Much of this isolation is connected to the differences in perspective, research interests, and classroom experiences between the faculty member and her colleagues (Phelps, 1995). Whatever the source of the cause, intellectual isolation translates into a loss of the stimulation of constructive intellectual exchanges, which, in effect, brings about what can only be described as intellectual starvation (Sutherland, 1990).

To move up the academic ladder, one depends heavily on the support of departmental colleagues. When departmental support is not forthcoming, African American female faculty must turn to alternative avenues to fulfill their collegiate and scholastic needs. Those sources could potentially be within their own institution; with other academic colleges and universities; or completely external to academe, such as government and/or private industry partnerships (Moses, 1997; Peterson & Spencer, 1990; Singh et al., 1995). As expressed by one African American female faculty member,
Beyond the collegiality expressed by a few faculty members, I am invisible.... Faculty whose specialties are similar to my own rarely seek me out for exchanges or for participation in symposia, etc. I work pretty much in isolation, dependent upon extra-university cross-fertilization and moral support. (Moses, 1989, p. 18)

In reference to the academy, Spann (1990) defined chilly climate as “subtle ethnic and gender biases that ‘chill the air’ and act as critical influences in teaching, research, and service” (p. 1). As a function of the workplace environment, Turner and Myers (2000) pointed out, “Even when White faculty and administrators greet minority faculty with apparent cordiality, they project the underlying attitude that they are making ‘others’ feel welcome in ‘their’ space” (p. 84).

In addition to teaching, service, and research, there are indications that colleges and universities are beginning to identify collegiality as a new tenure criterion. If collegiality has made its way into the peer review process, this will undoubtedly present a new set of concerns for African American female faculty to confront and overcome (Garcia, 2000).

*Racism and Sexism*

Recent reports examining the status of women on college campuses are drawing the same conclusions reached two decades ago: female professors in academia, including those of African American descent, face a hostile work environment. This poor working environment is attributable to persistent and widespread gender and race discrimination (Aguirre, 2000; Collins, 2001; Jensen, 1982; Menges & Exum, 1983; Sayer, 1992; Simeone, 1987). These “isms” can impact many areas of the African American’s academic professional and personal self-image, to include her perceived credibility; her perceived competence as a professor and researcher; her teaching experiences,
assignments, and evaluations; her perceived interpersonal skills; and her perceived
decision-making skills (Phelps, 1995). As noted by Steward (1987),

Black women, who have gained access to higher education and higher paying positions, often find themselves in less than optimal work environments. The racist and sexist attitudes of colleagues can often result in less than satisfactory work conditions and increased stress in the life of the black female professional. (p. 3)

Unlike White women and African American men, African American women have to contend with a double consciousness of both race and gender (Collins, 2001). Allen (1995) referred to this double consciousness as “doubly oppressed,” which submits the notion that a woman of color may suffer discrimination, prejudice, etc., based on her gender, her race, or both (p. 6). The prejudiced behavior, attitudes, and resulting effects must be handled by African American women in both the personal and professional spheres of their everyday lives in academia, which, in no uncertain terms, impacts how Black women perceive their environment, their life decisions, their careers, and their place in the world in general (Reid, 1990).

Because of a perceived lack of status and power, African American women are especially likely to be treated in a superficial manner (Moses, 1997). Racism and sexism may be so fused in a given situation that it is oftentimes difficult to distinguish one from the other. As expressed by one HBCU faculty member,

It is difficult for me, as a black woman, to have the issue of sexism treated as a legitimate topic by my colleagues. While they understand the interconnections of racism and sexism at an intellectual level, at the operational level they tend to ignore it, or dismiss it, as not pertaining to themselves. (Moses, 1997, p. 25)

According to Farmer (1993), educational canon and power structure represent a belief in the supremacy of Whites and males, and, for this reason, the majority of those
who lead and manage educational institutions find “absolutely nothing” out of sync with things as they are (p. 200). In fact, the attitude among many White male faculty members is that African American faculty, especially females, must fit or be co-opted into the organizational cultures of America’s colleges and universities. As one female African American professor characterizes the situation,

The treatment for Black women has always been and still is very different than that for Black men, White women, and other minorities or women of color. Black women are faced with racism and sexism. Whites are ignorant about their racial behavior...when Black women point this out, then they become the ones with the problem, often called “too sensitive.” (Moses, 1989, p. 15)

Treatment similar to what is experienced at predominantly White universities by African American female faculty members can also be encountered at HBCUs. As noted be one African American female,

The most frustrating experience is working with Black males who refuse to see the chauvinism and subtle harassment in their interaction with Black women. Because these men are Black, this experience is even more upsetting. (Moses, 1989, p. 15)

Aples (1984) believes that males see little need for departments and colleges to eliminate the hostile and unwelcome environments African American female faculty members find themselves. If this is, in fact, the case, then it should not come as a surprise that many males will not acknowledge or take responsibility for the racism and sexism that exist in their institutions.

Career Advancement

Women, in general, and African American women in particular, confront unique problems because, in many instances, their assigned tasks make it nearly impossible for them to allot sufficient time and energy to the type of scholarly activities that would bring
them success in the tenure and promotion process (Burgess, 1997). African American female faculty are not only the least likely to earn full-time tenure-track positions, but almost 30 years after the Civil Rights Act was passed, and 25 years after sex discrimination was banned, the proportionality rule so judiciously applied in athletics is practically non-existent in departmental hiring or promotion throughout America’s colleges and universities (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). The absence of diversity in the make-up of tenured professors in the majority of four-year and doctoral-level institutions creates a perpetual cycle of repeating and reinforcing established institutional norms (Chliwniak, 1997).

In her writings, Burgess (1997) points out that the single most important goal most faculty members have upon entering the academy is the attainment of tenure, most notably for the power, privilege, and prestige it brings, as well as its implications of job security, increased pay, time allotted for sabbatical leave, and institutional support for research. However, because the male power structure controls the tenure process in America’s higher education institutions, it establishes the guidelines for the achievement of tenure, as well as controls when and how these guidelines can be changed. Burgess even goes so far as to assert that “it is not uncommon for these guidelines to be altered in midstream to preclude some populations from attaining the grand prize of academia” (p. 227).

Some African American female faculty members report clearly perceiving, and in some instances being blatantly told, that they did not fit “the profile” for advancement. Other African American female faculty members report of being given suspect, if not
outright false, information for being denied a promotion. As told by one African American female faculty member,

I was denied on the fact that I wasn’t here long enough. One of the [White] faculty had been here one year less than I had; that faculty member was granted promotion…. So the next year I applied for promotion again and was denied. (Turner & Myers, 2000, p. 89)

A few African American female faculty members have even reported being advised to seek employment at institutions where promotion for faculty of their racial group is more likely (Turner & Myers, 2000).

The tenure process does not grant African American women any extra consideration for the inordinate amount of time spent beyond advisement and office hours facilitating the socialization of minority students on campus, which could otherwise be devoted to scholarly pursuits (Williams, 1994). Most find themselves pushed into the position to serve as role models for their profession, race, and gender. As noted by one African American female who did not attain tenure at her first university, “I was doing a lot of things in terms of serving on this board, that board, being faculty advisor for one of the professional fraternities” (Turner, 2002, p. 79). Ultimately, the penalty for the absence of research in a tenure-track professor’s portfolio can be a missed or stolen opportunity for promotion.

The confounding issues of race and gender render African American women defenseless against rules and policies that hamper their access to promotion and tenure in America’s higher education system (Burgess, 1997). An empirical analysis of American Association of University Professors faculty data by gender and rank in 109 research institutions determined that, based on the rate of increase between 1975 and 1988, it
would take women 90 years to achieve equal representation with men and 161 years for
women to reach parity with men as full professors (Alpert, 1990; Glazer-Raymo, 1999).
If this is the case, it should not come as a surprise that attaining tenure in the American
higher education system is difficult, fraught with obstacles, for the most part, an uphill
battle, and sometimes unattainable (Burgess, 1997).

Summary of the Literature on African
American Female Faculty

America’s colleges and universities are microcosms of society at large, with a
history of socially, politically, and economically disenfranchising people of color. Most
faculty and administrators at predominantly White colleges and universities are aware
that their institutions are entrenched in a culture that often perpetuates racist stereotypes
and racial discrimination, whereby racism permeates the social knowledge of its
the difficulty in addressing these problems rests in the founding principles of American
higher education as established in 16th century colonial America: “Education in colonial
America was only for White males” (p. 278). While this same founding principle has
diminished in the area of student access, as detrimental and disenfranchising as it has
proven to be, it continues to be far too representative of the hiring practices of America’s
higher education system as America transitions into the 21st century.

Introduction to Literature on Historically Black
Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)

Beginning with its inception and up until the Civil War, higher education operated
on the notion of restricted access. The mission of higher education was to cultivate a
stable upper class so that the next generation of leaders could maintain the existing social
order. In this capacity, early institutions such as Harvard and Yale tended to deny access
to those who were not wealthy, male, Protestant, and White. These admission practices
had little, if any, impact on the African American population who, at the time, were
socially, economically, and politically held hostage by the institution of slavery (Brown
et al., 2001).

After the Civil War, Negroes continued to be excluded from America’s education
system. In the North, Negroes were generally prohibited from admission to traditionally
White colleges and universities (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). In the South, the
animosity exhibited by former slave masters made it virtually impossible for Negroes to
attend preexisting schools at any level (Brown et al., 2001). Under these hostile
conditions, historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were established to
serve the educational needs of Negroes and became the primary means for providing

HBCUs Defined

HBCUs are defined as institutions of higher learning founded prior to 1964 to
accept and educate the descendents of former slaves (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Brown et al.,
2001). Four basic elements are attributed to HBCUs: (a) established before 1964, (b) its
principle mission in the past was the education of African Americans, (c) its principle
mission currently is the education of African Americans, and (d) accredited or be making
reasonable progress toward accreditation by a nationally approved accrediting body.
Each HBCU is legally authorized by the state in which it is domiciled either to be a junior
college or provide an educational program of study for which a bachelor’s degree is
conferred (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).
There are 103 HBCUs clustered in 19 southern and border states constituting 3% of America's colleges and universities. Five HBCUs were created before the Civil War, 69 HBCUs were founded before 1900, and 29 HBCUs were established during the 1900s. Morehouse School of Medicine (1975), located in the state of Georgia, was the last HBCU to be established. Of the 103 HBCUs, 46 are private four-year colleges, and 38 are public four-year colleges. The state of Alabama has the highest number of HBCUs (seven) and the highest number of two-year HBCUs (seven) located in a single state. One HBCU is located in each of the states of Delaware, Kentucky, Michigan, and Oklahoma (Brown et al., 2001; Hoffman et al., 1996).

Birth and Evolution of HBCUs

Antebellum Period (before the Civil War of 1861)

Before the Civil War, free Negroes established African churches, African private schools, and African fraternal organizations in both northern and southern states that served as places of worship, schools to engage in the education of their children, and places for protection. Many of these institutions—established by Negro ministers—operated clandestinely due to overt White hostility and physical destruction. Retaliation by Whites was especially prevalent in the South where the education of Negroes was illegal and the schools were considered to be dangerous and revolutionary. Principal financial support for these institutions came from within the Negro community, with occasional assistance from other sources such as fund raisers held by Negroes, aid from White churches, and individual personal donations (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

During this same period, with respect to higher education, while upper- and middle-class Whites had at their disposal an impressive choice of academies, military
schools, law schools, and public and private colleges to choose from, the Negro population had only four such institutions: Lincoln University, Wilberforce University, the University of the District of Columbia, and Harris-Stowe State College (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Hoffman et al., 1996).

Lincoln University (Pennsylvania) and Wilberforce University (Ohio), founded in 1854 and 1856, respectively, were the only two Negro universities established by Negroes before the start of the Civil War. These institutions still remain in their original locations, are recognized as degree-granting institutions, and are active institutions in today's higher education system (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Hoffman et al., 1996; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). The remaining two four-year HBCUs founded before the dawn of the Civil War and still in existence today are the University of the District of Columbia (1851) and Harris-Stowe State College (Missouri, 1857) (Brown et al., 2001). The Institute for Colored Youth (Pennsylvania, 1837) had its origins as an elementary and high school for Negroes. This institution has transitioned into an accredited four-year institution and currently operates under the name of Cheyney State University (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

Postbellum Period (1865 to 1899)

Not until the end of the Civil War and the subsequent release of millions of jobless former slaves onto the streets of America did the issue of formal education for the masses of illiterate freed men attract the attention and concern it deserved from the majority society in America (Brown et al., 2001). During this time period, five million freed Negroes lived in the United States, and 92% of the total resided in the South (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Fueled by the notion of racial uplift, these new educational
institutions took on the herculean task of turning out students who could not only read and write, but who would also be recognized as a credit to both their race and the nation (Brown et al., 2001).

Revenues to fund the education of Negroes came from a number of sources: northern benevolent societies such as the American Missionary Association, state governments, private Negro church groups, and public land-grant funds for the construction of educational institutions made available through the Morrill Act of 1862 (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). The Morrill Act did not specifically mention equal educational opportunity, but the funds from this statute were to be distributed to the states, with the intention that they would foster educational opportunity for former slaves. Because of the animosity White Southerners felt toward the Negro population, Whites managed to redirect funds that were supposed to benefit the construction of HBCUs to their own schools, which were reserved for Whites only (Hoffman et al., 1996; Saunders & Westbrook, 2001).

In support of their own self-improvement, self-support, and desire to take full advantage of the opportunity for education, Negroes organized and raised money as craftsmen and day laborers to pay for the establishment and operation of private schools. With these funds, they purchased land, built schools, and paid teachers’ salaries. By 1870, Negroes, by themselves, had raised and expended over one million dollars on the education of their race (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Although HBCUs had the word “college,” “normal,” or “university” in their titles, in the beginning, their primary mission, particularly after the Civil War, was to provide elementary and secondary education for students who had had no prior educational
training (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). Many of these institutions were responsible for teaching former slaves to read and to train Negro clergymen. Eventually, they were transitioned into de facto teachers colleges (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Saunders & Westbrook, 2001). In fact, at one point in time HBCUs were producing half of America’s Black teachers. By 1928, however, most HBCUs had eliminated their elementary and secondary departments to concentrate on the college-level liberal arts curriculum (Hoffman et al., 1996). Nonetheless, these titles alluded to the eventual purpose these institutions were to serve, which was the provision of post-secondary education for the Negro population (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

During this period, the development and execution of public and private education for Negroes was slow, tedious, and not without conflict. A myriad of controversies and barriers cropped up at every turn: Missionaries competed among themselves regarding classroom instruction and curriculum; attempts by the southern power structure to sabotage the establishment and operation of these schools; government-mandated funds slated for HBCUs were often re-channeled to White colleges and universities; most states unfairly charged Negroes special taxes in addition to those required of all citizens in support of school funding; and HBCUs were used as an excuse to bar attendance of Negroes at White public and private institutions (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Although slavery was no longer legal, racist ideologies hindered Negroes from being protected by the same civil rights and citizenship as their White counterparts (Brown et al., 2001). Congress attempted to level the playing field through its passage of a Second Morrill Act in 1890, which required states with racially segregated public higher education systems to provide a land-grant institution for Negro students whenever
a land-grant institution was established and restricted for White students (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). However, the tables were turned back in favor of the South when the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* Supreme Court decision voted in favor of segregation by ruling that it was acceptable to develop racially divided social systems that complied with the prevailing standard of “separate but equal” (Brown et al., 2001). This Court decision not only sanctioned and legitimized the myriad of laws stipulating the separation of races with respect to all places of public accommodation, but in regard to education, it gave states the opportunity to revise constitutions and enact state laws that legally prevented Negroes and White students from attending the same schools at all levels of the education spectrum (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Despite these obstacles, the Negro push for education continued. By 1869, more than 3,400 educational institutions serving over 150,000 students, operated by joint efforts of missionary societies and Negroes themselves, reported to the Freedman’s Bureau. Many of these institutions either had majority White administrators and teachers, Whites as their first students, or Whites among the ranks of the student body. Although the majority of these schools did not survive, they laid the foundation for those that prevailed (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). By the close of the 19th century, approximately 66 new public and private colleges and universities (majority four-year and located in the southern states) had been added to the tally of America’s surviving HBCUs (Brown et al., 2001).

**20th Century**

In the early 1900s, HBCUs finally began to devote their efforts to offering courses and programs exclusively at the post-secondary level (U.S. Department of Education,
The early college curriculum at HBCUs was influenced by the debate between W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington, both of whom appraised the purpose and mission of HBCUs from different perspectives (Brown et al., 2001).

