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ABSTRACT

The present exploratory study was a qualitative effort to examine the variables influencing career choice and success of ethnic and racial minority faculty at a major research university. Nineteen faculty representing various ethnic and racial minority groups and academic disciplines were interviewed in-depth using specific probes generated from a four part model of career variables posited to lead to career success: societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual dimensions (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). The model was employed to formulate a semi-structured interview protocol to determine the types of variables evident during each professional's career history. Two theories were applied to the data to help us understand the variables influencing minority faculty's career choice and success. Attribution theory was used to investigate how the faculty perceived their career choice and success based on their attributions. Acculturation theory was then utilized to further explain the ethnic minority faculty's success in academia.

The findings revealed a constellation of variables that had an impact on the majority of these faculty when selecting academia as a career and pursuing success in the role. Faculty tended to attribute their career choice to external influences such as advisors and sponsorships, and success to their individual drive and competence along with early role models and financial supports. A bicultural stance and integrated ethnic identity was found in the faculty who were able to move through the academic ranks to obtain tenure. These faculty were adept at "code switching", using a different set of values and cultural orientation to respond to the university culture which predominantly reflects traditional societal values and norms.

In conclusion, attribution theory and acculturation theory have provided insight into the career choice and success of minority faculty. The common experiences voiced by the scholars in the study were recommended to be considered in future recruiting efforts and policy development regarding inequities in the work and educational arenas. The benefits of becoming
more sensitive to the multifaceted nature of culture and cultural differences and the demands of
the university culture are discussed further.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The recruitment and retention of ethnic and racial minority faculty is a pervasive concern in higher education today. The under representation of minorities among the faculty ranks continues to challenge researchers and policy analysts (Boice, 1992; Bourguignon et al, 1987; Exum, 1983; Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991; Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991; Miller, 1991; Olsen, 1990; Russell, 1991; Wilson, 1989). Women, who comprise 50 percent of the American population make up 27 percent of the faculty ranks, and minorities, who currently comprise 21 percent of the American population, only hold 11 percent of the professorial positions across the nation (Russell, 1991). Studies have documented that fewer women and minorities enter and are subsequently promoted within tenure track positions compared to white males (Menges and Exum, 1983; Russell, 1991; Gilley, 1991). Although a crucial shortage of faculty from various minority sectors of American society is evident, and there appears to be general agreement found within the literature that the problem exists (Gilley, 1991; Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988; Rosser, 1990; Wilson, 1982), virtually no literature explores the experiences of ethnic minority groups at various stages of faculty careers.

The limited involvement of women and minorities on higher education faculties has been studied in a complementary fashion. The literature available, however, offers a more extensive demographic and theoretical base to draw conclusions on the problems faced by women, than for minorities (Johnsrud and Wunsch, 1991; Marshall, 1985; Moore and Sagaria, 1991; Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). Although many researchers compare the plight of women and minorities in academia, only recently have factors influencing the chronic shortage of minorities pursuing and establishing a successful career as a faculty member been considered as separate issues from those encountered by women (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988; Miller, 1991; Olsen, 1990). Minorities face a monumental task of strategically positioning themselves within academe in order to advance through the ranks, a situation that has improved slightly for women.
The purpose of this study is to explore the variables affecting the successful entrance and retention of minorities into academia. The study incorporates a four tiered framework including societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual components that may influence entry and continuation in an organizational hierarchy (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). Although the model was generated in an attempt to explain why women are found within the lower ranks of organizations and experience obstacles in attaining positions of power, there are similarities in challenges confronted by both under-represented groups. Several variables such as socioeconomic status (SES), class, and family structure that have been shown to mediate the entry of women into administrative positions within organizations can be explored for minorities. Additionally, the scope of the framework allows for variables not previously considered and/or relevant to the study of women in organizations to be added to the model.

Two theoretical designs are used as a means by which to understand the data. First, attribution theory is one of the guiding conceptual underpinnings used to analyze how individual perceptions about behavior may differ among groups. The theory allows for specific examination of individual attributions for success and failure, and how those attributions may influence the decisions and/or coping strategies selected by various academic professionals, that may in turn channel their particular responses to the climate of the organization or department in which they work. Previous research in this area has demonstrated differences in attributions for success and failure between men and women (Kelley and Michela, 1980; Wittig, 1985). Applications specific to various cultural subsections of society have been limited (Uchino, 1987). The theory holds promise in furthering the understanding of the differences in career pursuits chosen by women and minorities based on their attributions for their successes and may be the critical factor in explaining the career decisions chosen. Secondly, attribution theory is considered along with the more encompassing cross-cultural theory of acculturation (Berry, 1980; Berry, et al, 1989). Acculturation relates to the introduction of and interaction with a new culture, the emphasis being on the potential for compromising one's previously held beliefs and values in order to function in
the new culture. Acculturation theory is used to examine how minority faculty explain their success or failure within the faculty ranks relative to the societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual factors that effect career patterns within organizations. Reactions to the barriers and supports encountered along the faculty career route and within a tenure track position are described to identify the perceptions of minority faculty experience in academe and their subsequent acculturation to the profession. Attribution theory is considered as an explanation to the professionals' career choice and general career success. Acculturation theory offers a broader lens to explore levels of career success based on the degree to which each faculty has adjusted and accepted the culture of the academic community and the culture of the dominant population.

**Historical Background of the Problem**

During the Civil Rights legislation of the 60's and 70's, an effort was demonstrated by Congress to ameliorate discrimination in the federal employment arena based on sex, race, religion and national origin under Executive Order 11246 (Brejcha, 1985; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Johnson and Hutchinson, 1990). Affirmative action compliance was subsumed under this order with the duties of enforcement relegated to the Department of Labor that placed hiring requirements on contractors seeking federal bids. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a companion piece of legislation passed a year prior to Executive Order 11246 (Wilson, 1989), requires equal employment opportunity for persons regardless of race, color, sex, or national origin in public and private institutions, state and local governments. Educational facilities became targets for implementing affirmative action mandates in order to raise the low percentages of minorities and women within the academic ranks. Despite the legal acknowledgment that a discrepancy in hiring practices exists, biases based on race and gender continue to permeate American society resulting in amendments passed in 1988 under the auspices of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, to remedy the situation (20 U.S.C. 1687,88) and the amendments to Title VII passed in 1991 that reversed seven supreme court decisions dealing with employment
discrimination cases previously biased in favor of the employer (Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1991).

Studies documenting the experiences of ethnic and racial minorities in accessing positions within the professoriate and successfully pursuing and completing the tenure and promotion process are scarce in the literature. However, the onset of affirmative action remedies brought the issue of hiring ethnic minorities to the forefront of administrative attention and prompted the examination of the plight of under-represented groups in post-secondary institutions (Menges and Exum, 1983; Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991; Smith and Sneed, 1989; Wilson, 1989). Studies to examine the impact of the legal mandates in hiring demonstrated insignificant gains in expanding the pool of available ethnic minority candidates (Bowen and Shuster, 1986; Smith and Sneed, 1989).

**Advancement Opportunities in Higher Education Institutions**

One factor that contributes to the minimal gains made in increasing the minority faculty population in institutions of higher education is the governance structure within the university system. Organizationally, decisions to hire and promote rests in the hands of tenured faculty within individual schools and departments. As discussed by Harvey (1991), "In most cases, faculty establish criteria for admission to the institution, determine curricula of the institution, and decide who should be hired or fired"(p. 119). A bureaucratic hierarchy where clear lines of authority are delineated from the president level to the clerical staff does not exist within the faculty ranks of colleges and universities. The closer a higher education organization resembles a traditional research university, the stronger the faculty's role in decision-making. Thus, faculty members are the decisionmakers regarding hiring and promoting within the university governance structure. Due to the power of academic departments, hiring decisions are often the responsibility of a select group of senior tenured faculty who have tended to be white males. Deans are promoted from the ranks of the faculty and usually have the veto power within colleges and departments. Although the flatness of the system suggests that collegiality connotes equal power among
faculty, the structure tends to mask the actual process in which decisions are made by a chosen few.

Traditionally, power in organizations is defined as:

(...) an influence by one person over others, stemming from a position in an organization, from an interpersonal relationship, or from an individual characteristic (...) power develops over time and grows out of an accumulation of resources during a person's career (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989, p. 51-52).

Senior faculty are in the most advantageous position for accessing resources and exercising influence. Studies of organizations have targeted the male networking system as a system closed to women and minorities entering those organizations (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). As described by Menges and Exum (1983):

Institutions that have shaped academic culture are relatively homogeneous by class, race, ethnicity, and gender. The values they emphasize, such as achievement and autonomy, are those congenial to a white, male, middle-class orientation. Many women and minority academics come from subcultures that have values, expectations, behaviors, and interaction styles different from those of the academic culture (p. 136).

The entry and promotion process within the higher education institution has been controlled by senior white male academics. Women and minorities continue to be clustered in the lower academic ranks and staff positions and tend to leave the institution more frequently than men (Menges and Exum, 1983).

Guidelines for promotion that are followed in more bureaucratic organizations typically possess clear and uniform rules of practice. In academe, the tenure track is a loosely-coupled system of power in which norms and traditions mold hiring and promotion practices. Rules are flexible and depend on the attitudes and values promoted by the particular department or school. Exum et al (1984) describes this normative system: “In the academic market, custom and precedence are important factors in hiring, promotion and transfer of faculty (...)”
universities, merit—traditionally defined in terms of scholarly achievement— is given the greatest emphasis in hiring and promotion decisions (p. 303). Merit, however, is not always clearly defined or objectively measured.

In recruitment, selection, and promotion decisions, the academic market is characterized by a reliance on precedence and custom, absence of clear and universally agreed upon formal standards, use of ambiguous criteria, and closed, confidential decision-making. This means that information is limited for all (Exum et al., 1984, p. 305).

Often, women and minorities are not made privy to the ambiguous and subjective requirements of the research and scholarship expectations and find the process confusing and demoralizing (Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991).

The strong emphasis placed on research by the majority of the professoriate as opposed to teaching and community service in university settings is not always shared by women and ethnic minorities (Olsen, 1990). The devaluing of the teaching and service aspects of the faculty role handicaps women and minority candidates seeking positions because they are not evaluated on the balance of their previous work experiences. The result is that even when affirmative action mandates require the consideration of women and minority applicants both in the recruitment and retention phases of their academic career, the criteria emphasizing journal publications instead of previous teaching and/or community activities may lessen their chances for hiring and promotion. The federal requirements call for a justification of applicant choice which has resulted in departments taking a defensive posture and in turn, relying even more stringently on traditional, quantifiable criteria such as the number of refereed journal articles accepted, to support the selection of a white male recruit over a woman or a minority (Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991). The paper requirements are satisfied but the flexibility in the hiring and promotion process is stifled.
The Situation of Women and Ethnic Minorities in the Professoriate

The effort to fit in with the white male majority may not be an easy journey for women and minorities as they move along an obstacle laden course (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Miller, 1991). Information and resources may not be as readily accessible to women and minorities due in part to the fact that they do not belong to the majority group. This may be a reciprocal dilemma whereby the resources are difficult to access and in turn, the limited access results in fewer minorities being adequately represented.

Critics of the federal anti-discrimination initiatives mention the lowering of standards to fulfill affirmative action mandates as a defense against changing hiring practices within the academy to accommodate non-traditional applicants such as women and minorities (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Harvey, 1991; Menges and Exum, 1983; Miller, 1991). Menges and Exum (1983) found that minority faculty remain in the minority within departments where the belief is held by tenured faculty that the standards were lowered to allow for increased numbers of women and minority candidates to fill positions that they may not have been qualified for. Women and minority faculty continue to pursue recognition for their competencies and qualifications to prove their worth.

Delineating the procedures for gaining tenure are critical for women and other under-represented groups on the margin of the university decision-making core. The criteria are ambiguous at best. Exum, et al. (1984) proposes that the "good old boy networks" continue to flourish due to the peculiarities of the academic market. Exum, et al, (1984) posited that minority faculty must exert additional amounts of effort to access and succeed in the tenure game due to the illusion of lowering the standards as the method for allowing minority faculty to enter the higher education field. Other studies investigating the experience of minorities in academia have described this same situation (Boice, 1992; Miller, 1991). Boice (1992) indicates in his interviews with faculty that minorities new to the professoriate tend to believe that they are viewed as second class citizens who had to work harder than other colleagues to prove their worth and do so without
complaining. Miller (1991) points out that "It also may be true that the one-minority-per-department syndrome exists because of the view that too many minority faculty or staff may lower the department's academic reputation" (p. 29). In the survey of minority faculty, success was attributed to hard work in almost half of the cases (Miller, 1991). Minorities may perceive a need to exhibit more effort to overcome the opinions of their white faculty peers concerning the lowering of standards to increase the numbers of minority recruits entering academia. Demonstrating competence to be accepted within the academic ranks as equals may be an ongoing challenge for minorities trying to cope with differential standards.

Research conducted on the discrimination experienced by minority faculty has resembled the results of the disadvantages faced by women in other employment areas (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Exum, 1983; Exum, et al, 1984; Miller, 1991). Racism, like sexism, is evident in higher education although its manifestations are covert. Examples of such illusive barriers experienced by women and minorities are tokenism, typecasting, and denial of equitable access to the upper ranks of academe (Bourguignon, et al, 1987; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Harvey, 1991). White males occupy the administrative ranks where decisions are made. Changes to the system of hiring and promotion within academe will continue to be slow unless studies employ theoretical frameworks that clarify the complexities that limit the numbers of under-represented minorities entering and succeeding higher education.

A Four Tiered Model of Variables Effecting Career Patterns within Organizations

During the past decade, studies concerning the limited numbers of ethnic and racial minority faculty, have focused on the laws and policies necessary to alleviate inequalities evidenced in the workplace between men and women, minorities and non-minorities. Affirmative action policies have acted as a catalyst to address the preponderance of white males in positions of power, across a variety of public and private sector domains including post-secondary institutions. An examination of the factors that influence the careers of minorities who have successfully entered the world of academe is long over due. Legal remediation to address the
small numbers of minorities selecting the field of the professoriate has not resulted in changes. Therefore, this study will examine the career histories of minority faculty using an analytical framework as a structural method of organizing the multifaceted components of career selection, recruitment and retention within the professoriate. The framework is used as an initial guide to developing a more grounded theory of career success for minority faculty.

Although Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) focus on the development of a leadership profile for women, they provide a model explaining women's acquisition and maintenance of power that can be applied to minority faculty. Consideration of potential factors influencing how women are viewed within an organization begins at the societal level. They argue that social norms and customs, role stereotyping and appropriate practices of socialization are external causalities for gender differences that act as a screen to consideration of individual job qualifications and skills. Organizationally, resources are reflected in the type of position power attained and the amount of control an employee possesses over organizational assets. At the interpersonal level, resources tend to relate to development of functional peer networks, mentor relationships, supervisory settings that promote individual autonomy, and supportive subordinate relations. Individuals, then bring to the workplace a compilation of potential resources that include skills, traits, and other valued characteristics. Ragins and Sundstrom postulate that the larger systems such as societal and organizational tiers have a greater influence on career progress than the individual and interpersonal factors. This point is further developed in Chapter 2.

When attempting to analyze each frame in regard to women, Ragins and Sundstrom consider social roles as the most persuasive of the four because the societal frame encompasses the organizational, interpersonal and individual levels. Organizational methods of selection and promotion are usually the second most significant influence on successful career progression. Interpersonally, relationships among professionals and individual resources can be seen as more or less powerful in accessing resources depending on the position held in the workplace. As emphasized by Ragins and Sundstrom, the lenses used here to clarify gender differences in
power acquisition are embedded systems, that is, the reciprocal influence among levels, is often
difficult to discern. The influence of the various levels may change depending on where the
employee falls in the career ladder.

The model holds value for examining minority faculty entering the university setting. A
process by which minority groups pursue academic careers can be charted based on the
analytical frame presented here. The framework can then be applied to a higher education setting
by assigning different experiences to the four categories. For example, previous evidence of the
societal constraints placed on hiring under-represented minorities into tenure track positions has
been documented (Menges and Exum, 1983; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Harvey, 1991;
Wilson, 1982; Wilson and Justiz, 1988). Affirmative action directives were a primary outcome of
the recognition of pervasive racial segregation and discrimination in employment. Similar attitudes
inhibited the progress of minorities within the professoriate. Laws instigated a change at the
societal level to, in turn, open the doors to a faculty career path previously off limits to minorities.

At the organizational level, the selection and promotion process that has been charged
with subtle biases in maintaining the status quo of the dominant white male faculty (Exum, et al.,
1984) may fit this particular tier. Within the interpersonal frame, sponsorship and mentoring have
been recently suggested in the literature as potential supports for assuring success of minority
recruits (Olsen, 1990). Individual characteristics such as effort and drive (Miller, 1991) and types
of degrees held, influence how the applicant perceives success and is viewed by others in the
institution. Thus, applying this model to the experiences of minorities may reveal an interactive
structure that explains the multitude of factors that seem to both enhance and inhibit their career
progress in the academic domain.

A similar framework was adopted to investigate the barriers to tenure experienced by
probationary and recently tenured faculty at a research university (Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991).
The four tiers included in the design encompassed organizational, professional/ interpersonal,
professional/ individual, and personal categories. Societal issues, that may play a primary role in
dictating the socialization processes, cultural attitudes, and attributions for success adhered to by ethnic minority groups were not included in the design. This examination of barriers to tenure omitted a thorough delineation of the specific variables impinging upon tenure accomplishments for minority groups due to the limited numbers of ethnic minority faculty. By aggregating the responses of the seven minority groups represented and comparing white versus non-white responses, the study found that significant differences by ethnicity could be extracted from the data that included four factors drawn from the four categories: tenure pressure, role preparation, autonomy, and quality of life. Examining these particular factors and relating them to societal considerations and attribution styles that may be culture bound will further our understanding of the minority experience.

In a follow up study, Johnsrud and Sadao (1992) interviewed sixteen ethnic minority faculty drawn, for the most part, from tenured faculty representing eight different ethnic groups. Preliminary results indicated that these faculty, although sharing some of the same concerns as other faculty with regard to cost of living, lack of adequate administrative support, and lack of collegiality as barriers to succeeding in the tenure and promotion process, described experiences that differed from other faculty. Four themes were highlighted in the findings: 1) the need for ethnic minority faculty to cultivate a bicultural stance; 2) the ethnocentrism they perceive on the part of white administrators and faculty; 3) their sense of obligation to serve their communities, students and families; and finally, 4) the discriminatory behavior they experience as minorities (Johnsrud and Sadao, 1992). Biculturalism as a social construct that represents flexible social adaptation may be a key variable that occurs in the acculturation process undertaken by these faculty and is worth further investigation. Acculturation theory as a bi-directional process has been described by Berry (1980) and Berry, et al (1989). The authors describe the duality of the construct as maintaining one's own culture while interfacing with a host culture. This interaction constitutes the basis of acculturation theory. Nagata (1994) explains the bidirectional process of acculturation and ethnic identity as opposed to a unidirectional model. "The linear model views
ethnic identity along a continuum with strong ethnic ties at one end and strong maintenance of the mainstream host culture identity at the other. The bicultural or bidirectional model suggests that individuals can simultaneously retain ethnic identity and involvement in both the traditional and host culture* (p. 111). The different experiences of faculty in contact with the host culture and the maintenance aspects of acculturation may directly influence a minority faculty member's success within the professional ranks, going beyond their initial attributions for career choice and success.

Statement of Importance

Efforts to recruit and retain under-represented minorities in academia are at a critical juncture in terms of future strategic planning efforts. National statistics have predicted that a significant attrition rate of tenured faculty will occur during the 1990s and beyond (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Schuster, 1990). Full professors are retiring from the academy, and there may be limited numbers of new, qualified candidates to fill those vacated positions. The changing student demographics that reflect an increase in the number of non-whites entering colleges and universities will call for a more ethnically diverse faculty population to provide appropriate role models and expand the curriculum to include more relevant coursework. Information concerning under-represented faculties' particular career paths may provide a broader picture of the barriers encountered and the successes achieved by minority faculty in predominantly white institutions.

There has been an ongoing debate concerning equal opportunity for minorities in academia as an outcome of the effects of implementing affirmative action mandates. Pay equity and balanced workload, among other pertinent employee issues, have been considered only recently as variables that may differ based on gender and/or ethnicity. Limited research has explored various dimensions regarding inequities in the recruitment, hiring and promotion process. Most recently, however, Russell (1991), provided data extracted from the 1988 National Survey of Post-Secondary Faculty. The study revealed that minority faculty averaged about the same salary levels as non-minorities. Time spent teaching versus research activities and
productivity as measured by the number of journal publications did not differ between minorities and non-minorities. Olsen (1990) found that the value placed on teaching versus research was higher for minority faculty members than for non-minorities, even though the percentage of time teaching was not significantly greater. This research suggests that there may be identifiable differences in why ethnic minorities pursue the academic career route such as the desire to teach and share knowledge as opposed to increasing scholarship. How minority faculty cope with the internal issues such as racial discrimination, tokenism and typecasting (Menges and Exum, 1983; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Johnson and Hutchinson, 1990; Miller, 1991) as well as ethnocentrism (Johnsrud and Sadao, 1993) has not been clearly delineated in the studies to date.

