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ABSTRACT

How faculty allocate their time among research, teaching, and service, and the perceived quality of that work determines whether faculty obtain tenure or are released from the university (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006). Prior research indicated that African-American faculty comprised 4.5% of the faculty at high-activity research institutions and 3.5% of faculty at very-high-activity research institutions (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016).

The purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure. Accordingly, upon analysis of the pre-existing research, the researcher attempted to ascertain whether African-American faculty felt disenfranchised or belittled during the tenure process. Finally, the study attempted to provide potential reasons that African-American faculty may not obtain tenure and whether the difference in the African-American faculty experience during the tenure process exposed them to unusually burdensome situations in comparison to their Caucasian peers.
The study involved 85 full-time higher education faculty. Faculty were anonymously surveyed and five African-American faculty members were interviewed. Enlightenment on what it takes to be successful at PWI research institutions is necessary to maintain and increase the number of African-American faculty in the academy. If the majority of full-time faculty remain Caucasian and male, the opportunity for diverse perspectives and points of view diminishes. People from different backgrounds and cultures bring forth different ways of viewing their environment and the world. This openness of thought and expression is a tenet of academic freedom (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

As a college sophomore, I decided I wanted to join a service sorority on the campus of the HBCU at which I was a student. I wanted to join this sorority because the sorority was dedicated to serving two of my passions, music and the marching band. So, I went to the rush and took steps to become a member of the organization. The process was one that I have not forgotten to date. When I was a student, hazing was still a part of the process of becoming a new member of an organization. As it was explained to me, hazing served two purposes: 1) to make those of us who were interested in membership earn the right to be a member; and 2) to solidify a bond between me and my line sisters. The process was difficult at best and humiliating at its worst. There were requirements imposed upon me that were demeaning and embarrassing. I was exhausted from lack of sleep. I endured physical pain from forced calisthenics and other sources. I was forced to show my big sisters a supreme level of respect, whether deserved or not. The feelings I experienced during the process included fear, worry, sadness, anger, exhaustion, embarrassment, and the rare instance of happiness, usually because something humorous occurred.

Fast forward over 25 years. After having been an adjunct professor for two years, I decided to pursue my doctorate because I enjoy teaching and influencing the learning of others and shaping their minds. As a doctoral student, I was lucky because I just happened to choose a university at which the faculty responsible for my learning were black females like me. Throughout my education, I was able to share my perspective with them and obtain solid advice regarding how to maneuver in my graduate program. I
had a listening ear and a shoulder on which to lean on at all times. I know I would not have been successful during the doctoral process if it were not for the two women who paved a way for me and who were there daily to aid in my success. During my tenure in school, I have become a mom and a cancer survivor, and I could not have endured without their guidance and support. This is why it is vital, in my opinion, that students have access to faculty that look like them, have the same cultural lineage or at least support their cultural lineage, and potentially share the same lens through which life has been experienced. My faculty members would not let me give up. They pushed me through to success because they had a vested interest in me. My hope is that this study will help more African-American professors achieve tenure and become a positive influence for students of color.

Academic tenure is a common and highly sought-after reward for faculty accomplishments (American Association of University Professors, n.d.b; Butler-Purry, 2006; Fairweather, 2002). How faculty allocate their time among research, teaching, and service, and the perceived quality of that work determines whether faculty obtain tenure or are released from the university (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006). The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure defines tenure as “the transition when, after a probationary period, an instructor or teacher should be terminated for adequate cause only” (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).

African-American faculty navigate in an academic environment where they see very few people who share their ethnicity (Ruffins, 1997). It is my belief that the tenure process for African-American faculty at PWI research institutions causes feelings that are
similar to those experienced by students being hazed during initiations into an organization. This bias pushes me to want to research the tenure process from the African-American faculty perspective. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019 (2018), African-Americans made up 6.1% of the full-time instructional faculty during the Fall of 2016. Additionally, data from the National Center for Education Statistics confirms African-American faculty accounted for six percent of all full-time faculty as of Fall 2015 (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). The number of full-time African-American faculty employed at four-year research institutions (Predominantly White Institutions “PWIs”) is even smaller. Prior research indicated that African American faculty comprised 4.5% of the faculty at high-activity research institutions and 3.5% of faculty at very-high-activity research institutions (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016). The minimal number of African-American faculty at PWI research institutions impacted this study greatly, as this study examined the feelings caused by tenure-track and tenured African-American faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure.

As an example, Dr. Alex Johnson (fictitious character and institution) applied and was hired as a tenure-track assistant professor at Umbridge University, a prestigious predominantly white, research institution (PWI) on the east coast. Dr. Johnson is African-American, and he came to Umbridge with a stellar educational and career vita. He was a Fulbright Scholar, had a dissertation fellowship in graduate school and worked with accomplished faculty in his discipline. He had co-authored two articles in respected, peer-reviewed journals. He was excited about the future and knew he could contribute extensively to his new department. From the first day on campus, one thing was apparent
to Dr. Johnson. No one else in his department looked like him and only a few members of faculty across campus were African-American. Dr. Johnson began to feel as though he was an outsider in his department even with his stellar credentials. His colleagues rarely talked to him, let alone offered to mentor him, nor did they request his assistance with their research agendas. He knew research was of utmost importance because it had been discussed during his recruitment process. Dr. Johnson also started to feel overburdened with his teaching workload and the needs of his students. He found it increasingly difficult to devote time and energy to his research efforts. To meet the criteria to obtain tenure, Dr. Johnson felt he needed coaching on department expectations and how to balance his workload effectively.

Background

Faculty Responsibilities

An overview of faculty responsibilities is vital because these responsibilities give insight into the time investment required for faculty to be effective. Tenure-track faculty at PWIs have three primary responsibilities; 1) research, 2) teaching, and 3) service (American Association of University Professors, n.d.; Orey, 2006).

Research. Research-related work encompasses responsibilities that focus on faculty scholarship, departmental, and institutional priorities such as writing and publishing, seeking out grant opportunities, serving on faculty search committees, and tenure/promotion committees (American Association of University Professors, n.d.). At PWI research institutions, faculty may be perceived as more productive based upon the type and amount of research activities in which one engages (Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). In addition, a research-intensive institution places
greater importance on discipline-based research, publishing and scholarship in the faculty member’s field of study (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999).

Faculty research is the most important factor that justifies the award of tenure at PWI research institutions (Bonner, 2006; Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013; Miranda, 2006; Orey, 2006). When evaluating research and publishing activities, tenure committees also consider:

- The prestige of the journal in which the research is published;
- The methodology utilized for the study; and
- Whether the research was conducted as an individual or collaborative project.

**Teaching.** Another faculty responsibility is teaching. Teaching responsibilities focus on the development and success of the students, their coursework and well-being (American Association of University Professors, n.d.; Miranda, 2006). Teaching includes curriculum development, classroom lecture, student advisement, office hours, thesis and dissertation committee membership, among other things (American Association of University Professors, n.d.). A focus on quality teaching would be highly rewarded at a community college or liberal arts college but PWI research institutions value faculty research contributions (Green, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006).

**Service.** Service is the last component of faculty responsibility (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999). Service can take many forms. Service encompasses mentoring students and other faculty, attending and participating in board meetings, fundraising, committee appointments on campus, and community service off campus (Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Misra, Hickes Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). Specifically, O'Meara (2005) discussed three types of faculty service including professional
contributions to the university, to organizations, and to the community. Service to the university could entail serving on committees for the department, college or university, curriculum development, mentoring students, conducting assessments, sponsoring student clubs, and maintaining a laboratory (Miranda, 2006). Service within the profession may encompass holding an office in an organization, consulting, speaking at national meetings, conducting reviews of research for publications, and conducting clinics and workshops. Local community service entails such things as speaking at local organization meetings, creating summer camps for youth, and serving on advisory boards (Miranda, 2006; O’Meara, 2005; Palmer, 2007).

**Hazing in Academia**

What is hazing, and does it manifest in the academic environment? People on and off college campuses have asked these questions. Usually, a hazing situation is described as involving students on a college campus, but are students the only persons who are put in the situation of being or feeling hazed? Hazing has been defined as “any action taken, or any situation created intentionally to cause embarrassment, harassment, or ridicule and risks emotional and/or physical harm to members of a group or team, whether new or not, regardless of the person’s willingness to participate” (Hazingprevention.org, 2015). Focusing on that definition was important as the study progressed.

The ways faculty allocate their time between research, teaching, and service, and the perceived quality of work determines whether faculty obtain tenure or are released from the university (Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006). African-American faculty are often pressured to spend excessive amounts of time on service by administrators because tenured faculty have more flexibility to decline the request
African-American faculty are also approached more frequently for committee work dealing with diversity issues and women faculty are pressured to spend time on women’s issues (Miranda, 2006; Stanley, 2006c; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006). This is detrimental to African-American faculty because very little weight is given to service activities during tenure reviews at PWI research institutions (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006). The small number of African-American faculty at PWI research institutions has been well-documented (Adams, 2006; The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016; Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013; Hinton, 2010). In these circumstances, the adage is true - “Perception is reality!” The perception of the tenure review committee dictates whether tenure-track faculty achieve tenure or whether he or she is released from the position (Danley, 2003; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). This committee is usually comprised of Caucasian males because they comprise the majority of faculty at PWI research institutions. As a result, African-American faculty may feel they are disadvantaged from the start. All too often, tenure expectations for junior faculty are not clarified during the hiring process or the expectations are ambiguous at best (Palmer, 2007; Price & Cotten, 2006). Lack of guidance and mentoring from senior faculty regarding responsibilities has caused self-doubt and stress in African-American faculty (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Hinton, 2010; Price & Cotten, 2006).

The inconsistency with which faculty and administration value different aspects of faculty work often leads to tenure decisions which are debatable at best (Green, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006). As faculty job security rests with the outcome of tenure reviews,
the variability of process and standards can cause fear and stress (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006; Shapiro, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). Doubt and uncertainty regarding progress can cause a level of stress that is detrimental to the mental and physical well-being of junior faculty (Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006). In fact, African-American faculty often face stereotypes when pursuing tenure such as a general perception they will fail to achieve tenure (Adams, 2006). African-American faculty are placed at an immediate disadvantage since, typically, senior faculty are unwilling to mentor African-American faculty and access to mentoring has been shown to have a direct effect on successful attainment of tenure (Bonner, 2006; Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). Senior faculty have been known to show little interest in different or non-traditional research focuses (Adams, 2006). Additionally, as most universities do not provide written or verbal tenure guidelines detailing 1) acceptable scholarly topics, 2) which research topics would not be considered legitimate scholarship, and 3) which steps are appropriate for the successful completion of the tenure process, embedded prejudices and discrimination become factors in African-American faculty success or failure (O'Meara, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

African-American faculty are also stymied during tenure process because service to students can severely impact faculty productivity and it can divert precious time from research efforts (Green, 2008; Misra, Hickes Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). Students of color tend to seek out African-American faculty for guidance, advice and mentoring (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006a; Williams &
Williams, 2006). Students appreciate having exposure to faculty who share their background and experiences, especially when pursuing advanced and terminal degrees.

Williams & Williams (2006) provided supporting information regarding pitfalls to the service component of academic responsibilities and the negative effect time spent on service can have on an African-American faculty members’ pursuit of tenure. Mentoring students and serving on committees can take much needed time away from more highly regarded and rewarded research activities at PWIs (Williams & Williams, 2006). When African-American faculty account for a small number of, or there is only one African-American faculty member in the department or on campus, there is no one else to share those service responsibilities and African-American faculty are usually penalized during tenure reviews because minimal weight is given to service work (Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Danley, 2003; Green, 2008; Guidry, 2006; Misra, Hickes Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011; Williams & Williams, 2006). In addition, African-American faculty are often asked to represent the department, college or campus on university and department diversity committees (Adams, 2006; Bane, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006a). Department chairs seem to forget all faculty members should be able to contribute to discussions that focus on the topics of diversity and inclusion.

**Problem Statement**

Generally, the tenure probationary period at a university is a long and arduous one. Historically, predominantly white research institutions (PWIs) did not focus on the recruitment of African-American faculty (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This lack of recruitment implies Caucasians have historically represented most of the faculty at colleges and universities. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac
2018-2019 (2018), Caucasian faculty represented 77.6% of full-time instructional faculty. African-American faculty comprised 6.1% of full-time instructional faculty (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). The number of African-American faculty employed at four-year PWI research institutions was even smaller. At research institutions specifically (doctoral/research, high-activity research, and very-high-activity research), African-American faculty comprised 4.3% of full-time faculty (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016); and all research institutions are not PWIs (more recent data was unavailable).

Because of this variance, service can begin to demand a high percentage of African-American faculty time at PWI research institutions (Orey, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). This happens because African-American students search for faculty and administrators with whom they can identify on campus (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Seeing like individuals in prominent positions on college campuses inspires African-American students to believe they too can succeed in their educational pursuits and reach those professional plateaus (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). The desire for students to connect with someone who can relate to their experiences is a primary reason for African-American faculty burnout as it relates to service responsibilities. Research suggests if higher education institutions truly want to attract African-American students and retain them through graduation, institutions need to ensure African-American faculty are recruited and are successful (Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

As minimal African-American faculty are recruited to PWI research institutions, the number of African-American faculty who persist and achieve tenure will not increase,
especially if existing African-American faculty are pressured to devote excessive amounts of time to service responsibilities. A quantitative study by Bellas & Toutkoushian (1999) reviewed the time allocation of faculty across gender, race and family status. The study looked at various levels of faculty work to compare time allocated to teaching, research and service across independent variables. Based on the existing reward system, the researchers documented professors who devoted more time to research were provided greater promotion rewards at their institutions. At PWI research institutions, research is heavily weighted in consideration for tenure and promotion and service carries very little weight (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). Faculty who seek tenure must learn to create an appropriate balance of time and effort in research, service and teaching. If the allocation of time is not balanced properly, service, for example, can consume a large percentage of time but yield minimal rewards for a tenure dossier (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Bonner, 2006; Orey, 2006).

Additionally, faculty from different cultures and ethnicities bring a diversity of thinking to any organization (Patuti & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006). As universities and colleges are learning centers in society, having diversity of thought creates a more well-rounded group of students and allows for an expansion of ideas (Williams & Williams, 2006). Diversity of faculty is critical to the success of higher education (Palmer, 2007).

As previously stated, students typically reach out to faculty who can mentor them from a similar perspective (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This makes sense, especially as one considers the rigors of graduate education. Students who
want or need mentors during their educational journey tend to navigate toward faculty with whom they can identify (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). As a result, one could argue the minimal number of African-American faculty on campuses could lead to situations in which the few who are employed by PWI research institutions are in greater demand and, as a result, their time is spread very thin. Those students would place greater time demands on African-American faculty which would lead to less time for conducting research activities. At a research institution, lack of time for research would place faculty members’ ability to obtain tenure in jeopardy. Student demands are just one type of service conundrum for faculty. There are also commitments to campus and local community service and campus committee assignments. Numerous responsibilities and requests for a portion of a faculty member’s time imply there will be less time to allocate to research or teaching.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure.
The findings of this study, hopefully, provided suggestions for university administrative officials and faculty on how to aid in the retention of a diverse pool of faculty talent. In addition, the study offered suggestions of practices and behaviors in which African-American faculty can engage to increase the likelihood of successful promotion at PWI research institutions.

**Research Questions**

Below are the research questions that were asked during this study:

1) Was there a statistically significant difference between the time spent on research, teaching, and service by full-time faculty at PWI research institutions based on race?

2) Which factors assisted existing African-American tenured faculty at PWI research institutions to persist during the tenure and promotion process?

3) What were the most prevalent barriers or obstacles to successfully navigating the tenure process for African-American faculty on the tenure track?

4) What types of situations had African-American faculty at PWI research institutions faced that other faculty, particularly Caucasian males, did not experience?

**Limitations/Delimitations**

This study was a qualitative study of data from African-American faculty. As with any qualitative study employing interviews as a methodology, there were limitations to the applicability and generalizability of the study findings. The limited number of participants interviewed was a limitation of the study. Also, because of the small number of faculty selected to participate, this data could not be generalized across populations.
As a result, the ability to replicate the findings and the ability to apply the study results to other samples and populations was affected. In addition, the researcher’s preliminary assumption that service may have been a deterrent to successful completion of the tenure process for African-American faculty was a limitation as well.

Delimitations of the study included the researcher's decision to only select study participants employed at PWI research institutions across the country. The faculty members were either tenure-track or had received a promotion of tenure within the last five years. Faculty are more likely to remember their experiences during the tenure process if less time had elapsed since promotion. Only African-American faculty members were included in the interview sample although faculty from any race or ethnicity completed the survey.

**Significance of the Study**

This study was essential for many reasons. First, enlightenment on what it takes to be successful at a PWI research institutions is necessary to maintain and increase the number of African-American faculty in the academy. As of Fall 2016, African-American faculty comprised approximately five percent (6.1%) of all full-time faculty at four-year institutions, which was a small minority of the faculty population (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). An increase in African-American faculty at PWI research institutions is important because diversity of thought is a byproduct of diverse perspectives. The university is the breeding ground for exploration of knowledge. If the majority of faculty remain Caucasian and male, the opportunity for diverse perspectives and points of view diminishes. People from different backgrounds and cultures bring forth different ways of viewing their environment and the world. This
openness of thought and expression is a tenet of academic freedom (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).

An additional benefit of the results of this study is increased retention of a diverse student body. As the number of African-American students pursuing a college education increases, it is imperative the number of faculty with whom students can identify increase as well. In the Fall of 2016, African-American students accounted for 13.6% of the student enrollment at all colleges including two-year institutions (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). In 2014, per the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), African-American students accounted for 14.5% of all students enrolled in post-secondary institutions pursuing post-baccalaureate degrees, so the number of African-American students pursuing post-secondary degrees has decreased. The presence of larger numbers of African-American faculty in academic programs across campuses tends to encourage African-American and minority students to matriculate and succeed in school (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005). For fear of African-American faculty burnout and the failure of successful completion of tenure promotion, there must be an increase in the number of African-American faculty members or the academy will continue to risk losing African-American faculty.

Definition of Terms

1. Carnegie Classification System – the leading framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education for the past four decades. Starting in 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education developed a classification of colleges and universities to support its program of research and policy analysis. Derived from empirical data on colleges and
universities, the Carnegie Classification was originally published in 1973, and subsequently updated in 1976, 1987, 1994, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2015, and 2018 to reflect changes among colleges and universities. This framework has been widely used in the study of higher education, both to represent and control for institutional differences, and in the design of research studies to ensure adequate representation of sampled institutions, students, or faculty (The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.a).

2. **Doctoral Granting Institutions** – Includes institutions with a single research doctoral program based on the degree record and institutions with comprehensive doctoral offerings: those awarding doctorates in the humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields, plus doctoral degrees (research/scholarship, professional practice, or other) in one or more professional fields (such as business, education, engineering, law, and medicine). Of these comprehensive doctoral institutions, two subcategories were created based on the presence or absence of medical or veterinary degrees (this includes allopathic medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine). The remaining institutions were differentiated with respect to the plurality of research doctoral conferrals, in this case differentiating universities emphasizing the humanities and social sciences, those emphasizing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and those emphasizing professional fields other than engineering (The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.c).

Below are the types of institutions from which study participants were selected:

- Research Doctoral: Humanities/social sciences-dominant
• Research Doctoral: Comprehensive programs, no medical/veterinary school
• Research Doctoral: Comprehensive programs, with medical/veterinary school
• Research Doctoral: STEM-dominant
• Research Doctoral: Professional-dominant
• Research Doctoral – Other


3. Four-year Institutions – includes all four-year colleges or universities regardless of Carnegie Classification.

4. Marginalization – when participants within an organization are not recognized as a part of the mainstream and are treated as outsiders; creating an “outsider within” status in an organization (Hinton, 2010).

5. Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) – an institution of higher learning at which Caucasians account for 50% or more of the student enrollment (Brown & Dancy, 2010).

6. Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) – the process by which the university acclimates new faculty into its culture and decides if it wishes to keep or terminate them (Shifflett, Patterson & Reekie, 1995).

7. Tenure - status granted to an employee, usually after a probationary period, indicating the position or employment is permanent barring special circumstances (Dictionary.com, n.d.).
8. **Tenure-Track** – The probationary period after faculty is hired full-time but before tenure promotion is awarded (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).

9. **Token/Tokenism** – One of a few (if any) of a race/ethnicity who, due to a high degree of visibility and status as a universal symbol of his race, is often overloaded in his responsibilities (Lewis, 2016).

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter One of this study provided the introduction and background information related to the topic, as well as the significance and purpose of the study. It outlined the variables and concepts that were investigated. Chapter Two is the review of literature. It expounded on the existing research that pertains to the topic, and a conceptual framework was developed to explain the phenomenon under study. A deeper understanding of the tenure-track experience from various perspectives was explored. The exploration of this research resulted in a more thorough accumulation of data for this study. It also assured this study enhanced the existing body of knowledge currently available. Chapter Three is the methodology chapter. This chapter detailed the how and why of the problems that were investigated. The purpose of the study was reaffirmed, the basis of theory was established, and the nature of the data collected was detailed (Roberts, 2010). In Chapter Four, the methods for verifying the data and ensuring trustworthiness were detailed. In addition, Chapter Four included the results of data collection and an analysis of the data. Chapter Five completed the study by providing a detailed analysis and discussion of the results and outcomes. The findings were connected back to the previous research and theories discovered during the literature review. Implications of this data was explored
along with suggestions for future research. If there were recommendations to be made based on the data collected and findings, those recommendations were documented in Chapter Five as well.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Academic tenure is a common and highly sought-after reward for faculty (American Association of University Professors, n.d.; Butler-Purry, 2006; Fairweather, 2002). The way faculty allocate their time between research, teaching, and service, and the perceived quality of work determine whether faculty obtain tenure at their institution or whether faculty are released from the university (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Price & Cotten, 2006). Chapter One provided the definition of three primary faculty responsibilities. Research-related work encompasses the responsibilities that focus on faculty scholarship, departmental, and institutional priorities such as writing and publishing, seeking out grant opportunities, serving on faculty search committees, and tenure/promotion committees (American Association of University Professors, n.d.). Teaching responsibilities focus on the development and success of the students, their coursework and well-being (American Association of University Professors, n.d.; Miranda, 2006). And finally, there is service. Service can take many forms. Service encompasses mentoring students and other faculty, attending and participating in board meetings, fundraising, committee appointments on campus, and community service off campus (Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Misra, Hickes Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure defines tenure as the point in time after a probationary period where an instructor or teacher should only be terminated for adequate cause (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).
Juggling faculty responsibilities can cause feelings of stress and fear during the probationary period (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Price & Cotten, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Shapiro, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). Chapter Two provided an overview of literature on African-American faculty experiences during the tenure process, illustrating what makes the journey different and harsher for African-American faculty. The overview of research is important because it informs African-American faculty experiences while working at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) and provided the foundation for the analysis of African-American faculty experiences as compared to the experiences of their Caucasian peers. Also, Chapter Two presented the conceptual framework for this study, and finally, a summary of the chapter.

The purpose of this study was to document African-American faculty experiences during the tenure process at PWI research institutions and to assess their feelings. Accordingly, upon analysis of the pre-existing research, the researcher attempted to ascertain whether African-American faculty felt disenfranchised or belittled during the tenure process. Finally, the study attempted to provide potential reasons that African-American faculty may not obtain tenure and whether the difference in the African-American faculty experience during the tenure process exposed them to unusually burdensome situations in comparison to their Caucasian peers.

**African-American Faculty Experiences at Predominantly White Institutions**

made up 6.1% of the full-time instructional faculty at all institutions. At research institutions specifically, African-American faculty comprised 4.33% of tenure-track faculty in the aggregate for all Carnegie classification research-level institution (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016). In contrast, Caucasian faculty comprised 77.6% of full-time instructional faculty (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018).

It has been documented that African-American faculty do not obtain tenure at a similar rate as their Caucasian peers (Leggon, 2006; Stanley, 2006a). Research was needed to provide insight into the reasons African-American tenure achievement rates are lower than their Caucasian peers. Past literature on African-American faculty experiences and the tenure process generally reference two broad themes as to why faculty do not earn tenure: (a) lack of collegiality and mentoring which explores the peer and organizational relationships African-American faculty experience in the academy, and (b) bullying and isolation which explores the feelings of marginalization and intimidation African-American faculty experience in the academy (Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006c). These themes were the foundation for describing the experience of African-American faculty during the tenure process.

**Collegiality and Mentoring of African-American Faculty**

Lack of collegiality and mentoring are mentioned most often in literature on African-American faculty (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Stanley, 2006a; Stanley, 2006c; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Williams & Williams, 2006). Learning to navigate academia can be challenging for new professors (Adams, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Frazier, 2011). Collegiality and
mentoring are important because junior faculty interaction with senior faculty has a profound effect on faculty success or failure during the tenure process (Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006; Thompson, 2008).

Prior to starting a new position, a person is presumably excited about his or her future in a new role. There also tends to be curiosity regarding whether he or she will like the job, get along with his or her co-workers, and be a good fit in the workplace (Adams, 2006). Faculty are no different (Adams, 2006). African-American faculty hope to be accepted by their academic peers due to their accomplishments (Adams, 2006). They hope the job is the start of a bright future and colleagues will welcome them (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006). All too often, from the onset of their new career, African-American faculty are perceived by senior Caucasian faculty as affirmative action hires, implying they were hired to meet a racial quota rather than having been recruited for their intelligence and accomplishments (Thompson, 2008). This causes African-American faculty to feel devalued and disrespected (Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005).

The feeling of disrespect manifests itself in other ways as well. Like Caucasian faculty, African-American faculty are evaluated by senior-level faculty during the tenure process. It is a fact most tenured faculty are Caucasian (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). The disparity in the number of African-American junior faculty to Caucasian senior faculty can play an important role in why African-American faculty experience a more difficult tenure process. Tenure-track African-American faculty at PWI research institutions are reliant upon senior faculty to determine whether they are accepted as a member of the team (Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Ruffins, 1997). Dr. Janice Madden, a professor of sociology at the University of
Pennsylvania was noted comparing the tenure process to getting married (Ruffin, 1997). Dr. Madden stated marriage is a long-term relationship in which the decision of who is smart enough or good enough is based on the subjective opinion of another (Ruffins, 1997). It is senior faculty members who decide who is good enough to be a part of the club of tenured professors. A problem arises when similar to me bias occurs. Similar to me bias occurs when people believe the brightest and/or best people are like themselves (Rand & Wexley, 1975; Tillman, 2001). Because of this bias, African-American faculty often do not find many opportunities to bond with senior faculty at PWI research institutions. This bias often keeps senior faculty from working with African-American junior faculty (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Pittman, 2012; Williams & Williams, 2006). In selecting junior faculty mentees, senior faculty usually select junior faculty who have similar backgrounds and research interests (Orelus, 2013; Pittman, 2012; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Literature reveals many instances in which African-American faculty felt overlooked by senior Caucasian faculty who felt the African-American faculty research focus did not align with their own or the African-American faculty member was not intelligent enough to work with them (Miranda, 2006; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006d).

**Isolation and Bullying of African-American Faculty**

Although collegiality and mentoring are covered more frequently as topics in the literature, examples of African-American faculty being bullied is abundant in existing literature as well (Adams, 2006; DeAngelis, 2009; Green, 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006; Misra, Hickes Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011; Stanley, 2006a). The second broad theme of literature on African-American faculty focuses on
the concepts of bullying and isolation. Many researchers have documented that African-American junior faculty have long felt the tenure process at PWI research institutions is more difficult for them (Adams, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006a). African-American faculty experience feelings of intimidation and a sense of being on their own throughout the tenure process (Butler-Purry, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Stanley, 2006d). They watch as Caucasian peers seem to be embraced by senior faculty, but African-American faculty are not offered the same acceptance (Bonner, 2006; Miranda, 2006; Ross, 2006). There are instances when colleagues collaborate on research projects or grants, but African-American faculty are excluded from the opportunity to be involved (Miranda, 2006; Ross, 2006). Most African-American faculty feel the need to reach outside of their own department or school to collaborate with fellow scholars (Adams, 2006; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006). Described in previous literature are situations where African-American faculty feel their research has been deemed unimportant or been disregarded by senior faculty (Bane, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Miranda, 2006; Pittman, 2012; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006) and their research does not contribute to scholarship (Miranda, 2006). Generally, senior faculty, which are typically Caucasian, do not appreciate African-American faculty whose research has an ethnic or cultural focus (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006; Stanley, 2006a; Williams & Williams, 2006). Senior faculty members have steadfast opinions on the types of research they consider legitimate and will penalize junior faculty members whose research interests are outside those norms (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Orelus, 2013; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006). The environment is made more
unnerving because the Administration does not challenge senior faculty to support alternative research foci (Williams & Williams, 2006).

If senior faculty do not consider African-American faculty research to be acceptable, senior faculty will often refuse to mentor or even conduct collaborative research with African-American faculty (Miranda, 2006). This lack of interaction with senior faculty means African-American faculty will not be prepared for tenure reviews and, as a result, obtaining tenure at PWI research institutions becomes difficult, if not impossible (Squire, 2015). There are usually no written guidelines or parameters for obtaining tenure so junior faculty depend on senior faculty to learn the department’s and the institution’s expectations (Adams, 2006; Bane, 2006; Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005). African-American faculty experience the journey blindly if they are not receiving mentoring from those who have endured the process before them.

For African-American faculty, institutional fit is not only important in terms of appearance and attire, but also regarding scholarly pursuits. If senior faculty do not share African-American faculty research interests, they bully African-American faculty to assimilate or alter their course of academic research to what the department considers mainstream research (Bane, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Leggon, 2006; Pittman, 2012). African-American junior faculty are pressured to conform to the pre-established mold of senior faculty present in their department or risk being denied tenure (Adams, 2006; Guidry, 2006). When African-American faculty members are the only person of color in the room or on campus more than ninety percent of the time (Miranda, 2006), they must usually conform to the norms of the majority to be accepted. If African-American junior
Faculty are not willing to conform, their colleagues do not accept them (Bane, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Payne & Suddler, 2014; Pittman, 2012).

Tokenism is another form of bullying which occurs when African-American faculty are forced to become the team, department or campus representative for the African-American community (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006). Tokenism can occur when African-American faculty are the only or one of a small number of faculty of color in the department (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006). African-American faculty are often expected to represent the department regarding minority related issues (Jayakumar et al., 2009). Tokenism is not only bullying, but it also creates a feeling of isolation. It creates an atmosphere of degradation (Adams, 2006; DeAngelis, 2009; Green, 2008; Misra et al., 2011; Stanley, 2006a).

There have been instances in which African-American faculty have been the subject of blatant aggression aimed at driving the African-American faculty member from the department and institution (Harris, 2005). African-American faculty are compelled to walk between two cultures, academic and personal, if they do not want to be ostracized by senior faculty (Bane, 2006; Gaskins, 2006; Pittman, 2012; Ross, 2006). African-American faculty must wear two faces because the normal and accepted culture is not their own, but the culture of white males. Code-switching is the term referring to the need for African-Americans’ to forcibly change their mode of behavior or speaking to fit in (Bane, 2006; Hinton, 2009; Payne & Suddler, 2014; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006d). Caucasian faculty do not switch between cultures because their culture is the considered the norm (Stanley, 2006b; Stanley, 2006d). In many instances, African-American faculty
are not able to be themselves around colleagues; they must perform while at work (Bane, 2006; Stanley, 2006d).

Furthermore, African-American faculty often face criticism regarding their attire or hairstyle (Bane, 2006). African-American faculty have been told their appearance is inappropriate, which usually equates to the attire or style being considered too ethnic by Caucasians (Bane, 2006). African-American faculty have mentioned being physically touched by peers or students without their permission when the student or peer comments on the faculty member’s appearance (Bane, 2006). African-American faculty must smile and act un-phased even in the face of this type of disrespect and unwarranted scrutiny (Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Moore, 2001). This invasion of privacy and space (Bane, 2006) is a nod to the lack of personal freedom experienced by students during hazing (Campo, Poulos & Sipple, 2005; Hollmann, 2002; Pershing, 2006).

An additional topic addressed in the literature on the African-American faculty tenure process is their perception of how isolated, discriminated against, and marginalized they feel during the journey (Adams, 2006; Pittman, 2012; Stanley, 2006a; Stanley, 2006b). African-American faculty believe the journey is fraught with abuses with which their Caucasian peers do not have to contend (Bonner, 2006; Ruffins, 1997). Additionally, they feel disregarded and invisible at their institutions (Adams, 2006; Bane, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Howard-Baptiste, 2014). African-American faculty members feel like their opinions do not matter and they do not have a voice regarding departmental decisions (Bane, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006). African-American faculty are often relegated to teaching elective courses rather than the required curriculum for the degree majors (Stanley, 2006). The course schedule is, at times, considered a symbol of status.
for faculty (Bane, 2006). If a junior faculty member is not allowed to teach required courses, peers and students may call their level of expertise into question (Bane, 2006). Circumstances such as these create a perception that minimizes the African-American faculty member’s skill in the discipline and reduces faculty opportunity to make an impact on students’ educational journeys (Stanley, 2006).

One could ask how an environment of learning could be a breeding ground for bullying. Ironically, Keashly and Neuman (2010) stated aggression, which can create an atmosphere of bullying, is a part of the higher education faculty experience, but that same aggression can cause African-American faculty in a junior position to feel bullied by senior faculty. The researchers admit bullying in the workplace is not unique to higher education, but they suggest, due to workplace aggression in the educational setting, it may be an environment in which bullying thrives (Keashly & Neuman, 2010).

While bullying may seem contrary to the academy’s core values of academic freedom, autonomy, tenure, collegiality and civility, the study states those norms may shed light on why bullying occurs in academia (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Values such as academic freedom, autonomy, and collegiality should encourage a climate of open debate and the marrying of varied ideas, but at times have the opposite effect (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). In her 2012 study, Armstrong notes within many academic disciplines, high value is placed on adversarialism which is defined as attacking, critiquing, and defending one’s ideas (Armstrong, 2012). The debating of varied ideas can create a toxic culture precipitated by the various definitions of the terms themselves (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). For example, tenured faculty tend to feel they have earned the right to be above critique or reproach (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). As a result, African-American
faculty pursuing tenure must avoid the politics of providing constructive criticism to senior faculty (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Because senior faculty are rarely called out for poor or non-collegial behavior, the problematic behavior is not addressed; and therefore, a more toxic environment is created (Keashly & Neuman, 2010).

**Hazing and the African-American Faculty Experience**

In the same way people joining organizations are hazed and bullied during their experiences, this study made a comparison to African-American junior faculty experiences. A review of the literature on African-American junior faculty during the tenure process details similarities between the feelings resulting from the experiences of African-American junior faculty and the initiates of exclusive organizations. As suggested in the literature, the tenure process appears more difficult for African-American faculty than for Caucasian faculty (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Williams & Williams, 2006), and African-American faculty experiences may cause feelings that parallel the feelings initiates experience during hazing.

Hazing is defined as any action taken or any situation created intentionally causing embarrassment, harassment or ridicule and risks emotional and/or physical harm to members of a group or team, whether new or not, regardless of the person’s willingness to participate (Allen & Madden, 2012; Allen & Madden, 2008; Bauer Raposo, Nunes Caldeira, Martins, Mendes, Pinho Botelho, & Silva, 2015; What hazing looks like, n.d.). Hazing can consist of anything initiates are instructed to do as a group including standing in lines, carrying objects, and reciting speeches (Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen & Brust, 2012; Kimbrough, 2012). Literature that exists regarding hazing tends to
focus on hazing of initiates seeking membership in exclusive organizations such as sororities, fraternities, the military, secret societies, and even in student educational settings such as nursing or law schools (Cohen, 2012; Kimbrough, 2012; Office of Student Life University of Missouri, 2015; Pershing, 2006; Samuel, 2007). Conversely, minimal literature exists comparing the African-American faculty experience to a hazing experience (Ruffins, 1997). Therefore, this study presented literature on hazing to provide a basis for comparing new initiates’ feelings to the feelings of African-American faculty detailed later in the study.

**Rite of Passage**

When initiates seek entrance into exclusive organizations such as athletic teams, Greek letter fraternities and sororities, the military, or even academic disciplines, they are often put through tests to prove their worthiness (Anti-hazing policy, n.d.; Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen & Brust, 2012; Kimbrough, 2012; Pershing, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Ruffins, 2006; Samuel, 2007; What hazing looks like, 2015). It was noted hazing can even occur regardless of malicious intent (Allan & Madden, 2012). The authors of the National Study of Student Hazing conducted a study in which 11,482 students at 53 postsecondary institutions responded (Allan & Madden, 2008). The researchers cited 55% of college students involved in clubs, teams, and organizations had experienced hazing and 9 out of the 10 students in the study who had experienced a hazing behavior did not identify the behavior as hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008). This supports a conclusion that hazing occurs much more often than it is recognized, even by those experiencing it (Allan & Madden, 2008). The researchers found several negative results of hazing. The perceived negative results included:
• Feeling stressed;
• Having problems in relationships;
• Feeling guilty;
• Having difficulty sleeping;
• Having difficulty concentrating in classes;
• Feeling humiliated and degraded;
• Feeling depressed;
• Wanting revenge against organizers of the activities;
• Quitting the team or organization; and
• Considering a transfer to another college to name a few (Allan & Madden, 2008, p. 28).

Perceived positive results include feeling a sense of belonging, a strong sense of accomplishment, feeling stronger, and doing better in classes (Allan & Madden, 2008).

Several researchers have documented the practice of physical and/or mental abuse of students seeking membership in organizations to earn the right to be accepted (Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen & Brust, 2012; Kimbrough, 2012; Silveira & Hudson, 2015).

Researchers state hazing occurs so initiates earn the respect of those who are already members of organizations (Hollmann, 2002; Jones, 2004; Kimbrough, 2012; Ruffins, 1997). The behavior is meant to establish a pecking order within the ranks of the members of an organization and those who seek membership (Conte, 2014; Pershing, 2006). Conte (2014) stated hazing is a group effort during which the abusers believe they are building team spirit. Most of the time, hazing continues to keep traditions of the past alive (Scott, 2011; Yates, 2013). The existing members continue the behavior of those
who initiated them (Scott, 2011; Yates, 2013). The traditions are maintained because the members believe the traditions foster loyalty and love for the organization (Parks, Jones, Ray, Hughey, & Cox, 2015). Hazing abuses range from physical beatings to sleep deprivation to mind games (Allan & Madden, 2012; Campo-Flores, 2012; Kimbrough, 2012; Silveira & Hudson, 2015). Initiates of organizations tend to endure the hazing because they not only want to be acknowledged as a member of the organization, but they also want to be respected by the more senior members (Allan & Madden, 2012; Scott, 2011; Yates, 2013). Scott (2011) stated new initiates fear being ostracized or not accepted, therefore they allow themselves to be hazed. The initiates believe they are demonstrating loyalty to the organization and its causes by enduring the process of hazing (Scott, 2011; Yates, 2013). Initiates have also been known to feel a sense of pride and accomplishment at completing the hazing process (Allan & Madden, 2012; Scott, 2011).