Washington (a former slave and founder of Tuskegee Institute), a strong advocate of vocational training, believed that an HBCU’s role should be to prepare the freed people in the manual labor employment jobs that were available (masons, blacksmiths, farmers). In turn, the freed people would excel in those positions, and thus prove themselves worthy of better treatment and opportunity from the majority population (Brown et al., 2001; Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

DuBois (born free in Massachusetts; educated at Fisk, Harvard, and Berlin; a professor at Atlanta University; noted author, political activist, and editor), a strong advocate of the talented tenth (the broad training of Black men, the top 10% of Black intellectuals, who would lead the fight against racial segregation and discrimination), argued that an HBCU’s role should be to prepare students to become professionals (doctors, lawyers, teachers, and politicians) who would challenge discrimination and become leaders of the Black race in America. Acquiescing to the desires of both Washington and DuBois, the early curriculum taught at many HBCUs was made up of a combination of industrial and liberal arts courses that would allow students to succeed in life as well as in the classroom (Brown et al., 2001; Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Up until the 1920s, HBCUs were predominantly controlled by White administrators and teaching staff (Hoffman et al., 1996). Many of these institutions either had Whites as their first students or Whites among the ranks of the student body (see the history sections of the catalogs of the existing HBCUs). Starting in the early 1920s, the
reins of control of HBCUs began to be turned over to African American administrators as a consequence of two factors: (a) the return of almost 400,000 Black members of the Armed Forces from World War I and their (not all) subsequent enrollment at HBCUs; between 1929 and 1940, enrollment at HBCUs rose 62%; (b) the return of Black soldiers from World War II with money from the GI Bill to attend college; veterans made up as much as a third of HBCU enrollment during this time period (Hoffman et al., 1996).

Transitioning into the 1940s, separate but equal was still the law of the land. Although separate but equal was the reality of the primarily White American educational institution, it was not the reality for HBCUs or the students they served in that HBCUs did not receive the same level of consideration or support provided to other higher education institutions in terms of resources, funding, facilities, and operational consideration (Brown et al., 2001). Consequently, students had to contend with an educational system with scarce supplies, inadequate and outdated books (when they were available), an infrastructure that was in need of repair, and not much federal or state financial assistance.

Starting in the late 1940s, a series of Supreme Court cases were filed that challenged the "separate but equal" law as applied to education. These cases eventually culminated in the landmark 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas decision that ruled against the principle of "separate but equal" and ended, in principle, the notion of "separate but equal" (Hoffman et al., 1996).

Even though federal law stipulated that all systems of segregation be eliminated, 19 states (most located in the South) continued to operate dual systems of higher education. Because the law did not clarify what was meant by discrimination based on
race or national origin, the vagueness of the law enabled states to maintain their separate but equal practices (Brown et al., 2001). What followed the Brown v. Board of Education decision was 10 years of massive southern resistance, oftentimes disruptive and violent, countered by Black marches and demonstrations, and the escalation of federal intervention to enforce court-ordered desegregation (Allen & Jewell, 2002).

To end the cycle of violence, Congress passed Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide a mechanism for ensuring equal opportunity in federally assisted programs and activities (U.S. Department of Education, 1991, p. 3). Additionally, in 1965, Congress introduced 20 USC 1060, which represented the institutional aid program for HBCUs in support of HBCUs' continued contribution to the effort to attain equal opportunity in higher education for African Americans, low income, and educationally disadvantaged Americans from all walks of life. Through this act, a small cadre of HBCUs, which survived through decades of segregation and neglect, were granted additional funding to provide higher education to minority students who, because of extenuating circumstances, may not have been able to attend college (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

The Higher Education Act of 1965 moved the nation’s efforts to combat inequality and enhance higher education opportunity for disadvantaged students even further. A significant increase in post-secondary enrollment of the disadvantaged student population was a direct result of the Higher Education Act’s provision of basic educational opportunity grants and other forms of financial aid (Turner & Myers, 2000). Title III, included in the Higher Education Act, provided a boost to HBCUs by making available federal subsidies to targeted institutions characterized as “facing problems
threatening their survival, as being isolated from the mainstream of academic life, and as having strong desire and potential for a greater strength in academic accomplishment” (Roebuck & Murty, 1993, p. 41).

The 1970 Adams v. Richardson case, filed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, challenged the segregated dual system and lack of representation of minority faculty, staff, and students at White institutions in southern states. An unintentional outcome of this case was the examination of these same factors of institutions of northern and border states. In its 1977 decision, the Supreme Court directed states to achieve a better racial mix of students, faculty, and staff in public colleges and universities. A further stipulation was that the remedies these institutions implemented to comply with the court’s direction not be accomplished at the expense of or detriment to Black colleges (Turner & Myers, 2000).

Despite the decisions that have been rendered by the Supreme Court to remedy many of the problems that have plagued America’s colleges and universities, the higher education system continues to be hampered by recurring litigation that inevitably leads back to issues of discrimination, reverse discrimination, unfair treatment, and equal opportunity (for more information, see the 1987 Adams v. Richardson case dismissal, and the 1992 United States v. Fordice case relating to the dismantling of Mississippi’s dual system of higher education).

21st Century

Today, virtually all HBCUs are led by African Americans and have majority African American managerial and administrative staffs (see college and university catalogs of current HBCUs). In comparison to other higher education institutions,
HBCUs tend to be smaller in infrastructure and student enrollment, and less endowed in terms of financial resources, physical plant, and teaching facilities. HBCUs’ student population is typically majority African American, but in terms of diversity, overall student population is more diverse than that of predominantly White universities. HBCUs are recognized for their willingness to accommodate students who have not been adequately prepared for higher education, including many who require remedial training, and rank high in terms of the proportion of graduates who pursue and complete graduate and professional training (Hoffman et al., 2001; Roebuck & Murty, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 2003).

In 1984, two HBCUs accounted for 40% of all African Americans earning degrees in dentistry, two HBCUs accounted for 22% of African American medical doctors, four HBCUs accounted for 16% of African American attorneys, and one HBCU accounted for 82% of African American veterinarians. Up until 1991, HBCUs produced approximately 70% of all African American graduates. In 1993, it was estimated that over 300,000 African Americans will graduate from HBCUs in the next 25 years (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Despite these achievements, HBCUs have been criticized for perpetuating segregation by being mistakenly perceived as homogenous entities that only serve African American students (Brown et al., 2001). Some educators and policy makers have even argued that HBCUs have outlived their usefulness in that attendance at predominantly White colleges and universities is now open to African American students. Supporters of this stance feel that further duplication of physical facilities, academic programs, and services within a racially segregated, two-tiered higher education system is
counterproductive economically, philosophically, and pedagogically (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). While it is true that HBCUs were created primarily for the education of African Americans, it is also true that these institutions do not discourage or prohibit other groups from applying or attending (Brown et al., 2001). HBCUs were originally established when segregation was mandated and now continue with predominantly African American enrollments on a voluntary basis (Hoffman et al., 1996).

Although HBCUs often have been ignored during the debate surrounding diversity on the campus, HBCUs are perhaps the model for higher education institutions in that they willingly embrace and actively practice diversity. Not only do HBCUs recognize and accept people from different backgrounds, but they also reach out to those students who may have reservations about attending college due to their socioeconomic status, family background, and/or previous academic preparation. Most predominantly White colleges and universities do not accept, support, or actively engage in activities or program offerings of this sort (Brown et al., 2001; Jewell, 2002). With respect to faculty diversity, Whites account for 29% of the faculty and other minorities and foreigners account for 13% of the faculties at HBCUs (Johnson, 2000).

HBCUs continue to serve as a legitimate, relevant, and necessary academic choice for African American students. The attempts that have been made to threaten the viability of HBCUs with accusations of reverse discrimination hold little credibility when many predominantly White colleges and universities can be cited for this same shortcoming as evidenced by the lack of diversity on their campuses. Indeed, misrepresentations such as these only strengthen the justification of the need for the
continued existence of HBCUs as well as confirm the notion that dual systems of education continue to exist and affect higher education policy (Brown et al., 2001).

Executive Branch Authorization

In acknowledgment of the discrimination that has been endured by HBCUs for such a long period of time, a federal program was established to serve as a means by which the federal government could help strengthen and support HBCUs’ efforts through vehicles such as grants, contracts, and cooperative arrangements (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). In order of their appearance, the following executive orders have been signed into law:

1. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter signed Executive Order 12232, which established a federal program to provide a structured effort to help HBCUs access federally funded programs.

2. In September 1981, President Ronald Reagan signed Executive Order 12320, which established a federal program designed to achieve a significant increase in participation by HBCUs in federally sponsored programs.

3. In April 1989, President George H. W. Bush issued Executive Order 12677, which renewed the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and established the President’s Advisory Board on HBCUs. The Board was to advise the Secretary of Education on increasing federal and private sector involvement in strengthening HBCUs and facilitating technical, planning, and development advice to HBCUs with the goal of ensuring the long-term viability of these institutions.
4. In November 1993, President William J. (Bill) Clinton issued Executive Order 12876, to renew the HBCU Initiative, and added the requirement that participating agencies submit to the Secretary of Education and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget an annual Performance Report that measures each agency’s performance against the objectives set forth in its annual plan.

5. In February 2002, President George W. Bush established the President’s Board of Advisors on HBCUs (Board) within the Office of the Secretary of Education (Office of Minority Health Resource Center, 2003).

In the past, program directors and advisory boards had been tasked with staying cognizant of the most pressing issues facing HBCUs and communicating those issues to the President and the Secretary of Education. More recently, an added responsibility has been to carry out analysis and make recommendations as to how HBCUs can contribute to the solution of important national problems. The Board is required to prepare and issue an annual report to the President on the results of the participation of HBCUs in federal programs. Particular emphasis is focused in the report on enhancing institutional planning and development, strengthening fiscal stability and financial management, and improving institutional infrastructure, including the use of technology, to ensure the long-term viability and enhancement of HBCUs (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

Some of the more controversial recommendations put forth by these boards have not always been welcomed or supported by all of the HBCU community. One such example is the controversial 1991 plan initiated by the Bush administration to divide HBCUs into several categories based on their missions and programs. Federal agencies
would then focus attention and money on the category of HBCU that meets its particular need. Many HBCU presidents oppose this idea because it would allow federal government agencies and private foundations to shift money to the subset of HBCUs that have a facilities and resources advantage over the lesser-endowed HBCUs (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). So far, the case for or against this plan has not been made.

Continuing Importance of HBCUs

HBCUs are distinct from other American colleges and universities because they have established and maintained a very close identity with the ongoing struggle of African Americans for survival, fair treatment, parity, and advancement in American society (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Even though African Americans now have the choice to attend predominantly White institutions, many prefer to attend HBCUs. This preference may be attributed to a number of factors: (a) HBCUs tend to be more accepting and less prejudiced than majority institutions; (b) HBCUs emphasize the development of African American consciousness and identity, African American history, racial pride, and ethnic traditions; (c) HBCUs provide an African American culture and ambiance that many students find essential to their social functioning and mental health; (d) HBCUs are more willing to work with students who may have low grades and test scores, and, due to certain circumstances, may not be as well prepared (Brown et al., 2001).

According to President George W. Bush’s White House Advisory Board, HBCUs are in a strategic position to contribute to this nation’s effort to improve the educational credentials of minorities in that
1. By their history and tradition, HBCUs are committed to serving a broad range of students of all races.

2. HBCUs typically have support programs to help students requiring assistance to compensate for modest pre-college preparation.

3. HBCUs are located in those states with high concentrations of African Americans.

4. HBCUs are well known in the African American community and are natural magnets for this segment of the population.

5. HBCUs already account for a high percentage of graduates who go on to graduate and professional school.

6. HBCU graduates account for large minorities of African Americans in the professions and positions of public leadership.

7. HBCUs are positioned to serve low income minorities through programs of research and service beyond their traditional educational functions (U.S. Department of Education, 1999, pp. 7-8).

Because of all these important reasons alone, HBCUs will continue to be a necessary component of the American higher education system.

Summary of the Literature on HBCUs

Unlike other institutions, HBCUs were founded on and continue to be united by the distinct mission of positioning, preparing, and empowering African American students to succeed in what many perceive to be an otherwise unwelcome environment (Brown et al., 2001). HBCUs are an essential national resource and have served as the fulcrum of African American leadership. These colleges and universities have
championed the cause of equal opportunity in education, provided an opportunity for many who would not have otherwise had an opportunity to be a part of the college experience, and served as custodians of the archives and centers for the study of African American culture (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

While the nation has struggled, often violently, in its pursuit of equal educational opportunity, for a century and a half, HBCUs have continued to provide access to higher education for many African American students who would not have had the opportunity (Hoffman et al., 1996). As documented by the U.S. government, HBCUs have accomplished much with modest levels of financial support and a modest range of academic programs. Despite these limitations, they continue to serve as an important vehicle by which African Americans and other students pursue, advance, and accomplish their higher education goals (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

Summary of the Review of the Literature

Culture is defined and bound by the context in which it evolves. Colleges and universities, regardless of the type, may share similar norms and values; still, the culture of each college or university maintains its own distinct identity (Kuh & Whitt, 1988b). Ultimately, whether a group's practices are found to be similar to one's own or completely different, culture is cast as an all-encompassing and largely taken-for-granted way of existence embraced by those who exist in its environment (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). African American women in the academy differ in their experiences, backgrounds, appearances, educational levels, demographics, occupations, and beliefs. What links them all is their desire to be accepted as respected members of society, and their struggle to have a voice that can be heard in a world with many views (Collins,
2001). The issues and vignettes in this paper, as detailed by the authors identified in this literature review, clearly illustrate that African American female faculty members do not perceive themselves and their concerns as integrated into the missions, operations, goals, and organizational cultures of many of America's colleges and universities.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

Past investigations into the workplace experiences and perceptions of African American female faculty members and their corresponding academic organizational cultures have been conducted, for the most part, against the backdrop of predominantly White colleges and universities. During these investigations, African American female faculty members have been studied, not as a separate or distinct group, but included with other females and/or minorities, with the results of the research being reported as representative of the entire group. When researchers have focused their attention on African American female faculty as a distinct group in and of itself, the outcomes of many of these investigations have reported findings that describe their workplace environments as uninviting, chilly, non-supportive, and career limited (Aguirre, 2000; Allen, 1995; Hendricks & Caplow, 1998; Turner, 2002).

In addressing the study of organizational culture in higher education, Tierney (1988a) noted, “We most often trip over perceptions and attitudes, the intangibles that escape our attention even as they make up the fabric of daily organizational life” (p. 2). The purpose of this study was to explore the workplace experiences and perceptions of African American female faculty members working within the boundaries of an African American male-dominated HBCU organizational culture. In reference to the African
American female faculty members who participated in this study, specific research questions included

1. What have been the career experiences that have shaped the study participants’ workplace perceptions and attitudes about their organizational culture?

2. What opportunities, if any, have there been for the study participants to contribute to the shaping and influencing of the values and beliefs in their institutional settings?

3. What actions or incidences have helped or hindered their acceptance, participation, and progress in the academic workplace?

4. To what extent have the study participants perceived that they have been recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their particular academic organizational cultures?

Prior to the initiation of this research effort, written approval was applied for and granted by the University of North Dakota’s Institutional Review Board. The writer of this dissertation was the sole-source contact person and data collector for this study.

Research Methodology

Strauss and Corbin (1990) defined qualitative research as “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (p. 17). The qualitative process allows for the exploration and discovery of meanings and patterns about persons’ lives, stories, and behavior, as well as organizational functioning, social movements, and inter-actional relationships. Words, instead of quantitative data, are used to describe human experience and behavior in order
to obtain a greater understanding of the world as seen from the unique viewpoint of the individual or group under investigation (Bloland, 1992).

As Geertz (1973) pointed out, “Man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun. I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law, but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (p. 5). Traditional studies of organizations, oriented toward quantitative methods of rationally conceived structures and patterns, do not adequately capture the dynamics of culture. Similarly, conventional variables such as size, control, and location are of little assistance in understanding what holds an institution together (Tierney, 1988a).

Based on this study’s objective, a qualitative case study was chosen as the most appropriate strategy that would allow the necessary access and interaction to take place between the writer and the research subjects in order to accurately document and relay the personal stories of the work experiences of the targeted subjects (African American female faculty members) in their particular environment (HBCU).

Research Design

A strategy to use in exploring academic culture is to examine faculty perceptions of elements that describe the academic workplace. Implicit in this strategy is the assumption that faculty interpretations of features of the workplace provide information about the institutional dimensions that define the workplace. Faculty responses to workplace features also provide information about how faculty members conceptualize the academic workplace. The inferences one is able to draw from an examination of this information can help in understanding the faculty’s interpretation of how organizational
life functions. Though these perceptions are exclusive to the particular faculty member, they represent reality as seen from the perspective of that particular member (Aguirre, 2000).