The multitude of factors that may enhance or inhibit minorities pursuing academic careers has not been thoroughly examined in the research. Studies that explore ethnic differences in acquiring and maintaining positions of professional power in academia are scarce. Attaining the level of full professor, comparable to upper level management positions in other organizations, is not often mentioned in the literature describing higher education organizations (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988). Furthermore, the organizational characteristics particular to a university setting and the specific interpersonal experiences of professors have not been specifically targeted as potential variables that may negatively impact women and minorities seeking tenure and promotion.

With few exceptions, (Boice, 1992; Finkelstein, 1984; Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991; Miller, 1991; Reynolds, 1992) there are virtually no studies that incorporate a theoretical approach to isolating some of the variables impacting success in higher education. The overwhelming lack of research in this vein supports the need to document the variables that affect under-represented minorities' entrance and pursuit of tenure and promotion, and to create a model that furthers our understanding of the process engaged in by minorities pursuing faculty careers.
Within academe. This study will examine the perceptions of minority faculty experiences employed at a major public research university.

This study addresses the following broad research questions:

What are the societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual factors that influence the experience of ethnic and racial minority faculty as they prepare for entrance into and advancement within the faculty ranks?

To what extent do attribution and acculturation theories help us to understand ethnic and racial minority faculty's career choice and success?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following chapter examines some of the prevailing societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual issues that begin to explain a link to the continued absence of ethnic and racial minority representation within the faculty ranks. Explanation of the problems particular to the university scene are explored in depth. A thorough review of the research that undergirds this study is presented.

changing demographics in American society and education

The composition of America's people is changing rapidly to reflect a more multi-ethnic populace.

(...) nearly half of public school enrollments will be minority children by the year 2025, not only in large cities or southwestern border states, but also across the nation (...) Despite this escalation in public school minority enrollments, a growing pool of minority high school graduates, and, rising minority enrollments at the college level, overall minority participation in higher education is on the decline (Gilley, 1991, p. 17).

At present, the changing demographic composition of American society, has not been reflected in institutions of higher education (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988). Most ethnic and racial minority groups represented within the U.S. population do not pursue higher education opportunities. The majority of African Americans, Hispanics and American Indians are found attending two year colleges where access has been promoted (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988). Very few attempt to enroll in four year colleges and universities and when they do, the attrition rates far outweigh the retention outcomes.

In 1986, while blacks comprised 9.2 percent of undergraduates, they accounted for only 5 percent of graduate and first professional degree students. Hispanics comprised 5.3 percent of undergraduates, but only approximately 3 percent of graduate and first
professional enrollments. American Indians represented 0.8 percent of undergraduate enrollments, but 0.4 percent of graduate and professional students (Green, 1990, p. 55). Asian Americans do participate in post-secondary education but their distribution is not even across the disciplines (Green, 1990). Russell (1991) noted that Asian American professors were found within the science disciplines at a significantly higher percentage as compared to the arts and humanities. For example, there were 15 percent Asian American faculty in engineering and only 2 percent in humanities. They are also found in higher numbers within doctoral universities (10 percent) than in public two year colleges (2 percent). These figures parallel statistics regarding Asian American students.

Asian Americans have been found to congregate in fields such as engineering and mathematics due to their academic achievement level in these particular subject areas (Toupin and Son, 1991). A study conducted by Toupin and Son (1991) provides an examination of the "model minority" stereotype. Asian American college students tended to major more often in the science and mathematics areas than matched pairs of non-minorities. However, the G.P.A. averages of those students were not any different from the other white students in the same majors. The authors raised the issue of culture conflict that haunts many Asian American students who describe experiences where they feel caught between two cultures and experience problems when attempting to acclimate to the university life style. Even though these students appear to offer an example of achievement and superb study skills that surpass other students, the stresses associated with adjusting to the influence of family values and expectations on major and career choice as well as socializing effectively within a university setting are evident and tend to undermine the "model minority" concept. The same may hold true for Asian Americans that go on to pursue faculty careers.

As the student population increases in diversity, higher education institutions attempt to increase the diversity in their faculty and staff. Although there is criticism as to the genuineness of the efforts, the pool of ethnic minority candidates seems to be shrinking.
The problem worsens at the graduate level, where colleges and universities must look for new faculty members. Between 1976 and 1985, the total number of African Americans earning master's degrees declined by 32 percent. At the doctoral level the total dropped by 5 percent overall, including a 27 percent drop among African American men. Hispanic and Native Americans showed slight gains in the number of graduate diplomas earned during the same period, but their share of advanced degrees remains low: about 2 percent for Hispanics and only 0.4 percent for Native Americans. Over the past fifteen years, African Americans have earned only 4 percent of total doctorates conferred; they compose only 2 percent of college and university faculty. The number of minority faculty will drop further with the advent of massive faculty retirements expected by the turn of the century (Giley, 1991, p. 20).

The figures reported here are alarming when considering the numbers of ethnic and racial minority groups represented in today's U.S. population. The demographics provide the baseline data, but the research efforts to examine the issue are disconnected and non-cumulative in nature.

None of the minority groups represented in the U.S. are adequately represented in the ranks of the faculty (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988). In 1985, distributions of full-time faculty resembled the percentages reported in 1977. Whites continue to dominate the market currently and comprise 89.7 percent of the faculty population. The ethnic breakdown then drops to Blacks at 4.2 percent, Asian/Pacific Islanders at 4.1 percent, Hispanics at 1.7 percent and American Indians at 0.4 percent (Green, 1990, p. 82). In 1989, 86 percent of the candidates receiving doctorates were white and of those, 63.5 percent were male, 36.5 percent female. Minority groups as an aggregate increased to 12 percent of the Ph.D. holders and were divided into the following breakdowns: Asian, 5.1 percent; Black, 3.8 percent; Hispanic, 2.7 percent; American Indian, 0.4 percent; Other, 1.8 percent (National Research Council, 1991). The recent increases in minority undergraduates entering higher education institutions revealed a 10 percent increase
in minority student enrollment between 1988 and 1990 (Evangelau, 1992) that may have an eventual effect of enlarging the applicant pool.

Arguments justifying the continued monopoly of white males in traditionally white male dominated professions point to the lack of qualified applicants available to recruit from underrepresented populations (Smith and Sneed, 1989). The issue of supply has been targeted frequently as the primary cause of low numbers of women and ethnic minorities available to be hired into academic positions. When investigating the matter more closely, it appears that the pool of candidates actually available is not reflected proportionately in tenure track positions. As Rosser (1991) highlights, "Not only does the pipeline have leakage, it appears also to have substantial institutional blockage. (...) The pipeline metaphor does not reflect the statistical evidence that even when a 'reasonable' pool exists, hiring does not keep pace at most institutions" (p. 229). Russell (1991) found that in fact, women and minorities, continue to be under-represented in the university professoriate. The statistics are especially bleak within the higher ranks at elite colleges and universities for both women and ethnic minorities, although the situation for minority faculty is very unclear due to minimal data collection, the tendency to generalize from Black and Hispanic experiences to all under-represented minority groups (Menges and Exum, 1983), and the combining of the investigation of ethnic and racial minorities with the examination of women's issues (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988).

The numbers of minorities involved in higher education careers may continue to plummet without a better understanding of the barriers and supports that in turn block and foster the success of minorities currently moving through the academic professional ranks. Reiteration of the statistics will not further the explanation for the continuing trend of small numbers of minorities in academia. Generalizing the situation experienced by female faculty to minority groups without considering other possibilities specific to race and SES may tend to minimize the importance of particular aspects of cultural mechanisms such as values, traits, attitudes, and behaviors that may differ by ethnic and racial background or cultural affiliation. Legal ramifications may provide an
Review of the Legislative Mandates for Affirmative Action

Affirmative action was conceived during the renaissance of civil rights activities during the volatile 60's and 70's. The concept was linked to U.S. historical landmarks. The fight for racial equality was first evident in the politics of the nation when the Emancipation Proclamation was put forth by Abraham Lincoln in 1863 as a result of the Civil War conflict and the release of the slaves (Wilson, 1989). The 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments were created as an outgrowth of this monumental piece of legislation and the dawning of racial equality was written into the history books as an indelible right for all citizens. However, segregation remained the rule and not the exception due to the court designation of separate but equal status for Blacks in America. Wilson (1989) remarks that a second rejuvenation of the civil rights initiative occurred in the 1940's, prior to the revolutionary period of the 60's and 70's when discrimination in hiring practices was acknowledged in two separate cases. Blatant resistance to including Blacks on white dominated campuses and in defense plants stimulating increased production for the eminent World War II was reported. Ramifications of the situations included two separate solutions: salary coverage for the hiring of Black professors was offered to all white faculty colleges by a scholarship fund, and for the latter case, an executive order was decreed that disallowed discrimination relating to race, color, creed, or national origin in industries receiving federal contracts. These precedents set the stage for affirmative action to remain under the purview of the courts due to the executive order nature of the requirements (Lesslow-Hurley, 1989).

Twenty years later, President Kennedy initiated an executive order in which the term 'affirmative action' was born. President Johnson expanded the ruling in 1965 which became known as Executive Order 11246 forbidding agencies that sought contracts with the federal government to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin (Johnson and Hutchison, 1990, Wilson, 1989). Sex was added to the list several years later. Even though race
was considered a predecessor to sex in the elimination of discrimination in the federal employment arena, the barriers continue to plague the upward progression of both under-represented groups in a somewhat mutual fashion (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988).

The impact of the federal initiatives has moved into yet another period of active investigation in the decade of the 90's. Some progress has been evident in the numbers of minority students entering colleges and universities as compared to twenty years ago, but the figures do not reflect the changing demographics observed in the nation today. The birthrate of the Hispanic and Black populations far exceeds that of Whites (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988). Women and minorities continue to be over-represented in the lower ranks within various employment sectors (Menges and Exum, 1983). This fact is glaringly evident within the professorial ranks, and is particularly significant at the top levels of administration and senior faculty.

Even at those institutions where there is an announced commitment to the equitable representation of women among faculty, administrators, and professional staff, there are persistent problems in overcoming societal, attitudinal, and structural barriers to genuine affirmative action. Affirmative action for women as for minorities, requires far more than neutral (or "equal" employment opportunity) hiring and retention practices. It means identifying and addressing the factors which continue to exclude women and to inhibit their advancement (Taylor, 1989, p. 29).

Limited changes have occurred in hiring practices after two decades of implementing affirmative action sanctions. The affirmative action imperative influenced the manifestation of tokenism and consideration of implementing minority quota systems to surface in the halls of academe (Menges and Exum, 1983; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Harvey, 1991). Non-minorities credited affirmative action mandates for the hiring of minorities and downplayed the qualifications possessed by the applicants (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Miller, 1991). In an interview study conducted by Bourguignon, et al (1987), minority and women faculty evidenced the
isolating dilemma of tokenism when entering traditionally white, male dominated fields. The outcome resembled an outward statistical compliance with the affirmative action imperative but resulted in fostering attitudes among the existing personnel that the new recruits were selected based on the legal requirement only. "In the abstract, American academicians favor affirmative action; at the level of concrete application, they tend to see unfair advantages for minorities and women when considering the consequences of affirmative action" (Smith and Sneed, 1989, p. 14). One explanation may be the observed tendency to comply with the regulations but not practice the "spirit of the law" (Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991, Sullivan and Nowlin, 1991).

**Barriers to Hiring, Tenure and Promotion**

The recruitment and retention initiatives follow an academic tradition that evaluates new applicants based on traditionally valued competencies such as number of journal publications and devalues experience in community projects, minority research, and teaching endeavors (Bourguignon, et al, 1987; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991; Lessow-Hurley, 1989; Menges and Exum, 1983). The faculty hold the power in initiating substantive changes in the process that will result in the increase in the currently limited hiring pool. As stated by Sullivan and Nowlin (1990), "Unlike any other single profession, recruitment and selection are the domain of the faculty, and the process is so decentralized that there are as many recruitment and screening policies as there are faculty search committees" (p. 47). This loosely-coupled governance system presents the new recruit with different expectations for accomplishing promotion depending on the department and the orientations of the senior faculty.

The mechanics of tenure and promotion are as complex as recruitment. Information concerning the process is often ambiguous and obtuse. Formal feedback loops about progress of employees are inconsistent. Expectations for completing the necessary requirements to advance through the tenure process are obscure. Exum et al (1984) comments that "the small numbers of women and minority tenured faculty in elite research universities is a clear indication that not many overcome the obstacles in this final evaluation. (...) They must be strongly confident
about their work and abilities, as well as visibly productive, if they are to survive” (p. 313-314). The tenure process is akin to a maze of hidden mysteries that lie ahead of junior faculty to be uncovered and solved as they make their way through unmapped territory. The lack of appropriate mentors to assist these new recruits is one of the problems (Olsen, 1990). The issue is more acute for women and minorities because they tend to fall outside the inner network of established faculty communication lines, where informal exchange of information concerning the “tenure game” occurs (Exum et al, 1984; Menges and Exum, 1983). With the lack of appropriate support systems available to women and minority faculty, the odds for acquiring tenure seem to be stacked against them.

The ambiguity of the tenure process is further complicated by the professed reliance on meritocracy as the standard for achieving prestige in university circles. Merit is based on traditional research topics and approaches valued by the majority. Research focused on women and minorities has not been considered part of the established norms. "The devaluing of 'brown on brown' research stems from values undergirding institutions of higher education, which reflect culturally monolithic systems. These systems judge the quality of scholarship from the normative perspective of their own cultural group" (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988, p. 308). Therefore, merit based on academic standards set by the dominant faculty may discredit minority research conducted by minority scholars, but allow white researchers to investigate the issues incorporating traditional theoretical models. Merit is judged by others in the disciplinary community and is usually focused on refereed journal publications whose editors and referees are predominantly white males (Moore and Sagaria, 1991). "According to the dominant view, to be a scholar is to be a researcher--and publication is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured" (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). The narrow definition of acceptable scholarship confines itself to research and publication that is dictated by the institution's traditional norms for merit and its senior members.
Other activities such as community involvement and teaching recognition are devalued in academic circles. These job roles are reflective of one's worth in the local context (Menges et al., 1984). However, merit is defined by senior faculty members as advancement within the disciplinary field and not by the teaching and community service aspects of the profession (Menges and Exum, 1983). "Promotion and tenure reviews are likely to emphasize merit over worth since meritocracies are characterized more by rigor and uniformity than by flexibility. Affirmative action programs typically emphasize worth and that may explain much of the opposition to them" (Menges and Exum, p. 137).

Affirmative action encourages the recognition of teaching and service as acceptable job qualifications for the professoriate and the tradition of universities has been to place more importance on research accomplishments. Women and minorities are then at a disadvantage when required to demonstrate merit (Exum et al., 1984). Olsen (1990) found that white male faculty members spend more of their work time involved in research endeavors than women and specifically minority faculty. Additionally, the research activities of these groups tends to focus on race and gender topics. The emphasis on teaching and service as well as the non-traditional research orientations creates an ambiguous fit for women and minority faculty (Bourguignon, et al., 1987; Exum, et al., 1984; Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991). Additionally, other obstacles have been noted concerning the circuitous route to achieving tenure status. Women and minorities have limited access to information concerning the tenure process (Exum et al., 1984; Johnsrud and Atwater, 1991). Kanter (1977) analyzed the analogous problem in a corporation and isolated several factors that relate to women being denied advancement. Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) highlight these factors:

(...) supplies--having access to materials, money, and resources needed to meet the unit's goals and reward its members, information--having access to and use of information within the organization, and support--having the opportunity to make autonomous
decisions with the assurance that important people in their organizations will back them (p. 58).

Minority and women faculty are often left out of the power loop, sometimes referred to as the "old boy network", where information is shared about the specific tactics for fulfilling the tenure requirements and accessing fiscal supports for facilities and travel, among other resources.

Minorities and women also have higher demands placed on them from family responsibilities (Johnsrud and Sadao, 1992; Olsen, 1990; Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990), engage in more committee work, and take on more of their share of student advising (Menges and Exum, 1983). They tend to lack significant mentors and/or role models (Bourguignon, et al 1987; Olsen, 1991). All of these barriers combine to severely restrict their success in tenure track positions. These factors have been observed by researchers and reported in the most recent literature.

However, there are other less explicit factors that may influence the minimal progress of minority faculty in the professoriate that relate to the individual faculty member's attributions for their career choice and success.

Differences in Academic Careers of Women and Minorities

Economics, religion, culture, societal attitudes, and education are all areas that influence women's gaining entry into the work forces previously dominated by men (Moore, 1987; Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). Studies are scarce that investigate these particular variables' impact on minorities entering faculty positions. However, the limited research concerning the subject matter has revealed that there are differences in the academic careers of women and minorities (Menges and Exum, 1983, Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990). The disadvantages of minority faculty have been only recently documented and the accounts of the particular individuals limited to specific ethnic groups including African Americans and Hispanics (Exum, et al, 1984; Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990). Little research on other minority faculty groups has been undertaken. Generalizing experiences of minority groups in the aggregate is ill-advised, although some of the discrepancies revealed in the hiring and subsequent tenure process have been noted as having a larger audience.
application when examining general inequities present (Exum, et al, 1984, Harvey, 1991). Small numbers continue to be a problem when attempting to disaggregate by specific groups.

Family responsibilities and financial pressures place undue burdens on ethnic minorities during their pursuit of the educational credentials required for entrance into the faculty ranks and continue to be major concerns throughout their career (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988; Menges and Exum, 1983; Olsen, 1990; Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990). "The need to support or to raise a family during a lengthy educational program may weigh disproportionately on women and minorities" (Menges and Exum, 1983). Economic pressures may short circuit the faculty career aspirations of an ethnic minority. "There is a need to encourage minorities to pursue graduate education earlier, before heavy family demands and other financial obligations make it less possible" (Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990, p.44). Olsen (1990) found that women and minority faculty experienced non-linear career paths where interruptions were not unusual.

Overall, white men tended to choose an academic career earlier than other faculty groups, to emphasize research from an earlier date, to move through their graduate/postdoctoral training in a more direct manner, and to aim for positions at more prestigious research-oriented universities. To the extent that women and minorities deviate from this model, a model closely allied with traditional models of graduate training, their socialization process will be different and will require greater accommodation on the part of individuals and institutions to be successful (p. 7).

Financial limitations, family responsibilities, parent support, and prior school success are factors that may inhibit the successful pursuit of a career in academia. These variables may also influence the kinds of attributions for success made by ethnic and racial minorities.

Another consideration related to the family is the early socialization of women and minorities for later pursuit of college and professional careers. There has been some research although limited that has identified situational variables involved in the early acquisition of power as a direct result of the socioeconomic status of parents. Brislin (1988, 1991) has postulated that
early socialization toward accessing power strategies occurs for young children in families with higher educational levels and SES. Young male children acquire the skills to employ power strategies by gaining information early on from their success-oriented parents who actively exercise power strategies and value the development of these techniques in their sons. Skills such as the art of persuasion, diplomacy, and delegation, for example, are experienced in many social gatherings and community affairs. Brislin points out however, that many groups are not privy to the nature of how power works such as:

(...) females whose parents do not feel it appropriate to have their daughters exposed to power, people from the middle and working class, people who hold minority group status in a country, and recent arrivals such as immigrants, refugees and people on temporary sojourns from another country (p. 1).