Researchers have also documented hazing and the types of behavior construed as hazing (Allan & Madden, 2012; Campo et al., 2005; Cohen & Brust, 2012; Hughey & Parks, 2011; Kimbrough, 2012; Parks et al., 2015; Ruffins, 2006; Silveira, & Hudson, 2015; Yates, 2013). This study primarily focused on psychological hazing and the feelings experienced by new African-American faculty as a result. The study also addressed behaviors that are mild forms of physical hazing.

More docile forms of hazing consist of situations meant to cause embarrassment or humiliation such as forcing initiates to dress a certain way or to wear certain attire like a beanie hat or paper bag (Allan & Madden, 2012; Parks et al., 2015). Initiates have also been asked to run personal errands, purchase things such as food and other merchandise
with their own funds or are often made to become a personal chauffeur or valet for existing members (Allan & Madden, 2012; Scott, 2011). Psychological forms of hazing include depriving individuals of sleep, yelling at them, or calling them names (Allan & Madden, 2008; Parks & Hughey, 2011; Parks et al., 2015). Sororities and fraternities have been documented as forcing initiates to endure long, seemingly endless question/answer sessions regarding organizational history and other information, purposefully causing the mental breakdown of initiates (Parks & Hughey, 2011; Parks et al., 2015). Both fraternities and sororities are known to make initiates create speeches or greetings for each member of the organization to show respect (Parks et al., 2015). Hazing by sorority members has been described as ways to curb unwanted behavior in those initiates seeking membership (Parks et al., 2015).

Samuel (2007) referenced hazing as a law school student stating there was a constant feeling of being inadequate with no feedback to confirm or deny those feelings. He described law school as very competitive, as each student seemed to be pitted against one another to determine who was best (Samuel, 2007). This competition was encouraged and perpetuated to the point where students would be eliminated from the program due to the pressures of the situation (Samuel, 2007). He stated success in law school had to be earned through blood, sweat, and tears (Samuel, 2007).

Non-life threatening, physical forms of hazing include situations of self-mutilation such as writing disparaging sexual or racist comments on the initiates bodies (Allan & Madden, 2008). Initiates have been forced to objectify themselves and have been treated as objects forced to do the will of the existing members (Allan & Madden, 2008; Parks, Ray, Jones, & Hughey, 2014).
A Comparison of Hazing to Academia

This study sought to provide insight on (a) whether it is true African-American faculty pursuing tenure at PWI research institutions endure an environment that causes feelings of fear, insecurity and anxiety regardless of their accomplishments, intelligence, and talent during their tenure process; (b) whether their experiences cause feelings comparable to feelings experienced during hazing activities initiates endure when joining organizations; and (c) whether this hazing is a contributing factor as to why African-American faculty do not successfully obtain tenure. It is interesting to note hazing is proposed to have originated in Europe, prior to the 1700s; from the same place the United States molded its concepts of the university (Parks et al., 2015).

African-American faculty have described the tenure process as generating varied negative feelings (Adams, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Danley, 2003; Howard-Baptiste, 2014). In fact, most faculty may develop negative feelings during the tenure process, but African-American faculty believe their experience is more harsh or burdensome for them than their Caucasian peers (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Williams & Williams, 2006; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006). Additionally, African-American faculty feel the tenure process is stressful and degrading (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Stanley, 2006a). Initiates attempting to join organizations often feel degraded and experience stress as well. Williams (1992) stated during the pledging process, the initiates attempting to join an organization are often made to act with one voice and one mind, to not promote individuality, and to share a common experience which is meant to unify the group (as cited by Parks & Spencer, 2013; Jones, 2004). African-American faculty face a similar pressure to conform in the
same manner as those attempting to join private organizations. Williams and Williams (2006) argue African-American faculty can also experience a sense of exclusion and isolation from their campus community due to minimal support (Adams, 2006; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005). Junior faculty need the support of senior faculty in the form of mentoring, collaborating on research and receiving feedback on their work to succeed (Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Stanley, 2006c; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Thompson, 2008).

**Hazing by peers.** In their study, Keashly & Neuman (2010) stated higher education breeds a toxic environment because disrespectful behavior on the part of tenured faculty is rarely addressed. Ultimately, Keashly & Neuman (2010) believed aggression and bullying are a part of the faculty experience and those behaviors are detrimental to faculty, students, and the institution. When the majority acts aggressively against, or bullies one who is seeking membership in the club known as tenure, the behavior is quite intimidating and can be harmful to the health and well-being of that person. Criticism of peers can pose an internal conflict, as autonomy is a key benefit of the profession. As a result, the administration’s lack of action to diminish negative behavior can cause conflicts to fester (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). In his study, Armstrong (2012) believed the reason faculty within the university treat each other so badly is because the foundation of the university is built upon reasoned argument and that creates a hostile environment at its core, with everyone seeking to discredit one another. During the tenure process, African-American faculty often feel marginalized, alienated and subjugated by senior faculty who are typically Caucasian (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006; Patuti & Hinton, 2003; Stanley, 2006a; Williams & Williams, 2006).
In the same way students are hazed and bullied during their initiations, this study was conducted to analyze whether African-American junior faculty experiences were comparable. An example of similar feelings being expressed occurred when an African-American faculty member felt her colleagues made very little effort to understand her research focus (Adams, 2006). Adams (2006) said she felt her peers’ perceived she would never obtain tenure so why bother to support her efforts.

Disrespect is another indicator of a hazing experience and can manifest itself in many ways. An African-American faculty member felt he was not invited to collaborate with his peers because of stereotypes such as African-American faculty are lazy, or they are not intelligent enough to add knowledge to research (Ross, 2006). In addition, colleagues have told African-American faculty the only reason they were hired was due to affirmative action, not because of their education, skills, and talents (Adams, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Pittman, 2012).

To expound on the sense of marginalization further, the pressure to conform or do what you are told is repeated throughout stories regarding the student hazing experience (Anti-hazing policy, n.d.; Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen, 2012). When people are being hazed, they are unable to have their own thoughts and ideas (Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen, 2012; Ruffins, 1997). The ideas of those in power or the majority are deemed right (Campo-Flores, 2012; Cohen, 2012; Ruffins, 1997). African-American faculty who decide to focus on ethnic issues or research related to underrepresented populations often find their efforts minimalized or even trivialized (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006; Stanley, 2006a). Research focusing on ethnic issues is perceived as not adding additional...
knowledge to the discipline (Bonner, 2006; Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013; Miranda, 2006). This perception can place African-American faculty at a disadvantage from the very beginning of the tenure process; unless African-American faculty choose to pursue research senior faculty at the institution deem to be mainstream. The lack of faculty with similar focus and research agendas within a department has been argued as a reason why African-American faculty struggle to acclimate to their campus environments and have not felt supported (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006; Modica & Mamieseishvili, 2010).

The argument of what is valid or invalid scholarship at a PWI research institution is won by senior faculty who are primarily Caucasian when different cultures and ethnicities are not integrated into the power structure (Miranda, 2006; Stanley, 2006). When research is focused on ethnic studies, African-American faculty work is not highly regarded by senior faculty as scholarly research, and this could ultimately reduce the likelihood that African-American faculty will earn tenure regardless of a high degree of intelligence and effort (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Hooker & Johnson, 2011; Miranda, 2006; Misra et al., 2011; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006).

Often, African-American faculty are prejudged as not being able to successfully complete the tenure process (Miranda, 2006). This preconceived notion of failure also occurs during hazing membership rituals; the active members do not attempt to form a bond or a relationship with the initiates because they feel there is a high likelihood the initiate will not complete the initiation process (Pershing, 2006). The instinct is to withdraw support and allow the initiate to flounder and potentially fail at reaching their
goal (Pershing, 2006). Often, the active members even layer obstacles, whether physical or mental, to deter the initiate from reaching his or her goal (Pershing, 2006).

**Hazing by administrators.** Another challenge facing African-American faculty pertains to service. Service responsibilities can hinder African-American faculty pursuit of tenure because the time allocated to service carries little importance in the tenure and promotion decision, and therefore, is a hindrance to the process because service can consume a large amount of faculty time and resources (Miranda, 2006; Misra et al., 2011; Moore, 2001; Williams & Williams, 2006). Faculty who devote too much time and energy to service often find they have not allocated enough time to teaching and conducting research (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Misra et al., 2011; Palmer, 2007; Price & Cotten, 2006; Stanley, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006).

African-American faculty are often pressured to spend excessive amounts of time on service by administrators because tenured faculty have more flexibility to decline the request (Miranda, 2006; Orey, 2006). The administration tends to approach African-American faculty to serve on committees dealing with diversity issues; and African-American female faculty are asked to serve on diversity committees as well as those committees focused on women’s issues (Miranda, 2006; Stanley, 2006c; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006). Additional time spent on service can impede African-American faculty progress during the pursuit of tenure because very little weight is given to service during tenure reviews at PWI research institutions, as previously mentioned (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006). If constructive feedback is not provided on a periodic basis throughout the tenure process, African-American faculty can harm their chances of attaining their tenure promotion (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelley, 2005). Periodic feedback
from tenured faculty and/or administration would help African-American faculty stay focused on what the department considers important for tenure consideration (Guidry, 2006; Leggon, 2006; Stanley, 2006c; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Thompson, 2008).

As referenced earlier, African-American faculty experience forced tokenism. Administrators often appoint them as the token representatives for African-American people who are employed at their institution (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Miranda, 2006). Time devoted to service comes with little reward and African-American faculty are still expected to maintain a rigorous research schedule (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Misra et al., 2011; Price & Cotton, 2006).

**Hazing by peers and administrators.** Another potential parallel between hazing and the tenure process occurs when African-American faculty are scrutinized or are suppressed by the majority. Imagine being in a room full of people but feeling alone, or worse, invisible (Bane, 2006; Stanley, 2006). This scenario is a regular occurrence for African-American faculty at PWI research institutions (Butler-Purry, 2006; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006a). African-American faculty often feel they must prove themselves to be accepted by their peers, the administration and the students (Bane, 2006; Hinton, 2009; Ross, 2006). They feel obligated to move back and forth between two different worlds; their culture and academia (Hinton, 2009; Ross, 2006).

It is often difficult for the two worlds to co-exist. African-American faculty have had to modify their style of dress or their hairstyles to align more with what is acceptable to the majority (Bane, 2006). One African-American faculty member described a situation in which a Caucasian senior faculty member glared at her because of her attire and questioned whether she was teaching that day (Bane, 2006). The situation was even
more embarrassing because students were present during the disrespectful interaction (Bane, 2006). In addition, her opinion was not well received at department meetings and her ideas were often overlooked. She received the most undesirable teaching schedule within the department and colleagues felt they could approach her and touch her at will (Bane, 2006).

**Hazing by students.** Not only do African-American faculty experience disrespect from peers, but they also experience disrespect from students, especially Caucasian male students (Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Guidry, 2006). An example of how students treat African-American faculty members poorly occurs when students, who are usually Caucasian and male, question the credentials and expertise of African-American faculty in a disrespectful manner in the classroom (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). In a 2014 research study, Howard-Baptiste provided details of one participant who was openly disrespected in class by one of her Caucasian students. The student’s tone of voice conveyed a dismal level of respect for her as faculty (Howard-Baptiste, 2014). Caucasian students challenge African-American faculty’s intellectual ability, competence and authority (Bonner, 2006; Pittman, 2012). Caucasian male students have been known to challenge the knowledge of African-American faculty in the classroom (Bane, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Guidry, 2006). Additionally, Caucasian students tend to express negative comments regarding African-American faculty within evaluations, such as:

- The professor is too ethnic;
- The professor does not know what he or she is talking about and does not know how to teach;
The professor is intimidating;  
• The professor’s grading system is too harsh; and  
• The professor’s class was not entertaining and did not maintain the student’s interest (Guidry, 2006).

It is uncommon for these types of comments to be made regarding Caucasian faculty. Caucasian and non-African-American faculty do not have the same expectation of entertaining students (Orey, 2006). They are not told that their classes are too white. There is a perception African-American faculty are there to entertain students not educate them (Bonner, 2006; Guidry, 2006). Caucasian faculty are not the target of these preconceived notions nor do they receive the same negative feedback on a regular basis, but it is quite common for African-American faculty (Bonner, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Howard-Baptiste, 2014; Orelus, 2013).

**Conceptual Framework**

To properly frame this research, it was imperative to study what experts have stated regarding this topic. Existing research leaned toward examining the issue of time allocation from different perspectives such as gender, position, pre- and post-tenure. A qualitative study by Williams & Williams (2006) explored the perceptions African-American male professors held regarding the tenure and promotion process. The researcher concluded African-American male professors experienced a sense of exclusion on their college campuses. Several studies concluded African-American faculty feel isolated on their respective PWI campuses (Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Hinton, 2009; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006b; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). The Williams’ study went as far as to insist there are two actions that can contribute to the persistence of African-American
male faculty as they seek promotion and tenure on college campuses. First, colleges should embrace the varied talents that manifest within a diverse faculty. Second, African-American male professors and any minority faculty should learn to rise above the unjust stigmas bestowed on them because of their race (Williams & Williams, 2006). A study by Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly (2005) stated there was a lack of support for African-American faculty and students at PWI research institutions in addition to an even greater lack of support for their research interests. The researchers believed the study of challenges faced by African-Americans in the academy would aid in the betterment of the campus community by creating a more just and equitable environment.

A quantitative study by Bellas & Toutkoushian (1999) reviewed the time allocation of faculty across gender, race and family status. The study looked at various levels of work to compare time allocated to teaching, research and service across independent variables. Based on the current reward system, the research supported professors who devoted more time to research were provided greater rewards in terms of promotion at the institutions. The research proposed professors who conducted greater amounts of research were more likely to be promoted and granted tenure. Recommendations from the research included restructuring the current system for promotion and tenure to consider non-traditional types of research and for minority professors, in the interim, to redirect their research focus to more traditional areas of study (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999).

**Critical Race Theory**

Scholars have argued Critical Race Theory (CRT) provides a lens through which readers can find meaning in subjects’ experiences and feelings (Ladson-Billings, 1998;
Parker & Villalpando (2007). UCLA School of Public Affairs – Critical Race Studies website (2009) provides details regarding the concept of critical race theory (CRT). CRT was born out of legal scholarship. Derrick Bell, an African-American law professor at Harvard, and Alan Freeman, a Caucasian law professor at SUNY-Buffalo Law School, are credited with the initial development of the theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). CRT was a way to explore and analyze racism from a legal perspective (UCLA, 2009). Parker & Villapando (2007) stated CRT is committed to the social justice agenda in its attempts to eliminate all forms of bias. It allows people to see hidden racism and biases present and provides a start for thinking through behaviors to correct those biases (Parker & Villapando, 2007). Being influenced by CRT allows for persons to consider the narratives of people of color as legitimate and an important part of race relations (Parker & Villapando, 2007).

Participants in this study were asked to provide a narrative of their experiences and how they felt during their tenure process. Understanding critical race theory brought awareness to readers of their biases while gaining insight on the experiences and thoughts of the participants, the concepts and assumptions that were used, and the expectations or suggestions for changes that were presented (Smith, Yosso & Solorzano, 2006). Subjects’ experiences should be analyzed through the CRT lens for enhanced understanding (Smith et al., 2006). This study utilized six of the seven tenets of Critical Race Theory, as it has been applied to higher education, in order to provide insight and perspective on African-American faculty experiences. The six tenets are:

1) the permanence of racism;
2) experiential knowledge (counter-storytelling);
3) interest convergence theory;
4) whiteness as property;
5) critique of liberalism; and
6) commitment to social justice (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

The Permanence of Racism. CRT argues racism is engrained in our society and institutional racism exists in the thread of American culture (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; UCLA, 2009). The effects of institutional racism are not a set of isolated individual acts, but a system providing advantages to those in the dominant culture and imposing disadvantages on those considered to be a subculture or inferior (UCLA, 2009). African-American faculty still deal with the aftermath of racist ideologies and behaviors of the past (Jayakumar et al., 2009). The institutional racism permeating organizational structures may aid in the creation of obstacles such as non-acceptance of ideas, scholarship, and tokenism of African-American faculty (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006). For instance, if African-American faculty are asked to take on a greater proportion of the service responsibilities in the department and on campus, the additional time allocated for those activities should carry the same weight other aspects of faculty work carries (Moore, 2001; Orey, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006).

Experiential Knowledge (Counter-storytelling). Experiential knowledge is the consideration of the experiences of other people, specifically people of color, as valued, legitimate, appropriate, and important in understanding and analyzing racial subordination in education (Critical Race Theory, 2015). The personal narratives from
African-American faculty provided context to the majority narrative widely accepted as truth (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

**Interest Convergence Theory.** Interest convergence theory states that the interests of people of color, African-Americans in particular, will only advance once their interests converge with the interests of those considered to be in the majority (Critical Race Theory, 2015). In essence, the people in power will need to see benefits from the interests of those who are considered to be inferior or less than (Critical Race Theory, 2015). An example given is the Supreme Court’s decision to strike down Plessy v Ferguson in Brown v Kansas Board of Education (Critical Race Theory, 2015). There were three benefits to whites in overturning Plessy v Ferguson: 1) the U.S.’s desire to be seen as a world leader as communism was spreading, 2) a reassurance that equality and freedom were truly valued by the U.S., and 3) the realization that the South could not fully become a part of the new industrialized society without integrating just as the North had already done (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

**Whiteness as Property.** Whiteness as property entails the assumption of privilege that is preserved by white people (Critical Race Theory, 2015). The idea that there is an exclusive club in which only being white provides membership (Critical Race Theory, 2015). This privilege is based on excluding others merely because they are not white (Critical Race Theory, 2015). In higher education, this club is typically the tenured faculty that makes the decision of who will or will not successfully obtain tenure. The white male perspective is the dominant perspective, and therefore sets the tone for tenure achievement. By deconstructing this perception of dominance and reconstructing it into a
more equitable social construct, tenure achievement could be a more level playing field for all who seek it.

**Critique of Liberalism.** Critique of liberalism means being skeptical of concepts such as equality, color blindness, race does not matter, equal opportunity and the like because those concepts do not actually exist. The concepts were developed to help white people feel better about the prevalence of racism in this country and the fact that racism and oppression has not been eliminated. Typically, any change under these concepts are also instituted at a pace that makes white people feel comfortable regarding the changes, not because the changes are the right thing to do (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

**Commitment to Social Justice.** A commitment to social justice is key to effecting change (Critical Race Theory, 2015). Critical race theorists understand that racism has had an effect on education and the foundations of education and there is work to do to correct the problems racism created (Critical Race Theory, 2015). Theorists believe the inequalities created by racist ideologies must be eliminated and no one can rest until that occurs (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

**Racial Micro-aggression**

Racial micro-aggression is a term describing racially insensitive behavior, regardless of whether the behavior is covert or overt; and it describes behavior African-American faculty at PWI research institutions deal with on a regular basis (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Hooker & Johnson, 2011; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Smith et al., 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). Micro-aggressive behavior is intimidating and demeaning (Campo-Flores, 2012; Jones, 2004; Parks & Spencer, 2013; Ruffins, 2006; Smith et al., 2006). This study presented information on
racial micro-aggressions as a framework, so readers can decide for themselves if the interactions of African-American faculty at PWI research institutions with others is reminiscent of micro-aggressive behavior.