Unlike quantitative inquiry, which typically depends on large samples selected randomly, qualitative inquiry typically focuses in-depth on relatively small samples, selected purposefully. The advantages of purposeful sampling lie in the fact that it allows the researcher to select information-rich cases for in-depth study from which a great deal can be learned about issues of central importance to the purpose of the evaluation. Though the samples are typically small and do not technically permit broad generalizations, logical generalizations can still be made from the weight of evidence produced from such samples (Patton, 2002).

For this research effort, two strategies of purposeful sampling were employed: criterion sampling and critical case sampling. Criterion sampling, defined by Patton as cases that meet some predetermined criterion of importance, represented the candidates who met the predetermined criterion established for this particular study. Critical case sampling, defined by Patton as those cases that can make a point or are particularly important in the scheme of things, represented the significance (in terms of academic fields of study) and limitations (in terms of numbers) of the population sample.

Research Site and Sample Selection

The research for this effort was accomplished at a Carnegie-classified HBCU at the doctoral/research level. To protect the anonymity and privacy of the research subjects, detailed information such as geographical location, institutional make-up, and
other identifying markers that could have revealed the identity of the HBCU for this study were not disclosed.

The strategy for this study was to secure commitments from at least 7, but not more than 10, full-time African American female faculty members employed at the HBCU and assigned to the same school or college within the HBCU. The rationale for utilizing a doctoral/research HBCU was based on the assumption that a university at this level would possess the diversity of departments and number of faculty that would be needed to satisfy the study's criteria. The rationale for the number of subjects took into consideration the approximately three to five hours that would be needed to complete the interview process with each subject. The rationale for seeking faculty working in departments within the same school or college was to facilitate later analysis of the subjects' workplace experiences within and between departments.

Subjects for this project were required to meet the following criteria:

1. African American female faculty member with doctoral degree.
2. Tenured or tenure-track status.
3. Full-time instructional professor at the Full, Associate, or Assistant rank.
4. Employed in departments not traditionally populated by females.

Initially, the study HBCU's College of Arts and Sciences was selected as the sole-source location to solicit research candidates. The assumption was that Arts and Sciences, with its broad range of departments, would be able to provide the requisite number of candidates during the search for subjects, even after taking into account potential candidate attrition (i.e., no response, no longer a faculty member, decline to participate) that would likely occur. However, the low number of candidates identified
during the preliminary search for subjects made it necessary to include two additional professional schools located on the HBCU’s campus: the School of Business and the School of Engineering.

In a study conducted by Glazer-Raymo (1999), it was found that women (to include African American women) earn the majority of doctorates in psychology (62%), education (60.5%), and humanities (50.7%); and, they earned fewer doctorates in the life sciences (40.7%), social sciences (36%), professional fields (36%), mathematics (22%), physical sciences (21.7%), and engineering (11.2%). In fact, policy analysts frequently identify science and engineering fields as problematic for women, who earn only 33% of these doctorates. National Center for Education Statistics 1998 figures revealed that, at degree-granting institutions, full-time African American male faculty outnumbered full-time African American female faculty by a ratio of at least two to one in the academic fields of business, biological and physical sciences, communications, economics, engineering, the fine arts, philosophy, and political science (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Taking into consideration the purpose of this study—research of African American female faculty working in a male-dominated environment—academic areas in this study HBCU’s College of Arts and Sciences and School of Business that resulted in a near equal or greater ratio of women to men were not considered for inclusion in the participant pool. The departments that were within the parameters of this study in the College of Arts and Sciences were Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Math, Physics, and Political Science. All departments within the School of Engineering and the School of Business were considered for candidate recruitment.
For the departments represented in this study, a numerical breakdown of faculty representation (full-time Full, Associate, and Assistant professors) resulted in the following:

- Biology: 23 faculty members comprised of 5 (four African Americans) females and 18 males (majority White).
- Chemistry: 20 all-male faculty members (majority foreign-born).
- Economics: 16 faculty members comprised of 3 White females and 13 males (majority foreign-born and White).
- Math: 29 faculty members comprised of 1 African American female and 28 males (majority foreign-born).
- Physics: 19 faculty members comprised of 1 African American female and 18 males (majority foreign-born).
- Political Science: 20 faculty members comprised of 4 females (three African Americans) and 16 males (majority African American).
- Engineering (Chemical, Civil, Electrical, and Mechanical): 35 faculty members comprised of 3 African American females and 32 males (majority foreign-born).

In sum, of the 127 faculty members who represented the targeted departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, 9 were African American females. Of the 35 faculty members who represented the departments in the School of Engineering, 3 were African American.
American female professors. For the School of Business, 2 African American female professors were on the faculty rosters out of a total of 27 faculty members.

To ensure objectivity in the participant selection process, names of females were obtained from the departmental listings of the study HBCU’s Internet site. Administrative representatives from each academic department were contacted by telephone to confirm the accuracy of the faculty personnel roster to include race, gender, faculty rank, and current status of all faculty members on the personnel roster. Once confirmed, pertinent information on each African American female on the relevant personnel rosters, to include office telephone number, office location, and electronic mail (e-mail) address, was gathered for the upcoming contacts. The final tally of the African American female professor applicant pool was 14.

After final verification of African American female participant names and status was completed, an introductory e-mail that contained relevant information about this project and its writer was sent to each of the 14 candidates to solicit their participation as participants in this research project. The initial call for candidates resulted in eight acceptances, two declines, and four non-responses. Two weeks later, a follow-up e-mail was sent to those candidates who had not responded to the initial interview request. No responses were obtained on the second attempt.

With the second e-mail solicitation concluding the search process, the outcome resulted in 8 of the 14 professors agreeing to participate in the study:

- One tenured Assistant Professor and two tenured Associate Professors from the College of Arts and Sciences Biology Department.
- One tenure-track Assistant Professor from the School of Engineering.
• One tenured Associate Professor of Math from the College of Arts and Sciences.
• One tenured Assistant Professor of Physics from the College of Arts in Sciences.
• One tenured Associate Professor and one tenure-track Assistant Professor from the College of Arts and Sciences Political Science Department.

Due to work and other schedule conflicts, one of the Biology professors (Associate) removed herself as a candidate for this study.

The final count resulted in seven African American female faculty members agreeing to participate in this study (names used to identify the participants in the following descriptions are fictitious):

• April, a tenured Science professor, comes from a college-educated family. All of April’s post-secondary education was completed at an HBCU. In addition to her 30-plus years of higher education teaching and publishing, she engages in scientific research with various government institutions. April is a member of several professional scientific associations (national and minority-focused) and is an active contributor in the effort to strengthen minority and female presence in the field of science. April also organizes and supports programs that recognize student academic excellence on campus. April’s current work schedule is prioritized in the following order: teaching, research, and service.

• Brenda, a tenured Science professor, comes from a college-educated family. All of Brenda’s post-secondary education was completed at an HBCU, but she also completed work as a post-doctoral Research Fellow at a predominantly
White university. In addition to her 25-plus years of teaching and research, Brenda has authored (alone and in conjunction with other researchers) numerous journal articles and at least one book. Brenda has active memberships in some of the professional scientific associations and is an active advocate in leading more women and minorities into the fields of science. Brenda’s current schedule is prioritized in the following order: teaching, service, and research.

- Carla, a tenured Science professor, comes from a college-educated family. Carla earned her undergraduate and master’s degrees at an HBCU; she earned her Ph.D. at a predominantly White university. In addition to her 30-plus years of teaching at an HBCU and a predominantly White university, Carla interrupted her academic teaching to work in private industry as a scientist for a few years. Carla’s career in academia has been devoted to teaching and service. She attributes the absence of significant research in her professional career to the difficulties she has had over the years in establishing the necessary contacts to pursue such efforts in her specialized field of science. Carla is an active member of professional associations that work toward increasing the number of women and minority representation in the fields of science. Carla’s current work schedule is prioritized in the following order: teaching, service, and research.

- Denise, a tenured Math professor, comes from a college-educated family. Denise earned her undergraduate and master’s degrees at an HBCU; she earned her Ph.D. at a predominantly White university. In addition to her
30-plus years of teaching and service, Denise has an active research and consulting schedule with federal government and private industry that involves collaborative projects with various experts in the fields of math and science. Denise has written numerous articles and contributed to the publishing of a number of books. Along with her membership in the professional associations, she is active in the academic and local communities with promoting math education at the lowest academic levels to better introduce and prepare minority and female youth for careers in math and science. Denise’s current work schedule is prioritized in the following manner: Majority effort is spent on research and teaching, and the remaining time is devoted to service.

- Eve, a tenure-track Political Science professor, comes from a college-educated family. Eve earned her undergraduate degree at an HBCU, but fulfilled her master’s and Ph.D. requirements at a predominantly White university. Eve’s current professor position is her first as a professional in the academic community, but she did gain some prior teaching experience working as a Graduate Teaching Assistant while working on her Ph.D. Eve participated in some academic research with other professors while working on her Ph.D., and is now engaged in her own academic research at the study HBCU. Eve is relatively new to the academic work environment (less than five years) so she is still trying to establish a suitable balance for her teaching, research, and service responsibilities.
• Fran, a tenured Political Science professor and former Fulbright Fellow, was the first person to graduate from college in her immediate family. Fran earned all of her post-secondary degrees at predominantly White universities. Before coming to the study HBCU, Fran had taught at several predominantly White universities, worked for a federal agency, and worked as a consultant. Along with her teaching and service responsibilities, Fran is actively engaged in research. Though she has been in the academic community for less than 10 years, Fran has contributed articles to numerous academic journals and has published more than one book. Fran has associations with the national and international professional associations related to her career field. Fran’s current work schedule is prioritized in the following manner: research, teaching, and service.

• Glenda, a tenure-track Engineering professor, comes from a college-educated family. Glenda earned all of her degrees from predominantly White universities, along with teaching and research experience as a graduate assistant. The study HBCU is Glenda’s first professional position in the academic community. Although she has been in the academic arena for less than seven years, Glenda carries a heavy teaching and research workload. Her engineering background has enabled her not only to be involved in numerous innovative research projects internal and external to the study HBCU, but to be a sought-after representative for minority-focused recruitment efforts for the field of engineering. Glenda’s current work schedule is prioritized in the
following manner: research and teaching allotted near-equal time, then service.

Pertinent information discovered about the academic departments relevant to this study included:

- Historically, all of these departments continue to have either no African American female faculty representation or significantly little female faculty representation.
- With the exception of the Political Science department, foreign-born and White males outnumber all other groups (White females, foreign females, African American males).
- The majority of these departments' faculty members consist of professors who obtained their doctoral degrees and/or tenure during the 1960s and early 1970s.
- For the Biology, Math, and Physics departments, when compared with the male faculty members who received their Ph.D.s in the same time period as the African American females in this study, the African American females have been the only members who have not advanced in rank to Full professor.
- For the African American female professors who obtained their tenure at the study HBCU, tenure was obtained during the time periods when a female occupied either the departmental chair or female provost position.
- Of the represented departments, only the Biology, Political Science, and Engineering departments have had an African American female in a chairperson position.
All of these departments are in the midst of personnel turnovers (due to retirements) and are actively recruiting new faculty members.

To begin the data collection process, initial interview sessions were scheduled and confirmed with each participating subject through e-mail and telephone follow-ups. All subsequent interviews and any other additional contacts/appointments needed for data verification were scheduled through telephone and/or e-mail.

Data Collection

Qualitative data collection requires that the writer be the main research instrument, be personally involved, and have personal contact with the research subjects (Bloland, 1992). According to Glesne and Peshkin (1992), data are reported, not as a simplification of social phenomena, but as a “descriptive write-up” (p. 7) that explores the range of behavior and expands the understanding of the resulting interactions.

This study utilized Dolbeare and Schuman’s three-interview model (Schuman, 1982), chosen for its ability to accommodate access to ideas, thoughts, and emotions that cannot readily be identified through observation alone (Bloland, 1992). And as Mishler (1986) pointed out, interviewers do not lend credibility to a topic; they tend to explore by holding one meeting with an interviewee whom they have never met before.

In this model, the first interview of each subject captures as much information as possible about the interviewee in the context of the topic up to the present time. The second interview allows the interviewee to focus on and reconstruct details of her/his present experience in the context of the topic being discussed. The third interview encourages the interviewee to reflect on the meaning of her/his experiences to express the
intellectual and emotional connections between the subject’s work and life (Schuman, 1982; Seidman, 1991).

Though no strict rules apply to the execution of this model, Dolbeare and Schuman do provide a few general guidelines to help keep the focus and direction of the interviews true to the original intent of the study.

1. Maintain a balance between providing enough openness for the subject to tell the story and enough focus to allow the interview structure to work.

2. Decide on the length of time for the sessions before the interview process begins and adhere to the limit.

3. Allow enough time between interviews for the interviewee and interviewer to reflect on what was said in the previous interview, but not so much time they lose the connection between the two (Seidman, 1991).

Interviews for this study were semi open-ended. After the lead-in question or comment was delivered (to establish the focus for the session), subjects were given the latitude to speak about their experiences and perceptions in the context of the focus of the session. Lead-in questions or comments consisted of the following:

1. First Interview focused on brief family history, choice of higher education professor as a career, academic employment positions held, academic achievements, affiliation with professional organizations, and current perspectives on their status in their current positions.

2. Second Interview focused on individual teaching/research/service responsibilities, other institutional responsibilities, interactions/relationships
with colleagues and superiors, and workplace culture in terms of collegiality and value systems (collective and individual).

3. Third Interview focused on their recognition and acceptance as culture bearers and knowledge bearers, strategies to increase the representation of African American female faculty members, and their roles as change-agents to advance the image of African American women as culture/knowledge bearers.

These questions were in the context of (a) obtaining a more detailed explanation of a particular point that had been expressed by the subject, made for the express purpose of clarifying the comment that was made rather than to steer the subject’s comments toward a certain end, to query the subject on specifics; and (b) to either steer the conversation back to the previously stated focus of the session, or to obtain more information related to the previously stated focus of the session.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) pointed out that convenience, availability, and appropriateness were paramount considerations when arranging for the time and place for the interview process. When respondent convenience was the overriding consideration, their suggestion was to “defer to your respondents’ needs because their willingness is primary, limited only by your capacity to conduct an interview in the place that they suggest…. You take what you can get and defer to the preferences of the respondent” (p. 73).

Interviews for this study were accomplished during the Spring and Fall 2002 academic semesters. For each subject, interview sessions were completed during a consecutive three-week time period with each session lasting between 45 and 75 minutes.
Due to numerous work schedule conflicts, two subjects completed their interviews in two extended sessions.

Interview sessions were conducted with the subjects in one of three formats: on-campus sessions, daytime office telephone conversations, or evening home telephone conversations. Four subjects' interviews were conducted on campus and in person. Due to work schedules, two of the subjects' interviews were conducted by telephone (one during the day and one during the evening). Due to constant interruptions during the process of interviewing, one subject, who started off with on-campus interviews, decided to change the sessions to off-campus interviews. Permission to tape the interview sessions was granted by each subject prior to the onset of each subject's series of interviews.

During the interview sessions, the writer acted in the capacity of listener, note-taker, and observer. The writer also maintained a journal that was used to document observations and thoughts about the subjects' comments and their interactions with colleagues and students.

Contents of the taped interviews were transcribed within 24 hours of each interview session while events were still fresh in the writer's mind. If any clarification or confirmation of information obtained from the previous session was in order, a notation was made in reference to the area in question, and further clarification was sought at the beginning of the next interview in the series for that particular subject's sessions. This strategy of data management was repeated throughout the interview process until its completion.
To ensure the credibility of the information on the tapes, at the conclusion of the
last interview, the writer requested from each subject that permission be granted to
contact them to address any issues of content clarification from the last interview, to have
them review the transcribed information to ensure the accuracy of the transcription, and
receive their approval to utilize their quoted comments from the transcribed data;
permission was granted.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved three flows of data activity: data reduction, data display,
and conclusion drawing (Miles & Huberman, 1984). As defined by Bloland (1992), data
reduction summarizes or paraphrases collected data so that the result is a more succinct
and manageable representation of the whole, data display organizes information into a
more compact and accessible form, and conclusion drawing clarifies the meaning of the
data.

Data collection and data analysis were sequential occurrences as codes were
developed and categorical relationships were revealed and checked against emergent
themes. Data reduction was accomplished following a format suggested by Miles and
Huberman (1984) which involved the use of contact summary sheets to reflect
on/summarize interview sessions, the coding of interviews to categorize collected
information into emerging themes (the transcription and review of interview tapes), and
memo writing (created during the review of the interview data and journal entries) to give
rise to the relationships between codes.

The basic analytic technique was thematic analysis (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973).
This technique directed that the writer (a) structure and code the data in order to root out
important aspects of the data; (b) once themes were revealed, determine how they fit
together; and (c) refine the principal ideas that recurred throughout the data and develop
them into the central story line. Specifically, the coding scheme involved the following
process:

- Within 24 hours of the recording of an interview, the tape was replayed and
  information that was directly related to the particular focus of the interview
  was extracted.