Brislin posits that women and minorities may then, gain access to positions of authority and continue to hold positions of influence due to their parents' SES/class level and whether they have been exposed early on to successful power strategy developmental experiences. Gruca, et al (1988) supports this premise and found that early childhood experiences with a college-educated father may influence later success in sex atypical working experiences for their college educated daughters. Boice (1992) found that Anglo faculty trained at elite colleges and universities experienced frustration in disconfirmed expectancies for their blue collar worker student population. Minority faculty did not echo the same concern and tended to relate more readily with the students they encountered. Cultural differences in how people think and behave may have an impact on individuals' later work performance in a setting that holds beliefs that are incongruent with those valued in the ethnic minority culture they originated from. How these differences relate to individual perceptions of success are considered in the scope of the following study.
Definition of Racism

The subtleties of discrimination are difficult to pinpoint due to its intangible nature. Societal norms remain fairly constant and tend to be dictated by the elites in a population. Racism has permeated American society for the 200 year period of its existence (Wilson, 1989). Racism as defined by Dube (1985) and quoted by de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (1988), refers to the notion that some races view themselves as superior to others. Individuals can be considered racist if they hold these superior attitudes toward others. Van Dijk (1993) furthered the construct of racism by identifying discrimination as part of the overall social norms and standards of the dominant culture. He refers to this theory as “elite racism” or an “everyday racism” (p. 5) that is difficult to discern due to its appearance as seemingly appropriate perceptions of others that are considered different from the norm. Johnsrud and Sadao (1995) applied the theoretical framework to the common experiences voiced by minority faculty. The university subculture becomes the dominant value system that minority faculty must “accommodate” to. The majority of faculty are already a part of the dominant university subculture and do not have to change their attitudes to accommodate to “differentness”. Diversifying the curriculum or promoting minority research are considered “sub-standard” to the status quo of the academic world. Racism then, can be applied to any situation where there are dominant and minority groups co-existing. Elite racism offers a more expanded viewpoint of how minorities as a group, confront prejudice that exists in the daily norms and values of the dominant group with they interact.

Ethnic and racial minorities face many challenges in pursuing a career in academe. Once inside the walls of academe, minorities face ongoing bombardment of racial prejudice, both overt and covert (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988). Often, racism acts as a blockage to even entering into the academic ranks. As noted by de la Luz Reyes and Halcon(1988), there are now more Hispanic Ph.D.'s available within the applicant pool, but the barriers they face when entering academia continue to stifle their progress.
Ten to fifteen years ago we might not have been able to name ten Chicano Ph.D.'s unable to obtain academic positions. This observation is at once ironic and paradoxical: we are considered the elite and best-educated members of a minority community that is still struggling desperately to graduate its members from high school, and yet, rather than finding a payoff at the end of the educational tunnel, we find a dark path draped in full academic regalia (...) (p. 301).

Adherence to traditional standards is a hallmark of post-secondary education. For example, the promotion of pluralism in academic curriculum stimulated a heated debate on the value of returning to the classics versus a more liberal arts approach to instruction.

In fact, popular views of "what should be" in curricula used by American educational institutions probably are best represented by Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind and O'Neill's How Much Do You Know? The Ultimate Test of Common (and Not so Common) Knowledge. These two vastly different publications send the same message: knowledge important to the intellectual development of Americans is chiefly ethnocentric (Noley, 1991, p. 108).

Courses and degree programs that expand the curriculum by offering topics addressing non-western viewpoints are shunned by the status quo. At the same time, the report A Nation at Risk, suggested refurbishments in the American education system to more adequately serve the needs of its diversified body of students, or suffer the political and economic consequences of catering to an academic elite (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988).

Educational reform is misdirected if it merely leads to exclusivity. Historically, our nation's schools have underscored the need to support a democratic society and assimilate individuals from many cultures and ethnic groups. Unfortunately, the move toward exclusivity, raising standards and failing to provide for all to meet those standards, appears to be the rule and not the exception (Justiz, Bjork, and Wilson, 1988, p. 115).
Both overt and covert forms of racism can be detected in higher education settings. As argued by de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (1988), "(...) long and well-established patterns of behavior are so entrenched that they function as standard operating procedure" (p. 301). Combating the intricacies of prejudice requires a multi-dimensional set of strategies that address the many layers of societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual dimensions in which the attitudes and beliefs are embedded.

**Tokenism and Typecasting**

One strategy for understanding prejudicial behavior is analyzing the types of tactics employed by the majority group. Tokenism as a type of institutional bias was examined in depth by Kanter (1977) in her examination of the limited numbers of women entering and being promoted within corporations. Tokens are selected to meet affirmative action pressures but they are often relegated to positions that hold little power or prestige. The prevailing attitude is expressed succinctly by Campbell (1982):

> Tokenism appears in myriad forms. The most obvious is having only one woman or Black on a committee, council, or staff. The most subtle is allowing only a few minutes on the agenda for "her report" or asking her "to take part in this decision"--not because she is expected to add anything, but because it just wouldn't look good to overlook her, especially with all these new government regulations (p. 338).

In academe, minority faculty tend to be selected for positions on the periphery of the academic mission. Minorities hold positions such as affirmative action officer or director of multicultural studies and are less frequently found in tenure-track positions (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988). The perception held by some white male faculty is that ethnic and racial minority applicants lack the adequate credentials, publications, and academic record that would legitimately enable them to qualify for an academic slot (Bourguignon, et al, 1987; Menges and Exum, 1988).

Women and minorities tend to congregate in stereotypical fields (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon; 1988, Russell, 1991). Women gravitate toward education and health sciences while
specific minorities such as Asians are found in engineering. When moving into traditionally white, male dominated disciplines such as business and science, women and minorities are faced with a double challenge of tokenism based on the job type as well as the challenge of the role of university faculty member.

Typecasting, job stereotyping, and occupational stratification all relate to the belief that women and minorities fit in certain traditionally designated fields or positions. In higher education, women continue to congregate in female stereotyped fields such as education, social work, nursing, and student services. Typecasting, when ethnic minorities are expected to fill specific jobs such as ethnic studies professor (Miller, 1991), is evident in tenure track positions found in fields such as ethnic studies and foreign languages where minority candidates predominate (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988). The surface visibility that results, satisfies the affirmative action hiring requirements, but inhibits the further movement of minorities into the mainstream of the professorial system. They are only visible on the outside of the university power structure and are in a disadvantageous position when attempting to penetrate the more powerful academic positions within the system. Their increased numbers as an aggregate are confirmed, but the acceptance of their presence in fields traditionally occupied by white males is still infrequent. Additionally, students are denied a more enriched curriculum because programs such as ethnic studies and women's studies attract ethnic and racial minorities and women as opposed to all students. An avenue for better understanding diverse viewpoints is not accessed which could further our knowledge and understanding of others' cultures and beliefs (Wilson and Justiz, 1988). The negative impact of tokenism and typecasting goes beyond limiting the opportunities for ethnic and racial minority faculty and women in academe and can result in oppression and exclusion from the majority group.

Acculturation Theory

Acculturation theory offers a societal level lens to examine the issue of cultural differences and the process by which individuals cope with those differences. Berry (1980,
1990) and Berry, et al (1989) describe acculturation as a process of valuing one's own culture while maintaining contact with another culture within a pluralistic society. Change almost inevitably occurs when moving from one dominant culture to another. Four distinct classifications of acculturation have been described in empirical studies of immigrants that may lend themselves to a further understanding of the process. Most recently, the terms used to classify the degree to which one accepts and adjusts to the new culture and continues to adhere to the culture of origin capture four attitudinal levels: assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization. Berry and Kim (1988) define these types and base them on two underlying premises: “Is my cultural identity of value and to be retained? Are positive relations with the larger(dominant) society to be sought?” (p. 211). Assimilation refers to the process of dissolving the cultural beliefs of a primary culture adhered to by a non-dominant/minority group and accepting the norms of the majority or mainstream culture. Integration is opposite to assimilation in that the culture of the non-dominant group is maintained within the existing majority culture although there may be acceptance of particular norms relating to daily functioning within the overall governmental system. The next two types of acculturation relate to more negative situational characteristics. With separation, the minority group operates totally outside the majority system either by choice or by design of the majority culture such as segregation. The fourth option of acculturation then is marginalization which encompasses the loss of adherence to the particular beliefs and customs of the original culture coinciding with a lack of acceptance of the majority's ways. This experience has been described by second generation Asian American students who recognize their adherence to the larger cultures' life style, but at the same time are expected from family members to behave and act differently than the norm based on their parents' cultural traditions (Ahn Toupin and Son, 1991).

Acculturation refers to the process by which individuals adapt their socialized world views to function in a culture different than their primary one. Socialization occurs as a natural developmental process as individuals expand their knowledge and understanding of their primary culture. Values, rituals, and traditions are complimentary. Resistance, misinterpretation, conflict
and rejection do not usually occur during a socialization process because the culture is already embedded in the individual's way of thinking. However, when persons move from their primary culture to exist in a secondary culture, problems of adapting and accepting new ways of thinking and behaving may result. As described by Berry (1980, 1990), acculturation can be viewed as an adjustment to the newly introduced set of norms. Acculturation is referred to here as a unidirectional process by which one becomes either assimilated with or separate from the host culture. Biculturalism is the third term being included here to capture the process of adopting some of the customs, rituals, and habits of the dominant culture and at the same time, maintaining the values and traditions of the primary culture. Biculturalism is comparable to the integration option included in the explanation offered by Berry (1980, 1990). The critical aspects of biculturalism are that the individual is capable of coexisting in two cultural atmospheres. The primary culture is valued, promoted and preserved within the individual, and at the same time, the new cultural mode is learned, understood and recognized as an important component to the individual's overall effectiveness in the mainstream culture. This fifth component to the model was highlighted in a study of ethnic and racial minority faculty (Johnsrud and Sadao, 1992). A recent review of the literature on acculturation and ethnic identity includes the mention of a bicultural/bidirectional model as compared to previous unidirectional acculturation models previously discussed (Nagata, 1994). Biculturalism refers to the ability to effectively switch between cultures as required by the situation or institution. Biculturalism resembles integration in that both cultural identities are preserved and used within the appropriate contexts. Biculturalism may be the way that minority faculty are able to successfully move into faculty positions while holding on to prior cultural traditions. The societal component then, continues to be critical in analyzing a minority's movement into a system that differs from the values held by that minority group member. The outcomes for success may depend on the type of acculturation strategy used as well as to what the individual attributes their success.
The literature to date has emphasized that the journey through the academic ranks is complex and may reflect an individual's pre-conceptions of the faculty experience based on what social process is adhered to (Reynolds, 1992). Reynolds (1992) employed qualitative techniques similar to the current study, to investigate junior faculties' approach to coping with the demands of a new professor. Although socialization and acculturation are sometimes used interchangeably, Reynolds described them as distinct anthropological constructs that explain the development of cultural beliefs. Socialization occurs early on in an individual's life experiences and allows for the creation of a "world view" that acts as a lens for understanding, interpreting and reacting to the environment which surrounds the individual. Acculturation is a process of changing one's world view to adopt the majority culture. "Acculturation, in contrast, is a process that assumes initial differences in world view between the individual and the group" (Reynolds, 1992, p. 638).

Reynolds discovered that junior faculty assimilate more readily to their new faculty status when their perceptions of the role are congruous with the culture of the university department, in other words, their previous socialization processes are complimentary to the standards of the institution. The notion of competition and individual self-reliance is an established norm for faculty. Individuals that have been socialized to value these characteristics are more likely to adhere to this style once entering the academic circles of performance. If their expectations are in direct conflict with the institution, faculty may proceed through an acculturation process. Acculturation is a challenging proposition because it requires one to dissolve some previous beliefs and adhere to unfamiliar ones in order to be accepted and survive in the new setting. This area has been studied in depth in relationship to foreign sojourners entering new countries for work or school ventures (Brislin, 1990; Kim, 1986), but is a relative newcomer to the higher education arena in respect to faculty experiences. Although socialization has been used to described faculty experience within the academic institution, this study will focus on the broader construct of acculturation to explain the process by which ethnic minority faculty adapted to the culture of the host culture and later academic community in order to achieve success within a faculty post.
The acculturation model is a multi-dimensional process by which groups and individuals' attitudes toward the change that occurs when moving from one culture to another can be explained. The strategy selected by an individual may be influenced by other moderating variables such as generational status, education and income, age, years of residence in the United States, country of origin, job skills, religion and purposes of immigration (Sodowsky, et al, 1991, p. 196). Additionally, individuals select different acculturation attitudes depending on the situation (Mendoza, 1984 in Sodowsky, et al, 1991, p. 195). An individual within a minority group may have attitudes of acculturation within the larger society and within sub-cultures such as the university setting that are affected by many external societal factors as well as those internal to the person.

Values Defined Across Cultures

When defining differences among cultures, researchers have attempted to conceptualize dimensions that are generalizable to all types of cultural perspectives in order to then examine cultural differences based on universal themes. Hofstede (1983, 1989) and Hofstede and Bond (1984), in extensive research conducted with IBM companies internationally, developed four categories of values that influence work values and behavior. The values were derived from examining employee values at a national culture level with four themes resulting from the large scale study of nations:

1) power distance-- the extent to which less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept that power is distributed equally; 2) uncertainty avoidance-- the degree to which members of a society feel uncomfortable in unstructured situations and support beliefs and institutions that provide certainty; 3) masculinity/femininity -- preference for assertiveness and competition versus nurturance and modesty; 4) individual/collectivism-- preference for a loose social framework where individuals care for themselves and their immediate families versus a tight framework where the in-group care for its members in exchange for unquestioning loyalty (Shwartz, 1992, p. 2).
Hofstede was able to show national profiles of values that differed by nation consisting of the four value components. Other cross-cultural researchers have further defined the concepts in their work (Kim, 1992; Triandis, 1980). Only recently, Shwartz (1992) developed "individual-level indexes" as opposed to the cultural level that Hofstede pioneered, in order to more adequately study differences between persons in the belief systems that they embody and the corresponding effect on their particular behavioral patterns. Shwartz generated a list of values that were evidenced when a person behaved in a certain way that lead to the accomplishment of the particular value type. As explained by Shwartz,

(...) Values represent, in the form of conscious goals, three universal requirements of human existence to which all persons and societies must be responsive: needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and survival and welfare needs of groups. In order to cope with social reality, individuals and groups represent these requirements as specific values about which they communicate (p. 2).

Shwartz identified 56 values that fit into the following types:

- **Power**: social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.
- **Achievement**: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
- **Hedonism**: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
- **Stimulation**: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
- **Self-direction**: Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring.
- **Universalism**: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.
- **Benevolence**: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.
Tradition: Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion impose on the self.

Conformity: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.


This typology is the most recent empirical effort at refining both Hofstede's and other researchers search for a method of comparing people's beliefs and their impact on attitudes and behaviors. The study emphasized the use of individual profiles of values to examine cultural differences and may further guide the evolution of a grounded theory of the particular subset of minority faculty involved in this study.

**Personal Efficacy Theories**

Personal efficacy encompasses a set of beliefs that influence the way a person behaves in certain situations. There have been several related theories that have been included under the general heading of personal efficacy that have been discussed by Saltzer (1982). In a comprehensive review of the studies relating to the efficacy model, Saltzer (1982) noted that none of the studies encompassed the complete model which is composed of normative beliefs, self-efficacy beliefs, behavioral efficacy beliefs and outcome attributions among others, based on "the elements of Bandura's (1977) general theory of behavioral change" (Saltzer, 1982).

Attribution theory is one component of the personal efficacy model that may predict behavioral occurrences. Of all of the potential personal efficacy theories that may influence behavior, attribution theory is being selected for consideration in this study as one potential theory for describing the way ethnic minority faculty consider their career choice and success. It is important to note, however, that the analysis of behavior may extend beyond the attribution one makes for the success or failure of the behavioral outcome and potentially involves whether persons believe they possess the qualities to achieve the particular behavior or if the behavior is an achievable task within the confines of their overall belief systems.
Attribution Theory and its Relationship to Higher Education

Causal attribution has been examined as an explanation of differences observed in the way people view particular events or behaviors, and how prior beliefs, information, and motives affect their perceptions (Kelley and Michela, 1980). People target specific aspects of the situation and of the person being observed to derive relationships that further their understanding of the environment thereby increasing their perceived control over it (Wittig, 1985). "In order to derive such antecedent-consequent relationships, people focus on certain invariant or consistent aspects of the situation. These include the behavioral dispositions of individuals and aspects of the environment" (Wittig, 1985, p. 1). For example, a company employee interviewing a prospective job applicant who attends the session dressed in casual attire may attribute his clothing selection to his lack of self-marketing skills. Studies have shown that inaccurate causal attributions are generated by a person's previous cultural repertoire and individual motives (Kelley and Michela, 1980). "Not only do we attribute the reasons for behavior to either situational or personal factors, but we make these attributions in predictable ways, based on our point of view and the effectiveness of the behavior" (Gordon, 1987, p. 47). The interaction of these influences on attribution and the consideration of the context within which the attribution is occurring has not been explained.

A three way classification scheme offered by Wittig (1985) as an adaptation of Frieze et al. (1978) describes attributions for success and failure. Attributions are categorized as either internal or external depending on whether the attribution is made based on behaviors generated by the person or behaviors exhibited by persons other than the individual. First of all, internal attributions can be stable and controllable such as effort (although sometimes effort is a temporary state and then considered unstable). These attributions are consistent and predictable over time. Secondly, ability is considered an internal attribution but is categorized as uncontrollable but stable, and fatigue is the unstable match. Ability is innate within the individual and cannot be changed, whereas fatigue is also a person specific aspect of behavior that can be changed by
shortening the length of the task or providing an opportunity for the person to recover from the fatigued state. On the external side, outward causes also fit the stable versus unstable pattern. When others consistently help or interfere, their action is looked upon as controllable, stable and predictable. If their interference occurs in a particular instance, then it is categorized as unstable. Task ease or difficulty is listed as stable and uncontrollable and luck is both unstable and uncontrollable.

An examination of the research on gender biases as potential factors influencing perceived causation in hiring practices (Deaux, 1976) may offer a lens from which cultural differences can be considered. Frieze et al (1982) reviewed twenty-two studies on self-attribution research and found that men and women differ in the attributions subscribed to when accomplishing a task. Men tend to attribute their successes to ability and are less likely to attribute their performances to luck. The differences may be related to a locus of control issue where women, due to a previous subservient role assignment and low expectancy for success, tended to view any achievements as an outcome stemming from an external influence as opposed to internal qualities. Relating this tendency to the classification scheme reveals that men use internal and stable although uncontrollable attributions for their accomplishments, and women depend on the external control of others or of luck when attempting to describe their unexpected successes. Men, who are in a position to hire or promote, may subscribe to a more stereotypical viewpoint, and may tend to attribute future success in a job to men more often than women based on the perceived abilities men possess over women. This bias may also cross ethnic and racial lines. The differences may relate to a conflict between cultures and an ethnocentric attitude about who is the most well suited for a particular job type. If so, changing the attributions made by the majority group would be the most feasible way to diminish the culture conflict whether it be gender or ethnicity based.

Deaux (1976) postulated that when making judgments about a person's expected performance, external attributions of causality are chosen when the performance of the individual
does not fit an expected cultural norm. Sex role stereotypes are sources for decision-making practices where sex role success, consistent with the expectation is attributed to internal causes and sex role inconsistencies are assigned external attributions (Wittig, 1985).

When performance is in agreement with social norms and the value of the outcome is high, the likelihood of internal, stable attributions for the performance is maximized.

When there is less agreement between the performance and social norms and the value of the outcome is low, external, temporary, attributions will be increasingly invoked (p. 5).

For example, men have been typically found in administrative positions where decision-making occurs. A man, in a management position such as a college presidency, is the expected candidate to fill the vacancy based on previous cultural stereotypes. It is more likely that when a man demonstrates success in a university decision-making post, he will be commended for the accomplishment based on his abilities and effort because his success is consistent with the norms for that occupational type. If a woman enters the higher education management arena, the expectations for her performance are based on gender-specific roles that are mismatched with an executive slot that requires decisions to be made. If she is successful in this atypical job position, the attribution made for her success will be external or based on luck, since the established norms dictate that a man is better suited for a decision-making role, and a woman is not expected to be able to perform adequately in this kind of situation.

Speth et al. (1986) provides a thorough review of studies on attributions for success in hiring decisions.

When concerned with causal attributions as a measure of bias, the basic assumption is that the source of an individual's success largely determines the value of that person's success. The bias is in favor of a person whose source of success is internal and against a person whose source is external (p. 9).

As described in the previous management vignette, success based on the ability or assumed ability of a job applicant is stable and dependable. An employer will be in favor of hiring a
candidate who is considered qualified for the job based on their abilities as opposed to success derived from a lucky break. Men will be considered for positions that are traditionally filled by males over women, where the expectation about their potential performance is unclear due to a reliance on socially acceptable norms for what women are supposed to do. The ambiguity may relate to the stereotypical expectation that women are perceived less likely than men to be successful.

External causes are then used to explain unexpected success versus ability. For instance, biases were evident in favor of male applicants when the job requirements and the applicant qualifications did not match (Gerdes and Garber, 1983, as reported in Speth, et al., 1986). Speth et al. (1986) found that during the screening process for hiring counseling psychologists for either a counselor or director slot, the sex of the applicant interacted with the ambiguity of fit condition of the job and the gender-specific attributes assigned to the role.