One of the primary theorists of the concept of racial micro-aggression is Derald Wing Sue, PhD (Campo-Flores, 2012; Jones, 2004; Parks & Spencer, 2013; Ruffins, 2006). Dr. Sue has defined racial micro-aggressions as brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, & Esquilin, 2007; Sue & Constantine, 2007; Sue, Rivera, Watkins, Kim, Kim, & Williams, 2011).

Racial micro-aggressions manifest in three forms of behavior; micro-assaults, micro-insults, and micro-invalidations (DeAngelis, 2009; Sue & Constantine, 2007; Sue et al., 2007). Briefly explaining each, micro-assaults are explicit racial attacks whether physical or verbal upon an individual or a group. Micro-insults can be described as behavior that is rude and demeaning to someone’s racial identity or culture. Finally, micro-invalidations are behaviors and/or communications that minimize or negate the opinions or thoughts of people of color (DeAngelis, 2009; Sue & Constantine, 2007; Sue et al., 2007).

Faculty of color experience micro-aggressive behaviors from administrators, superiors, peers as well as students (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner-Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010). See Appendix A for specific examples of micro-aggressive behavior. The table is being used with permission from the authors of Racial Micro-aggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice, American Psychologist, Chapter 2,
Howard-Baptiste (2014) described moments of overt and covert ways students, colleagues, and others communicate disrespect and distrust of African-American women’s abilities and worth as mammie moments. Many African-American female faculty have experienced some level of disrespect while in or outside of the classroom by not just colleagues, but their students as well (Bane, 2006; Guidry, 2006; Hinton, 2009; Howard-Baptiste, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Dr. Monty, a pseudonym, described a situation where a Caucasian student felt it was acceptable to challenge her expertise and background even as an undergraduate, first time student to the study of linguistics (Howard-Baptiste, 2014). Caucasian faculty are bestowed the respect their years of learning has earned them from the beginning (Howard-Baptiste, 2014). African-American faculty are forced to deal with being mistreated simply because of their skin color and must earn the respect due to them (Howard-Baptiste, 2014).

**Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher provided insight into the role of all full-time faculty. Examples of African-American faculty experiences from their own counter-narratives were provided. In addition, a conceptual foundation was laid to allow readers to have an open mind when reading about African-American faculty experiences at PWI research institutions in the hope of increasing the African-American faculty tenure and promotion success rate.

This researcher sought to document first hand experiences of African-American faculty at PWI research institutions. While doing so, one goal was to explore reasons African-American faculty have a lower success rate for tenure and promotion. Another goal was to increase the numbers of African-American junior faculty who persist and
obtain tenure and promotion at their respective PWI research institutions. Research shows students are inspired when they see someone who looks similar and shares similar backgrounds and experiences having achieved the success for which the students are striving (Butler-Purry, 2006; Orey, 2006; Squire, 2015; Stanley, 2006b). If educators are interested in increasing student retention and encouraging students to pursue higher education as a career path, especially African-American students, there should be concern for the retention of faculty that provide inspiration to those students (Orey, 2006; Squire, 2015).

**Implications for Future Studies**

Many researchers have found the stress and anxiety induced during the tenure process has made it difficult for faculty to persist and successfully become a member of the club (Armstrong, 2012; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Stanley, 2006a). The more African-American faculty members perceive their environment as hostile, the more likely it is African-American faculty will leave the academic setting (Armstrong, 2012; Jayakumar et al., 2009). During the review of existing literature, this researcher noted literature focusing on the African-American faculty experience at PWI research institutions is almost non-existent (Hollmann, 2002; Ruffins, 1997). Workplace bullying amongst adults emerged as a research focus in the 1990s but few educational researchers, if any, have paid attention to bullying in their own backyards (Hollmann, 2002; Keashly & Neuman, 2010). In addition, numerous scholars have published works evaluating the tenure process and successful tenure promotion (Danley, 2003; Fairweather, 2002; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Hinton, 2010; Link, Swann & Bozeman, 2008; Williams & Williams, 2006). However, very few research studies have examined the
experiences during the tenure process from the African-American perspective (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Williams & Williams, 2006). Because it is virtually impossible to obtain hard data describing the requirements for faculty promotion and tenure, studies with proper controls comparing promotion and tenure outcomes by race are practically non-existent causing speculation on the reasons for non-success. Reasons for non-success would be an interesting study topic if a universally accepted rubric for tenure achievement could be created and accepted by like institutions.

An additional suggestion for future research pertains to work time allocation. There have been minimal longitudinal studies tracking faculty work/time allocation throughout the tenure process (Green, 2008; Harter, Becker, & Watts, 2004; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000; Misra et al., 2011; Palmer, 2007). As mentioned previously, studies were found that tracked work time allocation for smaller periods of time during which faculty were seeking tenure, but none were found to analyze work time through the initial hiring and completion of the tenure probationary period. Longitudinal studies would provide a better picture of hindrances causing faculty performance to suffer during the pursuit of tenure. A longitudinal study would take time but the benefits from the study could be enlightening for academia, especially for PWI research institutions. It could shed light on whether work and time allocation differences exist between races, genders and disciplines and provide a more succinct measurement by which performance could be judged.

This study asked if African-American faculty are hazed during the tenure process. In doing so, the researcher analyzed whether realistic expectations are placed upon
African-American faculty when critiquing their performance at PWI research institutions. Finally, the study sought to provide the Caucasian majority in faculty and administration an understanding of African-American faculty experiences and tone of the tenure probationary period as perceived by African-American faculty, in the hope of creating a plan to increase African-American faculty retention in the academy. The study presented recommendations that may enlighten senior faculty and administration on the ramifications of having scholarship biases and encourage acceptance of more varied research methodologies and topics.

Chapter Three will provide details regarding the methods to be used to identify subjects for the study, how the study will be conducted and an outline of how the data from the subjects will be analyzed.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019 (2018), Caucasian faculty represented 77.6% of full-time faculty. African-American faculty comprised 6.1% of full-time faculty (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). The number of African-American faculty employed at four-year PWI research institutions was even smaller. At research institutions specifically (doctoral/research, high-activity research, and very-high-activity research), African-American faculty comprised 4.3% of full-time faculty (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016); and all research institutions are not PWIs (a more recent stat was not available). This disparity in diversity historically resulted from a lack of focus on the recruitment of African-American faculty at PWI research institutions (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This lack of recruitment meant Caucasian males represented and still represent most of the faculty at PWI research institutions.

The purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information that can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) identify which factors, such as mentoring, may have contributed to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure.
The research questions were as follows:

RQ1: Was there a statistically significant difference between the time spent on research, teaching, and service by full-time faculty at PWI research institutions based on race?

RQ2: Which factors attributed to the success of existing African-American tenured faculty at PWI research institutions during the tenure and promotion process?

RQ3: What were the most prevalent barriers or obstacles to successfully navigating the tenure process for African-American faculty on the tenure track?

RQ4: What types of situations have African-American faculty at PWI research institutions encountered that other faculty, particularly Caucasian males, did not experience?

The findings of this study provided suggestions for university administration and faculty on how to aid in the retention of a diverse pool of faculty talent. In addition, the study offered suggestions of practices and behaviors in which African-American faculty can engage to increase the likelihood of successful promotion at PWI research institutions.

**Research Design**

This research study was conducted with the goal of increasing African-American faculty retention at PWI research institutions. It was believed that a qualitative methodology would provide results with greater breadth and depth of information (Roberts, 2010). The qualitative findings resulting from the study were equally weighted
and collected concurrently (Roberts, 2010). All the data collected was gathered to determine the following:

1. If there was evidence service is a cause of failure to complete the tenure process;
2. How much time was spent on service work by faculty seeking tenure;
3. How faculty who had achieved tenure allocated time to research, service, and teaching, and finally;
4. Recommendations regarding time allocation and service to promote successful completion of the pursuit of tenure.

In conducting the study, a survey (see Appendix C) using SurveyMonkey was disseminated to faculty at various universities to gain general insight on the tenure-track faculty experience. Faculty at any type of university responded, but the participants included in this study were full-time faculty at PWI research institutions who had already attained tenure or were on the tenure track. Data was requested from faculty regarding faculty rank and status, institutional information, and time allocation among their primary responsibilities while pursuing tenure at PWI research institutions. Obtaining insight from faculty on time spent on responsibilities has implications for this study if faculty, regardless of ethnicity, spend similar amounts of time on teaching, research and service duties. This would imply there are other reasons for African-American non-success in tenure achievement. The survey was distributed to faculty regardless of race or gender to obtain a baseline comparison of experiences. Additionally, the participants were asked to share their experiences during the tenure probationary period at their respective institutions.
Participants selected for the survey (see Appendix C) were all full-time faculty at PWI research institutions. I contacted the Institutional Research Office at one midwestern university and requested a list of email addresses for faculty members. The university declined providing a list but was willing to forward my survey to all full-time faculty at the institution. Other institutions contacted were unwilling to provide faculty information as well but offered to distribute the survey if I paid money to the university to do so. Instead of paying other institutions, I obtained approval from the Institutional Research Board at my institution to include a social media collection strategy. I am a member of several professional groups on Facebook and LinkedIn. I posted requests for participants on both social media platforms. Faculty who receive the survey were asked to forward it to colleagues who are also full-time faculty at PWI research institutions.

Convenience sampling was used to obtain a robust sample of full-time faculty participants. Convenience sampling is defined as utilizing survey participants who are easily obtained (Merriam, 2009). The survey (see Appendix C) consisted of nineteen (19) closed and open-ended questions. The survey responses allowed me to compare variables such as race, demographics, tenure status, and work/time allocation. The information on work/time allocation provided insight on whether faculty, regardless of race/ethnicity, allocated similar amounts of time to teaching, research and service. If faculty, regardless of race, allocated the same amount of time to each aspect of faculty work, this information infers there are other reasons African-American faculty do not successfully achieve tenure at the same rate as their peers. As the survey data was obtained from a larger sample population than the interviews, the data received from the surveys is more reliable and generalizable in comparison. Excluding current rank and
institutional status, all survey questions referred to the immediately preceding semester or quarter. Several survey questions were obtained from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty NSOPF: 99 Questionnaire. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty is conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences, a division of the U.S. Department of Education. The survey was created to provide insight on the persons who create education policy, curriculum, and effect educational outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, National Study of Postsecondary Faculty – Overview, n.d.). I used objective questions that focused on faculty and institution demographics from the NSOPF questionnaire.

A rolling sample was also utilized. In rolling sampling, the recipients were allowed to forward the survey to faculty who they felt met the survey criteria (Merriam, 2009). I lost control of who received the survey, but any faculty members who were not full-time or did not work at a PWI research institution were discarded from the sample.

Once I received at least twenty survey responses, interviews (see Appendix D) were conducted. African-American faculty were specifically targeted to participate in the one-on-one interviews. I interviewed five faculty members from PWI research institutions to gain insight on African-American faculty’s perceptions of their experiences during the tenure probationary period. My original goal was to interview ten faculty members but I did not receive ten affirmative responses to my interview request. The interview protocol contained eight (8) open-ended questions that were posed to participants. The interviews obtained phenomenological data drawing on the experiences and the resulting feelings of tenure-track faculty (Merriam, 2009). The use of phenomenological research served to assist me in more clearly understanding the
experiences and feelings of tenure-track faculty (Scott, 2011). Phenomenology as a means of research allowed me to focus on the lived experiences of the participants (Merriam, 2009). I attempted to depict the essence of the participants’ experiences and assessed any similarities between them. This illuminated any trends that hinder African-American faculty’s successful completion of the pursuit of tenure at PWI research institutions.

Participants were interviewed to obtain more detailed information regarding the feelings experienced by African-American faculty during the pursuit of tenure. The interpretation of those experiences was analyzed through coding to determine the existence of common themes (Merriam, 2009). Interview questions were used to gain a more insightful understanding of feelings experienced during the pursuit of tenure. Interpreting faculty perceptions led to a deeper understanding of the feelings experienced during the pursuit of tenure, which may help break down existing social barriers and constructs within higher education. The faculty interviewed were also asked to complete the initial survey to confirm basic demographic and professional information.

As previously stated, I interviewed five (5) faculty members from various PWI research institutions. The number of female and male faculty respondents was not a factor in the selection criteria. Current tenure status was not a factor affecting whether a faculty member was selected for an interview, but the faculty member had to be full-time and had to be employed at a PWI research institution during their pursuit of tenure.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the survey responses is detailed in Chapter Five. The analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel to compile descriptive statistics shared by faculty
participants. The data was used to compare work time allocated to research, teaching and service by all the faculty included in the sample and to assess any variances in the amount of time spent on any activity by race.

The goal of using qualitative data was to provide deeper insight into all the data collected (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative research asks the question why some phenomenon has occurred (Merriam, 2009). I made comparisons and deduced trends in the data obtained (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative data was collected from structured interviews with a small sample of full-time African-American faculty at PWI research institutions. They were asked questions regarding their experiences during their pursuit of tenure (see Appendix D). The interview responses provided details of faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure and insight on how African-American faculty felt during their experiences. The analysis included looking for common themes/categorical descriptions among African-American faculty experiences. Once saturation of themes (categories) or emergence of regularities presented themselves, the data analysis was considered complete.

Coding, which entails assigning a means of organizing the data, was used to make information, once collected, easily retrievable (Merriam, 2009). The interviews were recorded with the permission of the participants. I used a transcription service for transcribing the interviews. I took notes during the interviews in order to assist me in generating insights about faculty experiences and to begin the deduction of common themes (Merriam, 2009). Open and descriptive coding was used so that I did not make assumptions regarding the meaning of the data being relayed during the interviews (Merriam, 2009). Open coding is being accepting of whatever information and meaning
is divulged during the process (Merriam, 2009). Descriptive coding entails using the participants’ own words to develop the codes that will be used in analyzing the results (Merriam, 2009). Analysis of the responses provided the primary basis for any recommendations I developed to aid in the retention of African-American professors at PWI research institutions. Interviews commenced after approximately 20 survey responses had been received because data saturation was a possibility at that point. Data saturation occurred when the responses begin to be repetitive, not bearing new information or insight (Merriam, 2009).

I pretested the survey and interview tools to ensure they provided the answers to the research questions. For the interview responses, member checks were used to confirm whether information was interpreted correctly (Merriam, 2009). Member checks allowed me to solicit feedback from participants on whether my analyses and assumptions were accurate (Merriam, 2009). Member checks also allowed me to confirm that information provided was interpreted correctly (Merriam, 2009).

**Validity and Reliability**

Proof of reliability and validity of any study using human participants is vital. A reliable study is one in which the research findings can be replicated (Merriam, 2009). Reliability is difficult to interpret in studies on human behavior because humans are inconsistent (Merriam, 2009). Validity refers to the ability of study findings to be applied or extrapolated to other situations (Merriam, 2009). Due to the use of human participants, the first step in verifying either was obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to ensure that no persons were harmed from participation in the study. This process was completed prior to the collection of any data from study participants.
Several survey questions were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Post-Secondary Faculty survey. Because NCES survey responses are self-reported, NCES considers the questions to be accurate and reliable (See Appendix B). Reliability of survey data obtained from faculty was accomplished by the anonymous collection of the data and analysis to look for trends in faculty work/time allocation by race. Data collection for this study was designed to ensure participants would have full anonymity. The surveys were targeted initially, but responses were collected anonymously through Survey Monkey, an online web-based survey tool. When completing the survey, the name of the respondent was not a required answer from participants. Participants were also able to forward the survey to any peers whom they felt would willingly participate. If a participant chose to identify themselves, their identity was protected by assigning each respondent a number which was used during data analysis.

Alternatively, reliability and validity standards for interview-based research demand the study be conducted in an ethical manner (Merriam, 2009). As such, this researcher’s bias must be disclosed. I believe the tenure process for African-American faculty causes feelings in faculty similar to those experienced by new initiates of organizations while being hazed. I also believe African-American faculty endure experiences that are mentally abusive and exhausting and are uncommon to Caucasian faculty.

And finally, if qualitative research is to influence existing knowledge, the study should have been conducted ethically (Merriam, 2009). Interview responses were collected and analyzed simultaneously. This allowed me to consistently measure whether
the interview tool truly met the goals established for the study and make refinements where needed. This action further strengthened the reliability of the study.

Assumptions

My initial assumption was the sample size was representative of the population. I believe the respondents to the survey and the interviews answered truthfully and were forthcoming with insight of their experiences. There was also an assumption the participants were selected appropriately which allowed trends to be identified in the participants’ responses. The expectation was participants willingly wanted to provide insight on the research topic. Additionally, I assumed the instruments chosen for the study were valid and obtained sufficient information to analyze African-American faculty experiences compared to the experiences of faculty of other races at PWI research institutions.

Study Limitations/Delimitations

Research studies have inherent weaknesses due to their narrow scope and the number of the participants of the study. This study was no different. First, the study was limited in the number of participants asked to participate. The survey was sent to a rolling sample of full-time faculty at a Midwestern PWI research institution. Faculty were able to forward the survey to peers, so the number of respondents could not be anticipated. I chose to use a survey tool consisting of Likert Scale responses and open-ended questions. This type of survey was used to increase the likelihood that participants would respond by reducing the amount of time it would take to answer the questions. If respondents did not qualify to participate in the study based on their answers, those
surveys were discarded. The uncertainty in the number of survey respondents also resulted in the lack of generalizability of results to all faculty at PWI research institutions.

The number of faculty selected to be interviewed were an even smaller sub-set of the survey participants. Only ten African-American professors would have been invited to be interviewed to provide insight into their experiences during the pursuit of tenure at PWI research institutions. Unfortunately, only five faculty members met the qualifications to be interviewed. As a result, the small number in the interview sample negates generalizability, but provides data that can be analyzed and categorized for trends in African-American faculty’s feelings during their pursuit of tenure. It should be noted that generalizability is not normally a goal of qualitative studies (Merriam, 2009). An additional limitation of the study was the self-reporting of survey results. This process increased the potential for incomplete responses as well as inaccurate interpretation of the questions being asked. Also, the conditions at the workplace of each individual respondent may have varied enough that it created biases which affected the study responses.

Delimitations of the study included the choice to interview only African-American faculty regarding their experiences at PWI research institutions instead of including all ethnicities. This choice was made to provide insight as to why African-American retention rates are lower than the retention rates of faculty of other ethnicities (The JBHE Foundation, 2007). My goal was to provide information helpful to university leadership in retaining a diverse body of faculty.
CHAPTER 4

Data Collection

Historically, predominantly white research institutions (PWIs) did not focus on the recruitment of African-American faculty (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This lack of recruitment implies Caucasians have historically represented most of the faculty at American colleges and universities. The tenure and promotion processes are long and arduous for all, but the result of a lack of diversity in leadership and administration has aided in minimizing the success for the few African-American faculty that pursue tenure (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Bonner, 2006; Orey, 2006).

Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure.

The findings of this study, hopefully, provided suggestions for university administrative officials and faculty on how to aid in the retention of a diverse pool of faculty talent. In addition, the study offered suggestions of practices and behaviors in which African-American faculty can engage to increase the likelihood of successful promotion at PWI research institutions.
Below are the research questions that were asked during this study:

1) Was there a statistically significant difference between the time spent on research, teaching, and service by full-time faculty at PWI research institutions based on race?

2) Which factors assisted existing African-American tenured faculty at PWI research institutions to persist during the tenure and promotion process?

3) What were the most prevalent barriers or obstacles to successfully navigating the tenure process for African-American faculty on the tenure track?

4) What types of situations had African-American faculty at PWI research institutions faced that other faculty, particularly Caucasian males, did not experience?