- The extracted data were analyzed along with other written notes that had been
  taken during the interview session, which enabled the interviewer to look for
  recurring ideas, inconsistencies, and any unclear comments in the text. This
  step was also where any questions that emerged from the review of the tapes
  and notes were prepared so that they could be addressed during the next
  scheduled session for the particular subject.

- After the review of new information that was extracted from recent
  interviews, a review of previously examined information was conducted to
  ensure that all data were being incorporated and compared on a continuous
  basis.

- As more tapes were obtained and replayed, and more data were extracted, the
  writer was able to begin comparing the information obtained from the
  interviewees to look for any repeated instances of particular areas of interest.
  This is where the attempt began to establish the codes. The notes created
  during the review of the tapes were used to consider and further develop trains
of thought and ideas that were emerging as the taped information and written notes were merged.

- Once the writer was able to distinguish particular categories emerging from the collective review of the interviews and other notes taken during and after the interviews, the development of subsequent themes was able to take place.

The conclusion drawing phase incorporated the results of the data reduction process, literature reviews of other research conducted on African American female faculty in other academic workplace settings, and a review of relevant policies and procedures particular to the study HBCU’s organizational practices (see Figure 1). This iterative process resulted in the development of a visual representation (see Figure 2) presented later in Chapter V, which was used to provide an integrated summative visual representation of the workplace perceptions of the research subjects as they related to the HBCU’s organizational culture and workplace activities. Due to the small number of subjects for this study (seven), a qualitative software program was not deemed necessary to manage and organize the data collected for this study.

Kuh and Whitt (1988b) pointed out that no one institution’s culture is the same as another’s. As such, descriptions and interpretations of events and actions from one institution are not generalizable to other institutions. To that end, the results of this study, presented in the following chapter, should not be used to portray a single individual’s experiences or perceptions as representative of all African American female faculty members’ experiences at HBCUs, nor should the descriptions and discussions of the practices of this one HBCU, as described by this study’s subjects, be perceived as representative of all HBCU organizational cultures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>*Perceptions about institution and department culture</td>
<td>*Culture of dissatisfaction as reflected by Faculty apathy and professors’ perceptions about students’ attitudes and confidence in the institution.</td>
<td>Black female faculty at HBCUs have concerns about many of the same issues (e.g., students, service assignments, racism, sexism, career paths) that occupy their colleagues at traditionally White universities. Some of these concerns vary in relation to their chosen fields and seem to be mitigated by their responses to the learning environment. Nevertheless, they remain committed to the advancement of Black females in the academy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>*Perceptions about faculty members’ commitment to students and work</td>
<td>*Student attitudes and behaviors, service responsibilities, and a lack of institutional support were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvinistic</td>
<td>*Concern about adequacy of infrastructure and material and human resources</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td>*Teaching issues centered around student needs, attitudes, and behavior</td>
<td>*Culture of dissatisfaction as reflected by Faculty apathy and professors’ perceptions about students’ attitudes and confidence in the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>*Concern about adequacy of infrastructure and material and human resources</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>*Concern about adequacy of infrastructure and material and human resources</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distractions</td>
<td>*Concern about adequacy of infrastructure and material and human resources</td>
<td>*Research issues centered around institutional barriers were noted as major areas of concern in the teaching, research, and service areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basics</td>
<td>Assistance Respect Attitudes Commitment Collaboration Accepted research Peer recognition Resources Bureaucracy Time commitment Advising Diversity Faculty interaction Marginalization Isolation Mentoring Peer recognition Peer system “The exception” Role expectations Promotion/tenure System fairness</td>
<td>*Service-plus</td>
<td>*Problems with racism, sexism, and career advancement continue to be of concern; however, the responses to these issues differ between senior and junior professors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. African American Female Professors and HBCU Organizational Culture.
CHAPTER IV
DATA PRESENTATION

The purpose of this study was to explore the workplace experiences and perceptions of African American female faculty members working within the boundaries of an African American male-dominated HBCU organizational culture. In reference to the African American female faculty members who participated in this study, specific research questions included:

1. What have been the career experiences that have shaped the study participants' workplace perceptions and attitudes about their organizational culture?

2. What opportunities, if any, have there been for the study participants to contribute to the shaping and influencing of the values and beliefs in their institutional settings?

3. What actions or incidences have helped or hindered their acceptance, participation, and progress in the academic workplace.

4. To what extent have the study participants perceived that they have been recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their particular academic organizational cultures?

The population for this study consisted of seven (five tenured and two tenure-track) African American female professors working at a doctoral/research-level
HBCU within academic departments not typically populated by African American female professors. Specific academic departments that met the criteria for this study included the Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Mathematics, Physics, and Political Science departments from the College of Arts and Sciences and all departments from the School of Engineering and the School of Business. These departments were chosen based on the extremely low representation of African American females on their respective faculty rosters. The African American females who participated in this study were faculty members of the Biology, Math, Physics, Political Science, and Engineering departments of the study HBCU.

Theme One: Culture of Dissatisfaction

Tierney (1988c) postulated that the three dimensions of an organization—infrastructure, environment, and organization members—work in concert to reveal its organizational culture. Placed in the context of Tierney’s dimensions, the professors in this study portrayed the study HBCU as being not conducive to their workplace productivity or career advancement due to the lack of basic resources and the poor conditions of the institution’s facilities (infrastructure), the ever-present bureaucratic barriers they encountered when carrying out workplace and career-related activities (environment), and the erosion of faculty and administrator commitment to the university and its mission (organization members).

HBCU Environment

When describing the overall culture of the study HBCU, one professor referenced her comment to include all HBCUs.
I think the HBCU is the most conservative university and very difficult for females to get leadership roles because of the conservative atmosphere.

(Denise)

Other professors who expressed their perceptions confined their comments to the study HBCU’s environment.

The way that this institution is structured is very bureaucratic. There is just so much that you have to learn. I’m trying to navigate this myself to figure out the system…. When I was hired, one of the things they told me was, “We want your ideas; we need your freshness.” I have ideas that I’m ready to share but when I come up against this bureaucracy and the resistance at the faculty meetings, what’s the point? (Eve)

The particular value of sharing and trying to make the best of what’s going on, making sure everybody is served, is not necessarily a strong value within the department or the institution. I don’t go to faculty meetings because they’re a waste of time. If there were something that I considered to be valuable in my growth or my commitment to the university that I could gain from going to faculty meetings, I would go. (April)

This institution is chauvinistic; an “ol’ boy” network whereby whenever there are opportunities for faculty exchanges, believe me, the dean will call up his buddies and give them the opportunity, even when those opportunities are supposed to be competitive. It has a culture of mediocrity because a person attends this institution riding on other people’s coattails. (Fran)

The department is very political and so it sets you up in your little sphere to operate according to your own demands. I walk the beat according to what I think I have to do. (Carla)

Eve summed up the general perception of the study HBCU’s organizational culture with a comment made to her by a senior White female professor in her department.

She was very blunt and told me the only way that I was really going to be “happy” here was if I use the institution as little as possible. She doesn’t even make her photocopies at the institution; she buys all of her own office supplies because it’s just too much bureaucracy to get a piece of paper! Her attitude is rooted in the lack of resources and the bureaucracy she’s had to deal with for more than 20 years. (Eve)
Faculty Commitment

Professors attributed the overall decline in institutional faculty commitment to the student population and their teaching/research/service responsibilities to internal fragmentation, general apathy, and external distractions.

Some question the commitment that non-African Americans have to teaching. In some departments, some African Americans that we have, qualitatively speaking, they’re not competitive, tend not to do any research, and tend not to keep up in the field. (Denise)

The faculty members are not as interested as they once were. A lot of the students are reluctant to take classes and courses from different faculty members. Some even talk about changing majors to avoid these professors. (Brenda)

I see faculty members who have been out there for a while, and they’re in the majority. They’re very comfortable with the culture as it is—not necessarily that they like it, but they don’t challenge it. Then I see another group that’s not comfortable with the culture; yet, they don’t feel that they can necessarily challenge it. They work with it and they expend enormous amounts of energy trying to get things done. In the meantime, the older group—most of whom have tenure—really don’t contribute much in terms of research, teaching, and service. (Eve)

People around here moonlight to the Nth degree. It’s not unlikely for professors to have three full-time jobs. If you’re teaching at the college level, the quality of your teaching is really lowered. (Fran)

Facilities and Resources

The ability of the HBCU to obtain and maintain facilities and resources was a major factor in the professors’ perception of the study HBCU’s preparedness and ability to promote and advance the image of a Research I university in that it put into question the institution’s commitment to academic excellence, as well as the faculty members’ ability to pursue research without undue barriers. These conditions resulted in a vote of “no confidence” in terms of expectations for future improvements by senior and junior professors alike.
This is a Research I institution, but we don’t have the basic things (labs, temperature controlled areas, water) that we need to conduct research. If you want to have people perform the job, you have to provide the basics that they need. There was a professor who came here from another institution, but he left after the second year. (Brenda)

I expected to come to this institution and have the administrative support, infrastructure, and facilities set up so that I could do my research, to have students who were hard working come and work with me. It’s difficult to get things done. I’ve been trying to improve the situation, but not with much success. (Glenda)

When I talk to my colleagues, both White and Black, we acknowledge that we are not out of the loop, but we’re not tightly woven into the loop. (April)

Both junior and senior professors singled out institutional bureaucracy, poor management, and faculty/staff indifference as playing a major role in the perceptions that students form and the attitudes that students display (graduate and undergraduate) about the institution.

I’m very concerned about student assistance, guidance, and direction at this institution. Students transfer from one institution to this one on the expectations that this institution is better than the one they came from, but it is not. (Carla)

Here, nobody knows where you are, and they don’t care. New students don’t know where to go for assistance. They’re forced to either wait long hours for assistance (during beginning-of-semester enrollment) or told to come back the next day. Students have no idea what to do. (Brenda)

I push my students because I know they can do better than what they do. Lots of professors do not say anything. (April)

There was one dissenter in the group of professors who felt that students were also part of the problem and needed to be held more accountable and take more responsibility for their academic progress. This professor felt that, many times, external activities, beyond the control of the institution, could be identified as the reason for at least some of the situations that students found themselves in.
Students are working 40 hours per week and are much more interested in making money than going to class. Most of the students at the graduate level work. They complain that they have too much reading; but to them, too much reading is any reading. Some faculty care about this issue; some don’t. (Fran)

Overall, regardless of the lack of support coming from the institution and the decline in commitment to the students by other faculty members, these professors felt that it was their responsibility, as educators, to do the best with what they had at their disposal to ensure that what the students came to the institution to accomplish could be achieved.

Theme Two: Workplace Perceptions—Same Issues, Different Angles

As previously pointed out in the literature review, teaching, research, and service are the benchmarks used to determine the prospects for a faculty member’s potential and eligibility for promotion. For the faculty members in this study, teaching loads, time to pursue scholarly work, and service activities were identified as issues of concern, but not for the same reasons as were pointed out by African American female faculty members at predominantly White universities.

According to the HBCU’s faculty handbook, department faculty guides, and comments made by the professors, the HBCU in this study does not prescribe a set balance for teaching, research, and service. Teaching/research/service balance issues were not of much concern to the senior professors, especially since they were nearing retirement. However, two junior professors had their own individual perceptions about the balance issue.

With the way the university is set up, there is this emphasis on teaching. You end up spending so much time and energy on teaching, and it doesn’t really get the weight that it should get when it comes time for tenure. And, of course, it’s difficult as a professor because you’re trying to balance doing your research and teaching, and, inevitably, your research ends up suffering. (Eve)
This institution is flexible. It has general guidelines and expects you to have a reputable amount of teaching, research, and service. (Glenda)

**Teaching**

At the study HBCU, teaching load is dependent on the level of students a professor is advising and the amount of research s/he is engaged in. This strategy is in place to allow a professor some leeway and independence in managing her/his own workloads. A query to the professors about the number of classes they were currently assigned to teach found that, on average, each professor had between two and four classes assigned, and they felt that the teaching load was appropriate when compared to their research projects that were underway and current advising responsibilities.

For this particular group of professors, the primary issue was not the number of classes on one's teaching schedule, which, for these professors, ranged between three and five, but the type of class (i.e., introductory or advanced, independent study or regular, lab or seminar, undergraduate or graduate), the preparation needed for the class (i.e., readings, class activities, tests, labs), and other incidental occurrences (primarily student-related) that had an impact on the time and effort needed for the effective execution of the particular class.

I teach an entry level course. I cannot use my notes from one semester to the next. The issue is change (in course content). It's an awful lot of preparation. Then I teach a senior seminar; the topics change every semester. (April)

I'm teaching the smallest number of students I've ever taught. The students are much less prepared than they were in the past and need so much more help. Sometimes, it's like teaching high school. (Carla)

The students come by your office all the time—it's very teacher-oriented. And, because of the needs of the students—a lot of them are coming from disadvantaged backgrounds and have not had the best education—they come to rely on you a lot. (Eve)
As pointed out in the literature review, female professors do have to confront challenges from students concerning their professional capability and authority. But in this instance, these problems seemed to garner concern only from the junior faculty members. An example of each junior professor’s experience revealed the following:

The majority of students in our department are male. There’s a great deal of lack of respect accorded to you as a Black female. That can be true at White institutions too, but not to the same extent. (Fran)

The biggest problem I have is them dealing with me as a person in authority. I get a lot of problems with students not taking me as seriously or thinking that I come off being really nice. The students are thinking “Gosh, it’s no way she’ll fail me.” (Eve)

I had a student ask me what my area of specialization was, what my area of focus was. I don’t think this student would have done that if I had been a man. (Glenda)

The senior female professors are still occasionally confronted with students questioning their ability; but, due to their time and experience in the academy, their level of concern about this issue has diminished.

I had male students who hated the fact that they were being taught by a female. I still get students who resent having a female teacher, and they still let me know. But I don’t let it bother me. (Carla)

The students perceive me as very difficult, very demanding, very challenging. What I experience is they come up with strategies that are designed to cover their lack of responsibility. It challenges you because you’re put in the position of being judge and jury in trying to determine what is legitimate and what isn’t. (April)

More than students challenging their authority, both junior and senior professors voiced concern and exasperation about a growing trend among students who come to class unprepared and unwilling to participate. As told by three senior professors,

You get some students in class with the attitude “You better not call on me,” because it gets them upset. I call on a student for a response to a question, and
s/he’ll say, “I don’t know,” then I’ll ask, “Why are you here?” I feel like saying “Drop the course,” because that student is affecting the other students that are in class to learn. (Denise)

I put students in groups to work on problems among themselves. One student, who did not want to participate in the group setting said, “We’re paying you to teach us; we’re not being paid to teach ourselves.” (Carla)

A student was sitting in my class in the lab with a newspaper open in front of her while everybody else was working. I said, “You’re not working.” She said, “No, I’m not.” I said, “Where is your manual?” She said, “I don’t have one.” I said, “You can borrow mine.” She said, “I don’t want to do anything.” Then, she stood up and said, “I’m paying your salary,” and grabs her belongings and walks out. Later on that day, I was in my office and someone knocked on the door, and here was this same student. She comes to my desk and opens her textbook and says, “Professor, I have a question.” She acted as if nothing had happened earlier that day. When I was in school that would have never occurred. No student would have stood up and said anything to a professor, even if you were thinking it. (Brenda)

Of equal concern was the students’ persistence in pursuing and insistence on obtaining their preferred, not earned, grade. These episodes were most evident when grades were returned after exams or during final grading periods. Both junior and senior professors were accosted by students on campus grounds, in their offices, by telephone, and, with the advent of technology, by e-mail seeking a change in grade. For instance,

I hate to give exams because, always, the day after when I give back their grades I’m bombarded with comments to the effect I shouldn’t have done this or I didn’t ask that question right. They’re constantly questioning their grades or how I grade the exams. Same with the final grades; they want to call me on it. Not if I could reconsider the grade, but that they don’t feel they deserve the grade. They’re very forthright about the grade they think they should have received. I had one student who e-mailed me several times and very adamantly tried to get me to change the grade, and that’s not uncommon. (Eve)

Today, students come in with this consumer attitude toward education: “I’m paying for this class and you need to give me the grade that I’m paying for, I’m not paying for an F!” (Glenda)

There can be an overt kind of intimidation that students will try to use in trying to get a better grade than they deserve. I’ve had students come to me and basically
acknowledge trying all sorts of things to win my support of them—try to win me
over is the language they use. They think that you’re being mean. I have students
that say things like “Oh, you’re just trying to be difficult” or “You didn’t
understand what I was saying.” (Fran)

Students demand that their requests be satisfied. They leave notes in faculty
boxes demanding explanations for grades. My position is grades are not
negotiable. (April)

To add an even more complex and sensitive aspect to these issues, in some
instances, being at an HBCU, some African American students come to expect
preferential treatment from African American professors. And, if this special treatment is
not forthcoming, student actions can sometimes lead to negative consequences. As noted
by one senior professor,

Black students’ expectations of what they get from the Africans, Indians, Chinese,
and Whites is very different from their expectations of Blacks, especially females.
They expect us to turn inside out to help them find everything—hold their hands,
etc. They have these expectations for Black teachers that they don’t have for
Whites, and then it’s the Whites that mistreat them. Yet, it’s the Black teachers
that they report, and that always makes me angry. (Carla)

Attitudes such as the one just expressed put all professors in a compromising position that
oftentimes pits the student against the professor. It is situations like these that the
institution will either choose the “politically correct” route or stand firm with the
regulations and policies of the institution as its defense. The problem is, depending on
the situation and the amount of leverage the student has, the outcome may not always
result in what should occur, but what may be negotiated to occur—politically or in the
best interests of the institution and/or student. In the words of one senior professor,

Students have more power than you think. They have learned to manipulate the
system to the disadvantage of the professors and the university is put in a position
to either defend the professor or stand up to the student and parents. The realities
are that pressure put in the right place may well get the result that was being
sought and the students know this. (April)
In the environment of the HBCU, professors deal with students from diverse racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Whether it is the professor’s or the institution’s responsibility, it would seem to be in the best interest of both parties to find the necessary balance that will satisfy the needs of the student, the faculty member, and the institution.