In this study, when males were applying to a position for which their background did not provide a direct match, raters predicted greater luck for males with feminine attributes than for males with masculine attributes. Therefore, in the ambiguous fit condition, the raters showed a clear preference for the traditional male over the non-traditional male. Ratings for the female applicant for the ambiguous fit condition were not significantly different regardless of their gender-related attributes (p. 9).

When males with female characteristics applied for the director position, luck was assigned by the raters for their success or failure. Males with male attributes and females possessing more female attributes received higher luck ratings when applying for the counselor position. The findings suggest that assigning the attribution of luck for the success of women may be more than a gender-specific occurrence and reflects the stereotype of the particular job. Male applicants that did not match the job requirements for the director position were more likely to be assigned the attribution of luck when they did not possess the socially acceptable male characteristics assumed to be more appropriate for this type of management level position. Males are expected to be bosses. With the counselor position, the nature of the job is more ambiguous and may have
stereotypical characteristics that favor a female, mediator type profile. The men with more male traits were assigned the attribute of luck when being hired for the counseling position since there was more of an ambiguous fit between expected attributes and job type. Attribution theory offers an explanation for continued slow movement of women being hired into positions of faculty leadership, in spite of previous studies negating gender differences in traits, power, motivation, etc. and the legal efforts that have been undertaken. The ambiguous fit notion of women and ethnic and racial minorities entering a previously white, male dominated profession may result in attributions of luck being offered for females and ethnic and racial minorities who are not expected to demonstrate success in this type of career.

Attribution theory has received little attention in the area of multi-cultural research in higher education. The studies that are available tend to be conflicting or inconclusive. Attribution research in general is relatively a newcomer to the psychological field that explains differences in people's attributions for behavior. As highlighted by Kelley and Michela (1980) in a literature review on the subject,

We are now aware of some of the errors produced in attribution processes by the attributer's a priori beliefs and motives. However, a model of the interplay among information, beliefs, and motivations is not yet in sight. We now know that the attributions an actor and observer make for the former's behavior are often different (…) We now know many of the consequences of attributions, most importantly those having to do with our feelings, self-evaluations, and social behavior. However, difficult questions about the long-term consequences of various causal views and the possible threats to viability posed by errors of attribution have yet to be addressed (p. 494).

The causes for the under-representation of ethnic and racial minorities in post-secondary education are explored by applying attribution theory as one way to examine whether their self-reported perceptions of career choice and success vary by the specific situational circumstances being described about various career experiences.
Attribution theory may offer an explanation for the reasons that individuals assign causality to success and failure in different ways, in varying situations and within the different levels of the four tiered framework of career variables. The theory as reviewed by Kelley and Michela (1980) describes attributions as perceived causes of another person’s behaviors and the consequences of such perception. Perceived causes in behavior are flavored by existing stereotypes or generate confirmation of why such stereotypes exist (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). For example, “to the extent that the development of power depends upon perceived skill and ability, power may depend upon attributions” (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989, p. 63). Expectations concerning performance may be based on attributions; stable, internal causes such as ability promote future expectations for success and unstable causes such as luck trigger doubt in later performance (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989).

Studies that examine attribution theory in relationship to the causes of success and failure are abundant (Kelley and Michela, 1980). In general, success of an unknown person is supposed to reflect inner conditions of the person such as ability or effort. Researchers in the area suggest that attributions are the result of an interaction among person and environment factors which need to be considered concomitantly when examining differences in attributions among groups (Gordon, 1987). The person’s perceptions of self and the situational variables interact to produce an attribution for a particular behavior.

In a more recent study of gender differences in attributions for success, Russo et al (1991) surveyed 200 hundred male and 42 female top level management personnel and reported results contrary to the past studies linking women’s self-perceptions of success to external factors. The three female researchers found that both senior men and women considered ability and hard work key to their accomplishments, women more so than men. This provides conflicting evidence to the notion that women tend to attribute their success to luck. Another aspect of the attribution process was highlighted in this study. Interpersonal relations for female colleagues
were viewed by both genders as less important to career success than ability and effort, but were seen as more important to them than luck. Career satisfaction was significantly correlated to interpersonal relations for men. Due to this finding, the authors warn:

(...) Care should be taken not to use an analytic structure that is more appropriate for the pattern associated with males, which can happen easily in research areas where men are the majority of the sample. Context may affect interrelationships as well. (...) In any case, the internal-external dimension of attribution theory appeared to fit the men's data much more closely than the women's. This dimension should be reexamined for "goodness of fit" to women's experiences in professional contexts (p. 346).

Again, a universal theory of attribution style may not be attainable when there are differences in perceptions based on gender concerning a person's success and may also be true when comparing attributions of minorities versus non-minorities when considering success. In this study, women perceived that ability and effort was more important for their success than their male counterparts. The authors suggest that women may assume that men are entitled to the higher level management positions and therefore do not need to work as hard as women. Additionally, there was no difference between men and women in the study concerning the importance of luck to career success. However, the findings revealed that "both self and social attributions to luck were positively correlated with our measure of actual career success for women, while this was not true for men, and the differences between the correlations were significant" (p. 347). The authors suggest extending attribution research to investigate both the interpersonal dimension in relationship to women's achievement and the concept of entitlement that may be reflected in the norms of the status group, in this case men.

In scanning the attribution research for cross-cultural comparisons, there seems to be a gap in considering differences by culture or race. Minority underachievement is one topic the theory has been applied to (Uchino, 1987). "Attribution research in achievement motivation has shown that minority students, in certain domains of achievement, do tend to make differential
attributions following success and failure compared to majority students" (Uchino, 1987, p. 9). In a review of the literature on the topic, Graham (1986) as reported in Uchino (1987) found that Black children attribute their own success to luck and task ease which have been categorized as external attributions and unstable, that tend to negatively impact the student's self-concept concerning future achievement motivation. Uchino (1987) summarized the findings as, "(...) Black children do seem to perceive the causes of success as white children do; however, in light of the current review, they do not seem to see their own causes of success as white children do" (p. 9). The author suggests investigating how these attribution styles are developed and that socioeconomic status may confound the findings. "There is evidence suggesting socioeconomic status is an important mediator of attributions because when it is controlled for, motivational differences between whites and blacks disappear" (Graham, 1986 as reported in Uchino, 1987, p. 11). Additionally, different minority groups may subscribe meaning to motivational pursuits and behavioral causalities in differing ways that may threaten the validity of generalizing the theory cross-culturally. Uchino (1987) recommends further testing of attribution theory at various educational levels for minority groups.

A study of minority and non-minority college women's attitudes toward the differences in success and failure subscribed to women based on ethnicity revealed that the ethnicity of the observer as well as the subject moderates the attributions for the success or failure of those subjects within an occupation (Romero and Garza, 1986). The Anglo women in the study made similar attributions for success or failure in a job for Anglo, Black, and Chicana subjects. The Chicana women however, identified ethnicity as a key factor in attributing the career success of Anglo women and the failure of minority women. If an Anglo woman fails, the Chicana women attributed other factors to the cause such as lack of personal contacts. Due to the differences in attributions made by minority women versus non-minority women for success within an occupation, the authors suggest that minority women may be more aware of potential social norms and structural barriers interfering with equalities within the job market and consider this premise
more feasible than the possibility that minority students tend to exaggerate the influence of social considerations. In either case, furthering the examination of ethnic variables was supported in this empirical research endeavor.

Application of the theory in management and higher education fields has been limited and generally has been applied to student populations as mentioned above, and has only recently examined administrative hiring practices (Mark, 1984; Speth, et al, 1986). However, the relationship of perceptions and attributions and their effect on adjusting to established norms within the university setting has been evident in recent investigations of ethnic and racial minority and women faculty. Exum et al (1984), found that women and minority academics felt that they had to exert more energy to overcome the perception of their white, male cohorts, and that when success with these peripheral groups was evidenced, it was due to some external support and not individual effort. For instance, one of the tenured Black women in their study found that when her accomplishments were recognized by the white male colleagues, they targeted a "magical power" as the reason behind receiving undeserved attention such as grants and her failures were categorized as her own inability to perform adequately to meet their rigorous standards. Male faculty have been shown to attribute success to their personalities and abilities more so than women (Miller, 1991). A more recent study of newly hired faculty described a similar finding where women tended to volunteer their problems relating to self-confidence more readily than their male peers concerning scholarly writing (Boice, 1992). This gender specific delineation in this study was consistent across races.

The results of the various attribution studies are mixed and the picture is far from clear concerning whether or not norms assimilated by members of a society early on in the socialization process affect the way in which attributions are made for their own accomplishments and those of others. Analyzing the perceptions of minority faculty concerning the barriers and supports they encountered during the various phases of their career histories may provide an avenue for
exploring their continued lack of representation within the academic profession and their seemingly slow progress in attaining positions of power within the academic profession.

A Multi-dimensional Model for the Study of Career Choice and Success

To attempt to investigate the multitude of factors presented here would extend beyond the scope of the current research effort. However, consideration of a descriptive framework for studying minority access to the faculty ranks is warranted to examine the factors such as parents’ SES, access to resources, appropriate role models and early socialization processes, that seem to influence one's attributions for success and in turn, the acculturation attitudes one subscribes to in accepting the role of a faculty person. The organizational barriers such as tokenism and typecasting may act as further deterrents to achieving satisfaction in a faculty position if they impose values that are incongruous with the individual's imbedded cultural belief systems. The interpersonal dimensions such as mentoring and collaborative research work if present, may enhance a minority faculty's perseverance especially if the cooperative value is present in their culture. Traits at the individual level, such as motivation, drive, and commitment, may be additional factors that further describe the available coping mechanisms minority faculty have available to them and determine the strategies they pursue in acculturating to the professoriate. Delineating the various factors will allow the researcher to identify the acculturation process each faculty person experienced and describe it through the specification of the variables discussed by the informants.

Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) reviewed the available literature to date on gender and power in organizations and isolated particular variables that demonstrated potential for further examination of women's slow progress in administration. They categorized the factors into four levels: societal-- role behaviors and socialization towards particular careers; organizational-- sex-typing and differential placement based on job expectations appropriate for women; interpersonal-- mentoring and access to networking systems within the organization both informally and formally; and individual-- educational background, career aspirations, self-concept,
and motivation. Gender differences appear to be affected by a multiplicity of variables and correspond to inequitable access to resources (Ragins and Sundstrom, 1989). In order to examine the significant elements determining access to positions of power within organizations, the authors promote a four tiered approach to analyzing the multifaceted and interactional nature of access to power. They warn however, that,

Although the key processes at each level of analysis interact to create gender differences in power, processes at the societal level may have an overriding impact. Sex-role socialization at the societal level sets the context for work-role expectations at the organizational level, sex-role stereotypes at the interpersonal level, and the cycle of powerlessness at the individual level (p. 81).

These cautions may imply then, that societal factors such as SES, racial prejudice, and ethnocentrism, are more pertinent in the efforts of women and minorities to move within the ranks of any organization including academia, than some of the other dimensions already explored in the literature and may indirectly influence attributions for success and failure made at each of the four levels.

The four categories delineated in the model can be applied to the study of minorities' pursuit of a faculty career within higher education. Olsen (1990) found that parental influence affected the decision to enter academia. Other previous studies have not considered the impact of values and expectations of women and minorities that guide their career explorations. Because value systems developed during the early years of socialization within family and social networks may affect the way in which attributions for success are made, clarifying the specific beliefs and goals subscribed to by ethnic minority faculty may further our understanding of the differences in faculty career pursuit and advancement that is evident in the most recent literature. Delineating the other situational and internal causes that may influence attributions of ethnic minority faculty in terms of their career accomplishments may also be revealing. This study uses the four tiers in exploring the access to academia for minorities by gathering information on their career histories. Consideration of the impact of values and attitudes on their perceptions of the barriers and supports to pursuing an academic position is examined.
Reasons that faculty identify for success and failure throughout their career path are analyzed relative to societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual dimensions using attribution and acculturation theories to guide the examination. At the societal level, descriptions of their early experiences concerning career choice and college goals is explored. Examples of job stereotyping are gathered to assess whether attributions for success are based on individual considerations for pursuing a faculty position and whether they differ from traditional, parental expectations. Within an organizational context, individual faculty member's perceptions of whether the structure inhibits or fosters career growth and development is addressed. The recruitment and hiring experiences of the faculty members are examined to analyze the consistencies with the candidates' job qualifications and expertise and resulting faculty position offered. For example, did the candidates perceive their hiring to be a result of their internal abilities or based on affirmative action requirements? In the interpersonal area, situations where success has been attributed to a supportive mentoring situation and establishment of employment networking opportunities is compared to any non-supportive work settings and a lack of connectedness with the organization blamed for failures, as opposed to the assigning of causality to either internal characteristics of ability and/or effort or external causes such as luck. Internal attributions for success such as individual skills and effort are measured against other external causalities for success and failure to explore potential patterns that exist in the way ethnic and racial minority faculty perceive success and failure in academia, and whether there are consistencies in the attributions made that relate to specific individual and situational variables found in the pursuit of an academic career. This exploration of success and failure experiences throughout the faculty's career development period is also examined for evidence of acculturation to the academic milieu and the society at large.

The study undertaken here explores faculty perceptions guided by the cross-cultural theories of acculturation and attribution. As depicted in Figure 1 (p. 49), a graphic comparison of
## Figure 1. Theories That Influence Perceptions And Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>SOCIETY</th>
<th>SELF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Host Culture</td>
<td>Acculturation Theory</td>
<td>Attribution Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure in Host Culture</td>
<td>Marginalization-</td>
<td>External Attribution for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of ethnic culture and non-acceptance in host culture</td>
<td>Internal Attribution for Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Culture</td>
<td>Separation-</td>
<td>Internal Attribution for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-acceptance of host culture</td>
<td>External Attribution for Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in Host Culture</td>
<td>Assimilation-</td>
<td>Internal Attribution for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of ethnic culture but part of host culture</td>
<td>Internal Attribution for Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Culture</td>
<td>Integration-</td>
<td>Internal Attribution for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintains both cultures</td>
<td>External Attribution for Failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the two theories is provided. The chart was developed by this researcher for comparison purposes only and has not been scrutinized under rigorous research conditions in this format although the individual theories have received some attention in the literature. Acculturation theory is an anthropological construct specific to society, and attribution theory relates to the self-perceptions of individuals. Under acculturation theory, Berry (1980) proposed four categories that people might fall under as a result of their acculturation to the host culture. Marginalization is the loss of the ethnic culture and non-acceptance in the host culture. This category is similar to an external attribution for success and an internal attribution for failure. Separation is when there is no acceptance of the individual in the host culture. Their traditional culture remains intact. The comparison to attribution theory is that they would make internal attributions for their success but blame external forces such as the host country for their failures. Assimilation occurs when there is a loss of the ethnic culture and the individual takes on the norms and attitudes of the host culture. Here the individual might still feel confident that his success is due to his own capabilities but also will blame himself for any failures. Integration refers to a maintenance of the minority culture while accepting some of the norms of the mainstream culture. Comparing this category to attribution theory, the individual attributes success to internal abilities and failure to external sources.

Attribution theory provides a way to consider the individual perceptions faculty discuss that relates to their career choice and success. This theory is a psychological construct that focuses on the individual's perceptions of an event, while acculturation theory looks at social level interactions between an individual and a different cultural environment. Both theories relate to a change in behavior based on an internal perceptual response to a situation. This study incorporates attribution theory to attempt to explain faculty's perceptions of career choice and success and employs acculturation theory to define the process by which faculty adhere to as they move along their career paths as ethnic minorities entering a host culture different than their own. The four part model serves to describe the variables that need to be included when considering career choice and success. Attribution and acculturation theories are then used to further our understanding of how minority faculty perceive their career choice and success.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

The study was conducted as an extension of the second phase of the Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study at the University of Hawaii at Manoa (referred to as the Barriers Study), a collaborative research effort sponsored by the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs during the 1990-92 school years. The first phase of the Barriers study was initiated and reported in 1990-91. Results from the survey of all faculty hired between 1982 and 1988 revealed differences in the experiences of faculty concerning the tenure process based on ethnicity among other variables. The population of ethnic minorities, even when aggregated, was too small to allow generalizations to be made. A more qualitative approach to identifying the potential discrepancies in the experiences of ethnic minority and women faculty was included in the second phase of the project that was completed in June, 1992. The informants in the second phase of the study were then asked to participate in this dissertation study. As a research assistant to the principal investigator of both phases of the Barriers Study, this researcher conducted the interviews of sixteen ethnic and racial minority faculty concerning their perceptions of the tenure experience. These same informants were then asked to participate in this dissertation study. Responses obtained from the Barriers Study interviews of these minority faculty helped guide the development of the interview tool for this study.

Site and Sample

The site chosen for the study was the University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM), a state supported research university located in Honolulu, Hawaii. This higher education institution was selected for several reasons. The UHM exists in a multi-cultural region and draws both students and faculty from throughout the Pacific Rim. This uniqueness offers a more diverse campus setting as well as state population.

The State of Hawaii presents the researcher with a wide cross-section of ethnic groups that may further enrich the data already available on African Americans and other ethnic minorities.
such as Hispanics and American Indians seeking the professoriate as a career. The total resident population in the State of Hawaii obtained during the 1990 census of population reflected the following breakdowns by percentage: White, 33.4 percent; Asian/Pacific Islander, 61.8 percent, which includes Japanese, 22.3 percent, Filipino, 15.2 percent, Hawaiian, 12.5 percent, Chinese, 6.2 percent, Korean, 2.2 percent, and Other A/P Islander, 3.3 percent; Black, 2.5 percent; Native American, 0.5 percent (Labor Force Information for Affirmative Action(AA) programs, 1992). The minority categories include all non-whites. Hispanics are classified as white. The AA/EEO office on campus follows the federal guidelines when reporting the number of ethnic and racial minorities hired by departments which includes Black, Hispanic, Asia/Pacific Islanders, and Native American. Because of its close proximity to Asia and the Pacific and the multi-ethnic populace evident in the State of Hawaii, faculty recruits included in the Asia/Pacific category include Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Hawaiian, Filipino, and other Asia/Pacific Islander. In this study, Chinese and Korean groups are represented separately due to their cultural differences and large resident number in the state. Although all of these groups possess differing cultural backgrounds and ethnic heritages that may invalidate the tendency in research studies to aggregate their experiences, the reporting of the results is done in an aggregated fashion to assure confidentiality, especially for ethnic groups whose numbers within the faculty are few.

The inhabitants of the State of Hawaii constitute an unusually integrated ethnic pool to gather data on minorities not typically represented at other U.S. universities. Population demographics in the state reflect a different constellation of Americans by ethnic group not found as yet in other areas of the country. Hawaii is a cross-cultural blend of many ethnic minority groups including Asia/Pacific Islanders, Hawaiians, Blacks, Caucasians, and a large proportion of interracial mixes due to the past immigration of both Asia/Pacific, American, and European cultures. Both the faculty and student populations therefore, are more racially mixed as compared to other research universities elsewhere in the nation. The situation in Hawaii may be a capsulated version
of American society in the 21st century. Studying the experiences of faculty here may elicit new considerations to explore when addressing the plight of ethnic minorities in academia elsewhere.

As mentioned earlier, in 1990-1991, ethnic minorities comprised 30.1 percent of the total faculty at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. In 1991-1992, that figure rose to 30.7 percent (UHM Affirmative Action Plan, 1992-93). When compared to a 61.8 percent of Asia/Pacific Islanders residing in the State of Hawaii (Labor Force Information for AA programs, 1992), the disproportionate representation of the State's composition of ethnic and racial minorities is evident. The total full time tenured faculty at UHM in 1991-1992 was 69.3 percent White, 13.8 percent Japanese, 9.6 percent Chinese/Korean, 3.4 percent other, 1.9 percent Hawaiian, and 0.9 percent Filipino. The majority of tenured faculty positions are held by men at 73.5 percent (UHM Affirmative Action Plan, 1992-93). In comparison, the undergraduate student population which represents 67.9 percent of the total student body is comprised of: Japanese as the largest ethnic group at 34.3 percent, Whites at 17.8 percent, Chinese/Korean at 14.1 percent, Filipino at 10.1 percent, Hawaiian at 6.8 percent, and 16.2 percent other (Ching, 1992). Filipinos at 15.2 percent and Hawaiians at 12.5 percent of the total state population are severely under-represented on the campus in both faculty and student categories (Labor Force Information, 1992).

Nationally, ethnic minorities comprise 9.6 percent of the faculty (AA/EOE Report, 1992). In the State of Hawaii, Asia/Pacific Islanders hold 29.2 percent of the faculty positions at UHM. At first glance, this figure appears high as compared to the rest of the Nation. However, Asian/Pacific Islanders comprise 61.8 percent of the total State population so when compared with this figure, they continue to be under-represented in a locale that would appear to have a larger pool to draw from (Census, 1990). Table 1 (p. 54) displays the statistics presented here.