**Participants**

Faculty from all university types were allowed to respond to the survey. The survey was distributed to faculty regardless of race or gender to obtain a baseline comparison of experiences. Participants selected for inclusion in the study were all full-time tenured or tenure track faculty at PWI research institutions. I posted requests for participants on social media platforms such as LinkedIn and Facebook through professional organizations of which I am a member. Faculty who received the survey were asked to forward it to colleagues who were also full-time faculty at PWI research institutions.

**Instruments**

Two instruments were used to obtain the data necessary for this study. A survey (see Appendix C) was disseminated to faculty at various universities using
SurveyMonkey to gain general insight on the tenure-track faculty experience. Data was requested from faculty regarding faculty rank and status, institutional information, and time allocation among their primary responsibilities while pursuing tenure at PWI research institutions. Additionally, the participants were asked to share their experiences during the tenure probationary period at their respective institutions.

I contacted the Institutional Research Office at one midwestern university and requested a list of email addresses for faculty members. The university declined providing a list, but was willing to forward my survey to all full-time faculty at the institution. Other institutions contacted were unwilling to provide faculty information as well, but offered to distribute the survey if I paid money to the university to do so. Rather than paying other institutions, I obtained approval from the Institutional Research Board at my institution to include a social media collection strategy. I am a member of several professional groups on Facebook and LinkedIn, so the survey was distributed using those platforms as well.

The survey (see Appendix C) consisted of nineteen (19) closed and open-ended questions. The survey responses allowed me to compare variables such as race, demographics, tenure status, and work/time allocation. The information on work/time allocation was used to analyze whether faculty, regardless of race/ethnicity, allocated similar amounts of time to teaching, research and service. If faculty, regardless of ethnicity, allocated the same amount of time to each aspect of faculty work, this information infers there are other reasons African-American faculty do not successfully achieve tenure at the same rate as their peers. Excluding current rank and institutional status, all survey questions referred to the immediately preceding semester or quarter.
Several of the survey questions were obtained from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty NSOPF: 99 Questionnaire. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty is conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences, a division of the U.S. Department of Education. The survey was created to provide insight on the persons who create education policy, curriculum, and effect educational outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, National Study of Postsecondary Faculty – Overview, n.d.). I used objective questions that focused on faculty and institution demographics from the NSOPF questionnaire.

Convenience sampling was utilized to obtain a robust sample of full-time faculty participants. Convenience sampling is defined as utilizing survey participants who are easily accessible as participants select others with whom they are affiliated (Merriam, 2009). Additionally, the initial recipients were allowed to forward the survey to faculty whom they felt met the survey criteria (Merriam, 2009). I was not privy to the names of individual faculty who received the survey, but any faculty members who were not full-time or did not work at a PWI research institution were discarded from the sample.

Upon receipt of at least twenty survey responses, the conducting of interviews began (see Appendix D). Five faculty members from PWI research institutions were interviewed in order to gain insight on African-American faculty perceptions of their experiences during the tenure probationary period. The original goal was to interview ten faculty members, but only five faculty responded affirmatively to participating in an interview. The interview protocol contained eight (8) open-ended questions that were posed to participants. The interviews obtained phenomenological data that drew upon the experiences and the resulting feelings of tenure-track faculty (Merriam, 2009). The use
of phenomenological research assisted in a clearer understanding of the experiences and feelings of tenure-track faculty (Scott, 2011). Phenomenological story telling allowed a focus on the lived experiences of the participants (Merriam, 2009). I attempted to relay the essence of the participants’ experiences and assessed any similarities between them. This illuminated any trends that hinder African-American faculty’s successful completion of the pursuit of tenure at PWI research institutions.

**Faculty Survey**

The survey was initially sent to all full-time faculty at a PWI research institution in the Midwest on June 5, 2018. The original plan was to distribute the survey to faculty at multiple PWI research institutions in the Midwest, but the targeted institutions were not willing to disperse the survey to their faculty without additional stipulations. Additionally, the survey was made available to faculty online through LinkedIn and Facebook on June 6, 2018 in targeted professional groups. Email invitations to participate in the survey were distributed to faculty at other research PWIs based on individual recommendations from existing faculty. A follow-up invitation was sent to the primary university on July 10, 2018 to capture responses from faculty members who may have been on break as of June 5th. The survey was closed to participants on August 25, 2018 with a total of eighty-five (85) respondents. Certain respondents had to be excluded. Exclusions were made for the following reasons:

1) The respondent was not a full-time instructional faculty member

2) The respondent did not work at a research PWI

3) The respondent worked at an institution outside of the United States

4) The respondent was not tenured and was not on track for tenure
After exclusions, the number of respondents decreased from eighty-five to fifty-five (55). As a result, the independent variables, Caucasian versus non-Caucasian, were utilized due to the small number of African-American survey participants (12). Comparing African-American faculty responses to other ethnic groups did not yield viable results. As shown in Table 1, the majority of the respondents for the faculty survey were Caucasian (65.5%) and tenured professors (80%). The greater proportion of Caucasian faculty respondents provided a basis of comparison to responses given by the African-American faculty during interviews.

Primarily, the survey provided demographic information for the respondents. Of the fifty-five who qualified for inclusion in the study, the demographic breakdown is noted in Table 1.

Table 1 *Demographic Information of Faculty Respondents* (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty by Specific Ethnicity/Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Other Pac. Is.*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 *Demographic Information of Faculty Respondents (N=55) Cont.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Caucasian versus non-Caucasian Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Caucasian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other Pacific Islander

The majority of the survey respondents were tenured faculty at a rate of 80% to 20%. Associate and full professors responded almost equally with a difference of 3 additional participants at the Associate professor rank. By far, Caucasian faculty responded the most to the request for participants at a response rate of 65.5% of respondents being Caucasian. Considering this study focused on African-American faculty experiences, the rate of response by African-American faculty (21.8%/12 respondents) was disappointing.

Additionally, faculty responses from question eighteen (see Appendix C) in the survey provided insight on activities that faculty determined as having aided or hindered the successful completion of the pursuit of tenure. Six of the fifty-five faculty members described a positive experience while pursuing tenure. They felt they were supported and agreed the great mentoring they received was an important factor in their success.

In survey feedback, faculty described the following experiences as obstacles to success (Appendix C – question 21):

- Nine faculty members who stated they received little to no support from their internal department peers or administration and there was a lack of mentoring offered to mitigate this issue.
Seven faculty members described the process for pursuing tenure as a moving target because the requirements or milestones for success were constantly changing or were unwritten with little guidance.

Four faculty members described the pursuit of tenure as painful and/or stressful.

Two faculty members described the process as petty based on treatment from colleagues and two stated colleagues actually attempted to sabotage their accomplishments.

One faculty member described the pursuit of tenure as a hazing process; one felt discriminated against due to varying standards; and one felt the process was demoralizing because his or her department had an abysmal tenure promotion record but no one was concerned with fixing the problems that are present in the system.

There were instances in which one participant provided an example of multiple obstacles that impeded their progress toward earning tenure. As only tenure-track and tenured faculty responses were included, it was not possible to assess whether these hindrances or roadblocks actually caused faculty to be unsuccessful.

The faculty survey was also utilized to determine to what degree faculty agreed upon the importance of teaching, research and service as faculty responsibilities.

Question seventeen (17) of the survey (see Appendix C) asked: “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly disagree/Disagree/Agree/Strongly Agree):
1. Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution? _________________________________

2. Research and publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution? _________________________________

3. At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching? ________________________________

4. Mentoring of faculty is essential to faculty success during the tenure and promotion process? ________________________________

Likert Scale responses were obtained and the frequency of the various responses provided insight into how faculty feel regarding the importance of certain responsibilities (see Table 2).

Table 2 Faculty Beliefs Regarding Faculty Responsibilities by Ethnic Group (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Strongly Ag re</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Faculty Beliefs Regarding Faculty Responsibilities by Ethnic Group (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 27 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 16 (84.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 3 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 2 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 1 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring of faculty is essential to faculty success during the tenure and promotion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 32 (88.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 19 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 2 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Caucasian: 2 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-Caucasian: 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Faculty Interviews

African-American faculty were specifically targeted to participate in the one-on-one interviews. As previously stated, I interviewed five (5) faculty members from various PWI research institutions. The interview participants were selected from those survey respondents who volunteered to participate in the interview. A faculty member was selected for an interview if he or she had attained tenure or had tenure-track status, was a full-time member of faculty, and was employed at a PWI research institution during the pursuit of tenure. Although the number of female and male faculty respondents was not a factor for the selection criteria, I interviewed three female and two male faculty members, all of whom had successfully achieved tenure by the time the interviews were conducted.
Participants were interviewed to obtain more detailed information regarding the feelings experienced by African-American faculty during the pursuit of tenure. I utilized counter-storytelling, a tenant of Critical Race Theory, to elaborate on the experiences of the interview respondents. Those experiences were analyzed through coding to determine the existence of common themes (Merriam, 2009). Once themes were developed, the participant was given the opportunity to review the assigned coding. This was done to have the participant confirm if his experiences were interpreted properly. Interpreting faculty experiences led to a deeper understanding of their feelings during the tenure process, which may help break down existing social barriers and impediments to tenure achievement among African-American faculty within higher education. The interviewees were also asked to complete the initial survey to confirm basic demographic and professional information. Their responses were also included in the survey.

The first interview participant had a very different story to tell than the other four participants. I will call her Dr. Tammy Stark. Dr. Stark felt very encouraged and supported. When she began her tenure journey, peers offered to collaborate with her immediately. When Dr. Stark started at her university, there was a delay by the university in building her lab. Dr. Stark described the frustration that the chair of her department felt because of the delay. As a result, several peers offered her space to work while her lab was being built. She was ultimately invited to apply for tenure and to submit her dossier for full professor; both occurring earlier than the normal timeframe. She never felt that her promotions were an uphill battle. In her words, “She had a very easy time of it”. Her research is focused on lab experiments, so she spends very little time publishing. Her experience was so different than the other participants that she has
been told by others when acts of micro-aggressive behavior take place, but she usually does not notice them.

Research Questions

Research Question One

Research question one (RQ1) states: “Was there a statistically significant difference between the time spent on research, teaching, and service by full-time faculty at PWI research institutions based on race?” The data used to answer this question came from the 85 survey respondents who qualified to be included in the research study. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between Caucasians and non-Caucasians in the number of hours per week spent on teaching, research, and service. Of the 55 respondents who participated, there were 36 Caucasians and 19 non-Caucasians. One of the Caucasians was excluded from this analysis because the total hours spent on research, teaching, and service was above 168 hours (i.e. 7 days per week X 24 hours = 168 hours). MANOVA results indicated that there was not a significant difference between Caucasians and non-Caucasians in regard to the number of hours spent per week on teaching, research, and service (Wilks’Λ=.97, F(3, 50)=.52, p=.668, η²=.03). Since the results of the MANOVA were not significant, post hoc analysis was not performed.

Research Question Two

Research question two (RQ2) states: “Which factors assisted existing African-American tenured faculty at PWI research institutions to persist during the tenure and promotion process?” The most repetitive response regarding bridges to success was the support received from good mentoring relationships. This was stated in responses from
the surveys as well as the interviews. Fifty-one of the fifty-five survey respondents (92.7%) felt that mentoring was important to extremely important to the successful navigation of the tenure process. Mentoring allowed faculty members to be more prepared and to learn from faculty who had successfully navigated the process. Mentors also provided insight on the hidden requirements for tenure achievement and provided examples of review dossiers which assisted junior faculty in being prepared at the time of review.

**Dr. Tammy Stark.** Dr. Tammy Stark advised the chair of her department would schedule time with each junior faculty member to ensure they would all get approved for tenure. He took the time to inquire about the papers faculty were working on and the status of those projects. She learned later that her chair overruled many objections that people had to her tenure approval. He was insistent that Dr. Stark had promise and was on the right track. Dr. Stark was the only interview participant that said peers were willing to collaborate with her on projects when she first arrived at the institution. Peers offered her lab space to work while her lab was being built and it took over a year for the lab to be completed. Her peers and the dean of her school exhibited their belief in interest convergence theory as they appeared to understand the department would benefit through the success of all faculty.

**Dr. Clark Kal-el.** Dr. Clark Kal-el’s experience was drastically different but he did give kudos to his institution because the school provided start-up funding which was money to support his research efforts the first couple of years during his pursuit of tenure. Dr. Kal-el learned quickly to use the funds for human capital and support as opposed to equipment. He paid for graduate assistants and students to help with data analysis. This
helped him expedite his pursuit of tenure. In the process, he also helped graduate students learn how to write literature reviews, how to collect data and how to analyze the data. He developed a machine so to speak to keep his scholarship moving forward. A second way that Dr. Kal-el felt supported happened when he was able to share his experiences with peers; who he defined as those in the same position as he, pursuing tenure at the same time. He and his peers shared notes and frustrations, which helped each person persist. Dr. Kal-el was the editor of his own journal for which his department initially provided funding. He used the journal as a way to help peers publish their work and that built goodwill amongst he and his peers. Both actions, to help peers and students, are examples of interest convergence theory.

**Dr. Bruce Wayne.** It was difficult for Dr. Bruce Wayne to expound on many factors that helped him succeed in his pursuit of tenure. Dr. Wayne’s situation was different from other participants in that he pursued tenure at the PWI where he had obtained his doctorate so the faculty in the department knew him well and generally supported his efforts. His post-doctoral internship was at the institution as well. The university actually pursued him to come teach and research there, and there was a degree of comfort in that for him. He stated he received the rah-rah encouragement which equated to “We’re here for you! Keep pushing.” Many of his colleagues were his former professors, so this was easy for them to do, in his opinion. Dr. Wayne had support from full professors who are African-American and from other departments. They would invite him to meet with them and have discussions. One such discussion was the lack of African-American representation within the administrative ranks in the school of Arts and Sciences. Additionally, they would provide insight and encouragement regarding his
research efforts. They even encouraged him to think about pursuing administration. He is still considering whether that is truly his ultimate goal.

**Dr. Diana Prince.** It was also difficult for Dr. Diana Prince to think of things that helped her persist in her pursuit of tenure. She stated her institution assigned her a mentor from the beginning, but her mentor was mediocre. He was better at giving her department gossip than giving her meaningful suggestions on how to succeed. She went out of her department to find a mentor and had success. In her opinion, networking was vital. She stated that she pursued another mentor, and her persistence is what helped her succeed. She also had what she called a protector. This colleague was tenured and went out of her way to make sure that Dr. Prince was using her time wisely and not overburdening herself. Her institution also offered faculty leaves and money for conducting research. She travelled throughout Europe to conduct research for her book and that was funded by her institution.

**Dr. Stacy Zamora.** Dr. Stacy Zamora, the fifth participant, was unable to provide any feedback on factors that enabled her to persist during her pursuit of tenure. She mentioned an adage that was told to her by her parents and grandparents, “You have to be 10 times as good as the next non-minority white person in order to have the same kind of career.” In all, she credited her success to working harder and being better than everyone else in her department.

**Research Question Three**

Research question three (RQ3) states: “What were the most prevalent barriers or obstacles to successfully navigating the tenure process for African-American faculty on the tenure track?” As a result of the initial survey, the most important barrier to
successful navigation of tenure entailed the lack of mentoring, guidance, and support by senior members of faculty. The dismissive nature of tenure review committees was also a factor as it pertains to ethnic or cultural research, the journal in which an article or research is published and the number of publications in general.

Dr. Clark Kal-el. Dr. Kal-el’s recitation of obstacles or barriers began with a change in the department leadership shortly after being hired. Everything that was negotiated but not in writing in his contract was rescinded with the new dean and provost. He was originally hired to start a new program, which was never launched. Starting a new program in the department would have been a solid achievement to be included in his tenure dossier. That was the beginning of the frustration that he felt. He was promised the funding for his journal and that was eventually rescinded. The new dean also wanted Dr. Kal-el to prove himself again, whereas the dean that hired Dr. Kal-el had told Dr. Kal-el that he had exceeded the expectations for tenure with his existing body of work. Dr. Kal-el stated it felt like he was going through a hazing process because he had to “pay his dues” to navigate the faculty ranks. He had published ten peer-reviewed journal articles within the first year and a half of his employment with the institution, but he learned that one of his colleagues wrote a neutral third year review letter in an attempt to sabotage Dr. Kal-el’s prospects of tenure promotion. Dr. Kal-el then determined he did not know who he could or could not trust because he respected that professor and had wanted to work closely with him. The typical department expectation was to write one to two articles per year and he had written ten.

An additional obstacle to success was colleagues’ disregard of Dr. Kal-el’s research agenda. Because his research focus was different than that of senior faculty, it
was deemed less important. During the tenure review process, faculty are required to obtain letters from internal and external reviewers regarding their tenure dossier. First, Dr. Kal-el’s list of external reviewers was rejected. Some of his research focused on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and, as a result, he wanted external reviewers who were an expert in the topic, so he submitted the name of several scholars at HBCUs and peer institutions. He submitted six names and his Dean said no to the names Dr. Kal-el submitted. Subsequently, Dr. Kal-el submitted names of professors with whom he had prior contact to confirm their willingness to participate in his review. His dean advised that none of the external reviewers responded to the university’s request for feedback. Dr. Kal-el’s work was eventually submitted to non-peer aspirational institutions such as Harvard, the University of Michigan, etc., which, in Dr. Kal-el’s opinion, was biased and unfair. Why would his research be sent to institutions which were of exceptionally higher caliber than his institution? Dr. Kal-el’s dean encouraged him to delay his tenure application and to reach out to other journal editors to obtain advice on publishing in their journals. Dr. Kal-el was disappointed in this suggestion as he felt, as a journal editor himself, he was on the same level and he considered other journal editors his peers. Dr. Kal-el was treated as what he termed an “Associate Professor light”. He was highly compensated and was hired as an Associate Professor, but he did not have tenure, so he did not measure up. His compensation prompted jealousy among his peers. They were aware of his salary because compensation at public institutions is accessible by the public. He was so stressed by all that was happening that he broke out in hives when having a discussion at home with his wife one evening. He published extensively so that he would never have to be in the situation in which he
found himself. Dr. Kal-el stated that he feels black people are held to a higher standard than other faculty. He stated, “When you break the mold, another mold is created to replace the old.”

Finally, Dr. Kal-el felt that administration, too often, equates equity with equality. Equity means that everyone gets similar things, but it’s based on the needs of that person, his unique skillset or what he knows. Everyone cannot be treated the same and does not need to be treated the same. There is a heavier focus on equality so that everyone can say…..well, we gave. He used the metaphor of “everyone assumes an open door means easy entry”. Dr. Kal-el gave the following as an example:

I would say, “I need to order these six books this year,” right? Well, all of a sudden, the next year, there is this book rule where everyone has $300 to buy books, right? Everyone has a little account for that. Well, everybody’s not going to use $300. There are some people who will not buy a book for next year, for the whole year. They (the institution) were so worried about this notion of being equal, rather than this person may need research software and this person may need more books. Let’s make sure we do it. I think that’s also problematic sometimes, and where predominately white institutions can work on. The discussion should not be about here is the standard, fit into the standard. It should be about, yes, we have a standard, but what are the things that you need, and we can help you in meeting that standard.

**Dr. Bruce Wayne.** Dr. Bruce Wayne experienced obstacles as well. He did not have top tier graduate students from his own department with whom to work, so he
worked with graduate students from other departments. Dr. Wayne stated the A list graduate students in his department were usually lured away with significantly greater monies from larger research one institutions such as Michigan, USC, and UCLA. Other minority students who wanted to work in his lab were ruled out due to test scores. He had colleagues who might have as many as four graduate students to help do the work or manipulate data and he, typically, only had one very consistent graduate student. This lack of support caused him to fall behind with his research agenda.