Research

Research I universities stress the importance of research, publication, proposal writing, and the acquisition of grants. Because of their tradition of devoting the majority of their efforts to teaching, some HBCUs at the research and doctoral levels have not lessened their emphasis on teaching to the extent that they should have (Johnson, 2000). But as indicated by most of the professors in this study, the study HBCU, while still stressing the traditional importance of teaching, has began to express more often its expectations for faculty in the areas of research, grant writing, and publications.

At the study HBCU, research expectations mimic those of teaching. Similar to teaching expectations, though a certain amount is not specified, professors are expected to remain actively engaged in some form of research to advance and/or maintain their knowledge level in their specific career field. This guidance is more implied than stated and is left to the discretion of the school/college or individual departments as to the level of enforcement these entities will choose to implement.

A web site review of the institution’s list of the recent publications (within the last seven years) of professors who had published since 1997 revealed (a) on average, almost none of the professors who had been tenured for at least 20 years had current publications (1999 and beyond); (b) most publications were attributed to professors in the sciences
and engineering; and (c) the majority of the publications were short articles (less than 10 pages) written for field-specific journals. It should be noted that the lack of publications attributed to some professors may be the result of not all publications being listed on the institution's web site, some professors opting not to participate on the listing, or choosing not to submit their publications for listing.

Experiences and perceptions about the study professors' research choices and collaboration opportunities were divided along social sciences and the non-social sciences lines. Professors in the non-social sciences felt that their research was well received by their colleagues—internal and external to the institution. As expressed by one junior and one senior professor, respectively,

A lot of my research is collaborative (with individuals outside of her department, but within the institution). The people I see mostly are people involved in similar research or on the same research project. I see them more than I see people in my department. (Glenda)

I don’t have any problems with my work. Because of the nature of my research, generally, my work is recognized. What I do is very accountable and quantifiable in terms of peer recognition. (Denise)

In fact, one junior professor felt that being an African American scientist or engineer at an HBCU, one has to almost be extra cautious of requests for participation in research projects that originate from outside of the institution. As stated by one junior professor,

I get lots of calls to participate on collaborations with people outside of this institution, and especially from government agencies. Some of them have a requirement for a minimum of input from minorities, so a lot of times people will call here and say, “Would you be interested in working with us on this grant or proposal...?” I don’t think they would call me up if I couldn’t do the work, but people do call us up because we’re an HBCU. People used to call us and use us to get money or get a proposal and then we’d never hear from them again. So, the institution had to make up an agreement to ensure that we would work on the project if we provided them the use of our individual or institution name in the grant or proposal. (Glenda)
Social science professors, on the other hand, perceived their experiences and perceptions as representative of what has been documented by previous researchers in that their choices for research were not as valued as those of their male counterparts. As noted by one professor,

A lot of people think that HBCUs do a lot of research on social issues related to the Black community. That is a fallacy. I can say from my own experiences that I don’t see a lot of my male colleagues in this department pursuing research that focuses on Black issues. (Fran)

However, an interesting twist to this issue, as detailed by one junior professor, revealed that the devaluing of social science research by colleagues was not exclusive to race-related, ethnic-related, or women’s issues-related research pursuits. Research areas that are not familiar to colleagues or typically explored by colleagues in the department can also be a factor.

First and foremost, you’re always justifying your research agenda. The research that I do is global. Many of my colleagues are scared away from those pockets because they don’t know the topic. It can limit access to funding when you go to your field’s national organizations (“ol’ boy’s” clubs) for support. If you have their backing you get the money; if not, you don’t. (Fran)

The most crucial issue impacting the effective planning and execution of the professors’ research pursuits did not revolve around credibility or collaboration issues, but facilities and resources (human and material) barriers originating from inside the study HBCU. Once again, bureaucracy played a major role in stymieing the efforts of both junior and senior professors in accomplishing their research goals and potentially contributing to the infusion of funds into the institution via their submission of proposals and acquisition of grants. As revealed by a number of professors,

There’s not a lot of support from the institution for tuition and stipend support for the graduate students who assist with research. The burden is on the grant
writer/professor to produce grants that will accommodate the cost of the graduate students and the institution's overhead. (Glenda)

A lot of my research problems have to do with the lack of resources that the institution and the department has. Most of our graduate students work full-time, so we don’t have a good student culture where the students are helping with the grading, helping with faculty research like at other universities. It’s a juggling act. I’m still trying to figure it out. (Eve)

There are all of these administrative barriers to doing research and applying for external grants. One problem is the institution’s overhead—it’s so high that any money you get is eaten up before it gets to you. But you don’t see any of that administrative overhead reflected in the quality of work that you provide. (Fran)

Being at a Research I institution you are expected to research and publish. It’s very difficult to do that because of the bureaucracy and the time and energy you have to expend just to be able to carry out independent research. It’s a circus to get around it. A lot of times you’re put in a position where you might have to compromise your research interests to get around the bureaucracy if the ultimate goal is for you to stay there and get tenure. It’s very frustrating. (Eve)

The administration wants us to write proposals to bring money into the institution, but how can we when we don’t have the basics? We had a meeting and somebody said, “We need microscopes.” Somebody else said, “But you can’t write from this institution and say you need microscopes. They expect you to have them.” But that’s what I would ask for because we still need the basic stuff. So, when they talk about writing a proposal, I simply ignore them. (Brenda)

Undoubtedly, as expressed in this last comment, the prospects of tackling the different layers of bureaucracy can eventually lead to some professors deciding to remove themselves from the proposal writing process. Maybe senior professors can afford to choose this route, but junior non-tenured professors cannot elect such an option.

These comments point out the fact that some barriers can apply to all professors, regardless of gender or race. However, the point to be made in these comments is that poor resources and facilities can be a hindrance and can have a negative impact on any faculty member’s ability to pursue and conduct research. Consequently, for these African
American females, dealing with these problems adds another layer of difficulty to the other barriers that they will inevitably confront.

Service

Because of the historical ties that HBCUs have with their communities, many HBCUs see community-related service and academic excellence as the links that foster the appreciation of the ties between the curriculum and the environment beyond the institution’s campus. For these reasons, many deans and department chairs encourage faculty to engage with the surrounding community (Kannerstein, 1978). Reviews of the study HBCU’s catalog, faculty handbook, web site, and various department guides revealed that the study HBCU was involved in the typical institution and department-wide committees that any other higher education institution would be involved in at the Research I level.

The senior professors at the study HBCU did not perceive themselves as saddled with an inordinate amount of service or advising, but the junior professors thought otherwise. Ironically, each junior professor had a different experience that led to that conclusion.

Because our department is relatively small, most of the people have been here for a long time, very few who are mid-career, and a couple of professors who are relatively new, which means that the people who’ve been here longer, they’re less likely to do certain things…. It’s just a lot of service activities that take a lot of energy, so the burden kind of falls on the younger faculty members. (Glenda)

I get called on more than my colleagues to do certain things, for panels (so that it can be diverse), and you wouldn’t believe how many times I’m called on. That’s another service, but it gets tiring to be “the one.” (Fran)

Initially, I didn’t have a problem with too much service. I am on several committees within the department and I do head two programs that started out small, but have become much bigger, and I’ve had to take on a greater role
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because the person who was working with me on these programs is no longer here. I don’t want to get too involved in spearheading projects because I’m already doing a lot, and I don’t want to take on so many new responsibilities when I haven’t gotten tenure yet. I’ve seen what happens when that is indeed the case. (Eve)

Beyond the typical assigned institutional service responsibilities, both senior and junior professors found themselves being drawn into, for lack of a better term, service-plus duties. Service-plus can be defined as assistance that is not necessarily beneficial to the professor’s professional advancement, but, nevertheless, essential to the maintenance of the institution’s campus and community image.

Both junior and senior professors had been solicited to provide their assistance in the service-plus arena; however, the two groups split when they revealed their thoughts on the personal and professional benefits each gained from the experience.

One of the attractions of being a young professor is that students feel like they can relate to you a little bit more. They will come by my office to just chat or want me to be their advisor, which is nice and flattering, but, on the other hand, it’s like “Oh, my God! I can’t deal with all these students.” (Eve)

As a woman and an African American, a lot of times they put you on these committees and want you to mentor students. They say, “You’re young and I think you’re a role model,” and they get you tied up in all these other activities. But when it comes time for tenure, they’re not going to say, “Oh, great, we’re going to give you tenure because you’ve been doing this,” and most people know that. It’s hard because the people you have to please politically are asking you to do these things. You don’t want to say no, but, at the same time, you’re being asked to do something, which isn’t very good for your career. It happens a lot. I don’t like it when I get phone calls all the time saying we have some summer students or summer programs and would I be willing to talk to the students about what I’m doing, especially when it’s a program that has nothing to do with my research. (Glenda)

There are students who come to me preferentially who are not assigned to me. I don’t refuse, even if they’re assigned to someone else. These students feel that certain faculty members are not really interested in them, in their careers, so they respond to that by not going to that person for advice. (April)
We know how difficult it is for us at a predominantly White institution; it's equally difficult for our students. So, to be in a position to help a student, I think it's great, although I know it's draining. But they need direction; they need all of these things that I'm able to give to them. It's very important that the students perceive us as being human. (Denise)

Teaching, research, and service are the major benchmarks that affect promotion and tenure. Undoubtedly, a faculty member's success or lack thereof in these areas is a function of the institution's ability to support the faculty member's efforts. With respect to the professors in this study, the majority agreed that their HBCU had not provided the ideal workplace setting where these benchmarks could be rigorously pursued and achieved.

Theme Three: Generational Changes in Attitudes and Outlooks

Faculty members are required to contribute to the functioning and advancement of the academy through their inputs from teaching, research, and service. In the process of carrying out these professional responsibilities, it is assumed that the faculty members will engage and interact with their colleagues within and outside of the department. These interactions are expected to foster the kinds of information sharing and collaboration that eventually lead to faculty members developing a sense of belonging to and acceptance in the group (department/institution).

Collegiality

Rather than assessing their departments as being uninviting and chilly, as reported in the literature review by some African Americans at predominantly White colleges and universities, the professors in this study attributed the lack of collegiality in their departments to a state of affairs hovering between indifference and apathy among the
faculty members. However, this state of affairs did not seem to impair the performance of senior faculty members. As expressed by one senior professor,

You go to faculty meetings. You teach your classes. You do your research. You can collaborate (with other faculty members) if you want to. (Brenda)

Junior professors, while not in disagreement about the air of indifference in their departments, were more concerned about the lack of opportunity for them to be able to look to senior faculty members for guidance and mentoring.

When I was first hired at this institution, the faculty members were very enthusiastic about me being there, and I really could not have asked for more support. It was very refreshing because I knew they wanted me to be here. The tide changed, though. (Glenda)

The problem I'm having the most with is the lack of teamwork among faculty members. It's difficult for a new faculty member coming in. I'm anxious to work on my own research, but, to some extent, I still feel like I might need a little bit of guidance. It would be nice to have somebody that I could feel comfortable working with to guide me with respect to the research goals I want to accomplish. There is not even any connection between the female faculty members. (Eve)

The department is very segmented. Everybody just kind of does her/his own thing. There are professors in the department that I've never even seen. I'd feel uncomfortable going up to a tenured professor or a Full professor and saying, "Hey, you want to work on this research project with me?" There should be a stronger sense of reaching out. (Eve)

Unlike African American female professors at predominantly White colleges and universities, none of the professors in this study had experienced feelings of marginality or isolation while working at the study HBCU. As expressed by two senior professors,

Never experienced it. I pay more attention to what the trends are in the field, so when they're [colleagues] having problems related to teaching, they'll come to me to explain something or for suggestions about how to do something differently. When it comes to research, I have the background knowledge, so they'll come to me for advice/guidance. (Carla)

Isolation—no. We have seminars; members present their materials; they publish a paper and a copy is given to each person. Everyone wants to know what the
other is doing. The more information you have, the better because you can build on that; you can collaborate with someone. If I have something you need, information-wise, we can share. I think that happens here. (Brenda)

In fact, the only revelations about feelings of isolation were found to be when these professors attended functions away from the study HBCU. When they did occur, these feelings were the result of being the only female, the only African American, or both at national conferences, meetings, seminars, or other such gatherings they were directed or opted to attend. In the words of one senior professor,

I’m tired of being, if not the only female, certainly the only minority. And when you have these meetings that run from seven a.m. to seven p.m., and at seven p.m. there’s not even anybody that you want to go out to dinner with, it gets tiring after a while. I don’t give up because one is better than none. And if I refuse, there would be none—that’s my rationale. (April)

Racism and Sexism

It was evident by the variations in viewpoints expressed by the junior and senior professors that racism and sexism are still potent and passionate issues for African American female faculty members in the academy. In light of the diverse representation found in many HBCUs’ faculty ranks, this issue becomes even more relevant because of what such a diverse mix of racial, ethnic, social, and cultural backgrounds and within genders can imply in terms of individual perceptions of racism, sexism, preferential treatment, and fairness.

The recollections of experiences that the professors in this study attributed to racist and/or sexist attitudes and behaviors, and the perspectives that they offered, ranged from the typical to the unique. Some examples pertained to specific workplace incidents.

There were a couple of departmental gatherings related to an international faculty exchange. The person (male) who was given the responsibility to host these
people invited the former graduate studies Director (male), but didn’t invite me, and I was the Director at that time. It’s just an “ol’ boy’s” network. (Fran)

Some comments pointed out perceived differences in the treatment of women:

African American women have to compromise a little bit more. White women have had to do some compromising, but not to the extent African American women have had to do. There’s more of a burden that African American women have to shoulder in that once they’re in the institution, it’s a matter of survival, of being able to maintain what they have as opposed to “rock the boat,” and to really push for change. Whereas, White women, being more accepted by males, have felt a little bit more leeway being able to do that. (Eve)

There’s kind of a peer system, even within the minority enclave. Black women are at the end of the line—in every line. If it’s Black faculty, then it’s the Black male faculty that are predominant. (Denise)

It’s not a position that many people want to be in because on the one hand we’re always trying to succeed and to do our work and not be seen as “Oh, that’s a woman doing this work”; but, on the other hand, if we were to go off constantly and want to talk about the fact that “I’m a woman, and there are not that many women, and what are you doing about women, women, women”...people begin to marginalize you. Or, do you want them to say, “She’s interested in engineering, or science, or math, or whatever the subject area, and she’s a woman.” (Glenda)

Unfair treatment was noted in the area of promotions.

A former colleague who left the institution because she didn’t get tenure knew her subject area—that was never an issue. The Chairman of the department she left was [foreign-born]. The same is true for this department—when the Chairman was a [foreign-born], he didn’t tenure either one of the three top Black women in the field. Just because you have a department that’s Black male-dominated, does not guarantee that you’ll get tenure. (Carla)

Overt race-based comments or covert race-based thoughts were perceived differently by two junior professors.

Some people come right out and mention how happy they are for me to be Black and female. But this doesn’t bother me as long as I am not marginalized. (Glenda)

Unfortunately, when you’re the only one, people start to think that you’re an exception. Then, anything good you do is not attributed to your skills. Everyone knows you; everyone notices you; everyone remembers who you are. You’re
really not allowed to really blend in, not have everyone just kind of curious to see what kind of a presentation you’re going to give or someone thinking “Let me see what her proposal looks like; I know she’s Black.” It’s tiring. (Eve)

Sexist behavior and “women’s work” issues garnered different perspectives.