Hiring trends at UHM until recently, have resembled national trends that show a significant deficit in hiring and promoting ethnic and racial minority faculty. However, when compared to
Table 1. Population Percentages for the State of Hawaii and the UHM Student and Faculty Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Races</th>
<th>1990 Census Data- % of State Population</th>
<th>Fall 1990 UHM Students- 67.9% of total Undergraduates</th>
<th>1990-1991 AA/EEO Data- % of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAIIAN</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE/KOREAN</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure includes: API, B, and NA
national statistics, UHM does better than most universities in recruiting and selecting ethnic minority faculty when considering total numbers hired (see Table I). Despite the increased numbers of women gaining Ph.D.'s nationally, the number of women faculty gaining tenure at UHM during the last decade (1979-1989) showed a 3 percentage point drop (15.2 percent from 18.5 percent) (UHM Biennial EEO-6 Report). Similarly, a 1 percentage point decrease was evidenced in minority faculty tenure acquisition of those faculty in tenure track faculty positions (29.3 percent to 28.0 percent). This trend may be improving however. In 1991 and 1992, 26.1 percent and 26.5 percent of the faculty were women. The percentage for men dropped from 73.9 to 73.5 during this same period which indicates some changes in improving the parity of the situation for newly hired female faculty recruits. Ethnic and racial minorities in 1990-1991 increased two percentage points to 30.1 and again in 1991-92, 30.7 which may reflect the efforts of the University to address the low numbers of women and minority faculty (UHM Affirmative Action Plan, 1992-93). In any case, UHM is comprised of a higher proportion of ethnic and racial minority faculty as compared to national research universities and is demonstrating gains in numbers of faculty hired.

Beyond the statistics, the population of the UHM faculty offers a larger pool of minority sub-groups to interview. In order to begin to develop a better understanding of how the various population sub-groups represented in Hawaii are recruited and retained in academic faculty positions, perspectives from several under-represented minority groups are explored. Under-represented here refers to the statistically under-represented groups that are documented more frequently in national studies of faculty found in the mainland U.S. universities such as Blacks, Native Americans and Hispanics. Additionally, the statistically under-represented group of Asian/Pacific Islanders is further delineated by specific ethnic and racial categories, some of whom are not considered significantly under-represented as a single group such as the Chinese/Korean and Japanese as compared to the Filipinos and Hawaiians. However, in this study, all Pacific
Islander groups that are included in the study are considered under-represented when compared to their total population in the State of Hawaii.

The University of Hawaii at Manoa has recently attempted to address the low incidence of under-represented minorities in faculty posts by activating a more proactive affirmative action position and funneling research support to investigate the issue. During the 1992 school year, a Commission on Diversity was appointed by the President as an advisory body (UHM Affirmative Action Plan, 1992-1993). However, AA/EEO initiatives at the university administrative level were questioned when the Office of Federal Contract Compliance revealed through a standard audit that irregularities in hiring practices did exist (Young, 1992).

Research Design

Procedure

As noted above, the study reported on here was an extension of the second phase of the Barriers to Retention and Tenure of Ethnic Minority Faculty Study (Johnsrud and Sadao, 1993). Many of the minority faculty interviewed for that study participated in this research. Although the focus of the interview was different, the process by which the protocol was developed was similar to the Barriers Study (see Appendix B). In this way, information gleaned from the findings from the Barriers Study was considered in the development of this study.

The importance of the bridge between the two studies cannot be overemphasized here. Cross-cultural researchers and persons from ethnic and racial minority backgrounds different than the majority group warn against assuming that Western theoretical paradigms generalize across cultures (Kornadt, et al, 1980; Tierney, 1992). The Barriers Study employed a methodology that allowed for the researchers to query the informants regarding potential biases that might affect the investigation process. Therefore, a description of the design of the Barriers Study is warranted to demonstrate the transition into this study and the continuation of the methodological considerations used in the Barriers Study. The information obtained from the various informants who participated in the Barriers Study guided the design of the interview protocol for this study,
the procedures for enhancing the sample and data gathering techniques and the sensitization of the researcher to the problems of examining issues influenced by cultural difference.

**Focus Group Interview**

A focus interview format (Marshall and Rossman, 1989) was conducted as a preliminary data collection and design strategy during the Barriers study. Suggestions for gaining access and assuring participation from the minority cohorts were gathered. The group participants included two female participants on day one and four participants, two male and two female, on day two. The structure of the sessions was participant focused versus facilitator driven although the focus group moderator lead the discussion with a brief explanation concerning the findings of the first phase of the Barriers Study, specifically in the areas relating to ethnic minorities' differential depiction of the tenure process and variables associated with obstacles to achieving tenure such as academic isolation, chair and department relations, and community involvement/commitments. The groups were asked to discuss some of their own experiences related to the tenure process and identify specific barriers they confronted or expect to confront during the process.

The sessions were facilitated by the principal investigator of the Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study, and notes were taken by two research assistants. The sessions were audio-taped and transcribed.

The focus interviews were analyzed prior to the individual interviewing phase of the Barriers study. Strategies suggested for interviewing minority groups and potential barrier and support issues akin to this particular cohort, were incorporated into the individual interview schedule used in the Barriers Study. The group on day two was also asked about their impressions of three, white, female researchers pursuing investigation of minority issues on campus. The group agreed that the need for the study was important and that women researchers had some justification in studying the plight of ethnic and racial minority faculty because women's concerns and experiences resemble some of those faced by minorities within the faculty ranks.
The initial results of the focus group interviews were then used to develop the Barriers Study interview schedule (see Appendix B) and proceeded with an exploratory research activity involving the interviewing of sixteen ethnic and racial minority faculty. The selection process follows.

Sample

The participants for the dissertation study were selected from the faculty included in the original data set for the Barrier's study. The sampling technique chosen during this study was a combination of purposeful sampling (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982) and snowball sampling methods. Faculty were selected from the list of tenured ethnic and racial minority faculty that was used to conduct the focus group interviews as well as by snowball sampling. Faculty members that represented each of the following ethnic minority groups found on campus were interviewed: Japanese, Chinese/Korean, Hawaiian, Filipino, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and Native American. A male and a female were selected per ethnic category. A total of 16 key informants were interviewed. An effort was made to select the participants from instructional faculty across the disciplines classified under Arts and Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Applied Disciplines to maintain a heterogeneity by department affiliation and create a diverse sample of faculty by ethnicity and field. In this way, the exploratory nature of the study could be best served. Due to the small numbers of some of the ethnic minority groups represented on campus as well as a tendency for certain groups to be found in particular disciplines exclusively, a balanced representation across fields was not achieved.

A listing of all of the ethnic minorities hired at the University of Hawaii at Manoa was obtained from the personal data files available from the Personnel Office on Campus. Names of faculty members from various departments on campus that represent various minority groups was extracted, and a list of potential interview candidates was generated. For the most part, the faculty were selected by asking other under-represented minority faculty for suggestions of faculty that might be interested and available to participate in the study as well as those who had some
experience with the tenure process and the University system in general. The participants were then contacted by phone and briefed about the study. If they were interested in participating, an interview time was scheduled. For the most part, the interviews took place in the offices of each faculty member.

The informants were asked at the end of the Barriers Interview session if they were interested in participating in this dissertation study. Follow-up calls were made to each faculty member. Three replacements were necessary due to attrition for various reasons (e.g. not interested in the career history study and departure from the institution). One informant was interviewed after leaving the university in the new state of residence while the researcher was on vacation at the same locale. Additionally, the Chinese and Korean category was separated per suggestion of one of the informants to more adequately represent the Korean viewpoint and distinguish between the two ethnic groups. A total of 21 faculty including two informants used to pilot the career history interview schedule were interviewed for the dissertation study, 14 of whom had been previously interviewed for the Barriers Study.

The majority of the faculty interviewed for the study were from the United States and affiliated territories (14), and the remaining were foreign born nationals. Three of the five non-U.S. born had resided in the U.S. for over ten years. One of the participants in the pilot phase was a U.S. born national and the other was a foreign born national. An effort was made to select tenured faculty although several of the informants were either promoted but in non-tenurable positions (2) or not as yet tenured (3) because of the low incidence of certain ethnic groups.

In-depth Interviewing

Both studies employed interviewing as the main method of data collection. In the Barriers study, specific barriers and supports experienced by probationary and tenured minority group faculty during their academic careers were examined. In the dissertation study, career histories were obtained. The in-depth interviewing technique used in both studies, allowed the researchers flexibility in pinpointing patterns that emerged from the data and a method of
triangulating the data collected among the various informants tapped to enhance the validity of the design (Marshall and Rossman, 1989). The data collection phase of the Barriers study was conducted during the Spring, 1992 semester, and the dissertation study was conducted during the Summer session period and extended into the Fall, 1992 semester.

During the Barriers Study as well as the dissertation study, cross-cultural experts were queried for potential interview strategies they would recommend (e.g. specify a topic to be discussed during the interview; ask the informants directly what their specific experience was like), techniques of how best to approach the faculty members, and appropriate situations in which to conduct the interviews in. Culture specific styles to be aware of such as the type of questions asked, the dress worn, the time of day the interview is scheduled, and the reimbursement of the interviewee's time were issues explored with experts.

Elite interviewing (Marshall and Rossman, 1989) was used as the main research interviewing approach in both studies wherever possible. Prominent, tenured, ethnic and racial minority faculty members who could offer information, expertise and familiarity with local issues and organizational policies that new faculty recruits may not have been privy to were interviewed during the Barriers study. This same strategy was employed when interviewing the faculty again for this dissertation study. Again, due to the small numbers of some of the ethnic minority groups represented on campus, this selection technique was not always possible.

Telephone contact was made at least two weeks prior to the interview date scheduled. Requests to participate in the study were prefaced by the name of the sponsor who recommended the particular faculty selected to participate. Calls were initiated with other faculty suggested by colleagues and interviewees as part of the snowball sampling technique until all the selected minority groups were included in the sample, two from each category previously specified.

The interview process for the Barriers study employed a semi-structured, open-ended interview style. This same approach was used in this dissertation study. (see Appendix A)
Barriers study results were referred to in order to clarify any reference to previous answers that were made by the informants during the career history interviews. Each interviewee was requested to describe their own experience with academia and the process of entry and promotion.

During the development of the dissertation interview schedule, the four tiered approach was employed as a preliminary guideline in generating questions. Attributions for successes and failures were gleaned from the informant's perceptions of their actual experiences to avoid contaminating the interview process with direct questions that would have inhibited certain self-perceptions. Similarly, information concerning past socialization experiences and their particular acculturation to the university system was generated by asking questions about their past history, the reasons behind their career selection and other influences such as parent involvement in their career choice. The interviewee directed the outcomes of the interview facilitated by the interviewer. Demographic variables for the most part were gathered from the protocols developed for the Barriers study. Minimal reference to the personal identifying information was made to assure that confidentiality of the informants was not compromised.

Each interview for the Barrier's study was approximately one hour to one hour and fifteen minutes in length. The dissertation interviews were between one hour to one and a half hours in length. A brief review of the process and confidentiality was provided prior to the start of the interview for both studies. The interviews for both studies were recorded on audio tape in order to minimize the need for note taking during the interview sessions. Additionally, taping each interview allowed the researcher access to the original data source as themes continued to be developed and compared to previous interview information. Each audio version of the interviews from both studies was transcribed using the Data Collector Program (Turner and Handler, 1991), an organizational qualitative research package used on the Macintosh Computer.

Permission to access the personnel files of the UHM system to obtain names of the ethnic and racial minority faculty members was obtained prior to compiling the sample listing for the
Barriers Study by the principal investigator of the study. The Human Subject's Review Committee was also contacted to seek approval of the Barriers study. Interviews from both studies were number coded in order to assure anonymity of the participants. Personal identifiers such as name, department affiliation, discipline, colleges attended, ethnicity among others were omitted from the transcriptions unless permission was granted by the informant. Only one informant indicated that the personal identifiers could be included in the interview information.

Pilot Study

In order to assure that the questions would generate information on the faculty's career histories and experiences with the academic environment, as well as allow the subjects to answer all the questions within the allotted time period, a pilot study was conducted using the interview protocol that was designed during the proposal stage of the dissertation process. Two informants, one male and one female from different minority backgrounds and academic fields, were interviewed with the original interview schedule. Their names were derived using the snowball sampling technique. They indicated an interest in the study and agreed to participate. They were unaware that they would be participants in the pilot phase as opposed to the dissertation study in general. Neither faculty person was involved in the Barrier's Study so some of the background information available from the Barrier's Study informants had to be generated during this interview period that may have increased the amount of time necessary for both interviews. A brief description of the Barrier's study was also provided to them since they were interested in the background of the study.

Each pilot interview lasted approximately one and a half hours. After conducting an initial analysis of the protocols, several questions were omitted to decrease the amount of time required to answer the questions. Other questions were reworded so as to increase the likelihood of an open ended response (i.e. what changed to how or why). Some questions were moved from one probe section to another such as a general probe to an ethnic probe if they appeared to elicit information that more directly related to that particular theme. The final version was reproduced
and used during the data collection phase. Three questions that did not seem to elicit substantial responses concerning career choice and career success were used only if the time permitted. These questions were then omitted from the overall analysis phase and were used for supplementary information only.

Several coding labels were derived from the pilot findings that later guided the identification of emerging patterns present in the research interview data. The four part framework of societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual dimensions used in the development of the interview questions was applied to the pilot interviews as a method to organize the responses into potential themes to consider when analyzing the faculty interviews. However, the categories were used in the earlier stages of analysis to elicit potential directions for the examination to proceed and not as the only possible schema for the data to be categorized in. In this way, the phenomenon of career choice and career success could be grouped by an existing framework that would provide a starting point for furthering the analysis beyond the coding process but not be limited to this framework, once further patterns emerged.

The themes selected during the analysis of the pilot interviews were then considered during the subsequent interviews completed. Cultural orientation toward education, family values, personal influences, and early opportunities for academic advising were explored as potential intervening conditions impacting career choice and career success. Early versus later experience of bias based on ethnic difference was considered as a clue to the faculty being able to successfully assimilate into an academic setting dominated by a majority ethnic group other than their own and whether or not the living experience in Hawaii provided a multi-cultural milieu that formed a safe haven from discrimination based on race.

Because the interview was semi-structured in nature to act as a guide to eliciting responses, all of the questions were asked of each informant unless the time did not permit. This also allowed for some uniformity across interviews that was then used to analyze the data.
collected. Some additional probes were accessed on occasion to either encourage a more thorough response or clarify the question being presented.

**Analysis**

The constant comparative method (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982) was employed initially to examine emerging trends during the data collection period. The responses to particular questions were compared and cross-checked for themes and similarities. Themes revealed in the Barriers Study were accessed as possible themes initially when examining the process for gaining entry and achieving promotion in the higher education faculty sector.

Codes that emerged during the initial phase of the analysis were then incorporated as guides to further identifying the meaning of particular responses. The interviews were compared for similarities and differences, similar to a multiple case study format (Yin, 1989). The categories presented at the outset of the investigation were then modified and restructured during the ongoing analysis phase after each interview was analyzed. Codes were inserted under particular themes in an evolving process of theory revision, delimitation and formulation. The emerging model was applied to the organization of the formal study. The research purpose and questions were then redefined as information concerning barriers and supports was gleaned from the data.

The Data Collector Program was employed during the transcription and the initial coding phase of the analysis. The transcription phase served in the dual capacity of a preliminary analysis and clerical task (Marshall and Rossman, 1989). Interviewer comments were interspersed in the narrative transcribed to guide further delineation of coding schemas. Computer indexing furthered the initial analytical procedure by categorizing the data based on previously discussed variables and creating newly discovered themes and codes.

Axial coding was then used to relate themes to subcategories of data and begin to develop concepts and relationships among the codes (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The grounded theory approach to formulating an overall schema and demonstrate conceptual linkages was used in an attempt to further refine the data consisting of earlier coding devices, memos and diagrams.
The result was an interwoven matrix of external and internal variables influencing career choice. Categories included parent influence, personal influence, ethnic minority experience, bicultural experiences, incidents of influence, value of education, and university culture. Within each category, specific codes were generated such as direct and indirect influence, parents as role models, mentors, international experiences, etc.

As suggested by some of the focus group interview participants in the Barriers Study, a reader was employed to review the analytical sections of the drafts for cultural accuracy and appropriateness. The reader was a faculty member with expertise in multicultural studies.

Limitations

Despite efforts to select participants to be representative of the total ethnic minority grouping, the limited sample and the qualitative approach did not allow generalizations to the population as a whole. The key informants were unable to provide all the needed information concerning cultural sensitivity when raising issues about family, class, SES, power, educational aspirations and background. Some variables were not discussed due to prevailing cultural norms not within the purview of the interviewer. Additionally, due to the political nature of the information queried and the potential violation of privacy, it is assumed that some interviewees did not reveal all of the potential variables that affected their career choice and success. The examiner kept in mind that her nationality and ethnicity as an Anglo American researcher might be inhibit the responses of some of the ethnic and racial minority members included in the study although no obvious rejections were evident.

Because the researcher conducted a thorough examination of previous research, thus, providing a richer background of knowledge to base assumptions on, it is possible that unintentional biases influenced the type of questions developed for the interviews and the analysis of the results during and after the study. The researcher made every effort to assure that expectations of the researcher for ethnic and racial minorities to attribute success differently
based on their cultural background and beliefs did not direct the interview probes or guide the later analysis.

The conclusions proposed are only generalizable to the aggregate group studied and were not intended to represent the beliefs of different ethnic and racial groups, due to the variations in beliefs and customs of various minority groups represented in the study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The findings reported here were organized and refined based on the theories reviewed in the previous sections. Due to the theory exploration and developmental nature of the analysis process, several potential explanations were applied to the data and redefined as new concepts emerged from the initial themes. The four tiered framework for describing the various factors impinging upon these faculty's career experiences was used to organize the initial results concerning attribution variables. From that point, the factors were incorporated into a more expanded theory of career choice and success. A general overview of the demographics collected during the interview sessions is presented followed by the results section. The findings are organized into six main themes: 1) The influence of individual characteristics on career choice and success; 2) The influence of parents and extended family members; 3) The importance of mentors, teaching experiences and external supports; 4) The value of education; 5) Success and the influence of discrimination; 6) the bicultural professional. The comments of the interview participants are documented extensively to allow for the representation of their voices when explaining their perceptions of success within the academy.

Demographics

The nineteen faculty consisted of a heterogeneous group of ethnic and racial minority faculty including nine males and ten females. To maintain the integrity and confidentiality of the informants, the recording of the demographic data was kept at a minimum. Some general statistics are mentioned here that have some applicability to the development of the results section. Table 2 (pp. 68-69) provides a complete breakdown of the demographics by frequency and percentage.

Eight faculty were born and raised in Hawaii, five were born and raised in the Continental U.S. and six were foreign born nationals (see Table 2, p. 68-69). Three out of the nineteen received their post-secondary training outside the U.S., the majority receiving their training in the
### Table 2. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OF BIRTH</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States(Continental)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States(Hawaii)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Track-Probationary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEGREE EARNED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts/Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All But Dissertation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle Class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence Lifestyle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Continued) Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERATION</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Generation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARENT'S EDUCATION LEVEL</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Only one parent of each informant was considered for each category and was not specified as mother or father.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS IN FAMILY</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt/Uncle Sibling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. Four of the women came to Hawaii because of their husbands’ employment opportunities, and the others came for the academic positions that were offered to them. Four of the women were from dual career couples as compared to two of the men.

Over half of the faculty were over forty-five years of age. Most of the faculty held tenure track positions, and two thirds of the group had attained tenure or as in one case, came from a previously tenured position. However, due to the small number of some of the under-represented ethnic and racial minority groups on campus, two of the informants selected were in non-tenured positions although one had been recently promoted (see Table 2, pp. 68-69). All but two held a doctoral degree, and one of the two was actively completing the dissertation phase of a doctoral program (see Table 2, pp. 68-69).

Most of the faculty were raised in middle to upper middle class environments except for those who came from island communities where a subsistence lifestyle was more the norm. Four of the U.S. citizens and two of the foreign born nationals were from immigrant family backgrounds (see Table 2, pp. 68-69). Nine of the nineteen came from homes where one of the parents was from a culture other than the primary ethnic classification represented (see Table 2, pp. 68-69). Several had one parent of either Anglo American or European decent. All of the faculty interviewed came from two parent homes except for one although extended family was involved in the upbringing in that particular situation.

When considering birth order, half of the faculty were the youngest in their families. The others were close to an even distribution of oldest child, middle child, and only child (see Table 2, pp. 68-69). Over half of the faculty participated in private or parochial schools during their elementary and secondary school periods.