A second obstacle Dr. Wayne experienced was the demand on his time to mentor students of color from departments across campus (not just his own). He was one of a very small number of African-American professors on campus. As a result, students of color depended on him for guidance and advice regardless of their discipline. He could never refuse a student. He did not want to, but that time spent mentoring students detracted from his ability to devote time to his research agenda. Since service was not important at his PWIs, the time away from research was a hindrance to success. Dr. Wayne stated there are all these things that faculty of color are required to do that are ultimately deemed unimportant, but he disagreed. He felt these things were just as, if not more, important because it meant faculty helped students succeed. Dr. Wayne stated that most do not understand the minority experience in academia and when you try to address it or discuss it, you are seen as making excuses.

In addition, Dr. Wayne stated lack of collaboration with colleagues was a hindrance to success. Dr. Wayne’s research focused on minority mental health as the broad umbrella. Then there were a number of mini-umbrellas such as racial identity, experience of racism, the impact of sport on minority girls, and other topics. In his
opinion, his colleagues were either very short-sighted or overtly negligent of the opportunities for collaboration available within all of mental health. His department has a large trauma research focus. In reality, all aspects of trauma affect the African-American community. He has a colleague that focuses on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). According to Dr. Wayne, “No one has ever come up and said, Why don’t we partner up and look at cultural markers and cultural themes in violence, victimization and urban life and factor them with PTSD?” Dr. Wayne stated that his city is 60 percent black. He believes if faculty cannot determine how to incorporate the minority experience into almost every element of the research they are conducting in psychology, that’s an issue. He believes it’s important to the field, but it should also be important to colleagues, but they do not consider those elements important, nor do they factor them into their work when they should. If it was important to his colleagues, they would incorporate his focus into their research and thus collaborate. In fact, Dr. Wayne is often told to add a white comparison group to his research. His response to that:

We have spent the last hundred or so years studying white psychology. Historically, whites have always driven the narrative. I’m trying to capture the essence of the minority experience. The comparison stuff is crazy. This is where minority mental health kills me. We have figured out what happens with white folks. We spend 10 years on that, get that figured out. Then all of a sudden, we say, “Oh, this might be an issue for some other people”. We’re always looked at 10 years after the mainstream shit, whatever it is, whether it’s LGBT or whatever it is. It’s always a five to 10-year lag. I’m like, “You know what? Let’s eliminate the lag. Let’s focus
on this group that’s historically not been looked at exclusively. The system from day one has focused on these populations and not on African-Americans. The minute we try to call attention to us, people get all bent out of shape. I have always had a big joke in my lab and the students make fun of me. They say if you’re straight, white, able-bodied, with resources, we don’t give a fuck. The reality is I strive to give a voice to people who historically have had no voice. My notion of blackness doesn’t have to be linked all the time to its opposition to whiteness. One of the things that’s been liberating about this work though has been the ability to focus on blackness devoid of black as other. The black experience is front and center.”

Finally, the stresses he experienced regularly was a hindrance. Trying to convince colleagues that his research was not disjointed but flowed into one consistent area of focus, minority mental health, took a great toll on his mental and physical health. Dr. Wayne had fifteen publications on what seemed to outsiders to be very different areas. He had received three or four grants in what appeared to others as very different areas of focus. He was also stress because he was told, “It wasn’t just about publishing XX number of articles, it was also about the journals in which the articles were published.” That’s what made the finish line unpredictable in his opinion. His department chair had even recommended that he postpone the tenure track pursuit and transition to a year to year or a three-year contract to give himself more time. He knows had he followed that advice, it would have changed the entire track of his career.
Luckily, he learned early that as faculty, he could not just say, “Give me a number and I’ll hit it or surpass it. The process was squishy and I accepted it as such.”

Dr. Wayne described a situation that happened to an African-American colleague who was treated poorly. The colleague was being badgered by a senior faculty member. A Caucasian female faculty member brought some sort of complaint against her, so she was called into a meeting. The other African-American faculty wanted to be there to support her. The Provost told the African-American faculty they were not allowed to be present. The colleague was re-traumatized during the meeting because the white professor was allowed to exert racial micro-aggressive behavior toward her saying, “If you were from the United States, you would recognize how I tried to communicate.” Dr. Wayne felt it left this individual in the room essentially by herself with no support and probably no one else who cared nor considered that she was in a room of seven people where she was the only person of color.

In the post-Trump election error, Dr. Wayne advised the situation on campus had grown even worse. He sits in his faculty meetings as the only faculty member of color. He explained that he sits in meetings looking around the room and no one looks like him, and they definitely do not think like him. It creates this feeling of isolation and aloneness. He felt invisible more often than not. He stated, “If people realized how angry he was in general, they would be terrified.” To quote him, “I’m always happy-go-lucky. I’m the happy Negro. I laugh and joke and make fun. That’s part of my personality, but the reality is, underneath that is a significant amount of anger about the state of the world and all sorts of things.” Dr. Wayne is frustrated when people say they do not see race, that little metaphor that is said too often in the United States. Some
people say, “I don’t see race”. His response to that was, “Well then, you don’t see me and you’re definitely not going to grasp the fullness of my experiences as a person of color. Broader socio-cultural themes lead into and trickle down to experiences on campus. To think that there’s some wonderful disconnect between what is seen in the broader world facing the races and sexes; and that doesn’t trickle down to campuses; people are deluding themselves.” Dr. Wayne confirmed the classroom is not a safe space. “Faculty teach these racially charged classes because that was and is their area of interest and the subject matter itself has implications for teacher evaluations. A lot of faculty of color teach these classes. White students come in and they get defensive. They give low teacher evaluations and that is interpreted as the faculty member not knowing what he’s doing. It’s an inflammatory class. It’s one that makes people uncomfortable. That’s more a reflection on the student’s experience, not so much the teaching.”

Dr. Wayne even described the alienation felt from family and friends and the sacrificing of safe spaces that caused additional stress. He told the story of a colleague who went home to New Orleans for Christmas. The colleague and his father physically fought each other in the kitchen of his family home. The colleague’s father was a blue-collar worker. The father said, “Oh, you think you’re better than us. You’re one of these boogie niggas now”. The colleague responded, “No dad. I’m just on a different path.” A fist fight ensued. Dr. Wayne concluded there is an extra layer of tension for African-American faculty as they move up the educational ladder. He stated that even black students leave the safe space of home to attend institutions of learning and potentially face the backlash from it.
Dr. Diana Prince. Dr. Diana Prince described the pursuit of tenure as one of the most stressful times in her life! “You have this lingering fear that, realistically, if you don’t achieve tenure, you won’t have a job, you’ll have this Ph.D. for nothing, and you won’t get another job.” In her own words, “Tenure is a soul-sucking, aging process that you wonder, at the end, if it’s all worth it. There were constant tests to prove your worthiness; attempting to prove if you’re smart enough or whether you have the work ethic.” She stated, “Achieving tenure is very uncertain and requirements were malleable.” Dr. Prince felt the tenure process was intentionally ambiguous. She stated, “There is a gray area in tenure requirements and the gray area is where they get you in or out.” She explained that it was vitally important for her, an African-American female, to be successful. Dr. Prince explained, “African-Americans, generally, represent the entire race, especially in times of failure and wrong doing.” If she did not succeed, it could have had a negative effect on future hiring practices of the university. In her own words, “The more black women that don’t get tenure, the less likely black women will be hired, because someone’s going to say….We hired black women. They don’t get tenure.”

Dr. Prince had a joint appointment in two departments. She was faculty in the History Department and in the African-American Studies Department. She stated she did not know what being dual appointed meant until she started the job. It meant that she had to give 100% to both departments, which was a source of the stress. She stated, “You had to attend both departments’ meetings.” There was double the service imposed on her, such as committee work and mentoring. One department only had three faculty members and was growing, so all three faculty had to be at all department meetings. Also, as a black woman, she was requested to be on all diversity/inclusion committees.
and was given an excessive amount of duties. She stated, “As a black woman on campus, I was expected to serve in a number of roles and the amount of service was almost triple that of my colleagues.” She commented on it as tokenism, the expectation of her to represent for minorities. Dr. Prince, having heard of instances where the tenure clock was stopped for other faculty members, requested that her first year would not count toward tenure. She even provided the names of the professors for whom the clock was stopped, all of whom happened to be Caucasian men. Essentially, she was asking for another year to meet her tenure requirements. Her request was denied which seemed to strengthen the permanence of racism in higher education. She was told the Caucasian faculty who had received an extension of their tenure clocks had special circumstances.

For Dr. Prince’s third year review, she was told that she was not producing. She had written and published an article here and there. She had also written a chapter in an edited book, but none of that was good enough. She needed to write and publish a monograph book. She could not write a portion of a text book. She could not write a joint authored book. The book had to be singly authored and with an academic, reputable press. Rutledge was not good enough. It had to be University of ……… Press. So early on, Dr. Prince did not believe that she would obtain tenure. The saying “publish or perish” was repeated over and over to her. She had an immense amount of self-doubt and it weighed on her tremendously, almost to the point that she felt non-productive.

Dr. Prince did not feel supported by colleagues or administration in her efforts to obtain tenure. She consistently faced road blocks. When she asked colleagues if she could review their third-year review dossier, she would be told I do not have a copy, or I did not obtain tenure from this university, or they did not know where it was. No one
would share their dossier with her. She even asked the chair of her department for the requirements of a dossier and she received very generic and overarching instructions, nothing that was detailed enough to help. Finally, a colleague shared it with her and she was able to prepare for her review. Her experience during the pursuit of tenure felt very isolated. She stated she was invisible prior to obtaining tenure. The same professors who would walk by her in the hallway and not speak only began speaking to her once she achieved tenure.

Finally, Dr. Prince stated she has felt she had to do more and work harder to earn the respect of her peers and her students. Dr. Prince mentioned lack of respect students have shown as an obstacle to successful completion of tenure, especially in her disciplines of history and African-American Studies. Dr. Prince believes that ethnic minorities are judged more harshly by students in teacher evaluations. She stated, “Caucasian faculty automatically receive the respect of students from the first day they walk in the classroom.” She stated, “Students have reacted negatively to her initially.” She has taught students who think things were easier for her because she is an African-American female. She has had students who assume she is only going to discuss black history because she’s African-American. They have told her that she talks about race too much. She has been challenged on the concept of racism, having been told, “Of course you think this is racism because black people are supposed to think this is racism, but it’s not racism.” In evaluations, her teaching has been called skewed because she is African-American. She provided the following example from when she has taught on slavery:

I teach a lot on slavery, and so when students say, “That was just the culture of the time,” and I say, “That was the culture of the time.
However, slavery is still wrong,” their expectation is for me to say slavery is wrong because I would have been a slave. I would have been on the wrong end of the spectrum. However, if I was a white male and I said, “Yes that was the culture of the time. However, it’s still wrong,” it may be a little bit more respected because they do not think of him as biased.

Her peers have exhibited disrespect for her discipline and essentially, herself. She had been told that African-American History should not exist as a discipline and that she should focus on American history. As a result, she has been told that her academic focus does not have the same rigor as European History. African-American history is not considered academically rigorous or of the same intellectual level. This is another way that her expertise and scholarship has been disrespected in the past simply because the focus is on a racial minority. She told an interesting story regarding the department Christmas party held her first year on campus. She recounted:

Two black people came into the department at the same time; me, as a black woman, and a black guy. We were pretty much the only ones. At the Christmas party — I had been there all semester — a colleague came up to me and said, “How are you adjusting in the region?” and I said, “I’m doing fine,” and he asked how my husband was doing, because he assumed that the black guy in the department was the actual professor and did not realize, all semester, that I worked there. He thought I was his wife. So, that was interesting, and you know, the black professor, when he realized that they thought we were a couple, instead of two separate black people doing work in the same department as this person, he just laughed.
He thought it was humorous and did not correct them. I had to correct them, and I thought, “At least he had the Ph.D. and the job. I was just a wife who lingered around the university.” He did not realize how offensive that would be to me. For the last four months, I’ve seen this professor and he just assumed I was the wife of another black person. So, that was an interesting scenario of me explaining, “No, I’m an actual professor, too, and not this person’s wife.”

Dr. Stacy Zamora. Dr. Stacy Zamora’s history, for the purposes of this study, provided insight on how subjective and fluid the tenure process can be from one institution to the next. Her story is being told backwards. Dr. Zamora was turned down for tenure at her first tenure-track PWI institution. When she left, she had three tenured appointment offers at other research one institutions and ultimately accepted the one from the university at which she still teaches. Her prior institution was one that desired a certain number of publications for tenure. Her understanding was she needed at least four in refereed journals of sufficient, scholarly standing, plus a book in order to get tenure. She had three articles published and a book that was being published, and also had co-edited two books, an anthology and a scholarly edition, but those were not deemed sufficient as a substitute for one additional refereed article. She requested feedback regarding her tenure review through the Freedom of Information Act. She read in her internal letters the reviewers did not like the shape of her career, although she had national prominence. Prior to tenure review, several white male scholars had told her she had prestigious scholarship and her tenure was certain. At that time the job market was pretty robust. She had a book that was being published by an Ivy League press. She had
Running Head: AN ANALYSIS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN EXPERIENCES

two co-edited volumes that had already been published and reviewed. One of the articles she previously published had won a prize. This is why not making tenure raised a lot of eyebrows. Dr. Zamora had a sinking suspicion that she did not receive tenure because three African-American faculty were up for tenure in a relatively short time. Two of the three did not receive tenure. She believed whether or not they produced similar scholarship was the deciding factor.

As a child, Dr. Zamora had been told by her grandparents and others that a black child has to be 10 times smarter or better than a non-minority white person. She felt that her determination and skill may have actually worked against her in a sense. She felt it would be difficult for people to believe they were making a sound, strong affirmative action hire with her credentials. She stated, “It’s hard to pat yourself on the back and say, “I’m helping this worthy person who’s really pretty good…” when that person is showing that she or he is as good or better than maybe people in the department who are not only at the same level but maybe even a few years ahead. She believed her confidence, how well-spoken she was, and her accomplishments put some people on edge. Additionally, she explained that African-Americans are often presumed incompetent. She even referenced a book by the same title. She stated, “Black women, even more so than men, fail at their attempts for tenure at a greater rate. There is a double-edged sword, though, either be presumed incompetent or be overly competent and watch the haters begin to circle.”

Research Question Four

Research question four (RQ4) states: “What types of situations had African-American faculty at PWI research institutions faced that other faculty, particularly
Caucasian males, did not experience?” Generally, the African-American faculty interviewed agreed that scholarship and research with an ethnic or social justice focus was often dismissed or deemed to be unimportant in the sight of tenure review committees and senior faculty. As previously stated, Dr. Tammy Stark’s experience during the pursuit of tenure was unlike her peers but in the opposite sense. She expressed that tenure was not a stressful process and she had received extensive support from her department chair and peers.

**Dr. Clark Kal-El.** When asked to provide insight on circumstances that stood out in his memory of his tenure process, Dr. Clark Kal-El stated the process was frustrating and stressful from the beginning. He entered his institution and immediately faced broken commitments made by the dean who hired him in contrast to a new dean who was hired. Dr. Kal-el described the situation as a hazing process because he had to continuously prove himself to others. He described how colleagues at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) were not allowed to be external reviewers of his tenure dossier even though the schools he submitted were considered peer institutions. Additionally, he had written and published more than twice the required number of peer-reviewed publications, but his tenure was questioned. The most common reason given was the journals were not scholarly enough; the articles were not published in top tier journals. Dr. Kal-el broke out in hives telling his spouse about the pressure he was feeling from his dean and others. He stated that most tenure review committees are not culturally aware and that causes African-American faculty harm when going through their tenure review. Finally, there was a level of disrespect shown toward him as African-American faculty that Caucasian faculty did not usually experience. Students
would repeatedly not address Dr. Kal-el properly. He constantly had to remind his students to address him as Dr. Kal-el because he had earned that Ph.D.

**Dr. Bruce Wayne.** As previously stated, Dr. Wayne’s experience differed slightly from the other interview participants in that he pursued tenure at the institution at which he obtained his doctorate and conducted post-doctoral research. He was embraced by existing faculty because he had been their student. With that being the case, he still had obstacles he had to overcome as a result of being an African-American member of the faculty. The first obstacle he encountered included being unable to obtain graduate students for his research. His focus was African-American mental health. Most students who are interested in this field of study are African-American and the really smart students are taken by schools with ivy league programs who can offer much more money than his program could offer for fellowships. Other students would not be accepted for research internships because their grades or scores were not considered acceptable by administration. So, when other faculty had at least 10 graduate students applying to assist them, he was lucky if he had one or two that would apply.

Dr. Wayne also mentioned the level of attention that students demanded for guidance and mentoring. Students of color from disciplines all over campus would request that he mentor them because of the lack of African-American faculty from which to choose. He admitted that service took time away from his scholarly efforts, but he could never turn away a student. He did not want to. Since service is not a factor when tenure is reviewed, mentoring and service did more harm than good for him personally.

Dr. Wayne was the only African-American faculty member in his department. He stated that he collaborated more with colleagues in South Africa than he did with
colleagues in his own department. As there is a greater number, by far, of Caucasian faculty at PWIs, having the issue of with whom to collaborate was a much greater problem for African-American faculty than Caucasian faculty. Senior faculty was also very short-sighted and insensitive to ethnic or racial topics for scholarship. No one had ever asked Dr. Wayne to collaborate on cultural markers and cultural themes in violence, victimization and urban life and factor them with PTSD, for example. This is where he could have had great departmental partnerships but no one ever wanted to examine general mental health issues from a minority perspective. He commented:

“This city is 60 percent black. If you can’t figure out how to incorporate the minority experience into about every element of the research you’re doing in psychology, there’s an issue there. I think it’s important to the field but also should be just as important to colleagues, buy they don’t consider those elements important nor factor them into their work when they should.”

Lastly, Dr. Wayne discussed the feeling of isolation that African-American faculty face in academia. He mentioned that he has to hide who he really is at work. He cannot be his true self because he would be looked down upon by senior faculty who is not like him. Essentially, he is forced to code-switch while in the work environment and Caucasians do not have to do that because they are the majority in the workplace at PWI research institutions. He explained, “This is especially difficult in the age of Trump because racial tension is at a peak level since 45 became President. It is unnerving. It is a heavy burden to carry on a daily basis.” Dr. Wayne is convinced that the amount of anger he carries on a day to day basis would cause fear in the workplace due to
overreaction and inaction by peers. It also trickles over into the classroom. Dr. Wayne stated that faculty of color who teach courses that may be considered racially charged receive poor teaching evaluations from Caucasian students who disagree with what’s being taught, or Caucasian students simply refuse to take the course rather than to express an interest in discussing social justice issues. Dr. Wayne explained that there is stress involved when you are worried about whether students will enroll in your course or not. Dr. Wayne expounded on a number of unique situations that affect African-American faculty that do not affect Caucasian faculty.

**Dr. Diana Prince.** Dr. Prince mentioned a number of the same issues addressed by Dr. Wayne. She too mentioned that excessive service expectations due to African-American students who are in need mentoring was a significant burden on her and she did not want to reject a student because of the lack of options on campus. When Dr. Prince requested an extension of her tenure clock by one year and was denied, when she knew of Caucasian males who had been approved for extensions, that was insulting, but the norm. It was insulting because at first, the committee lied and said they had not heard of extensions being granted, but she was able to provide names of others who had requested an extension and were approved. That is when the excuse changed to “those were special circumstances”.