At meetings, women get dumped on to do memos, type letters, etc., even though there are secretaries in the department to do these things. (Fran)

After 30 years, you’re sort of one of the boys. I’m here; it’s just that I have a slightly different dimension. If they’re having problems with a female in the class, or females having some other problems, I have to handle it. The flowers for the funerals, the flowers for the weddings, I do. They don’t see me different, but that’s because of the years. (Carla)

Women are wanted, but it’s what they’re wanted and needed for. You’re wanted and you’re needed to do a lot of work, and women have been relegated to do the work, while the people who step out front are usually the males. Now, women have come to believe that, maybe, they could be up front too. But in our institutions, that doesn’t go down well. The males think that they should be the leaders and that the women should be doing the busy work. The males want the women in the classrooms. (April)

What is happening may be reflective of what I call the male ego. You’re taking a position that a male should have; you belong in the kitchen rather than in the classroom. Then you bring in gender, which is so totally relevant. There is a Black gender barrier, a White gender barrier—it’s still there. (Denise)

Situations that can lead a professor to question her ability and competency was noted by

one senior professor.

One year I was God’s gift to the classroom—I could do no wrong. The next year something happened, which caused the Chairman to give me a very negative evaluation. I went to the Chair for an explanation, which he did not provide. I spent the summer engaged in a work-related training course because I needed to know whether or not I had lost it—whether I was competitive. It was a very grueling test, and I did exceptionally well. What that told me was that I was just dealing with unjustified bias and that I needed to put that garbage in the trash can and put the top on it and go about my way. (April)
Interestingly, of the entire group of professors in the study, only one was hesitant to characterize any department or institution activities in a racist or sexist connotation. Her rationale was

It’s hard to say if conflicts are gender/sex related because of the small number of women. (Glenda)

Career Advancement

According to Fields (1997), HBCUs tenure and deny tenure to more African Americans than other institutions. Yet, because some HBCUs do not place a heavy emphasis on publishing, some view the HBCU tenure process as less rigorous. In fact, similar to other universities, professors at HBCUs are expected to have a reputable body of research and publishing, regardless of the amount of service and teaching they are engaged. And, maybe, these factors are sometimes used to satisfy other institutional motives that are outside the boundaries of the typical tenure and promotion issues.

Unless you have a set of research grants, you’re not going to get promoted. (April)

[The study institution] is starting to emphasize publishing as a way to scale down faculty staff. (Fran)

All of the professors had either been acquainted with or heard about former professors within the study HBCU who had departed due to a failure to obtain tenure status or promotion. For the senior professors, the issue of career advancement had always been fraught with obstacles. Some tried to challenge the system and failed; others adjusted to their plight and stayed—some with resignation, others with regret.

I had all the required publications and recommendations for promotion and I submitted my package. I knew I had met all the qualifications because my package was in line with the guidelines. The Department criticized me for not doing research here at the institution, and I said, “Oh, really; nobody said I could
not do research elsewhere.” They had a committee meeting—all men—and they decided that, even though I had completed all the requirements for promotion, they would not recommend me. A year later, I found out that my application had not even gone beyond the department. Here I was thinking it had gone to the College and to the Provost for review, and it had not gotten further than the Department Chairman’s desk. (Brenda)

When I was denied my promotion, even though I knew I had a case, it wasn’t worth the suits or the posturing and all the motions I would have had to go through to bring them down where they should have been. And it’s unfortunate that I did that. I regret it now. Not so much for myself, but for those who would come behind me. (April)

For all of the senior professors, had it not been for the intervention of a female administrator, they questioned whether or not they would have ever gained tenure status.

What we contributed to the institution was sufficient. Even though it was not necessarily research-related, the contributions to the life of the university was sufficient, so a small group of us was tenured by the female provost. (Carla)

These experiences have led senior professors to conclusions that indicate that they have little, if any, confidence in the study HBCU’s tenure and promotion process.

To get promoted, there is just nothing you can do. You may have tenure, do all the work, but you don’t get promoted.... Most of the time you have to either have some intervention from above or you have to have had such an overwhelming body of work that they can’t deny you. But otherwise, you’re not going to get promoted. (Carla)

Women are not encouraged to the leadership roles and they may not be encouraged to pursue full-professorship. (Denise)

The department chairs don’t really bargain in good faith. What they bargain with is I will pay you everything to get you here; I will keep you here until you’re old and less likely to go someplace else; then, I’ll treat you like hell. (April)

Junior professors, aware of what has occurred in the past at the institution, take a completely different stance on the promotion and tenure issue from their senior colleagues. They recognize the ambiguity of the process, as noted by one junior professor.
Like most universities, it’s ambiguous. It’s frustrating and it’s not that pleasant mainly because they really don’t tell you what’s going on. You’re kind of in the dark about what’s going on. It’s exactly what everybody says it is. (Eve)

If you’re a high achiever, you’re penalized. If you’re a low achiever, then that’s what a woman does. If you play the game, don’t do too much, placate the ones who are not doing anything, then you may hang around for a while. You go in and do the job the way it’s supposed to be done and people accuse you of acting like a man. Whatever they want to come up with, I let my work speak for itself. (Fran)

However, these junior professors also know that they have choices.

I’ve heard some horror stories about the tenure process at this institution that makes me believe that there are other dynamics going on. There might be the sense that some professors feel like I’m pushing too fast or going too far too fast. If that could influence their decisions, it’s a concern of mine, which makes me wonder how objective the whole tenure process is. (Glenda)

This is my first year on the tenure clock and I’m already thinking about Plan B for if I don’t get it. I don’t have to go through the experience of being rejected. If I don’t get tenure, and I feel that the process was unfair, I will definitely challenge the decision. If I worked that hard and I think I deserve to have gotten tenure, I can’t imagine not fighting for what is mine. (Eve)

You have to master the system. If the system is about teaching, research, and service, then you have to establish yourself in [these areas]. It’s not just about teaching. If you’re productive, people want you. If you’re not productive, you being Black and having a Ph.D. doesn’t mean all that much, and it shouldn’t. (Fran)

As one junior professor assessed the situation,

Older Black women have made certain compromises, but they have been choices that were made to survive in the academy. Younger Black women faculty members do sense that they have to be a bit more compromising, but in a wait and see attitude. If we feel that we do have to be more compromising just so we can survive and get tenure, we might be doing nothing more than supporting the status quo, which is something we don’t necessarily want. (Eve)

But, as pointed out by the senior professors, the past actions of the institution are the best evidence when it comes to revealing its record on the promotion of African American female faculty.
In the 30 years that I’ve been assigned in my department, I have been the only African American female faculty member. What you have is whatever cliques you’ve got in place; they try to see that there are more of them—try to hire those who identify with their color. (Carla)

I’ve been here 27 years, and there’s been one female chair for this department. (Brenda)

The present chairman of the department was overheard saying of the females in the department that he doesn’t expect any of them will get to be a full professor. (Denise)

Here you have a group of men—most of the time they’re men—and here is a man who is going to be evaluated. It’s a different mindset from here is a woman who is going to be evaluated. They look at every little detail for the woman, whereas for the man...I know; I’ve seen them in action. (Brenda)

The study HBCU has a less than stellar record when it comes to the tenure and promotion of African American female faculty members in the departments highlighted in this study. Nevertheless, the junior faculty members seem optimistic about their chances for promotion and tenure and plan to be prepared if the process does not work in their favor. The outcomes for these professors’ career advancement prospects are unsure; however, as one senior professor assessed the situation,

At HBCUs, tenure, in part, is who you know. Everywhere it’s political. It’s not just research. If they don’t tenure you, then, many times, they will keep you on as an instructor for years, so a lot of people just accept it. What really matters is that you make sure your faculty view you as valuable to the department; that’s first and foremost. Second is political—if you’ve got the work, but you don’t have the support of your chair, there’s no way you’ll get tenure. (Denise)

Tenure, especially to Full professor, is the crowning achievement for a faculty member in the academy. Teaching, research, and service are the measurement tools used by tenure and promotion committees to determine if the faculty member will be granted that status. However, elements within the institution’s organizational culture (i.e., racism, sexism) that are not always under the control of the faculty member can cause the
faculty member to either miss or be denied the opportunity for promotion and tenure. Senior female professors in this study allowed these elements to limit their career advancement at the study HBCU; based on the comments made by the junior professors in this study, they do not seem to be willing to accept the same fate.

Summary

Based on their work-related experiences, senior faculty members perceived that the study HBCU had betrayed them in terms of their professional expectations and career aspirations. In respect to the junior faculty members, the verdict is yet to be decided. However, one notion seems to be clear: Gone are the days when faculty members devoted their time and talents to one institution with the expectations that they would eventually attain tenure and promotions and, when those expectations did not materialize, resign themselves to the situation and remain at the institution.

Junior professors in this study speculate that new professors seeking careers in the academy, while still committed to service to the student body and the dissemination of knowledge, will be seeking to align themselves with forward-thinking institutions that will provide them the support they need to accomplish their goals, to include cultures that exemplify academic freedom and due process, and cultures that do not continue to subscribe to the biases, prejudices, discrimination, and stereotypes of the past. These junior professors believe that the absence of these attributes will no longer lead to the acquiescence or resignation that has been the norm of older professors, but, instead, to the eventual exodus of newer like-minded professors whose goal is to work at institutions that will be willing and able to meet their needs.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the workplace experiences and perceptions of African American female faculty members working within the boundaries of an African American male-dominated HBCU organizational culture. In reference to the African American female faculty members who participated in this study, specific research questions included:

1. What have been the career experiences that have shaped the study participants' workplace perceptions and attitudes about their organizational culture?

2. What opportunities, if any, have there been for the study participants to contribute to the shaping and influencing of the values and beliefs in their institutional settings?

3. What actions or incidences have helped or hindered their acceptance, participation, and progress in the academic workplace?

4. To what extent have the study participants perceived that they have been recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their particular academic organizational cultures?

The population for this study consisted of seven (five tenured and two tenure-track) full-time African American female faculty members working in a
predominantly male environment assigned to an HBCU’s College of Arts and Sciences and School of Engineering. Particular departments selected from the College of Arts and Sciences included the Biology, Math, Physics, and Political Science departments. As noted previously, these particular departments were chosen because of the traditionally low ratio of male to female representation that has been, and continues to be, evidenced in these departments throughout this nation’s higher education system. Information was gathered by way of interviews, which consisted of a series of three interviews per subject for five of the professors, and a series of two extended interviews per subject for two of the professors.

Discussion of the Interview Data

Institutional Culture

Tierney (1988c) pointed out the benefits of academic institutional culture in its ability to (a) provide organizational members with a sense of meaning, identity, and connectedness; (b) shape behavior, whereby group members act in particular ways because of the established boundaries of the culture; and (c) increase organizational stability, effectiveness, and cohesion. Flint (2000) further advocated organizational culture’s importance in reducing uncertainty for new members of the group. For the institution that was the focus of this study, these attributes were not evident.

All of the professors in this study perceived the study HBCU’s organizational culture to be one that was not conducive to accomplishing job tasks or pursuing career goals. The extent of the bureaucracy that each professor had dealt with at one time or another, even to accomplish small tasks, was the primary issue that had been cited for the lack of confidence in the institution and each professor’s level of frustration with the
institution's ability to meet ordinary day-to-day work-related needs (i.e., difficulties with locating and obtaining resources, contending with extensive paper trails, barriers to seeking confirmation on projects, slow responses of managers to faculty issues, reluctance by managers to make decisions).

Faculty negative attitudes about students, a lack of student support from the faculty members, faculty apathy toward the efficient and effective functioning within these professors' specific departments, and the formation of departmental cliques that contributed to these professors' perceptions of fragmentation among faculty groups were the primary factors cited as the reason for these professors' explanations for the overall degradation of the organizational culture of the institution.

Interestingly, even though these issues were put in the context of having a negative impact on the overall culture of the institution and their respective departments, the professors in this study did not seem to think that these problems impacted individual faculty member efforts to communicate among themselves about issues related to teaching and research in that the process of the exchange of information and collaboration still took place between faculty members to the benefit of their own individual workplace obligations and professional pursuits. In other words, these professors perceived that, even though the faculty members did not seem to have an interest in working together for the collective good of the institution, they could work together, one-on-one, when needed, for the individual benefit of their own personal departmental obligations and professional endeavors.
Students’ tendencies to treat female professors with less respect than male professors were no different than what was reported in research conducted by Turner (2002), Burgess (1997), and Sutherland (1990). However, according to the professors in this study, these tendencies had not diminished their ability to manage the classroom environment. No significant issues with excessive teaching loads were reported, especially since the study HBCU tended to adhere to the premise of balancing teaching assignments with the amount of research and service a faculty member was engaged in. Teaching schedules were manageable but had to be monitored so that they would not negatively impact research efforts. Discussions did reveal that the tenured faculty members seemed to have more influence over what classes they taught than the non-tenured faculty members, which could possibly be perceived as an earned privilege as a result of time and tenure at the institution.

Several researchers (Aguirre, 2000; Hendricks & Caplow, 1998; Johnsrud, 1993; Singh et al., 1995; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) reported about the difficulties that African American females face while attempting to initiate, collaborate on, and gain acceptance and recognition of the research they choose to pursue. To the contrary, problems of this nature were not encountered by the professors at the institution in this study. For the most part, the research efforts of the professors in this study were supported by their department colleagues, and, when sought out, the opportunity to collaborate with department/institution colleagues and partner with organizations external to the HBCU was forthcoming.
Similar to what was reported in the literature review by Turner and Myers (2000), Gubitosi (1996), and Graves (1990), there was an acknowledgment by the professors in this study of excessive service-related responsibilities. However, this excessive service issue did not relate so much to the number of students that was assigned to them, but the practice of students seeking them out personally for assistance and/or guidance, even though these students had not been formally assigned to the particular professor as an advisee. Additionally, the requests by the institution’s academic leadership for these professors to serve the dual purposes of female and minority representative at various engagements put a strain on the time that should have been devoted to job tasks essential to their current departmental obligations and future promotion and tenure efforts.

Workplace Issues

The literature review (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998; Garcia, 2000; Moses, 1989; Phelps, 1995; Sutherland, 1990) depicted many instances and examples of the problems many African American female faculty members at predominantly White universities find themselves confronting in the areas of workplace acceptance, to include marginality, isolation, and exclusion. All of these factors contribute to African American female professors characterizing their work environments as chilly and lacking collegiality. African American female professors from the sciences and engineering who participated in this study could not substantiate nor recall encountering such difficulties from within their particular academic departments or from their interactions in the general study HBCU environment. Although the professors from the social sciences did acknowledge the tendency of their male counterparts to devalue their research choices, it did not appear to dissuade them from or hinder their research pursuits.
Moses (1997) pointed out an important role of collegiality in that it fosters a sense of community as well as an atmosphere of creativity, in which people can exchange ideas, collaborate, and generally benefit from working as a team. The perceptions of this particular group of African American female professors were that the sense of community was lacking at this study HBCU as a result of faculty indifference and departmental fragmentation. Nevertheless, the lack of sense of community was not a barrier to these professors' ability to teach, conduct research (alone or in collaboration with others), or engage in campus or community service. As stated earlier, when the need arose, faculty members were willing to assist, collaborate, and discuss work-related issues, if approached by another faculty member. The offer of assistance or collaboration may not have been voluntary, but, when requested, the assistance or collaboration being requested was provided. It is in this context—to have senior faculty be more willing to show interest and offer assistance rather than have junior faculty have to seek out assistance—that the younger female faculty members in this study alluded to their feelings of anxiety about their departments.

Alexander-Snow and Johnson (1998) pointed out two negative consequences that faculty of color must contend with when they are subjected to exclusion: social and cultural alienation by colleagues, and/or being perceived as threats to the “status quo” by colleagues. They also pointed out the ramifications of such treatment: faculty of color not having the opportunity to learn and benefit from the political and informal norms that govern the culture they must function in.

In the case of the professors in this study, rather than perceiving their colleagues as being exclusionary, instead they characterized the faculty members in their
departments as small groups of cliques divided along racial and ethnic lines. In this particular situation, the issue appeared to be not one of exclusion, but one of self-enforced separation, possibly brought on as a result of the differences in the faculty members' various backgrounds, cultures, and values.

Phelps (1995) pointed out the perils of intellectual isolation in that it could lead to a loss of the stimulation of constructive intellectual exchanges, which could lead to intellectual starvation. If anything, from the comments that were made by the professors in this study, the loss of stimulation of constructive intellectual exchanges would not be a result of isolation, but the frustration with the bureaucracy in meeting the demands from the institution and the needs of the individual faculty member in attempting to satisfy the teaching and research needs.

Staples (1984) indicated that males saw little need for departments and colleges to change their environments to appease or increase the comfort levels of African American female faculty members; however, the tide may be changing for this new generation of faculty members. At least for this group of junior professors, their view was that the knowledge of the experiences of their predecessors had provided them with the insight to have alternative plans in place in the event that these issues became a hindrance to their careers.