Seven out of the nineteen faculty had at least one parent who had completed a college degree. The majority of parents, however, had only received a high school diploma and two had received less than a high school education (see Table 2, pp. 68-69).
Lastly, fifteen out of nineteen faculty members had teachers in their immediate or extended family. Nine were married to spouses who were either professors, or primary or secondary teachers. Several faculty had parents who were either professors, teachers or principals. Those who did not have spouses or parents who were teachers had siblings, aunts or uncles who were involved in the teaching profession (see Table 2, pp. 68-69).

Introduction to the Findings

In an effort to address the commonalities experienced by ethnic and racial minority faculty, the informants were considered in the aggregate. Studying and reporting in the aggregate obscures, however, the uniqueness of each individual’s culture as grounds for comparisons. The personal context of each individual makes a difference; nonetheless, the following broad commonalities were revealed: 1) Individual aptitude, curiosity and drive are determinants of career success; 2) Parent support, either emotionally, financially or both is critical to career success; 3) Mentors in the form of parents, academic advisors and teachers in the family, invitations being offered into academia, and in the majority of cases, graduate assistantships in college provide encouragement for pursuing scholarly goals; 4) Valuing education during their upbringing is important to career success; 5) Discrimination is evident in academia and society—foreign born and trained faculty residing in the U.S. had a more difficult time adjusting to the U.S. culture and minority faculty born and raised in the U.S. Mainland experienced more discrimination than those faculty residing in their home of ethnic origin; 6) Minority faculty with bicultural experiences are better prepared to adjust to the demands of a faculty career. The following sections will further highlight the key findings presented here.

The Influence of Individual Characteristics on Career Choice and Success

In general, the faculty attributed their accomplishments as academics directly to their hard work, perseverance, and aspirations toward academic excellence. Several faculty emphasized this point when they were asked “What is it about you as a person that influenced your achievements?”
I guess my high standards is probably the most important thing; just having high standards and having the ability to work hard. (Card 40)

About me? Well I think I'm hard working. I don't think I'm serious but many of my friends say that I am very serious about my work. (Card 29)

What is it about me? I think one standard is a desire to do something that is complete and credible. It's almost a feeling of anything I do, I want to do it in a good way, a good job. (Card 37)

I feel I've been very fortunate I would say. I think of course there is something you put into that. I am a hard worker. I am very persevering and love my job so I do put a lot of time into it. I think I've been quite successful if you want to look at that from the perspective of what I've achieved. I've got some publications. I've been offered many jobs actually. But I think that's a combination of many different things. Not just one. So I don't give credit just to myself for all of that. (Card 43)

But I always thought that even if you're not going to be the brightest person in the world, the hard work's going to pay off for you in the end. So I never took anything for granted. I always felt that if I really work at it and not take anything for granted, I should be successful at what I do. I guess that's something I carried for most of my career as a student as well as professionally. (Card 48)

Furthermore, these faculty described an inner determination that helped them achieve their goals. Individually, the majority of the faculty interviewed described an internal process of intellectual curiosity that set them apart from other bright and capable students.

And my curiosity. It's not purely intellectual. It's emotional. (Card 14)

I guess a third thing is just an insatiable intellectual curiosity. I just like to see how things work. (Card 21)

That's a tough question. Probably the drive to meet the human goals that I have; the commitment of making sure that I do the very best that I can. (Card 24)

There has always been this hunger to learn about the world; this curiosity. I wanted to be good. Whatever I did I wanted to be good at it. I played soccer. I wanted to be a good soccer player. I went to school. I wanted to become first. There was a competitive spirit in me. (Card 12)

Well, one is some kind of inner impetus; some kind of compelling drive and I think it's probably genetically determined in the sense that it's inherent. I don't know which particular ancestors. I guess I have some I could say, but none of my immediate family were at that level of curiosity; wanting to know more and wanting to find out. Anyway, this is something that is constantly a part of me and I cannot suppress it. I cannot. (Card 14)

My vision. I can see beyond the horizon. I always have been able to do that. I can anticipate things before they happen and they happen. I can also very quickly pick abstract elements and put them together very quickly and draw an inference and I'm usually right. I have very good intuition; all of the unquantifiable aspects. But I have very, what's the word? I can feel the trees. (Card 26)
The intellectual curiosity dimension that the faculty describe here may be particular for success in academia as a professor.

Another internal attribution for their personal success related to their interpersonal skills. The following are quotes concerning the "people" element of their personalities. The majority of the informants mentioned similar comments about enjoying people.

The business of smooth interpersonal relations that I realized very early on when I was about six years old that I can do this has been very much a part of my persona. (Card 21)

I think I can work with people. I can relate well with people. (Card 43)

Yes, I think a lot of it has to do with feeling some sort of loyalty to the people I work with in a department or in a unit and plugging away. (Card 45)

And so I get along with people. Even people with a reputation for being insensitive or incorrigible or mean. I know enough with my own character sensitivities that I can try to work out a harmonious relationship with those kinds of people. (Card 26)

The commitment to working with others combined with internal dimensions of persistence and drive seem to be the critical indicators of success for these ethnic and racial minority faculty.

Self-esteem was mentioned frequently as a key ingredient for these faculty's success. Their strength and perseverance toward personal achievement promoted an attitude of acceptance of failure as part of their own learning process.

And by validating my capacities, it has basically strengthened the foundation of my confidence not only in myself but in anything I get involved with. So I did not only feel that I have certain skills and abilities. I also have the conviction, the expertise and the confidence to demonstrate, perform or extend them. (Card 26)

So you know when you cannot go on forever and know how to back off when its beyond you. And maybe it's, we talked about it before: I'm comfortable with what I am. I'm very comfortable. So maybe that's it. Maybe that's my upbringing and feeling good about who I am, what I am; knowing who I am. (Card 29)

The nurturance of self-esteem throughout their career preparation period and afterward during their academic career may be critical to the success of ethnic minority faculty. Without the opportunity to develop self-confidence, these faculty, particularly those that faced biases and oppression during their upbringing, may not have pursued the academic route. For instance, the following faculty member describes his earlier career aspirations as a silent process until he
received verification from other white professionals that his desires were legitimate for him to consider as a minority.

And I just felt that I was just out of place in considering this because I knew no people, no people with my background who had ever done this. So I had no models except my professors who were all white at the (University). So I was a secret admirer of what I considered to be these giants who in turn were descendants of greater scientific and intellectual giants of earlier times. And I was inspired, and stimulated but also bewildered and somewhat dismayed. And it seemed like something being out of my reach and too much of a dream. And I was just like setting myself up for disappointment and discouragement and failure. So I tried not to think too much about it and didn't tell others about it. On the other hand, there were those on the faculty there and subsequently at (University) who encouraged me to think about it. (Card 2)

Adequate development of self-esteem appears important for choosing academia as a career as well as later success as a faculty member. Role models can be described as a moderating variable that played an important role in the developmental process by nurturing the students and providing them with the validation to foster their self-esteem. Therefore, self-esteem as an internal factor can not be seen as mutually exclusive from external influences such as the availability of role models during their early lives as well as during their career exploration phase.

The external variables mentioned here were not devoid of individual capacity for learning and achievement. Many of the individuals described their self-confidence and competitive spirit as having an impact on their success as a professional.

Oh well, well I'm bright. I like to work things through. I have a jigsaw puzzle mentality which I think is really useful if you are going into the kind of teaching field I was in. (Card 27)

Coming from a small place; a small farm from a poor family, you wanted to prove that you were no less inferior to anyone from the cows and so forth. And I realized that I had a certain amount of intelligence and willpower and always that kind of spirit to be the best and that was it. (Card 12)

But when I actually confront problems then it's a lot easier to deal with them because I have the motivation and the alertness to handle the problem. So I take a more proactive approach of anticipating problems and resolving them before they ever come close. That way I feel that there's a greater degree of control and coherence about the world around me. I like to plan ahead and I get things done. (Card 51)

These faculty were not hesitant to describe their assets along with the influences they derived from their parents and family upbringing. They admitted their strong personal attributes in addition to the external ones to follow concerning family and culture.
The Influence of Parents/Extended Family

Some of the parents and extended family were highlighted as teacher role models providing a constant example of educational success within the family unit.

I was always in an academic environment. My mother was a college teacher. (Card 31)

My mother predominantly because she was a career professional. And she always worked(...) She was continuously taking courses or training to upgrade skills. So learning was critical. She was always so very, very supportive in terms of being there; doing your homework and doing the extras, not just meeting the minimum but that going beyond. So I had it from both sides, parents that were very committed to education and school, and always supportive of that process. (Card 24)

So I didn't have a burning desire to be a teacher when I was growing up although my mother and father both had been teachers. My grandmother and my great grandmother all had been teachers. So there's a long tradition of teachers. And now it turns out that my daughter is going to be a teacher. So it's not surprising that I did. (Card 31)

Well you know my mother's a college graduate. She's a teacher. And she taught elementary school. And my father had two years of college. And my grandmother was a teacher. My father's sisters were college graduates(...) So I had it in my family, people who had college background, my immediate family. And I'm sure they had a great role in influencing my brother and myself. I mean there was never any doubt that we were not going to college. I mean that was sort of understood. (Card 35)

Parents as role models appear to strongly influence the path of pursuing a college degree and potentially a career choice of academia. This latter aspect of career influence did not seem as obvious as was the informants' inherent drive to complete an academic degree and pursue the professoriate as a profession. However, the family setting and parental attitudes fostered an environment by which these aspiring professionals could excel academically. Teachers in the family were instrumental in encouraging the completion of a college degree. Seven faculty identified either parents or extended family members as part of the teaching profession. Several of the individuals had more than one family member that were teachers. Nine of the faculty had spouses that were teachers.

The majority of faculty identified the influence of their family as a major external factor contributing to their success, although they were not always described as role models. When asked, "Were there any important incidents that occurred during your lifetime that influenced your current accomplishments?", parental support and involvement was often the response.
I think one of the biggest influences has to do with my parents who were immigrant people from (country), who had no education (...) I think because of that they were always encouraging me to go to school. And as immigrants they saw education as the key to success. (Card 16)

Well, I mean my family experiences. I attribute everything that I have done to my family influence. I mean there's no question about it. I mean I am for family. It might even be conservative today but I think that is really the foundation of this nation, the family. And its a value system that I had when I grew up. (Card 35)

Several faculty attributed their personal characteristics that affected their achievements to their parents directly. When posed with the question "What is it about you as a person that influenced your achievements?", several of the informants responded initially with their parents being the primary influence.

I guess the influences of my parents. (Card 31)

My early training. I mean I'm sure these are things that I must have learned from my parents in some way or another; by example you know or by channeling or something. (Card 40)

Stable family first of all.(...)Family values. I mean we spent a lot of time with the family and sometimes it was forced and sometimes it wasn't. There was always this center. (Card 21)

I feel grateful that I was brought up in a family that at least permitted this and supported this. Although inspiration didn't come immediately there, at least it was not a hurdle or an impediment. So I'm very grateful for that when I think how it might have been. Because I look back on some of my classmates who I feel that could have been even more this way but pooh-poohed it. One always put himself down. (Card 14)

The family played a major role in the success of most of these faculty. The environment they experienced growing up was one of encouragement and support. This external attribution may be a key consideration when analyzing the success of ethnic and racial minorities in professional spheres and pursuit of higher education degrees.

Parent influence on their career choice was either direct or indirect and tended to influence not so much the choice to become an academician but the route necessary to later become one. The following passages represent the indirect parental supports that were, nonetheless, identified as critical to their career aspirations. When asked, "How did your parents influence your career choice?", the responses reflected this indirect type of influence.

My parents weren't really interested. They thought, I suppose they were disappointed I hadn't become a medical doctor or a lawyer(...)But they gave me the freedom to do what I wanted to do and they supported; they were there all the time. (Card 12)
I don't think they influenced my choice of career directly. My mother always wanted me to be a medical doctor(...). But I think the way they influenced me more was indirectly. One, it took me a long time to realize that I came from a very scholarly oriented family. They did not see themselves as such. But it was a family where education was very highly prized. Scholarship was highly prized. (Card 18)

I mean I think my childhood is hardly anything that one would associate with preparing somebody. My mother didn't even finish high school(...). She's a strong survivor(...). If I inherited anything from her character I think it's a strong survivor(...). So it's a supportive thing in terms of family. They've always been there. (Card 29)

My dad unbeknownst to me until after he died, I didn't realize he was a college grad. Can you imagine that? He never talked about it. (Card 37)

Education and scholarship were valued in many of the homes. In addition to instilling the worth of education either directly or indirectly, some of the informants felt that their parents were there for support and encouragement. The indirect nature of this support in many cases allowed the scholars to experience a very favorable home environment both emotionally and financially. However, some of the influence on the scholars' choice of career was a very clear and direct message related to the value of higher education and scholarship.

Both my parents, they immigrated from (country) and they were at one time in their lives teachers. (...) I mean there was a lot of family conversation and having to be able to recite Shakespeare before you got your dessert and things like that. (Card 21)

It's not enough just to be intelligent but one had to hone it into some kind of formal education and training in order to have any chance at all in breaking into society. So we had great value where I grew up on education. And I would say even for poor people when I was growing up, education was truly the prize, the treasure, the pearl of great price beside religion. (Card 31)

Well I suppose a lot. I mean I grew up in a family that placed great value on education and intellectual accomplishments so that was highly influential. All the values that I got when I was a little kid are values that most academic people have. (Card 40)

It's part of life. That's an absolute I had to study and everybody else did. So that, and going to college was not a question. It's something you know the question is how well I could do rather than whether or not I went to college. (Card 51)

And yet I remember when I was growing up it wasn't even mentioned in the house that I was going to college. It was assumed. (Card 37)

Although he (father) secretly wished I would finish a college degree. And my mother felt that I deserved better so I should finish college no matter what(...). I guess I went beyond their expectations. (Card 33)

Not only did the parents promote the value of higher education, but also a critical element for pursuing a scholarly career path was presented: a desire for their children to value education and
strive toward professions that would inevitably upgrade their position in society as exemplified in the last quote. Even though these parents were not described as role models by their children, they helped stimulate the desire to do better than what they were able to accomplish during their lifetime.

The Importance of Mentors, Teaching Experiences and External Supports

When the informants did not have role models in their immediate and extended family groupings, they mentioned substitute mentors they experienced along the way. Twelve out of nineteen mentioned either a high school and/or college advisor/teacher that was instrumental in providing career guidance, direction toward obtaining financial supports and educational opportunities.

When I went to high school, I had teachers who were exceptional. And I think that was a much more important influence on my intellectual development. These teachers who were from (home country) who had gone to (country) come back and were teaching for the first time. (Card 12)

The teachers in my high school were exceptional. I would attribute a lot of my early intellectual curiosity to their endeavors. I think another very important factor was the teachers I had in college. One or two individuals took personal interest in me. And we used to take huge classes of 50 students and so on, basic introductory courses. But when they saw promise and some capacity for growth and intellectual development in me, they took an interest and encouraged me, critiqued my work. (Card 12)

I think the other probably big influence to me had to do with my graduate education at (research university). There was one woman, who was a Ph.D. person. And working with (name) I knew someday I would be a Ph.D. She was a fantastic model. (Card 16)

So I think that was probably that plus then over time, that kind of positive recognition that might be your calling. I think that's it plus a lot of other people have entered into my life over the years of recognizing your ability and encouraging you and giving you support and in some ways, actually opening doors for you. (Card 29)

There's no question that I had growing up in high school for example, I had a teacher that (provided) a tremendous amount of encouragement and support. In fact, I can go even further back in my ninth grade. I had a guy, a male teacher in intermediate school who was really tough. But for some reason, the chemistry was really good so he encouraged me a lot to study. (Card 37)

In high school it was (teacher). If it were not for him, I would be an electrician. I guess I would have retired now. I would be like most of my classmates. (Card 14)

There were just a whole string of people that he influenced and I was just fortunate to be one of them. (Card 48)

It started in my college years. The Dean of our college took me aside and said, "You are teaching material." (Card 33)
Whether it was a role model at home or one within the educational system, the majority of informants could identify mentors that had an impact on their pursuit of an academic degree. Some of the influential people also provided actual sponsorships to parochial schools where learning would be presumably enhanced through an individualized approach and teacher quality. Sponsorship was in addition to the mentoring that was revealed in the interviews.

In college, thirteen out of nineteen informants described various assistantships including teaching, research, and graduate types as an avenue for identifying and developing their teaching and research skills. Not only were role models important but the opportunity to actually practice the profession in a supervised environment seems to have been a critical component to considering a career in academia.

I started on being a teaching assistant at (research university) when I was working on my M.A. (...) I felt that my training as a T.A. at (research university) really probably had a major influence because it was such an excellent training that it made me just love to teach. (Card 31)

A second one is when I was actually at East/West Center going to the (country) to do fieldwork; to do field research and rediscovering how un-(ethnicity) I am. (Card 6)

I had a teaching assistantship and my husband was at the tail end of his doctorate. He had a research assistantship. (Card 13)

And he needed graduate assistants so I applied and obviously got hired because how many people are going to have undergraduate degrees in (discipline), be native speakers of the (language) he's studying and want to come home as a graduate assistant. (Card 18)

So I worked as a research assistant for all but one quarter of my time at (university). (Card 20)

But just being involved in the work and seeing how it's done or how one person does it really I think made me start thinking about the relationship between doing research, theorizing, all the socialization into academia. (Card 45)

The latter informant described the experience as being socialized into academia. The initial experience of working in the academic setting while completing the doctoral degree provided the opportunities for practice as well as financial support.

The faculty who did not mention assistantships described actual teaching experiences they were involved in prior to their acceptance of a college level position.
After the experiences in the classroom and the teaching at the junior/senior levels and at the graduate level, especially at the graduate level, I found a lot of similarities to the adult training area. (Card 7)

I had done teaching but that was not the main emphasis of my job. (Card 4)

I taught half time at other universities as a half time professor when I was doing my doctoral work. (Card 11)

But when I started to do this research project, I was also asked to do teaching on the side but not getting recognized or paid for it, but still getting exposed to teaching. (Card 15)

When I first moved over there I got a job teaching (subject) in their equivalent to our (type) institute, teaching college students (subject). (Card 19)

Teaching and working experiences available to faculty during their doctoral studies and post-doctoral positions groomed them for entry into the faculty ranks.

Along with assistantships, many of the informants pinpointed international experiences as key to broadening their horizons and expanding their educational repertoire. Fourteen out of nineteen described experiences of traveling or working abroad.

The fact that I've been living in several places and also (have been) confronted with lots of different situations. (Card 43)

I went to the mainland on a scholarship. (...) (Card 27)

The one thing was going to (country), the experiment in international living. I think that still continues to be both in my personal life and my professional life a very watershed experience. (...) I think the second thing that changed would be the (international) conference because it awakened me intellectually. (...) I started actively looking for a Ph.D. program. (Card 21)

And after I graduated I guess the other really critical experience was my first job when I went to work for the (organization). I worked in (country) for six months. I went to (country). I learned a lot of valuing of people. (Card 24)

Experiences such as attending college in the U.S. mainland, traveling with parents and participating in the military were discussed. The international experiences allowed the professionals to continue to achieve excellence outside their immediate cultural sphere of reference and become exposed to other cultures including the U.S.

Financial support in the form of scholarships, grants, parent contributions, and the G.I. bill were mentioned by eighteen out of nineteen informants. Even though the majority of the individuals interviewed came from middle class backgrounds, monetary rewards and opportunities
for study were as important to the completion of their degrees as mentors and teaching experience were. Because over half of the informants were youngest children, siblings were also available as role models and in some cases, financial support.

Another component of academic support both during their college education and later career pursuits were their individual spouses. Half of the spouses were also in the teaching profession and allowed the continuation of a stimulating educational environment within the home.

*It was a very supportive relationship. This person certainly wanted me to have a career and independence and whatever and pursue whatever I thought was better for me. So I think that was an important encounter. It has a strong effect on my life.* (Card 43)

*I think marriage, you know I feel in love with my wife(...)Even though both of us are intellectually inclined, there was a kind of reinforcement there that was very important for both of us. She sacrificed her career and followed me and that's why I'm leaving now for (country).* (Card 12)

(...) I have a husband who's been supportive; not just to give time but also to give advice. He's an academic. He's an associate professor. So he's been a nice mentor, a nice person just to say "You've got the potential, you've just got to do it." Having someone else believe in you helped a lot. (Card 16)

The spouses lent nurturance and support as well as cultivated a stimulating academic environment that the academics could thrive in. It would seem that success in academia then, depends on the series of supports the professionals received throughout their career building activities. The continuum of influence started early on in their educational upbringing and grew. These faculty had access to various socialization vehicles of influence all along their academic paths.