Additionally, Dr. Prince mentioned that any journal with “black” in the name is automatically determined to be a subpar publication and lacking a scholarly orientation. She has faced student misconceptions regarding her courses because her discipline is African-American Studies. Students automatically assume she has a skewed perspective as a result of her background and either refuse to take the course or challenge every word
she said. She was consistently faced with lack of respect from students. One of her students harassed her during the semester. In a paper he submitted, he stated that he could not imagine why slave masters would rape the female slaves because black women are so unattractive. He told Dr. Prince he wanted to study slavery because of his family history as slave owners. He was proud of that history. A Caucasian female professor had to complain about this same student before any action was taken against him. He was eventually dismissed from the university.

Dr. Prince detailed the ultimate in embarrassing moments when a colleague assumed she was the spouse of a new African-American professor instead of assuming that she was a colleague. She had worked at the institution all semester and passed him in the halls, but he could not wrap his head around the fact that she was a peer rather than the spouse of a male professor.

**Dr. Stacy Zamora.** The most interesting obstacle or roadblock disclosed by Dr. Zamora was her feeling that there was a restriction on the number of African-American professors that could be hired in a small period of time. A limitation on the number of African-American faculty who could achieve tenure fosters the whiteness as property theory; the idea that being white is an exclusive club in which African-Americans cannot join and they cannot enjoy the benefits of being white. Dr. Zamora had a strong tenure dossier which included a book published through an Ivy League press, she had two co-edited volumes that had already been published and reviewed, and one of three articles she had published won a prize. Around the time that she was eligible for tenure review, there were two other African-American female faculty members who were being considered. The idea that there could only be one who could be promoted would not
happen to a Caucasian professor. Dr. Zamora also believed that African-American faculty had to be ten times smarter and better at the job than Caucasian faculty in order to obtain the same position. Caucasian faculty perceptions of presumed incompetence of African-American professors also results in little collaborative efforts by senior faculty with junior faculty. If a Caucasian faculty member does not achieve tenure, it is not assumed that all Caucasians will fail to achieve tenure. If an African-American faculty member fails to achieve tenure, that failure could affect future hiring practices.

Dr. Zamora was also faced with micro-aggressive comments from a peer. He said, “Well, you don’t have to worry about getting a job. You’re a black woman”. She looked at him and said, “I don’t have to worry about getting a job because I’m smarter than everyone else”. In a different situation, she overheard colleagues say that black women were taking all the jobs. She walked over to them and remarked it is impossible for one person to take twelve jobs. Additionally, the white female student who claimed that she received a B- for her grade because she was white and Dr. Zamora was black was another example of something Caucasian men do not face. She laughed but politely told the student that B- is what she earned, not what she was given.

Summary

In this study, the researcher attempted to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences
in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure.

The study was essential for many reasons. First, enlightenment on what it takes to be successful at PWI research institutions is necessary to maintain and increase the number of African-American faculty in the academy. As of Fall 2016, African-American faculty comprised approximately five percent (6.1%) of all full-time faculty at four-year institutions, which was a small minority of the faculty population (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). An increase in African-American faculty at PWI research institutions is important because diversity of thought is a byproduct of diverse perspectives. The university is the breeding ground for exploration of knowledge. If the majority of faculty remain Caucasian and male, the opportunity to consider and explore diverse perspectives and points of view diminishes. People from different backgrounds and cultures express diverse perspectives of viewing their environment and the world. This openness of thought and expression is a tenet of academic freedom (American Association of University Professors, n.d.a).

An additional benefit of the results of this study is, hopefully, increased retention of a diverse student body. As the number of African-American students pursuing a college education increases, it is imperative that the number of faculty with whom students can identify increase as well. In the Fall of 2016, African-American students accounted for 13.6% of the student enrollment at all colleges including two-year institutions (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). In 2014, per the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), African-American students
accounted for 14.5% of all students enrolled in post-secondary institutions pursuing post-baccalaureate degrees, so the number of African-American students pursuing post-secondary degrees has decreased. The presence of larger numbers of African-American faculty in academic programs across campuses tends to encourage African-American and minority students to matriculate and succeed in school (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005). For fear of African-American faculty burnout and the failure of successful completion of tenure promotion, there must be an increase in the number of African-American faculty members or the academy will continue to risk losing African-American faculty.

Overall, the data obtained revealed two things upon which most faculty, regardless of race or ethnicity agree. First, faculty believed that successful completion of tenure entails establishing strong mentoring relationships. 88.9% of Caucasian faculty and 100% of non-Caucasian faculty expressed that opinion (see Table 2). Faculty also believed that scholarly research is the most important factor that influences the achievement of tenure promotion at their respective PWI. 75% of Caucasian faculty and 84.2% of non-Caucasian faculty stated they agreed with that statement (see Table 2).

No statistical significance was found in the amount of time spent conducting different aspects of faculty work. There simply was not enough data accumulated in order to determine whether Caucasian faculty spent more time on research, teaching or service, nor was there enough data to determine the same for non-Caucasian faculty.

Important findings were discussed and analyzed in Chapter 5 as a result of data obtained from the interview participants. This data helped identify circumstances that are common to African-American faculty but not commonplace to Caucasian faculty. For future
studies, a larger number of participants should be included in the survey and a longitudinal review of time spent conducting research, service and teaching should be included. This information will either provide support that African-American faculty endure unusual and/or unnecessary treatment during the pursuit of tenure or disprove it.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Generally, the tenure probationary period at a university is a long and arduous one. Historically, predominantly white research institutions (PWIs) did not focus on the recruitment of African-American faculty (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This lack of recruitment means Caucasian males have historically represented most of the faculty at colleges and universities.

Because of the variance in the population of African-American and Caucasian faculty in proportion to the student body, service can begin to demand a high percentage of African-American faculty time at PWI research institutions (Orey, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). This happens because African-American students search for faculty with whom they can identify on campus (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Seeing like individuals in prominent positions on college campuses inspires African-American students to believe they too can succeed in their educational pursuits and reach those professional plateaus (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

The desire for students to connect with someone who can relate to their experiences is a primary reason for African-American faculty burnout as it relates to service responsibilities. Research suggests that if higher education institutions truly want to attract African-American students and retain them through graduation, institutions need to ensure African-American faculty are recruited and are successful (Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). If minimal African-American faculty continue to be recruited to PWI research institutions, the number of African-American faculty who persist and achieve tenure will not increase, especially if existing African-American faculty are
At PWI research institutions, research is heavily weighted in consideration for tenure and promotion, and service carries very little weight (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). Faculty who seek tenure must learn to create an appropriate balance of time and effort in research, service and teaching. If the allocation of time is not balanced properly, service, for example, can consume a large percentage of time but yield minimal rewards for a tenure dossier (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Bonner, 2006; Orey, 2006).

Additionally, faculty from different cultures and ethnicities bring a diversity of thinking to any organization (Patuti & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006). As universities and colleges are learning centers in society, having diversity of thought creates a more well-rounded group of students and allows for an expansion of ideas (Williams & Williams, 2006). Diversity of faculty is critical to the success of higher education (Palmer, 2007).

As previously stated, students typically reach out to faculty with a similar background who can mentor them (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Students who want or need mentors during their educational journey tend to navigate toward faculty with whom they can identify (Adams, 2006; Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). As a result, one could argue the minimal number of African-American faculty on campuses leads to situations in which the few who are employed by PWI research institutions are in greater demand and, as a result, their time is spread very thin. Those students place greater time demands on African-American faculty, which leads to less
time for these faculty to conduct research activities. At a research institution, lack of
time for research places faculty members’ ability to obtain tenure in jeopardy. Student
demands are just one type of service conundrum for faculty. There are also commitments
to campus and local community service and campus committee assignments. Numerous
responsibilities and requests for a portion of a faculty member’s time imply there will be
less time to allocate to research or teaching.

The purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty
experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2)
compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior
that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research
institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as
administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences
in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to
identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-
American faculty who have obtained tenure.

The findings of this study provided suggestions for university administration and
faculty on how to aid in the retention of a diverse pool of faculty talent. In addition, the
study offered suggestions of practices and behaviors in which African-American faculty
can engage to increase the likelihood of successful promotion at PWI research
institutions.
Interpretation of Results

Research Question One

Research question one asked if there was a statistically significant difference between the time spent on research, teaching, and service by full-time faculty at PWI research institutions based on race. Results of a one-way MANOVA were not significant, therefore, one may conclude there is no statistically significant difference between the time Caucasian and non-Caucasian full-time faculty spent on research, teaching, and service. Unfortunately, due to no existing comparative research, this finding cannot be corroborated. Of important note is the small sample size for both groups within the survey. This could have affected the results of the analysis. From this, one may ask what other factors affect the achievement of tenure by African-American faculty. There is a dearth of available research, therefore no comparisons can be made to like research. Accordingly, it is recommended that more research be conducted which compares African-American work-time allocation to their Caucasian peers.

Research Question Two

Research question two asked which factors assisted existing African-American tenured faculty at PWI research institutions to persist during the tenure and promotion process? Researchers have overwhelmingly noted that mentoring from senior faculty, whether inside or outside of their departments or institutions was important to successful completion of tenure (Bonner, 2006; Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Hinton, 2010; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). The majority of both survey and interview respondents corroborated this sentiment. As an example, Dr. Stark’s dean took time with each junior faculty member to review their current
projects and scholarship. The dean did this to ensure junior faculty were making sufficient progress. Although he had to go outside of his department, mentoring was important for Dr. Wayne’s journey as well.

Networking was a second factor that would help faculty persist. African-American faculty are often excluded from the opportunity to collaborate with senior faculty (Miranda, 2006; Ross, 2006). African-American faculty felt the need to reach outside of their own department or school to collaborate with fellow scholars (Adams, 2006; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006). Junior faculty need the support of senior faculty in the form of mentoring, collaborating on research and receiving feedback on their work to succeed (Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Stanley, 2006c; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Thompson, 2008). This collaboration and networking provided support for the success that Dr. Stark and Dr. Prince experienced.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question asked what were the most prevalent barriers or obstacles to successfully navigating the tenure process for African-American faculty on the tenure track? Prior literature suggested that the lack of African-American faculty in academia is a factor associated with failure that African-American faculty experience during the tenure process (Orey, 2006; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). A diverse body of faculty is crucial at any institution (Palmer, 2007). Faculty from different cultures and ethnicities bring a diversity of thought to any organization (Patuti & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006).

The survey results show that senior faculty tend to be dismissive of research that focuses on racial or ethnic issues. Dr. Kal-el’s research was deemed unimportant because
his research focus was different than that of his peers. Additionally, when it came time to suggest external reviewers who were familiar with Dr. Kal-el’s research, all of his choices for external reviewers were denied by his Dean. An increase in African-American senior faculty at PWI research institutions is important because diversity of thought is derived from diverse perspectives.

The university is the breeding ground for the exploration of knowledge. If the majority of faculty remain Caucasian and male, the opportunity for diverse perspectives and points of view is diminished. This dynamic is one reason that African-American junior faculty have long felt the tenure process at PWI research institutions is more difficult for them (Adams, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Ruffins, 1997; Stanley, 2006a). Senior faculty members have steadfast opinions regarding the types of research they consider legitimate and will penalize junior faculty whose research interests that deviate from those norms (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Orelus, 2013; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006).

Dr. Kal-el discussed the intellectually stimulating proposition that administration, all too often, equated equality to equity. According to Dr. Kal-el, “Equality means everyone gets the same thing. Equity focuses on making a level playing field for everyone based on individual circumstances.” This would entail taking a more serious look at the time faculty spend on service responsibilities. Service responsibilities can hinder African-American faculty pursuit of tenure because the time allocated to service carries little importance in the tenure and promotion decision, and therefore, is a hindrance to their success (Miranda, 2006; Misra et al., 2011; Moore, 2001; Williams & Williams, 2006).
Faculty who devote too much time and energy to service often find they have not allocated enough time to teaching and conducting research (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Misra et al., 2011; Palmer, 2007; Price & Cotten, 2006; Stanley, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). For example, Dr. Wayne experienced a high demand on his time to mentor African-American students inside and outside of his own department because African-American faculty members were scarce on campus. Students of color depended on him for guidance and he would not refuse. He asserted that there was an immense pressure on African-American faculty to do things that ultimately had no bearing on their successful achievement of tenure. He stated, “If equity was deemed important, tenure review committees would take those demands into consideration as well. While it may not award tenure, it may be a valid reason for extending the tenure clock. After all, student success is most important; for without students, there would be no need for universities.” Dr. Prince was required to engage in twice the amount of service responsibilities as she had a dual appointment and was employed by two departments. For her, that meant more students, more meetings, more committee work, and more time spent away from research. As a woman, she faced committee work that dealt with African-American and female diversity issues. This, again, is something that should have been factored into her tenure review.

A second consistent obstacle was the lack of mentoring by senior faculty, more often than not, in the same department. Lack of collegiality and mentoring are mentioned most often in literature on African-American faculty (Adams, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Stanley, 2006a; Stanley, 2006c; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Williams & Williams, 2006). All too often, tenure expectations for junior
faculty are not clarified during the hiring process or the expectations are ambiguous at best (Palmer, 2007; Price & Cotten, 2006). Lack of guidance and mentoring from senior faculty regarding responsibilities has caused self-doubt and stress in African-American faculty (Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Green, 2008; Hinton, 2010; Price & Cotten, 2006).

Dr. Wayne had a background in minority mental health issues. Being that his institution was in a city that was 60% black, he was amazed that no senior faculty had ever approached him about collaborating on a comparison of any mental health issues and how they affected the African-American population. Working together would have served a greater purpose while also helping him to enhance his research efforts. In contrast, Dr. Prince was assigned a mentor at the beginning of her tenure process, but that experience provided little to no growth opportunities for her. Her assigned mentor was more interested in gossiping than providing her helpful guidance on her journey. She found her mentors outside of her department and the university. Lastly, the one respondent who was turned down for tenure, Dr. Zamora, had done everything right based on the past requirements for tenure that had been established. In this particular case, it was potential jealousy by peers that caused her to be rejected for tenure. She was immediately offered a tenure appointment at three other institutions, but the rejection was humiliating and unwarranted based on her dossier.

And, finally, the idea that scholarship must be published in a particular type of journal or publication was an obstacle faced by African-American faculty. An academic press was deemed less scholarly most times if it was not a *University of _______ Press*. Any journal with the word “black” included in the title of the journal was deemed subpar,
but those are the types of journals that target articles with an ethnic focus. When reviewing works published, tenure committees determine the prestige of the publication (Bonner, 2006; Griffin, Bennett, & Harris, 2013; Miranda, 2006; Orey, 2006). It is the opinion of tenure review committees whether a publication is deemed prestigious and faculty at four-year institutions are 77.6% Caucasian (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019, 2018). That number is even higher at PWI research institutions. As a result, the disparity of the population of Caucasian to non-Caucasian faculty has a direct effect on successful achievement of tenure by African-American faculty at PWI research institutions.

**Research Question Four**

What types of situations had African-American faculty at PWI research institutions faced that other faculty, particularly Caucasian males, did not experience? Racial microaggressions…. Caucasian faculty have never had to deal with racial microaggressions. Few people at PWIs, including the student body, look like African-American faculty (Ruffins, 1997). Per the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2018-2019 (2018), African-American faculty comprised 6.1% of the full-time instructional faculty at all institutions in the Fall of 2016. At research institutions specifically, African-American faculty comprised 4.33% of tenure-track faculty in the aggregate for all Carnegie classification research-level institution in 2013 (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2016-2017, 2016). African-American faculty have been perceived by Caucasian faculty as affirmative action hires, implying they were hired to meet a racial quota rather than having been recruited for their intelligence and accomplishments (Thompson, 2008). This causes African-American faculty to feel devalued and
disrespected (Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005). It would be difficult to find someone who assumed that a Caucasian person was hired only to meet a quota, even if they are female.

Dr. Zamora, a study participant, was told by a colleague that she did not need to worry about getting the job because she was a black woman. She responded that she would get the job because she was smarter than everyone else, but the statement made by the peer was insulting and inappropriate.

When African-American faculty members are the only person of color in the room or on campus more than ninety percent of the time (Miranda, 2006), they must usually conform to the norms of the majority to be accepted. If African-American junior faculty are not willing to conform, their colleagues do not accept them (Bane, 2006; Bonner, 2006; Payne & Suddler, 2014; Pittman, 2012). African-American faculty are compelled to walk between two cultures, academic and personal, if they do not want to be ostracized by senior faculty (Bane, 2006; Gaskins, 2006; Pittman, 2012; Ross, 2006).

Dr. Wayne provided an interesting example of code-switching. Code-switching is the term referring to the need for African-Americans to forcibly change their mode of behavior, speaking, or appearance to fit in (Bane, 2006; Hinton, 2009; Payne & Suddler, 2014; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006d). Caucasian faculty do not switch between cultures because the Caucasian culture is the norm (Stanley, 2006b; Stanley, 2006d). According to Dr. Wayne, “The post-Trump election world is drastically different than it was prior to the 2016 election. As African-Americans, in general, the stress and anger that manifests as a result of brazen racist activity and comments must be bottled up.” Dr. Wayne explained that he keeps that anger inside because others would fear him if he talked freely about his circumstances. He wears a mask on a daily basis. As he termed it, he
has to be the happy negro all the time. He explained, “There are plenty of things in this world that make African-Americans angry, but they cannot show it for fear of repercussions such as police brutality, job loss, or even being labeled aggressive.”

African-American faculty also feel disregarded and invisible at their institutions (Adams, 2006; Bane, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006; Howard-Baptiste, 2014). African-American faculty members feel like their opinions do not matter and they do not have a voice regarding departmental decisions (Bane, 2006; Butler-Purry, 2006). Dr. Prince has been told that African-American History should not exist as a discipline. It should just be American History. America had hundreds of years to get the teaching of American History right, but the telling of his-story still prevailed. Dr. Wayne has sat in department meetings as the only African-American professor in the room where no one thinks like him. He is always outnumbered and on the losing side of any issue. Dr. Wayne also mentioned feeling frustrated when people tell him that they do not see race. “Being African-American is who I am and if someone doesn’t see race, that tells me that they don’t see me. If they don’t see me, they won’t be able to grasp or attempt to understand my experiences as an African-American faculty member.”

Peers and students have called African-American faculty’s level of expertise into question (Bane, 2006). More specifically, Caucasian males often question the credentials and expertise of African-American faculty in a disrespectful manner in the classroom (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Price & Cotten, 2006). Dr. Wayne advised that the classroom is not a safe space, as Caucasian students come in and get defensive. Both Dr. Prince and Dr. Wayne felt that students judged African-American faculty more harshly on student evaluations. Dr. Prince felt Caucasian
professors were automatically given the proper level of respect from students, but she had to work to prove herself to each class. A student once told her, “Of course you would think this is racist because you’re black”. Students have told her that she talks about race too often, but she teaches African-American History. One of Dr. Prince’s students even harassed her, stating that he could not understand why slave masters raped black women because they are unattractive. He documented that in a paper he had written for her class. He said he wanted to study slavery because his family had been slave owners. Not many people are proud of that history, but he was.

Finally, the success or failure of a Caucasian faculty member is not indicative of the success or failure rate of another Caucasian faculty member in the future. If African-American faculty do not receive tenure, it is a direct reflection upon the likelihood of failure for a future African-American candidate and can even alter future hiring decisions (Miranda, 2006; O’Meara, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Both Dr. Prince and Dr. Zamora carried that burden because it was more prevalent for African-American female faculty.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study has a number of limitations as a result of the small sample size for both survey and interviews. In addition, there was a need for more African-American respondents in the study, in particular. It was not possible to compare the response rate of this study to a similar study as a result of the dearth of available research. As a result of the small number of respondents, the results of this study are not generalizable and further research is necessary to determine causality for failure of African-American
faculty to attain tenure. The ability to replicate the findings and the ability to apply the study results to other samples and populations was also affected.