Career Advancement Issues

Williams (1994) noted that the tenure process does not grant African American women any extra consideration for the inordinate amount of time spent beyond advisement and office hours facilitating the socialization of minority students on campus, which could otherwise be devoted to scholarly pursuits. Though the study HBCU’s
policy was to provide leeway for faculty members to balance their professional obligations to the institution, still, the professors in this study were faced with the issue of being saddled with extra duty in terms of advising, counseling, and being the minority representative at various functions and meetings external to the institution. Still, the historical academic arrangement of the male being the patriarchal leader and figure of authority and the female being the matriarchal nurturer and student consoler/problem-solver continues to be played out.

All of the senior professors (April, Brenda, Carla, and Denise) linked their experiences and perceptions about tenure and promotion efforts to racism and sexism. Due to the male-dominated environments they were confined to, these professors did not see their perceptions changing about these issues as they approached the end of their careers. In fact, the perceptions of these senior professors were in agreement with Farmer’s (1993) view that because educational canon and power structure represent a belief in the supremacy of males, the majority of those who lead and manage educational institutions do not see a need for a change in “business as usual.” In Denise’s words,

I think this institution makes it unattractive from the standpoint of the opportunities which they present to [the faculty member] that will allow [the faculty member] to do what [she] wants to do, and what [that faculty member] wants to do is move up the ladder, whether it is research that she is leaning toward strongly or whether it is academics. As a result, the doors that seem apparent never get opened or they get cracked, and there’s not enough room for [the faculty member] to do what [she] needs to do to get through that crack.

The junior professors (Eve, Fran, Glenda), while in general agreement with the senior professors about the presence of racism and sexism in the workplace and its impact on the tenure and promotion process, did not foresee themselves accepting outcomes similar to those of the senior professors regarding their future opportunities for promotion.
and tenure. The statement made by Eve in Chapter IV clearly represented the position of the junior faculty if faced with such an issue.

If I don’t get tenure, and I feel that the process was unfair, I will definitely challenge the decision. If I worked that hard and I think I deserve to have gotten tenure, I can’t imagine not fighting for what is mine. (Eve)

Figure 2 reveals that, for these African American female professors, this institution’s issues relating to bureaucracy and office politics, poor institutional support in respect to acquiring and/or having access to the appropriate facilities and resources, faculty apathy toward students, fragmentation between groups within the departments, the ongoing practices of racism and sexism (i.e., chauvinism, adhering to the “good ol’ boy” ways of operating) have operated in concert to affect the individual faculty members’ professional performance and the institution’s collective departmental cohesion. The consequences of these factors have resulted in these female faculty members perceiving the study institution, based on the actions of its leadership and faculty, as not only not living up to its obligations to the students and the community it is charged to serve, but also continuing to emulate the negative practices that other institutions have been faulted for engaging in that have defined America’s higher education system for centuries.

Inevitably, the extent to which these elements will continue to define and dictate the institution’s culture and impact the experiences and perceptions of the junior professors in this study will be borne out in their future decisions on whether to remain at this institution or leave.

The case can be made that some of the issues (i.e., departmental cohesion, racism and sexism, deficient facilities and resources) raised by these professors are equally or
similarly representative of the issues seen at other colleges and universities, regardless of the make-up of their race or gender. However, one would be remiss in merely focusing on the notion of similarity in and of itself. As pointed out by Etter-Lewis (1997), because prior studies tended to generalize findings about minorities regardless of ethnic or racial background, there was little opportunity to determine if the higher education experiences and perceptions of other groups besides White males or White females were that similar or different. More importantly, researchers now have the opportunity to focus on what useful information these similarities (and differences) can reveal toward finding ways to address the problems that these and other faculty members point out and continue to plague the American higher education system.
Discussion of Research Questions

1. What have been the career experiences that have shaped the study participants’ workplace perceptions and attitudes about their organizational culture?

Senior faculty members perceived the academic workplace at the study HBCU to still be promoting similar racist, sexist, and male-controlling attitudes and behaviors that were in place when they were initially assigned to their particular departments some 25 or more years ago. As noted by Carla,

There are still Neanderthals. There are still people acting out, 1940s behavior. Luckily, they’re dying out; most of them are dead. But, the only thing that’s happened is that the attitudes are less overt and more covert.

The suspicion that the perceptions of the senior professors could be due in part to the fact that their respective departments had not experienced any significant personnel changes for the past 30 years was quickly discounted when the expressed perceptions of junior professors directly aligned themselves with those of their senior colleagues.

Senior professors, acknowledging that their careers were coming to an end, saw themselves as not having to deal with the study HBCU’s racist and sexist attitudes for much longer. Their attitudes were not so much about not caring about their respective departments or their own continued performance, but about acknowledging that their time at the institution was coming to an end. According to April,

I stayed because I knew for a fact that if I went to another institution, I was going to face the same issues, maybe from a different complexion. But, what difference does it make now? If the words are the same, then the pressures are the same.

Junior professors, recognizing that their careers were just beginning, saw themselves as being vigilant about the behaviors and attitudes within their respective
academic departments and the study HBCU, and, as a result of that vigilance, being able to make choices about their future careers at the study HBCU.

2. What opportunities, if any, have there been for the study participants to contribute to the shaping and influencing of the values and beliefs in their institutional settings?

The opportunity for African American female faculty to contribute to the shaping and influencing of values and beliefs in their particular institutional settings (culture bearers) proved not to be the case at the study HBCU. In fact, there was unanimous agreement among the professors in this study that, in their particular professional fields of study, African American female faculty members continued to not be strategically positioned in the roles that would allow them to become major players at the study HBCU. Senior professors defined the problem in terms of what they perceived to be the continuing persistence of the ongoing male practice of distancing themselves from women in academe. In Denise's view,

It’s still a man’s world. It’s not the cold forbidding world that it used to be, but we’re still not being welcomed with open arms.

Junior female professors framed the issue in the context of women not being positioned to establish their place in the study HBCU’s culture. As explained by Glenda,

You don’t see women in positions where they can change the culture. It doesn’t seem like we’re welcome so much in the decision making circles to where we can get the universities and colleges to reflect the needs of women and minorities.

However one chooses to frame the issue, the result remains the same: an absence of the female experience ingrained in the fabric of the institution’s culture. Eve’s relevant example summarized the situation quite well.
Most of the stories that come out of the department that the faculty members exchange at parties and faculty meetings all pertain to male graduates and male faculty members who have been there, never female faculty members or female graduates, maybe with the exception of one or two. It's making it appear that the department is not reflective of everyone in the department. It's reflective of the men, but not the women.

For all of these professors, the bottom line for this issue remained unchanged. At this point in time, until African American female faculty members are recognized and acknowledged by their male counterparts as being important and necessary to the culture of the academy, their representation as it stands today leaves little if any opportunity for African American female faculty to contribute to the shaping and influencing of values and beliefs in their particular institutional cultures, let alone to those of academe in its entirety.

3. What actions or incidences have helped or hindered their acceptance, participation, and progress in the academic workplace?

The professors in this study did not identify any particular actions or incidences that benefited or contributed to their acceptance, participation, or progress in the academic workplace. In fact, their lack of attention to this area seemed to indicate that the issue of acceptance was either irrelevant or not a significant concern to them—an attitude that may be indicative of the previously described fragmented culture of this HBCU. The particular attitudes and behaviors that hindered these professors' participation, and progress, in their particular academic workplace settings were assessed as being similar to the attitudes and behaviors that other African American females at other American colleges and universities have identified as being barriers to their advancement and progression in America’s higher education system since its inception.
(i.e., defining a woman’s role in the academy, questions about a woman’s ability, the issues that revolve around a woman’s choice of scholarly pursuits, work assignments, the opportunity for women to advance in the academy). But, according to April, this pattern of behavior should not be surpising.

It’s not anything absolutely unique to the HBCUs—it’s across the board. The only thing that makes sense is that we are perceived as challenges to the male authority. It’s their perception of why I’m in the field. And that same colonial attitude exists today.

Senior professors suggested that, to the African American female professor’s disadvantage, the tendency for many African American females in the academy to be nurturers rather than change-agents had not helped African American females connect with their colleagues at the study HBCU. As indicated by Carla,

Women are more altruistic than men in that they’re concerned about making the whole process work, and that is really not the norm. We’d rather see the system go [function as it was meant to] while most of the other people like to do whatever they do to get recognized or some self-agrandizement, and that’s an unfortunate cost. Psychologically, you’re at peace with yourself because you’ve done it, but you’re at war with yourself because you have not done yourself a favor.

Even with the change in attitudes and behaviors of many of today’s students (i.e., confrontational, resistance to authority, demanding results that suit their needs, expecting positive payoffs from reduced efforts), and the loss of time that can result when time is used to assist students rather than for research, these African American female professors continue to commit the effort needed to provide the necessary services to the students in support of their educational goals.

The tradition of the African American female educator showing unselfish concern for students has personified the African American female’s role throughout the recorded
history of her service in the field of education. And, as evidenced by the service provided to their students by the professors in this study, refusing to turn students away who seek out their assistance will continue to be an important and integral part of the African American female educator's role throughout all levels of the American education spectrum.

4. To what extent have the study participants perceived that they have been recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their particular academic organizational cultures?

Even with the barriers that women inevitably face in academe, based on the merits of their professional efforts, both senior and junior professors in this study did perceive themselves as being recognized and accepted as legitimate and credible professional partners within their academic settings (knowledge bearers) by their colleagues at the study institution as well as those external to the study HBCU. However, because of the paucity of their representation at the study HBCU in particular, they did not perceive their presence as having a significant impact when placed in the context of the continued low representation of African American females throughout all of academe, especially in the career fields such as the sciences and engineering that have an exceptionally poor record of representation.

Senior and junior professors in this study voiced their concern about the continued lack of African American female professionals in positions within academe not only as it relates to opportunities for career advancement, but also to future opportunities for more women to gain more visibility throughout their campus communities. The visibility issue was a particular concern for the junior professors because of its importance in allowing
them to make a better connection with female students who may be contemplating careers in academia.

I don’t hear a lot of female undergraduate students talking about a particular female faculty member. To me, that’s kind of strange. We don’t have that many females, but there should be that one that the undergraduates should be able to relate to or connect with. (Fran)

Glenda suggested that female professors become the creators of or contributors to department or institution improvement efforts as one strategy for gaining recognition as a credible knowledge bearer/partner within the faculty ranks of the HBCU. For her contributions to this strategy, Glenda told the story of her success at revamping the curriculum of one of the programs in the department she is assigned to.

When I first came to this institution, I made major changes in the curriculum of one of our programs at the undergraduate level. I know it’s very political to change course content, but I was able to come and make suggestions that were incorporated and voted upon by the faculty successfully, and changes were made in our program. I’m pretty sure I would not have been able to do that at some other universities, and that’s an advantage because another reason for going into academia is to affect the curriculum.

Whether or not this one achievement suggests forward motion toward the acceptance and acknowledgment of African American women into the male-dominated culture of higher education, or just another instance of letting one more female/minority through the door to be held up as a token example of the system’s efforts to bring more females and/or minorities into academe, only time will tell.

*The Future of African American Female Professors in Academe*

Senior African American female professors in this study held a guarded, almost pessimistic, outlook about the future of African American females in the academy. The reasons for their unfavorable outlook stemmed primarily from the slow pace of progress
toward a more representative faculty that is more representative of the American population. April stated,

We have a very long way to go. We're still widely underrepresented and it seems like even though representation has increased, it does so in very, very small increments, and it takes a long time to see these increments take place. I don't get the sense that this pattern is going to change that much. (April)

However, April’s response to the question of why she and other African American females continue to remain at the study HBCU, and in academia, in spite of such perceived bleak forecasts summed up the sentiments of all of the professors in the study group. She responded,

I tell people that teaching is the best of all worlds because it’s the only career that you really have an opportunity to influence somebody’s life. You can step in the way and do something positive or you can get in the way and do some harm. I hope 90% of what I do is get in somebody’s way and do something positive.

And as expressed in a letter of gratitude sent to April by a former student who attended the study HBCU, she is living proof that the African American female presence in academe is not only needed, but also appreciated.

Thank you for understanding my circumstances. It is very rare in college to come across teachers who really care. Thank you for encouraging me along with the entire class to work hard…. In the end, I can honestly say I have been challenged, and triumphed, and won.

Conclusions

Kuh and Whitt (1988a) used terms such as mutually shaping and normative glue to describe the role of the academy’s culture in maintaining organizational unity, guiding individual and group behavior, providing a frame of reference for interpreting meaning of events and actions, and facilitating a commitment to the peer group and the institution.
Relative to their experiences, the participants in this study concluded that these characteristics, as viewed in the context of today's higher education institution, are

...[a] figment of the imagination; something that's proposed, but not realized and not instituted, and more akin to a philosophical agenda, which might be relevant in an idealized situation, but really is not a part of any academic environment.

(Denise)

Clark (1987) emphasized belief, commitment, and common interests as important elements that help shape the meaning and guide the direction of an organization's culture through the actions and achievements of its members. But these same elements, as perceived by the professors in this study, were not evident in their organization's culture.

From the perspectives of the professors that participated in this study,

We don't seem to share very well in college communities what successful education is. Everyone is out for her or himself. The focus now is money through research; there is less of a concern for teaching and learning. (Brenda)

Schein (1992) believes that groups develop cohesion and coping skills through the learning of a pattern of shared basic assumptions that undergirds the norms, values, beliefs, and principles that guide the members of the group. Dennison (1990) takes this notion one step further by implying that these same norms, values, beliefs, and principles serve as a foundation for management practices and behaviors. Based on the academic workplace experiences and perceptions of the professors in this study, their tendency is to believe that

...[i]f anything is true, there are truisms in which the moral fiber of the university is possibly compromised by individuals whose ethical and moral standards are less than normal, less than acceptable. (April)

An organization's culture derives its force from the values, processes, and goals held by individuals involved in the organization's workings (Tierney, 1988b). However,
it is difficult for such a force to be in effect when there is fragmentation and discontent within an organization to the extent of which was described at the study HBCU.

A lot of the individuals [other faculty members who she has had conversations with inside and outside of her department] aren’t happy to be here; therefore, they don’t think that they need to give to the department because they feel like they’re already giving as much as they can or as much as they want to give. Because they’re not happy, there’s not a sense of trying to do things a different way, which ends up being reflected in the department as a whole. What progress are we going to make if people are sticking around, but are unhappy? These people don’t want to do anything to change things, so it just becomes a vicious cycle. (Eve)

Research on organizations conducted by Pedersen and Sorensen (1989) discovered that, rather than being monolithic, organizations were often dominated by differentiation, inconsistencies, ambiguity, and conflict. Instead of a dominant and cohesive culture, Pedersen and Sorensen experienced organizations that they characterized as consisting of different subcultures and lacking a significant corporate culture. As for this study, Pedersen and Sorensen’s findings lend support and credibility to what was found to be the organizational culture experienced and perceived by the professors at the study HBCU.

Culture is taken so much for granted and so much value is put on the assumptions that established the culture of the organization that questions are never asked about the long-term viability or validity of those assumptions. When organization members are forced to discuss assumptions, they tend not to examine them but to defend them because the members of the organization have emotionally invested in them (Schein, 1992). Such has been and continues to be the case at the study HBCU.

For centuries, America’s higher education system has been operating on the basis of White male ways of thinking, acting, speaking, and behaving. The original White
male patriarchal values and beliefs have become so imbedded in and infused throughout America’s higher education system that attempts to either disengage or alter those beliefs and values have been met with resistance. Even for the nation’s HBCUs, in regard to leadership and faculty positions at America’s colleges and universities, though the case cannot be made for White male-dominated patriarchy, it surely can be made for African American male-dominated patriarchy: a legacy passed on by the White males who originally established the HBCU system. Nevertheless, though the conditions may not be ideal, were it not for HBCUs, the African American presence in general and the African American female presence in particular would be significantly less prominent in America’s higher education system.

Recommendations

Strategies for the Institution

Many African American female faculty members do not perceive themselves and their concerns as integrated into the mission, goals, and social structures of college campuses; however, job integration is not an issue that African American female faculty can or should battle alone (Moses, 1997). If institutions of higher learning expect to recruit, retain, and promote African American female faculty members, institutions must be willing to communicate and form a working partnership with their African American female faculty members. Open communication lines and active partnerships will enable the leadership at the various levels in the institution to be cognizant of the workplace issues that are of concern to African American female faculty members as well as the workplace strategies that have garnered success for this particular group of faculty members. These proactive measures will prevent the mistakes that were made in the past
with senior and mid-level African American female faculty members from being repeated
with junior and new African American female faculty.