Sixteen out of nineteen faculty also indicated that they were invited into academia as a career. Here are some of the types of invitations that were made.

*Yes, and being invited.* (Card 2)

*My husband moved to a new place and they had no (type) jobs. So they had a teaching job. Actually, the institute that he applied for read my resume very carefully, and they pursued and asked if I wanted to teach.* (Card 4)

*I was working for the (government) department for the State and some of the professors had a consulting project with us. They asked about my background and why I didn't apply for a position, a teaching position.* (Card 7)
But they said there's a program out here at the UHM that lacks people who are knowledgeable about the (region) and are not (ethnic group). So I think it's through his own revelation of that, that then I was invited by the UHM to come as a visiting professor. I intended to go back to my other job because this was a university visiting position. However, when I was here I was offered by the school of (discipline) and the school of (discipline) a position. (Card 11)

And at that time I was with the Honolulu (type) of program. And so we had faculty visit us. And they had kind of asked me to, if I don't mind being a clinical faculty which meant coming to campus and giving lectures and all. (Card 15)

I came to Hawaii because I was at a national meeting and I saw three of my colleagues from Hawaii, sitting at a table having a cup of coffee. And I went over and sat down and joined them and they said "We're trying to look for a new (professor)". Which is what I do. And so I told them about all of these wonderful students I had that were just finishing post docs and everything. And they said, "Gee, why don't you apply?" (Card 16)

I was offered a job as a lecturer at the University at the very beginning here. (Card 18)

Well, I didn't see that I could do anything else because my advisor put the job description in my box. I felt like, "What am I going to say? I'd rather stay here?" (laughs) (Card 20)

The socialization process toward an academic career in the majority of cases offered an entrance into the academic world of the professoriate at a critical juncture in each informant's career path. The combination of the socialization variables and the invitation to the university worked in unison to create a situation for these ethnic minority recruits to enter into academia.

The Value of Education

Some of the faculty described their early educational experiences as enriching ones. The opportunity for education was available, and in some homes, it was encouraged and expected. The values and belief systems regarding education of the ethnic and racial minorities interviewed were ingrained during their early years. Comments made regarding the value placed on education are as follows:

Great (value). It's not only intellectually, it's a necessity in (country). (Card 13)

High value. Very high. (Card 16)

That there is a very, very high value placed on education in my family and when I grew up and in the (ethnicity) community. (Card 36)

Oh, very high, very high. An illustration of that is my father always thought that teaching was the highest profession. (Card 39)

I see myself as both American and (ethnicity) but if you're going to talk about the minority one, a great deal. (Ethnicity), education, man that's the big thing. It was never a question that we were going to go to college. (Card 23)
The value of education was realized for them early on during their career exploration periods.

The importance of education within their ethnic culture was emphasized by many of the informants. When asked "What value does your culture place on education?", the responses were for the majority, very positive concerning Western education as well as cultural ways. Most of the informants discriminated between the Western educational process of formal schooling and the oral cultural traditions that many adhered to in their home environment.

*By education we usually of course mean Western education. The one that's automatically talked about right? But by education we mean not only that but also seeing, feeling and acting in our cultural way.* (Card 14)

I think it's somewhat different. I know the values that my parents placed on education were extremely prominent in terms of influencing my brothers and sisters as well as myself. My culture on the other hand, values wisdom. The process of getting wisdom versus the process of getting educated, sometimes are difficult to understand. Wisdom you learn and then immediately you behave it. Getting educated, going through an educational process over many years, you don't see the direct behaviors associated with what's learned because it's a different kind of process. I think sometimes they obscure the true value and the importance of education. Also education is directly tied to the immediate needs of the community. (Card 26)

*Well I think it's a matter of how you define education first of all. If you're talking about acquiring a body of knowledge just in an abstract sense, just so you have it, and you don't necessarily do anything with it, except enrich your life, I don't think a tremendous amount of value is placed on that. Because the emphasis is what the individual can contribute to the group's well being. And so any kind of education or training that the individual gets should be translatable into how can that give something to the larger group. That kind of training, that kind of education is highly valued. But just esoteric knowledge for the sake of having it I don't think is of any great value.* (Card 28)

*I think (culture) has always valued learning. I don't know when they started it. I would like to think that it was inherent in the culture. But it's something that, it is prized may not always be achieved.* (Card 30)

Education was an important variable in terms of the ethnic minority faculty's pursuit of an academic career as well as their obtaining the necessary cross-cultural awareness to adapt successfully to the university environment. Education in their ethnic culture was separated from Western education. These faculty felt that both were of value in expanding their repertoire of cross-cultural skills and cultural integrity. These professionals had the benefit of two world views. They learned the importance of maintaining their cultural identity while learning the dominant cultural mode for success. The combination of family support and values and personal motivation cultivated the academic professional's socialization skills. The informants that were exposed to a supportive and
enriching cross-cultural environment in their early years displayed more imbedded cross-cultural attitudes that allowed them to continue to succeed in a university system. These professionals presented themselves as highly integrated individuals within a multiplicity of cultural systems. The findings here represent the influence of society, family values and individual traits that combine to provide a highly sophisticated, capable and specialized professional.

**Success and the Influence of Discrimination**

But what is the faculty's definition of success? Faculty described the three job responsibilities of the academic as teaching, research and community service. The majority of the faculty interviewed valued teaching above all and considered research and community service as secondary components that support their teaching activities. Some of the informants indicated a frustration with their colleagues who place more importance on research and publications. This difference may reflect a more collective attitude of benefiting the total community as compared to a more individually-oriented approach to competition and academic achievement. Even though these faculty presented themselves as very bright and competitive individuals, the extended family emphasis of many of the cultures represented here may influence their active participation in the teaching part of the profession. However, the faculty that valued teaching also recognized the need to balance their work accordingly.

*I think that's why I feel so strongly about this profession, because I think its a very socially oriented profession where you help others.* (Card 18)

*Teaching of course is a very important part. The teaching, the interaction with students; that's very important to me.* (Card 30)

*I love to teach. I love my students. I love (field).* (Card 31)

*I was inspired to do this because I enjoyed teaching and I enjoyed the research and thinking about (subject). I was somewhat surprised this interest burgeoned. And I just felt that I was just out of place in considering this because I knew no people, no people with my background who had ever done this.* (Card 14)

*So my requirements are that I've got to be able to teach. I will do, can do research. I do it very well. But I don't want to ever be in a position where I did do research and no teaching(...)And so I guess one of the career goals is making a difference as a teacher.* (Card 21)

*And then colleagues, professors have their own standards of measurement for what constitutes a legitimate professor. And some of them are really heavy into research which*
is fine because it's fairly clear cut. They respect that sort of thing. I appreciate it but it's not necessary or important to me. Your teaching evals., your professional performance; those are the things. (Card 26)

The faculty that remain successful within a highly research-focused institution seem to adjust to the demands of publishing, although they do not lose sight of their primary purpose of influencing others through both teaching and research.

So I guess I'm torn. Prior to coming to the university level, my immediate response would have been to the students. You know, not just to teach but to see how I could help them realize their potential and I guess I still include that in my answer because it's a priority for me. But I guess the second reality, for me and an important part of my job is to contribute now to the broader range of knowledge and to do good research. (Card 16)

So that I see the research part of it as kind of a stepping stone to that other thing. And which is somewhat heretical because you're supposed to be the other way around and you're supposed to use the student's fodder for getting your research out. So that I see the research as a way or one of its values is becoming a better teacher because you stay on top of the stuff and all those neat things you find out you can pass on to the student. (Card 21)

I was writing and I realized that in higher education, if you are going to make a career out of it then you are going have to play the game. And the game is that you've got to do more than just be an excellent teacher or [professional]. There are going to be other criteria that you'll be judged by. (Card 35)

What I hear from the other faculty is that when you go for tenure review, community services is considered zero. And it's a mockery in a sense that this university is built on these three mission statements right? Teaching, research and service. And we give lip service to teaching and we give lip service to community service. And everything else is concentrated on publications. (...) But I think there's this artificial, almost fantasy kind of thing of no publication, no consideration of tenure and promotion. And all I'm asking is some sense of balance in the approach, that's all. And I feel I've been doing all three of the things that should be the hallmark of a faculty member. (Card 39)

I mean they're all important. Teaching is important. Research is important. The two are inseparable. Being on committees is important. (...) And it's all important to different people for different reasons so who can judge? (Card 40)

The faculty displayed a commitment to all three aspects of their job and seemed to be able to maintain a balance among teaching, research and community service. Their success related to this balance. They continued to keep teaching as a priority in their work while recognizing the need to conduct research to gain rank and tenure.

When discussing the importance of research in academia, the aspect of integrating the research to serve both their teaching and community responsibilities was emphasized over and
above the traditional standards of valuing research as the primary component of an academic's work focus. Community involvement was seen by many to be an important aspect of their job.

I see myself as a role model. I want to make myself available. But also, I want the community to know that we have a (ethnicity) person in the (discipline) department. There are many community needs and I think because (discipline) is so directly related to community concerns and practices and helping them solve problems, that I think they need to know that someone's up there. (Card 16)

One faculty member acknowledged her commitment to teaching but also wanted to focus on her research endeavors to address the tendency of stereotyping women as student caretakers and not really good researchers.

And generally they've(minorities) been not such terrific academics as researchers. They've been pretty awful, some of them. So to that extent I feel kind of typecast, that people have in my field this expectation because I do a lot of political stuff that that's all there is to her. So I think within the field, the perception of (ethnicity) American or (ethnicity) women academics is that they're probably not going to be very good researchers. But they'll be good mommies in the field; good mother figures in the field. (Card 47)

The aspect of stereotyping and typecasting ethnic minority academics surfaced in other discussions of hiring practices based on merit. There may be a dilemma experienced by these faculty when attempting to present themselves as competent academics. Having to prove themselves to overcome these various stereotypes was evident from many of the faculty comments. Valuing teaching may further de-emphasize their efforts to confront the perceived barriers of stereotyping and typecasting because research is usually considered by the faculty norm to be more critical to tenure and promotion. These faculty face other organizational members' attributions for their success that are influenced by stereotyping and typecasting based on their minority status.

Although failure was not queried about directly, the issue was raised during several of the interview sessions, unrelated to the probe concerning obstacles encountered during their careers. In general, the faculty tended to acknowledge their role in any failure they encountered as opposed to attributing their difficulties to external factors.

I think my family was fairly intact. If there were any problems its probably my fault or my doing in terms of my own growing out of adolescence and wanting to be independent and you know you're dependent. (Card 37)
But seriously, a lot of people are afraid to fail. But you cannot succeed if you only do things that make you succeed. I think that's one of the things I have learned. You have to take risks but you have to take risk with caution. And I think I try to do that. And I'm not always successful. (Card 29)

Or if I applied for a grant through the university system and didn't get it I couldn't say "Well they're racist." I mean I couldn't do that(...) That showed me that it's possible that my proposal was not good enough. (Card 35)

This attributional pattern is opposite to the type of failure attributions made by white males (Kelley and Michela, 1980). These researchers found that white males, when faced with a failure situation, tended to attribute any failure to others or external factors, while identifying success with their own personal abilities.

Not only is failure considered differently, the amount of effort expended on career goals is perceived to be greater for minorities. Several of the faculty, both male and female informants, mentioned the perceived expectation that they had to work harder than their white peers to succeed within an academic institution and the American culture in general. This finding is similar to the findings in the study conducted by Boice(1992). Some of the following excerpts highlight this attitude:

Well, and this is probably still true for other ethnic groups. I was told very early that "Look. As a (ethnicity) person, you're going to have to do more than everybody else in order to excel." That is so hard on an individual to feel that you can't just be ordinary. You just can't. You've got to excel. And that presents a very serious problem for individuals who are of minority backgrounds that in order for them to obtain the same opportunities they've got to be twice as good as an ordinary, white male for example. And I feel women probably feel the same way; probably experience the same thing. That is that you've got to be twice as good, you know. So that was said in my family when I was young. I mean you've got to be twice as good if you're going out competing particularly if you're going out in an interracial kind of thing, you've got to be twice as good. That sort of stuck in the back of my mind: what you do you're going to have to be good at it. I later found out that you could be average like other people and perform and do and you don't have to drive yourself crazy over the weekend when you should be relaxing and enjoying your family. (Card 36)

In that sense, it's much more typical because you have to make a double effort basically, not only be like the others but perhaps being more whatever to be able to survive. Because if you are the same you won't even be noticed. So you have to prove yourself. I mean you have to prove that you can do things and you can do them well. And that's for me the most difficult challenge in a way. They don't expect the same from you. They expect more. I don't know why. (Card 43)

And yet as I spoke to other colleagues of mine who are Japanese, Chinese, Korean, or whatever, and they tell me something that I've been feeling although I haven't been able to have the guts to articulate it and that goes something like this. That to even maintain a position here at the School or at the University, you've got to be almost twice as better as
another white person. I keep on hearing that you know. You’ve got to work extra hard. They’ve got to produce more than their so called standard or more than their neighbor. And it kind of grates them sometimes. And it’s something that reminded me of a kind of almost trite statement that I heard on the mainland when I started to deal with minority issues and that was about minorities being the last to be hired, first to be fired. (Card 39)

Ethnic and racial minority faculty attribute their success to their hard work but some consider the effort to be an unfair expectation when having to compete against the majority of the candidates who are white and already have a perceived automatic acceptance into the mainstream culture due to the fact that they come from the dominant group.

The Bicultural Professional

For the majority of the faculty interviewed, the movement into the mainstream culture began very early in their existence. This dynamic process can be categorized as an acculturation or biculturation into the U.S. culture. The individual becomes adept at “code switching”, applying the parts of the separate value systems to appropriate situations. Parental attitudes and the situational experiences of these ethnic and racial minority faculty provided an early base for later performance in an university culture. Most of the faculty interviewed had some contact with the dominant U.S. culture in both positive and negative ways. The perceptions of the faculty experience were influenced by the amount of acculturation that occurred early on in their upbringing and the values held by their family members.

I think that the home environment was supportive in this respect. I came from what might be called a fairly traditional family of (farmers). But what we had at home was a tolerance of ethnicity and pluralism. (Card 12)

Some of the faculty were raised in very stable and accepting environments where contact with the dominant U.S. culture was minimal. They grew up with a security about their own cultural identity that limited feelings of isolation they may have confronted later on when entering the university milieu.

I think I became more aware of diversity and discrimination when I left my country. (Card 44)

I wasn’t conscious of it. You’re not aware of it in your own place to begin with. You’re made aware of it when you’re outside. (Card 33)

I never felt a thing. No. No. That is the most powerful, significant, single factor of difference for me. I grew up where I was number one citizen. And I came when I was
twenty-four. There is absolutely no way anybody can take that away from me. You feel the difference. Now I can tell the difference when you meet a black person on the mainland and there's something about them that will stand out. If they're born and raised in Africa and they came for graduate studies and they stay, you can tell there is something different. There is a sense of dignity and ownership of your own person, soul, body, the entire shebang that makes you stand out. (Card 33)

So as a boy growing up, I had no white playmates. And high school, I had no contact whatsoever. And I'm not saying that regretfully. I mean it was good. It was good for me because then that’s when I became very sensitive and very conscious of who I was and my environment and the realities of America in the (region). So my first exposure to anything integrated was when I went to the service. (Card 35)

My domestic situation is only one of the boats that constitutes a fleet called culture. Fortunately, I had a very stable canoe or a very stable captain. So my canoe that I came from in the fleet of canoes was very stable. (Card 26)

These faculty expressed very positive aspects of growing up in an ethnic and racial minority culture which for them was actually the majority culture. There was no need to address the conflicts and demands consistent with minority experiences within a dominant U.S. culture.

For the most part, the minority faculty interviewed seemed to adhere to a more bicultural way of thinking and behaving. This biculturalism was found to occur early on in their development. Several, although not the majority of the faculty, described experiences that resembled marginalization and separation from the host culture. Discrimination occurred for those faculty who were residing in the U.S. from either birth or an early age. Discrimination and racism was evident at an early age for these faculty. Coping mechanisms were developed to confront the differences. When asked, "What was it like for you growing up as an ethnic minority?", episodes of discrimination and stereotyping were described.

It was a living hell. But it was a living hell that I got used to. I would not want it, I don't want anyone else to experience what I did. (...) And I don't have to, I don't ever want to defend my existence and my right to be here. I think that is a fundamental right. But that is denied from me. And that is a struggle. (Card 52--foreign born residing in the U.S.)

They kept having their parties at the yacht club but we didn't get invited anymore. It was, it was very painful. (...) So we went through a very painful time and at the time we really didn't talk about it a great deal. I mean that was how it was and you lived with it. And we made our own spaces. There was still enough of us so that we could form a kind of core. (Card 28--U.S. born and raised)

And the war broke out. And what was so bewildering for me was the hysteria broke out and my so called peers, my friends, my neighborhood chumps decided to attack me physically. So I used to get beaten up every day. (Card 39--Hawaii born and raised)
You know every time I had to do something; like I was running an errand for a teacher and I had to go from class to class to get a signature, it was just amazing. It was like I was walking, I was in a zoo and all the people were just looking at me. And you know, fingers pointing, "Oh, a(ethnicity)." *(Card 49--U.S. born and raised)*

Some responses to the question of the minority experience were that they were not a minority in the place they resided or came from. They were not exposed to discrimination when they were young although some were introduced to it when they entered college or the military.

*Well, I wasn’t growing up in (area); growing up among my own people. I didn’t even know what an ethnic minority was until I went to college. And then ethnic minorities, it just never had an impression on me.* *(Card 26)*

*So as a child I belonged to the majority. I looked like everyone else.* *(Card 44)*

I resent the stigma that minorities are in organizations because of their minority status rather than anything that has to do with their cerebral capacities. So I think I encountered that in the initial stages. *(Card 26)*

Then I went to (university) again. It was just being the novel graduate student. (...) Well, there was all this kind of positive stuff which in any kind of analysis you would have to see as tokenism. *(Card 46)*

*Well for one thing, I didn’t exist and I wasn’t important especially at the university that I went to. It’s very prep and all the rich kids go there. So in terms of social significance I was a zero. I’m not the type of person you would want to marry or even think about. (...) And in the U.S. for some reason, I know the reason but difference is difference and non-familiar things are threatening.* *(Card 52)*

The discrimination was described by some as blatant and by others as subtle. For the most part however, the informants did not dwell on the negative aspects of their ethnic minority experience.

Some recognized the situations they experienced as typecasting and the model minority mystique described in the literature concerning Asian Americans.

*More subtle things on campus. People surprised that there’s a (ethnicity) course on campus. I mean that’s generally the ordinary, response or people saying, “Oh, the only reason she’s teaching is she’s a (ethnicity) woman.”* *(Card 32)*

*But again, when I think back it had to do with the stereotype of being the (type)minority. I was a high achiever but was never taught to make waves; never taught to challenge authority. And I think part of the conflict sort of developed when I went to (college) because there they teach you to raise issues and question authority. So I think the challenge was to balance something out.* *(Card 16)*

These informants did not feel threatened or unable to confront the issues and resolve them. Again, the bicultural attitude enabled them to identify the problem and then deal with it accordingly, instead of harboring negative responses to the racism experienced.
Even though some of the faculty did not consider themselves minorities where they grew up, such as foreign born or Hawaiian born informants, there were other bicultural incidents that allowed them to learn Western ways such as American schooling opportunities.

The second most important thing was my father using his political influence which wasn’t very prominent at the time in trying to get me into a private school only for American children. (Card 26)

We also had two standards; one for the Americans and one for us in the villages. So we had our own teachers and the American kids had their own school. And so this person used to come there, and I remembered her well. (...) They contacted my mother who was working very hard because she was just a widow with (number) children and arranged for me to attend the American School. (Card 29)

The majority of the faculty experienced life styles that provided an opportunity for developing an awareness of the Western society, whether it was directly, as in the case of mainland U.S. citizens, or indirectly as has been described for the foreign and Pacific Island born faculty. Some ethnic and racial minority groups, especially those residing in the mainland U.S. tended to confront racism and discrimination earlier in their upbringing than foreign born recruits. The key aspect of developing a bicultural attitude seems to be the success of maintaining the integrity of the ethnic culture along with acceptance of the dominant culture. When encountering racism, this balance may have been more difficult to accomplish due to the early onset and continuation of the discrimination encountered. However, there are other factors in the lives of these faculty that provided the fortitude to combat the discrimination they were exposed to early on in their existence.

Some considered the ethnic minority experience as enriching as opposed to a disadvantaging one, that they could capitalize on when engaged in cross-cultural encounters.