The small number of respondents for the study may have been due to the timing of the initial distribution of the survey, which occurred in early June after the end of the Spring semester but before the start of summer session. A follow-up message was sent to faculty in mid-July and the survey was distributed through social media repeatedly throughout the months of June, July, and August. Again, eighty-five faculty members responded, but thirty were excluded from the study results for various reasons.

An additional limitation was the use of one institution for the initial distribution of the survey. I had originally planned to distribute the survey to multiple Midwest PWI research institutions. After making initial contact, the other prospective universities would not forward the research request to their faculty members, would not provide a list of full-time faculty members, or the institution wanted to charge a fee in order to obtain access to a list of their full-time faculty.

Finally, the nature of the study topic may have detracted from study participants, as faculty may be hesitant to respond to questions regarding the pursuit of tenure in general.

**Implications and Recommendations**

**For Higher Education Administration**

The findings of this study are intended to provide suggestions for university administrative officials and faculty regarding the retention of a diverse pool of faculty talent. Suggestions regarding practices and behaviors in which African-American faculty can engage to increase the likelihood of successful promotion at PWI research
institutions are offered as a part of this study. Since they have experienced the process, interview respondents were asked what they would change about the tenure process if they in fact had the power. The following are recommendations for faculty peers and administration to aid in the successful achievement of tenure by a diverse body of faculty:

- Tenure review committees and administrators should consider individual circumstances when considering the timeline for completion of tenure requirements. This includes consideration for different life choices such as marriage and motherhood.

- Good mentors are of vital importance to junior faculty to ensure that they have someone to guide them through the process.

- There is a need for senior faculty to have a sensitivity to scholarship that focuses on African-American issues or ethnic studies, especially when the African-American professor is the only one in the department. This does not imply that they should have an all access pass to tenure. It does mean understanding the difference in the research focus and either using more external reviewers or seeking guidance on criteria to judge that type of scholarship. The research is not less prestigious, just different.

- Administration and tenure review committees know that not all publishing venues are created equal, but they need to realize that a publishing venue that focuses on ethnic or African-American studies can be just as, if not more, credible than University Presses.

- Scholarship that expands knowledge of a topic/subject/discipline should be more important than simply requiring faculty publish a book. If articles are published
to accomplish this goal, is a book necessary? How about a blog that is followed by major contributors to the field and utilized as a resource for other academics? What is the real purpose of publishing and scholarly research?

- When selecting external reviewers, select reviewers at institutions of similar caliber (i.e. an extreme example would be sending a tenure dossier for a community college professor to a research university professor).

- Administration and tenure committees need to see the reality of the African-American faculty experience; more is expected of African-American faculty, and Caucasian faculty are provided courtesies that are not usually afforded to African-American faculty, such as tenure clock extensions.

- African-American faculty teach more of the racially sensitive classes; and it, therefore, affects their student reviews.

- African-American faculty are often requested to do more service-related work than their Caucasian peers. Keep in mind that all people should be able to speak to issues of diversity and fair treatment.

- Administrators and tenure review committees need to consider why teaching has been relegated to a status of being inferior to research and publishing when the purpose of the university is to impart knowledge.

**For Future Research**

In the future, a longitudinal study which includes African-American and non-African-American faculty and obtains feedback on work time allocation during the pursuit of tenure would provide more sound data to analyze. As mentioned previously, studies were found that tracked work time allocations for smaller periods of time during
which faculty were seeking tenure, but none were found to analyze work time through the initial hiring and completion of the tenure probationary period. Longitudinal studies would provide a better picture of hindrances causing faculty performance to suffer during the pursuit of tenure. A longitudinal study would take time but the benefits from the study could be enlightening for academia, especially for PWI research institutions. It could shed light on whether work and time allocation differences exist between races, genders and disciplines and provide a more succinct measurement by which performance could be judged.

For future studies, a larger number of participants should be included in the survey and a longitudinal review of time spent conducting research, service and teaching should be included. This information will either provide support that African-American faculty endure unusual and/or unnecessary treatment during the pursuit of tenure or disprove it. Very few research studies have examined the experiences during the tenure process from the African-American perspective (Danley, 2003; Fries-Britt & Turner Kelly, 2005; Hinton, 2010; Williams & Williams, 2006).

Because it is virtually impossible to obtain hard data describing the requirements for faculty promotion and tenure, studies with proper controls comparing promotion and tenure outcomes by race are practically non-existent causing speculation on the reasons for non-success. Reasons for non-success would be an interesting study topic if a universally accepted rubric for tenure achievement could be created and accepted by like institutions.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to 1) document African-American faculty experiences during their tenure probationary period at PWI research institutions; 2) compare faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure by race; 3) identify behavior that can detract from and contribute to success in promotion and tenure at PWI research institutions (information can be utilized for the benefit of all faculty as well as administration); 4) evaluate whether African-American faculty perceive any differences in their experiences when compared to the experiences of Caucasian faculty; and 5) to identify which factors, such as mentoring, may contribute to the success of African-American faculty who have obtained tenure.

This study utilized six of the seven tenets of Critical Race Theory (CRT), as it has been applied to higher education, in order to provide insight and perspective on African-American faculty experiences. The six tenets are:

- the permanence of racism;
- experiential knowledge (counter-storytelling);
- interest convergence theory;
- whiteness as property;
- critique of liberalism; and
- commitment to social justice (Critical Race Theory, 2015).

Throughout the discussion of the African-American interview respondents’ answers, I hoped each of the tenets of CRT aided in understanding their experiences from their perspective. Evidence of institutional racism was presented in each story told by the participants. This study sought to show the administration and faculty of PWI research
institutions that the institutions will benefit in the long run from the increased retention of a diverse faculty because this should cause a an increasingly diverse student body and will promote discussions that broaden everyone’s perspective and knowledge. Tenure was always built upon the idea of whiteness as property as a result of the history of higher education in the United States being established for white males (Geiger, 2016). The faculty respondents were critical of liberalism because they were confronted with circumstances on a regular basis that benefitted Caucasian men and admitted not seeing changes to the status quo. The results of this study, it is hoped, will ignite a fire under those in power in administration and senior faculty to move faster in expanding their perspectives on all facets of scholarship. The respondents consistently gave examples that alluded to the permanence of racism and whiteness as property. It was rare that the respondents’ narratives provided examples interest convergence theory.

This study asked if African-American faculty are hazed during the tenure process. In doing so, the researcher sought to analyze whether realistic expectations were placed upon African-American faculty when critiquing their performance at PWI research institutions. In statistical terms, I was unable to prove whether African-Americans face a greater level of service responsibilities and whether that may have an effect on the successful completion of tenure. The study did, however, provide insight on how much stress African-American faculty endure relative to activity that does not affect Caucasian faculty. The African-American faculty in this study do have to deal with racial micro-aggressive behavior from peers and students. This behavior does not affect their Caucasian peers. One could compare the feelings revealed by respondents such as stress, physical and mental anxiety, fear, having to prove oneself over and over again and the
trials of paying your dues, figuratively, to the feelings experienced by persons seeking membership in an exclusive organization. In this case, the exclusive organization is being a tenured faculty member at a PWI research institution.

Finally, the study sought to provide the Caucasian majority in faculty and administration an understanding of African-American faculty experiences and tone of the tenure probationary period as perceived by African-American faculty, in the hope of creating a plan to increase African-American faculty retention in the academy. The study presented recommendations that can, if open to it, enlighten senior faculty and administration on the ramifications of having scholarship biases and encourage acceptance of more varied research methodologies and topics.
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### APPENDIX A

#### Racial Microaggressions in Every Day Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Microaggression</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alien in own land: When Asian Americans and Latino Americans are assumed to be foreign-born</td>
<td>“Where are you from?”&lt;br&gt;“Where were you born?”&lt;br&gt;“You speak good English.”&lt;br&gt;A person asking an Asian American to teach them words in their native language</td>
<td>You are not American.&lt;br&gt;You are a foreigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascription of intelligence: Assigning intelligence to a person of color on the basis of their race</td>
<td>“You are a credit to your race.”&lt;br&gt;“You are so articulate.”&lt;br&gt;Asking an Asian person to help with a math or science problem</td>
<td>People of color are generally not as intelligent as Whites. It is unusual for someone of your race to be intelligent. All Asians are intelligent and good in math/sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color blindness: Statements that indicate that a White person does not want to acknowledge race</td>
<td>“When I look at you, I don’t see color.”&lt;br&gt;“America is a melting pot.”&lt;br&gt;“There is only one race, the human race.”</td>
<td>Denying a person of color’s racial/ethnic experience&lt;br&gt;Assimilate/acculturate to the dominant culture.&lt;br&gt;Denying the individual as a racial/cultural being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality/assumption of criminal status: A person of color is presumed to be dangerous, criminal, or deviant on the basis of their race</td>
<td>A White man or woman clutching their purse or checking their wallet as a Black or Latino approaches or passes&lt;br&gt;A store owner following a customer of color around the store&lt;br&gt;A White person waits to ride the next elevator when a person of color is on it</td>
<td>You are a criminal.&lt;br&gt;You are going to steal&lt;br&gt;You are poor&lt;br&gt;You do not belong&lt;br&gt;You are dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of individual racism: A statement made when Whites deny their racial biases</td>
<td>“I’m not racist. I have several Black friends.”&lt;br&gt;“As a woman, I know what you go through as a racial minority.”</td>
<td>I am immune to racism because I have friends of color.&lt;br&gt;Your racial oppression is no different than my gender oppression. I can’t be a racist I’m like you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth of meritocracy: Statements which assert that race does not play a role in life successes</td>
<td>“I believe the most qualified person should get the job.”&lt;br&gt;“Everyone can succeed in this society, if they work hard enough.”</td>
<td>People of color are given extra unfair benefits because of their race.&lt;br&gt;People of color are lazy and/or incompetent and need to work harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathologizing cultural values/communication styles: The notion that the values and communication styles of the dominant/White culture are ideal</td>
<td>Asking a Black person: “Why do you have to be so loud/animated? Just calm down.”&lt;br&gt;To an Asian or Latino person: “Why are you so quiet? We want to know what you think. Be more verbal.” “Speak up more.”</td>
<td>Assimilate to dominant culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permission obtained from Dr. Derald Wing Sue, Ph.D. by email on May 25, 2015.
APPENDIX B

Katrina,

Thank you for your e-mail. IPEDS data is self-reported data and is generally accepted as being accurate. There isn’t much detail I can provide with regard to how that data is tested, though you could follow-up with Sam Sarbett at NCES who may be able to give you more information. You can reach Sam at Samuel.Barbett@ed.gov or at 202-245-7749.

Let us know if you have other questions at 1-866-558-0658 or via e-mail at IPEDStools@rti.org.

Thank you,

Mike Williams
IPEDS help desk
1-866-558-0658
IPEDStools@rti.org

Katrina M. Hubbard
Business Systems Consultant
Sales and Service Conduct Oversight

Wells Fargo Community Banking Compliance & Risk
1 N Jefferson Ave 9th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63103
MAC H0004-099
Tel (314) 242-3929
Katrina.Hubbard2@wellsfargo.com
APPENDIX C

Survey Questions

Excluding current rank and institutional status, all survey questions refer to the immediately preceding semester or quarter. Several survey questions were obtained from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty NSOPF: 99 Questionnaire. The questions included:

1. What is your current faculty rank?
   a. _____ Assistant Professor
   b. _____ Associate Professor
   c. _____ Full Professor
   d. _____ Other: ___________________________________

2. In what year did you receive this rank? ______

3. What is your tenure status?
   a. _____ Tenured
   b. _____ Tenure-track
   c. _____ Non-tenure-track

4. What is the current Carnegie classification of your institution?
   a. _____ Research Doctoral: Humanities/social sciences-dominant
   b. _____ Research Doctoral: Comprehensive programs, no medical/veterinary school
   c. _____ Research Doctoral: Comprehensive programs, with medical/veterinary school
   d. _____ Research Doctoral: STEM-dominant
e. _____ Research Doctoral: Professional-dominant
f. _____ Research Doctoral - Other

g. _____ Post-Baccalaureate – Other
h. _____ Post-Baccalaureate – Comprehensive Programs
i. _____ Post-Baccalaureate – Single Program
j. _____ Other: ____________________________

5. If unsure of your institutions Carnegie classification (and you are willing to do so), please provide the name of your institution so classification can be confirmed.

6. Is your institution a predominantly white institution [PWI – defined as an institution of higher learning at which Caucasians account for 50% or more of the student enrollment (Brown & Dancy, 2010)]?
   a. _____ Yes
   b. _____ No

7. Are you a full-time faculty member?
   a. _____ Yes
   b. _____ No

8. What was your principle activity during the prior term?
   a. _____ Teaching
   b. _____ Research
   c. _____ Service
   d. _____ Administration
   e. _____ Sabbatical
   f. _____ Other: _________________
9. During the prior term, did you have instructional duties?
   a. _____ Yes
   b. _____ No

10. If yes, how many credit hours did you teach? __________

11. How many classes/sections did you teach? __________

12. During the prior term, approximately how many hours per week did you spend on
    the following activities?

**Research/Grant Related**

a. Scholarly Publishing/Writing ______

b. Grant Writing/Proposal Activities ______

**Teaching Related**

c. Conference Attendance/Preparation ______

d. Teaching Graduate Students ______

e. Teaching Undergraduate Students ______

f. Class Preparation ______

g. Student Advising/Office Hours ______

h. Professional Development ______

**Service Related**

i. University Committee Meetings ______

j. Service to the Community ______

k. Mentoring ______

l. Administration ______

m. Other: ______________________________________
13. In your prior term, on how many undergraduate/graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive, or oral exam committees did you serve? _______

14. In your prior term, on how many undergraduate/graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive, or oral exam committees did you chair? _______

15. During the next three years, which action is more likely?
   a. Accept a part time job at a different postsecondary institution? _____
   b. Accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution? _____
   c. Accept a part time job not at a postsecondary institution? _____
   d. Accept a full-time job not at a postsecondary institution? _____

16. What is your race?
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native _______
   b. Asian _______
   c. Black/African-American _______
   d. Caucasian _______
   e. Hispanic _______
   f. Native Hawaiian or another Pacific Islander _______

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly disagree/Disagree/Agree/Strongly Agree):
   a. Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution? _________________________________
   b. Research and publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at this institution? _________________________________
c. At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching?

_________________

d. Mentoring of faculty is essential to faculty success during the tenure and promotion process? ____________________________

18. Please share a story or experience from your tenure process.

19. If willing to be an interview participant in this study, please provide your contact information (Name, email address and phone number).
APPENDIX D

Interview Protocol

(Open-ended responses please)

1. How long have you been a tenure-track and/or tenured professor at your institution?

2. Provide your general recollection of what you experienced or are experiencing during your pursuit of tenure. What feelings were present or developed during those experiences?

3. Describe the system of support you received from peers and administration at your institution.

4. What were the highlights of the pursuit of tenure for you?

5. What were the disappointing moments, if any?

6. What would you change about the process of pursuing tenure if you had the power to change it?

7. Have you ever experienced a situation that you feel equates to racialized oppression? Please provide details of the experience(s).

8. Please share a story about your experience(s) seeking tenure that stands out to you.
APPENDIX E

Office of Research Administration

One University Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
Telephone: 314-516-5899
Fax: 314-516-6759
E-mail: ora@umsl.edu

DATE: May 17, 2018
TO: Katrina Hubbard
FROM: University of Missouri-St. Louis IRB
PROJECT TITLE: [1227219-1] An Analysis of African-American Faculty Experiences During the Tenure Process
REFERENCE #: 
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: May 17, 2018
REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # 2

The chairperson of the University of Missouri-St. Louis IRB has APPROVED the above mentioned protocol for research involving human subjects and determined that the project qualifies for exemption from full committee review under Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46.101b. The time period for this approval expires one year from the date listed above. You must notify the University of Missouri-St. Louis IRB in advance of any proposed major changes in your approved protocol, e.g., addition of research sites or research instruments.

You must file an annual report with the committee. This report must indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects to date from start of project, or since last annual report, whichever is more recent.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator must retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and they must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the UM-St. Louis human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

If you have any questions, please contact Carl Bassi at 314-516-6029 or bassi@umsl.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.
Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
An Analysis of African-American Faculty Experiences During the Tenure Process

Participant ___________________________ HSC Approval Number 1227219-1 & 1227219-2
Principal Investigator Katrina M. Hubbard PI’s Phone Number (314) 283-6107

1. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Katrina M. Hubbard and Dr. Shawn Woodhouse. The purpose of this research is to analyze African-American faculty experiences during the pursuit of tenure at predominantly white research institutions.

2. a) Your participation will involve
   - Surveys – participants will be asked to complete a confidential and objective seventeen (17) question survey that asks faculty status, rank, institutional information, their definition of teaching, research and service, and time allocation questions. The survey also asks faculty to share an experience that occurred during the pursuit of tenure.
   - Interviews – participants will be asked open-ended questions aimed at gathering more in depth phenomenological data.

   Up to one hundred and fifty (150) faculty member response will be accepted for the survey. The only requirement for survey inclusion is that the faculty member is employed at a research level post-secondary institution. Less than 10 African-American faculty members will be asked to participate as an interviewee.

   b) The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. No remuneration will be provided to survey participants. For the interviews, the amount of time involved in your participation will be approximately two (2) hours which includes any necessary follow-up the Investigator may request. As an interviewee, you will receive a $25 gift card for your time. You will be asked to complete the interview process in its entirety to be eligible for compensation.

3. There are no anticipated risks associated with this research as survey participants will respond through Survey Monkey and will only be identifiable, with your permission, by the Investigator. Risk to interview participants will be minimized by using pseudonyms/coding in place of participant names.

4. There are no direct benefits for you participating in this study. However, your participation will contribute to knowledge of African-American faculty perspectives and may help faculty and administration at predominantly white research institutions retain a more diverse body of faculty members.
5. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.

6. By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

7. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, Katrina M. Hubbard (314) 283-6107 or the Faculty Advisor, Dr. Shawn Woodhouse (314) 516-5889. You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration, at (314) 516-5897.

I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I consent to my participation in the research described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant’s Printed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Investigator or Designee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Investigator/Designee Printed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Dear UMSL Faculty Member:

This is an invitation to participate in a research study conducted by an UMSL graduate student. You are under no obligation to do so. An explanation of the purpose of the research follows.

UMSL has no direct or indirect interest in this study. The researcher conducting the study is solely responsible for the collection, analysis, protection, dissemination, and retention of the responses supplied.

Questions should be directed to the researcher.

--------

Good day,

My name is Katrina Hubbard and I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. My area of emphasis is Higher Education Administration. Thank you in advance for choosing to be a participant in my research study. The survey is faculty focused and should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete depending on the length of your open-ended responses. If at any time you are no longer interested in participating in the survey, you can withdraw from participation. If you believe that this is an important research study and would like to forward this survey to faculty peers at other research universities, please feel free to do so. Compensation for participation is the gratification of knowing that you have assisted one more student in her pursuit of academic excellence! I look forward to sharing the knowledge gained as a result of your participation. While this survey is meant to be a confidential opportunity to share your thoughts, if you have questions, I can be reached by email at hubbardkm@umsl.edu.

Katrina M. Hubbard, Doctoral Candidate
College of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis
hubbardkm@umsl.edu

Survey Link

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MHKV86D