HBCUs find themselves in a unique position in that their faculty body represents
a more diverse mix of racial, ethnic, and gender combinations than any other institutions
in the American higher education system. However, from the comments made by the
professors in this study concerning the level of apathy displayed by the faculty body, that
diversity has not been a benefit to this HBCU culture. The study HBCU has a daunting
task ahead in determining the causes for the apathy among and between these different
groups. But for the benefit of the student body, the faculty, and the credibility of the
study HBCU, this task must be undertaken. With respect to this particular study,
recommendations include

• Improved Communications: After confirmation that problems do exist,
communication with and between faculty groups will be the key to breaking
the silence and apathy. Some suggestions include one-on-one discussions
with faculty members, on-site and off-site forums to initiate discussions, and
suggestion boxes that seek faculty assistance with finding solutions to the
fragmentation.

• Enforcement of Policies: Leaders at all levels in the institution need to
sincerely commit to rooting out and ending racist and sexist behavior, no
matter how covert, seemingly unconscious, or supposedly unintended by the
perpetrator. At the least, institutions should provide an avenue for personnel
to report instances of racist and sexist behavior, and have in place clear and
well-publicized policies and regulations that promise strict enforcement and
swift repercussions for such negative behavior (Johnsrud, 1993). The implementation of programs of this nature will go a long way in proving the genuine intent of the institution's commitment to valuing all of its personnel, regardless of gender, racial, or ethnic status.

- Access to Tenure: The primary factor most linked with those who remain in the academy is the attainment of tenure status and promotion to Full professor (Gregory, 1995). But in a faculty member's movement toward that plateau, considerable bias, whether deliberate or not, can be shielded by ambiguous standards and decisions (Menges & Exum, 1983). The study HBCU needs to develop and implement a more clear and objective tenure evaluation system that will allow tenure-track faculty members to be aware of and understand the requirements and process for tenure, obtain guidance with their tenure plans, track progress, ensure periodic reviews that their efforts are meeting department and institution requirements, and be aware of what information is needed and in what format for the tenure review process. All of these efforts, in and of themselves, will be wasted if tenure committees are not perceived as objective, unbiased, and representative.

- More Women in Leadership Roles: Senior and junior professors in this study pointed out the lack of African American female role models and the lack of African American females in leadership positions at the study institution. Undoubtedly, this situation is a consequence of the low numbers of African American women at the HBCU, as well as African American women not being selected for leadership career paths. The study HBCU needs to review
their policies and practices concerning recognition and career progression to determine if these elements, or individual attitudes held by those who control the recognition and promotion processes, are the sources of the barriers that impede women's career advancement.

Strategies for African American Female Professors

Realizing that the academy can be hostile, or, at best, less than supportive, African American female faculty members must develop and implement ways to help ensure their own survival and success on campus (Bowie, 1995). African American female faculty members have a responsibility to each other for ensuring that the academic workplace environment is one that is conducive to the success and promotion of all African American female faculty members. Recommendations include

- **Mentoring**: Senior and mid-level African American female professors serve as mentors or ensure that mentors be assigned to junior and new African American female professors—even if a mentoring program is not in place in the department or at the institution.

- **Collegiality**: In the spirit of collegiality, senior and mid-level African American female professors offer their expertise and service in the areas of: listening, providing guidance, helping to find solutions to problems and generally extend the offer of friendship and camaraderie to junior and new African American female professors.

- **Support Groups**: Senior and mid-level African American professors assist mid-level and junior professors with becoming familiar with the culture of the department and institution; facilities and resources available to perform their
duties; the requirements or guidelines for promotion and tenure; department expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service; strategies to reach their teaching, research, and service goals. The creation of support groups among women, minorities, or those individuals who demonstrate the desire to promote the advancement of all faculty members is also an option.

- Self-initiated Outreach: Junior and new African American female professors need to seek out the advice and guidance of senior and mid-level professors and put aside the fear and hesitancy of approaching senior faculty members and chairpersons that is a typical tendency of new and junior faculty, but detrimental to the execution of teaching, research, and service responsibilities that will determine future prospects for tenure and promotion. Obtaining support from local and national organizations that represent their career fields, creating department/institution/external support groups to share concerns and solutions, and identifying self-help methods to improve professional performance and personal outlook are other vehicles that can be used for career support.

Recommendations for Further Research

HBCUs are an excellent source for the exploration of faculty diversity in that they represent some of the most diverse faculties found on the campuses of America's colleges and universities. While the exploration for this study was limited to one HBCU and a small sample of African American female professors selected from particular male-dominated academic fields of study, much more research is needed into the
dynamics that define the academic culture of the HBCU. Recommendations for further research at HBCUs include, but should not be limited to,

- The individual and collective experiences and perceptions of faculty members in the context of ethnicity, race, and gender in all its different combinations in the context of working at an HBCU and other colleges and universities in the American higher education system (i.e., organizational culture, organizational climate, faculty and departmental collegiality, teaching/research/service issues, promotion and tenure issues, connections and/or interactions with external institution community).

- The experiences and perceptions of male and female administrators working with diverse faculties (i.e., faculty acceptance and approval, conflict and resolution, recognition of and respect for position authority, individual and group attitudes, interactions with faculty).

- Issues of the marginalization of a faculty member or a faculty member's work efforts (i.e., faculty research choices, student attitudes and behaviors toward female and minority professors, faculty attitudes toward each other, service responsibilities).

- The perceptions of students about faculty members of different backgrounds (i.e., quality of faculty teaching and service, attitudes about women in faculty and leadership roles, the dynamics of authority and knowledge between female professors and male students, the changes that have occurred in student attitudes and behaviors throughout the history of higher education).
• The success or failure of faculty diversity at HBCUs (i.e., faculty acceptance and integration into the department and the institution, faculty cohesiveness between and within the various groups, conflict and resolution, dynamics of a diverse faculty and a diverse student body).

An important component of institutional excellence is the presence of a diverse faculty and its commitment and involvement in the operations and advancement of the institution. A diverse faculty provides support to students from diverse backgrounds; sends a message to the diverse student body that the institution cares about them and the quality of interaction they have with campus personnel; creates a more comfortable environment for students; is likely to contribute to a broader range of what is taught, what is researched, and what services are offered to the community; and, in adequate numbers, ensure that all faculty play more than a token or symbolic role in institutional change (Moses, 1994). Yet, for all the improvements that diversity can bring to this nation’s colleges and universities, in this unequal make-up of higher education, diversity still has not become an accepted and integral part of the American higher education system.

A few knowledge producers in the American higher education system are ready to embrace other knowledge producers who do not lock and think like them. But the majority of knowledge producers who are in the positions and are socially and politically defined as qualified producers of ways of knowing are not. According to their standards, those who want to enter are not at the level of academic excellence to merit entry. Yet, no mention is given to the unearned advantage and conferred dominance these knowledge producers wield because of White male skin privilege at predominantly White institutions.
and Black male skin privilege at HBCUs. Consequently, credible movement beyond a
"Mayflower" and male-dominated education system cannot be realized (McIntosh, 1992).

The results of this study have raised many questions that center around
organizational culture as it has been defined and characterized by the many researchers
who have attempted to understand it. The one central question is what are the
underlying reasons related to organizational culture that play a role in why America’s
higher education system continues to struggle with issues of diversity and inclusion and
the acceptance of knowledge bearers? Put in the context of this study, the two questions
that remain unanswered are (a) how can academic organizational culture provide
members with meaning, identity, and connectedness (Tierney, 1988a), reduce uncertainty
(Flint, 2000), and help develop a learned way to contend with experiences in their
academic environments (Barley, 1983; Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989) when there is not
much opportunity for communication between faculty members; and (b) if individuals
need to have an ongoing sense of the reality of their environment in order to act and react
(Pettigrew, 1979), how can this occur if institutional and departmental bureaucracy
impair the flow of communications and interactions needed for this level of
understanding to take place?

Flint (2000) and Evans (1996) pointed out the strength in organizational culture’s
ability to exert long-lasting impact and formulate group members’ perceptions and
understanding of events. Peterson and Spencer (1990) emphasized the downside of this
long-lasting impact in that, over time, organizational cultures become resistant to change,
and grow more conservative and more reluctant to question basic assumptions, even if the
culture has become dysfunctional or no longer viable, which the experiences and perceptions of the professors in this study tended to support.

African American women in the academy have realized tremendous accomplishments against unyielding institutional odds. Ironically, many of the barriers that personified the resistance that African American females contended with 50 years ago are strikingly similar to the barriers that they continue to contend with today. Nevertheless, for the professors in this study, while not completely satisfied with the current state of affairs at the study HBCU and in academe in its entirety, they are committed to staying the course for the sake of their students; because of their affinity to teaching, research, and service; and to contribute to the establishment of a more diverse higher education community that is representative of and open to all who seek to broaden their academic horizons. Their only hope is that the collective will of all African American women in the academy today will be enough to sustain the hope and support for continued African American female representation in the academy far into the future.

Today, for the women who have followed us, we hope that we hold the door to professional success slightly more ajar than it had been for us. We hope that instead of reinventing the wheel, African American women professors now entering the academy strengthen the positions we set in place. (McKay, 1997, p. 16)
APPENDICES
Appendix A
E-mail Queries for Solicitation of Participants

February 4, 2002

Dear (Subject's Name)

My name is Nadine Edgerson. I am a doctoral candidate enrolled in the University of North Dakota’s Ph.D. program in Higher Educational Leadership. I am currently in the dissertation-writing phase of my program.

As an African American female, I am aware of the limited literature available that addresses the work experiences of minority faculty members in the higher education setting. Even less information is available about minority faculty members in settings other than those that are predominantly white. It is due to this lack of information that I would like to explore the experiences of African American female faculty members working in a majority male academic environment at a historically Black college and university (HBCU). I am soliciting your assistance because (a) you are an African American female, (b) you are employed at an HBCU, and (c) you work in an academic field/department in which the faculty is, for the most part, typically male.

With your permission, I would like to conduct three 60-90 minute taped telephone or in-person interviews over three consecutive weeks (one interview per week) during the Spring 2002 academic semester. All interviews will be conducted by myself and will be one-on-one. If at any time you should decide to discontinue the interview process, any information obtained as a result of your participation will be excluded from the dissertation. All information collected from the interviews will be used only to support this project’s effort. To ensure each participant’s anonymity, participant identities will remain confidential, and any information in the interviews that could identify you or your institution will be masked or deleted from the dissertation.

Verification of this project can be obtained by contacting UND’s Institutional Review Board office at 701-777-4279 or Dan Rice, Ph.D., at either 701-777-2674 or Dan_Rice@mail.und.nodak.edu. Dr. Rice is the chairperson for my dissertation committee. Please feel free to contact me at 703-325-4376 (daytime) or 703-499-8567 (evening) if you desire more detailed information related to this effort.

Participation in this research effort is not compulsory, nor will your decision to decline impact any UND-participant relationships that may develop at a future date. However, I do hope that you come to the conclusion that this project is one that is credible and worthy of your time and attention. Your decision to provide your valuable input will be greatly appreciated. Your acceptance to participate in this project will serve as your informed consent.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this request. I look forward to your response.

Very respectfully,

Nadine Edgerson
February 18, 2002

Dear (Subject's Name)

My name is Nadine Edgerson. I am a doctoral candidate enrolled in the University of North Dakota’s Ph.D. program in Higher Educational Leadership. I am currently in the dissertation-writing phase of my program.

Two weeks ago I sent you an e-mail query seeking your permission for me to conduct three 60-90 minute taped telephone or in-person interviews during the Spring 2002 semester in support of this effort. I have not received a response from you as of this e-mail date. If the scheduling of the interviews is in conflict with your current workload or obligations for the Spring academic semester, I am open to scheduling the interviews during the Fall 2002 academic semester. Also, the three 60-90 minute sessions can be restructured to meet your time constraints.

Again, verification of this project can be obtained by contacting UND’s Institutional Review Board office at 701-777-4279 or Dan Rice, Ph.D., at either 701-777-2674 or Dan_Rice@mail.und.nodak.edu. Dr. Rice is the chairperson for my dissertation committee.

Please feel free to contact me at 703-325-4376 (daytime) or 703-499-8567 (evening) if you desire more detailed information related to this effort.

As pointed out in my first e-mail, participation in this research effort is not compulsory, nor will your decision to decline impact any UND-participant relationships that may develop at a future date. However, I do hope that you come to the conclusion that this project is one that is credible and worthy of your time and attention. Your decision to provide your valuable input will be greatly appreciated. Your acceptance to participate in this project will serve as your informed consent.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this request. I look forward to your response.

Very respectfully,

Nadine Edgerson, Ph.D. Candidate
University of North Dakota
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Appendix B
Interest Areas Related to Literature Review Findings

Work Environment:

1. African American female professors disproportionately represented at two-year institutions and HBCUs.

2. African American female professors sought out by numerous institutions that must choose from too small a pool of candidates, and are sought out by the most prestigious and wealthiest colleges and universities.

3. The African American female professors' presence the exception rather than the norm, her capability questioned and challenged, and her duties carried out with little or no acknowledgement or support from her peers.

4. African American female professors contend with conflicting and excessive academic demands, the designated representative on administrative committees that address minority issues, and serve as mentor and counselor to minority students even though these responsibilities are not valued or evaluated during promotion considerations.

5. African American female professors experience severe marginalization in environments characterized by alienation, exclusion, and devaluation by their peers, staff, administrators, and some students.
Organizational Culture:

1. Organizational culture as mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practice, beliefs, and assumptions that guide behavior; a normative glue that holds organizations together.

2. Organizational culture as representative of group-shared belief, commitment, and common interests.

3. Organizational culture as representative of a pattern of shared basic assumptions that undergird the norms, values, beliefs, and principles that guide the members of the group and management practices and behaviors.

4. An organization's culture deriving its force from the values, processes, and goals held by individuals involved in the organization's workings (Tierney, 1988b).
Appendix C
Statistical Data


Eighteen years and older by gender as of March 2000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>104,861</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>A-A Females</td>
<td>13,279</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>96,901</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>188,483</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201,762</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201,762</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


College enrollment by gender, within race and ethnicity represented in thousands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>5,722</td>
<td>8,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>14,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College enrollment by gender, within race and ethnicity represented by percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African American female enrollment compared against total enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Groups</td>
<td>13233</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14270</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty: Fall 1999, Full-time, excluding non-resident aliens and race unknown

Full professors in degree-granting institutions by gender, within race and ethnicity represented in thousands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>29,548</td>
<td>33,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>113,304</td>
<td>126,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>142,852</td>
<td>159,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full professors in degree-granting institutions by gender, within race and ethnicity represented as a percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Prof</th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associate, Assistant, and Instructor levels by gender, within race and ethnicity represented in thousands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>44,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>70,137</td>
<td>81,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>7,752</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>109,037</td>
<td>128,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>48,211</td>
<td>58,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,199</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>56,463</td>
<td>69,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8,431</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>9,318</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>104,674</td>
<td>127,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruct</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>32,794</td>
<td>39,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>32,009</td>
<td>38,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>64,803</td>
<td>77,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>10,448</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>7,076</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>119,905</td>
<td>143,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females 10,448 760 7,076 4,915 119,905 143,104
Males 9,820 860 13,801 6,207 158,609 189,297
Totals 20,268 1,620 20,877 11,122 278,514 332,401
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Associate, Assistant, and Instructor levels in degree-granting institutions by gender, within race and ethnicity represented as a percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Am. Ind.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruct</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


African American Female Full professors compared against the total (thousands and as a percentage):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Professors</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>158,096</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159,802</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>10,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>123,949</td>
<td>123,124</td>
<td>74,880</td>
<td>321,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>126,810</td>
<td>127,673</td>
<td>77918</td>
<td>332,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associate, Assistant, and Instructor African American female professors represented as a percentage against the total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
African American female representation at Full, Associate, Assistant, and Instructor levels represented in thousands against the total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>123,949</td>
<td>123,124</td>
<td>74,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>325,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>126,810</td>
<td>127,673</td>
<td>77,918</td>
<td></td>
<td>337,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associate, Assistant, and Instructor African American female professors represented as a percentage against the total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Af. Am. Females</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lowest program representation, percentage (standard errors appear in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.5 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.1)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0.4 (0.3)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.5)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.8 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.6)</td>
<td>4.6 (1.1)</td>
<td>7.0 (4.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest program representation (standard errors appear in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Af. Amer.</th>
<th>Teach Ed</th>
<th>Other Ed</th>
<th>Health Sci</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Eng &amp; Lit</th>
<th>Psych</th>
<th>Soci</th>
<th>Other Soc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7.7 (3.3)</td>
<td>5.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (0.4)</td>
<td>6.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.6)</td>
<td>1.3 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.3)</td>
<td>2.3 (0.7)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0 (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Standard errors appear in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.8 (0.3 )</td>
<td>1.7 (0.5)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.4 )</td>
<td>1.7 (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub Comp</td>
<td>3.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.4)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.6 (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pub 2-yr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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