So that I was always aware of my ethnicity. But I never saw it as a burden or as a disadvantage. I saw it as something that I could stand out because people would remember me because I was the brown one. And so far, even today, that kind of attitude has carried me through where I’ve never been in a situation(...) (Card 23)

I think my ethnic background enabled me to overcome my challenges because it became very obvious, very early that there were advantages in being from my region. For example, they let me into places and allowed me to do things they wouldn’t have allowed a Mexican or a Black person to. I learned very quickly how romanticized my part of the world was. (...) (Card 26)
Well as I said earlier, I think what it did was rather than create challenges, it created opportunities for me and special privileges. I don't think this is true now. I think (ethnicity) students coming onto campus now face challenges and barriers which were not there for me. (Card 28)

In the case of some of these professionals, their ethnic background and heritage was an asset for them when functioning within the majority society. They seemed to be able to promote their difference when pursuing their careers. At the same time, they were aware of the potential prejudice that they faced. These faculty later commented on episodes of discrimination that they met as a faculty person. There may be degrees of socialization, acculturation and biculturation depending on the type of ethnic experience one is raised in. The U.S. born ethnic minorities who were acculturated early on as well as the foreign immigrants that had limited exposure to the U.S. culture faced more episodes of marginalization than the Hawaiian born and Pacific Basin born faculty. However, there are some similarities that both of these groups possess that may encourage a more bicultural attitude, whether discrimination is experienced or not.

These professionals were introduced to some aspect of racism or discrimination at a pivotal point during their early or later developmental periods. The strategy for overcoming any negative attitude was described by several informants as a capability to preserve their ethnic identity along with adjusting to the dominant white culture of America.

The following quotes define the skills a majority of the informants possessed such as sensitivity, cross-cultural adaptability and multi-cultural awareness.

And it was also part of that discovery of yourself; your potential of what you can do. I also saw that in particular situations, I was very skillful and very good at the cross-cultural anything's. You know, explaining one side to the other or recognizing what you would call the cultural rules that one side is operating by and is being misunderstood or not being caught by the other. And I attributed this to the fact that I'm a minority American, so you're always code switching anyway. So I saw that was also a strength and something I could do well and that I liked. This is essentially what I see academics should be doing in introducing things from one side to the other whether its cultural or intellectual or artistic. (Card 21)

So I think learning to walk between two completely different sets of expectations, parentally, but even going more beyond that in terms of extended family; grandparents, aunts, uncles and it was literally moving from one extreme to the other. Probably not ever realizing or thinking about it at the time. But that I think was one of the critical skills, especially surviving in Hawaii and being successful in Hawaii, that you just learn to adapt to the norms and also not to be judgmental. (Card 24)
But again the difference between trying to balance the two worlds is sensitivity. Because of the acquired level of sensitivity that was generated and developed at home, I was able to walk very carefully along, walking on all the broken eggshells or glass depending on the situation. Being sensitive all the way around and also being able to adapt. (…) You cannot deal with change in a rigid or an inflexible manner. And the basis of adapting or adaptability is sensitivity. If you don’t have that, you really don’t have much other than you’re in for a lot of encounters that will be rough going. (Card 26)

But if you are really interested in an academic career, you cannot wait for the institution to change so that it fits a hundred percent into whatever culture you’re coming out of. You really need to make the accommodation. And I think if you look at people, women, (ethnicity) women who have succeeded on this campus, one of the ways they have done it is by breaking out of what is considered to be the traditional (ethnicity) role. And its unfortunate in a sense that while people applaud their success they will be really negative about the kinds of things they had to do in order to achieve those successes. (…) And if people around you say “Well, that’s not a (ethnicity) way to be.” That’s their problem. That’s my advice. (Card 28)

I had to have had a strong internal. That’s why I’m very confident about my looking at the world inside out. Because without that insider core, there were just so many things that made me shift gears so fast to adapt that you could have been overwhelmed. So people and events kind of combined to shape me in preparation. (Card 33)

But when you come to the U.S., it’s not the same because first of all, you know you are nebulous in terms of your character and appearance. So it’s being able to not be too intrusive and on the other hand be sensitive. think it’s an art maybe. It’s part of personality maybe. It’s a bunch of all those things. (…) But I learned to respond to Western ways. And I think I’ve learned to deal with Westemers where I feel comfortable and not feel like a (regional group). You’re always torn apart between being rude because our ways are so different. But I’ve learned to accommodate that. So I’ve learned I think. My friends say I’m truly very bicultural. (Card 29)

Bicultural. I feel like I function in this society and I like to be here. And at the same time I also feel that I am also happy when I go back to (region). So that makes me the way I am I think. (Card 43)

The attitudes of biculturalism appear key to functioning successfully within a society that poses differences as well as an academic community that challenges one’s way of thinking and behaving. The bicultural attitude stems from the early socialization experiences of these professionals as well as their own personal self-esteem and integrity. They appear willing to move between cultures to make the necessary accommodations for achieving success. They also consciously are able to recognize the need to trigger cultural “code switching” when confronted with situations that are in conflict with their own cultural perceptions and repertoire. They are actually experts skilled in bicultural awareness.

Most of the faculty interviewed were either raised in a middle to upper middle class home, except for those that came from the Pacific Islands, where class distinction is not determined by
monetary wealth but by lineage. The class distinction may warrant more attention in that it may provide a vehicle for pursuing a professional career in spite of the obstacles cited here concerning racism. In other words, young aspiring students that come from a higher class level where self-worth is partially determined by social recognition of the family, may have a better chance at succeeding.

**Summary**

The findings of the study indicate that there were variables that influenced the career choice and success of the scholars interviewed. The variables were categorized into the four levels offered by Ragins and Sundstrom (1989): societal, organizational, interpersonal, and individual domains. The majority of the faculty pinpointed the importance of a supportive family environment that placed a high value on education as critical to the development of their academic potential. Mentors were mentioned by most as having a direct influence on their career choice and success. In addition to role models available, most of the faculty interviewed here received an invitation to work within a university setting. Faculty identified their interpersonal skills and individual abilities, determination, and self-confidence as factors that influenced their success.

The findings revealed both internal drive, ability and curiosity as well as a multiplicity of external factors that socialized the informants toward a career as a faculty member. The family setting, the educational experience, the mentors and sponsors, the financial supports, the graduate assistantships and the experiences as leaders in student government, as well as the international experiences and being invited into the professoriate provided an atmosphere of learning and career exploration that resulted in choosing academia as a profession. All of the individuals possessed innate characteristics and received a variety of opportunities that resulted in their success in college and as an academic. The acculturation process was a lifelong occurrence and differed by individual depending on the kinds of experiences to which they were exposed. Beyond the educational foundation that was built, these individuals were part of an
ethnic and racial minority acculturation process within a dominant cultural atmosphere that also had an impact on their accomplishments. Immersion into a majority culture during these faculty's formative years and their later experiences in a university subculture, significantly influenced the informants' overall attitudes as an ethnic and racial minority person and a minority faculty member. The degree to which these professionals experienced integration into or marginalization from the dominant culture of the U.S. and the university, influenced their attitudes as a faculty member and may have played an important role in their career success, especially as related to their overall adjustment to the academic setting of a U.S. university. The discussion section that follows will further describe the implications of the variables for career choice and success presented here.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The following chapter further discusses the findings and the implications for future study. Three models are offered as interpretations of the findings presented in Chapter 4. The first model incorporates the previous four tiered grid and organizes the attribution variables by type and career phases. The variables are discussed more fully as they relate to faculty's career choice and success. Acculturation theory is employed in the second model to attempt to understand the experiences of minority faculty within the dominant U.S. culture and university subculture. Thirdly, success in academe is explored through the application of the bicultural conceptual model. This model draws from both attribution and acculturation theories to explain the impact of background on the aspiring academic.

**Attribution Variables Influencing Career Choice and Success**

The four part model by Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) provided an effective means for both the formulation of the interview questions and the later categorization of the variables influencing career choice and success (see Figure 2, p. 97). Attribution theory was used to analyze the type of attributions made as relating to the four distinct categories proposed for organizing the variables. Critical points in the faculty’s careers were included in the grid to further define the developmental period at which the attributions occurred. The variables were then listed by type—organizational, interpersonal, and individual, and by career phase—early years, college, recruitment to academe, and retention and tenure. The grid represents the first model generated from the grounded theory analysis.

Key variables in the societal domain were socioeconomic status, respect for one’s culture and the value of community. Parent and extended family role models provided stability and security for faculty to explore their academic potential. Later community involvement was highly valued by the majority of professionals. The faculty recognized the impact of external influences on their educational successes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF VARIABLE</th>
<th>PHASE OF CAREER-SUCCESS VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Years-Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal</td>
<td>-cultural experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-acceptance in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dominant culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-respect for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-parent role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>-type of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>-role of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-likes and interacts with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-participates in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-love for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-career aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal, Social norms and customs, role stereotyping, appropriate practices of socialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational, resources, positional power, involvement in decision-making, policy development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal, peer networks, sponsoring, mentorship, supportive supervisors, supportive subordinate relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual, skills, traits, characteristics, academic credentials held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Variables Influencing Career Choice And Success**
Organizational variables were found to enhance the personal strengths of the faculty. Private education, exposure to mentors and provisions for scholarships and financial supports were crucial to their success. This finding parallels the literature concerning the importance of financial availability for graduate students. The lack of finances and the need to support a family have been shown to be detrimental to attaining success in graduate studies (Justiz, Bjork and Wilson, 1988; Menges and Exum, 1983; Olsen, 1990; Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990).

Graduate assistantships offered during the faculty's college years provided a sound foundation for taking advantage of later career opportunities in higher education. Exposure to the profession during their training period allowed the faculty recruits to develop the skills required for successful entry and success in academia. Additionally, the type of school attended was also mentioned as important to educational development including elementary, secondary and post-secondary education institutions. Those attending private schools during their early years and renowned colleges and universities later on indicated that these schools made a difference in the quality of their education. Lastly, having an invitation to become a faculty member was highlighted as a key variable influencing the career choice of an academic professional. These opportunities were in the form of direct invitations from advisors, professors or colleagues to take a position at the university or indirect offers such as receiving notice of a potential job opening from their advisor. Several faculty were invited as visiting professors or guest lecturers based on their unique background or expertise and eventually were offered permanent positions. Many of the faculty used the word "invited" when asked "What influenced your choice of academia as a career?" This is a significant finding in that the choice of becoming a professor was encouraged by other professionals already in the field. Without the invitation to become a faculty member, many of the faculty interviewed for this study would have continued in administrative positions or selected other career directions. This finding may have significant implications when considering ways to increase the pool of ethnic and racial minority recruits. The organizational structure provided a variety of opportunities for these ethnic minority candidates. Without financial
supports, sponsorship, mentoring, and a direct invitation to become a faculty member, they may have selected other career routes.

Interpersonally, many of the faculty describe networks that were created early on in their education. In the majority of cases, parents and extended family were teacher role models for their achievement-oriented offspring. This early interaction with family lead to later connections built with teachers and advisors in high school. The college experience was also filled with networking opportunities among peers and mentors. Jensen (1982) in a study of women faculty found that the choice of dissertation advisor was critical to their acculturation to academic life. Once involved in a faculty position, working with colleagues, students and the community continued to be important connections that had an effect on their career success.

In the individual domain, faculty attributed success to several internal variables such as hard work and drive. Career choice however, appeared to evolve from a series of important external variables as has already been mentioned. Faculty used personal descriptors such as being bright, committed, curious, charming, hard working, driven, and visionary to identify their internal capacity for achievement. As classified by Wittig (1985), these faculty displayed internal attributions for their success in an academic realm. Attributing success to internal processes resembles the findings of a study of male and female administrators who identified hard work as critical to their success (Russo et al, 1991). Although some of the informants mentioned their good fortune that lead them to a faculty career, for the most part, success was an internally generated outcome.

In addition to the congruent values of competition and self-reliance that were found in many of the faculty interviewed, the value of education among others appeared to be dominant in the early experiences of the ethnic minority faculty interviewed. Education was found to be of utmost importance in the lives of these faculty. Family and society dictated the value of education and aspirations for a college degree and beyond. Although a career in academia was not realized
until someone evidenced the potential of these professionals and invited them into the academic world, education was valued as a key ingredient to success.

Several faculty raised the issue of the double standard imposed on ethnic and racial minority faculty as they attempt to gain recognition and success in an academic atmosphere. The perceptions of these faculty were that, within the organizational environment, colleagues, administrators and peers expected more from the performance of ethnic minority faculty. Some of the faculty felt that others attributed their success to external variables such as affirmative action requirements or policies for funding minority research as opposed to individual merit and achievement. Examining the attitudes of others regarding ethnic and racial minority success in academia would further the attribution theoretical perspective and clarify whether the double standard does inhibit minority faculty's pursuit of success in academia. As has been evident in the higher education literature (Boice, 1992; Exum et al, 1984; Miller, 1991), several faculty identified the double standard for ethnic minority faculty.

Prominent was the perception that ethnic minority faculty were required to achieve beyond the expectations of their non-minority cohorts. Several faculty discovered later on in their career after success had been achieved that the need to prove themselves to their non-minority colleagues may have only been their own perception of the situation and not the reality. Whether or not these faculty experienced the subtle expectations of the majority or just perceived it as such, it appeared to be less of an issue once tenure was achieved. Interviewing new recruits and non-minorities might reveal whether the attitude is in fact discrimination present in the non-minority university culture or a result of the typical standards imposed on all new faculty.

In summary, the study has revealed that ethnic and racial minority faculty attribute their career choice to external variables such as advisors and sponsors but attribute their success to their individual curiosity, ability and drive. In addition to the internal attribution for their success,
the majority of faculty credited their families for providing a supportive home environment that allowed them to pursue their academic aspirations. Role models and mentors in high school and college also supported their career and academic pursuits. Attribution theory allowed for a limited interpretation of these faculty's career choice and success. The theory provided an initial means to compare internal and external attributions for career choice and success as has been presented here. In examining the data further, acculturation theory was applied to consider other aspects of career choice and success discussed by these professionals.

**Acculturation Toward The Academy**

The acculturation experience each individual informant described during the interview sessions influenced their later successful interactions and functioning within the university culture. These faculty possessed innate characteristics that motivated them to aspire toward a professional position. The more exposure they received to the majority culture by way of parents and extended family as role models, early school experiences, and advisors and mentors, the better prepared they were to move through the educational ranks.

As depicted in Figure 3 (p. 102), the core U.S./university culture is proposed to be at the center of the circles of influence. Where the faculty fits within each cultural sphere has an effect on the degree of perceived success and acquisition of cross-cultural skills demonstrated by these faculty. Although the small sample only allows for the proposal of the spheres of influence as a possibility for explaining the degree of integration and acceptance in the dominant culture, it provides a conceptual framework to further investigate the bicultural socialization experience. In a study conducted by Wolf and Ingle (1993), generational status was found to be significant in the level of satisfaction within the university setting. Those faculty born in the U.S. were found to be more satisfied with social and academic integration than their immigrant counterparts. In the Wolfe and Ingle study, the researchers focused on a particular ethnic minority group to draw comparisons. Future studies conducted could trace individuals' ethnic roots and location of upbringing to explain the finding further. Increasing the sample to include larger numbers of
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Figure 3. Ethnic and Racial Minority Faculty's Socialization to the U.S. University Subculture as Influenced by Place of Birth/Residence/Training
ethnic and racial minority recruits that fall within each category of influence would also further the initial proposition discussed here.

The ethnic and racial minority faculty who were mainland born and trained fall within an inner circle. This group of aspiring students grow up in proximity to the majority culture, may have one parent from this social group and have early educational experiences including parochial schooling, student government, and other factors that provide a foundation for acquiring the complementary perceptions and behaviors that allow them to act according to the rules set by the dominant culture. These faculty are truly acculturated or more specifically integrated into the dominant social system. As faculty experiences and family background place them within the outer spheres of cross-cultural exposure, the less prepared they are to confront the perceived differences in their academic experience. They may describe discrimination, typecasting and stereotyping more readily than their ethnic and racial minority peers who possess a wider breadth of cross-cultural awareness and orientation. The faculty that grew up in Hawaii or the Pacific Basin, although not as acculturated as the mainland born minorities, possess bicultural skills available to them from living in a cross-cultural environment. Those individuals that grew up in foreign countries and came to the U.S. for their educational studies were less integrated into the U.S. culture due to the acquisition of bicultural skills later in their socialization period. Although successful within the faculty ranks, these individuals experienced more conflicting attitudes and views of the non-minority university culture because of the later familiarity with cultural differences. However, with the college experience and other early variables influencing their success, these faculty were able to develop the bicultural attitudes that allowed them to integrate into the academic environment. The foreign born/foreign trained faculty located in the outer ring tended to have attitudes about the dominant culture that separated them from the majority. They appeared to be unwilling to engage in the values and beliefs held by the core culture that would, in turn, enable them to be more effective in addressing the challenges of working in an unfamiliar cultural environment where they are considered the minority. They see the differences and do
not want to accept the host culture’s behavioral repertoires and would rather maintain stronger connections with their ethnicity of origin. The degree of biculturalism held by each faculty then, influences the way in which they perceive the host culture of the U.S. and the university system. The more that the bicultural attitude is ingrained in their perceptual processes, the more well suited they are to confront the nuances of discrimination posed by the dominant cultural group whether overtly or covertly manifested.

As posited by Reynolds (1992), the faculty that are socialized toward the university world view experience a congruence in their perceptions and actual experience. The faculty that are groomed during their early years to thrive on competition, self-reliance, and challenge to the status quo tend to accept the tenure requirements and balance the demands of teaching, scholarly writing and community involvement. Once accepted into the academy, ethnic and racial minority faculty who adhere to the rules by relying on personal strengths and aptitudes, move successfully through the academic ranks without the experience of marginalization. When their world view lacks the training to compete and confront cultural interference and challenge, these faculty may remain in peripheral academic positions such as lecturers and part time faculty posts. Given the small number studied here, this is clearly speculative. Again, extending the study from successful ethnic and racial minority faculty to a broader range of new faculty found within the academic ranks may lend support to this particular finding.

Several of the faculty were born into families where one of the parents came from a European or white background. Whether or not exposure to the attitudes of the dominant culture early on within the family unit offered the opportunity to learn the majority culture during critical developmental periods and prepare the young for interacting more effectively within the dominant culture remains to be found. In this study, however, the acculturation experience appeared to have been influenced by the non-minority parent. These faculty may have gained acculturation experiences during their formative years that helped them to develop the ability to “code switch” that later came naturally for them when functioning within the university subculture. The bicultural
awareness provided them easy access to the dominant culture because they derived the skills from family influences, not general experiences with mentors outside the family circle. These faculty were prepared to function simultaneously in two worlds by their earlier lifestyle that provided exposure to two different cultural perspectives.

Bicultural attitudes were found to be key in functioning within an academic milieu. Not only did the faculty members of mixed parentage demonstrate interpersonal skills in working effectively in two cultures, they also expressed a duality in value systems. These faculty had the ability to identify with the host culture while maintaining a strong tie to their ethnic background because their cultural reference was a duality of traditions, beliefs and values, one of which came from the majority culture. Biculturalism occurred for these professionals during their formative years somewhat like bilingualism develops in children. The faculty were integrated into two cultural systems from the beginning as opposed to having to adjust or adapt their already fixed primary cultural perceptions later on in their development when reformulating beliefs and values becomes more challenging. Future studies could examine potential faculty recruits from mixed parentage to see if this finding could be generalized outside the confines of this study.

Shwartz's (1992) typology of values can be compared to the beliefs expressed by these informants. Power and social status were reflected in the middle class backgrounds of the majority of the faculty interviewed. Even for the faculty that grew up in more subsistence life styles, family members were described as survivors that provided them with a security and self-confidence that carried through for them into their career exploration period. The power base for them was just as evident as the personal and monetary support derived from a middle class status. The individuals demonstrated high achievement orientation in their academic pursuits. They valued their personal drive and curiosity for learning. Although guided by mentors and advisors, these faculty valued self-direction and competence in the academic setting. Respect for family, tradition and the needs of others within their extended family and community were held in high esteem. The stable nature of their upbringing and educational experiences was evident.
Financial supports permitted them to pursue educational opportunities. The cross-cultural experiences allowed them to build on their personal strengths and adopt skills that enabled them to conform to the rigors of the academic environment without experiencing major rejection or failure. These faculty valued key traditions of the university culture that provided them with a foundation to face the challenges when confronting unfamiliar situations of the dominant culture. If their cultural differences presented a value profile of beliefs that were in direct conflict with the those held by members of the academy, success may have been an illusory goal. One of the informants suggested that the values he learned from his family were compatible with the values of every academic. Exploring the acculturation experiences and belief systems of new faculty members may reveal a typology of beliefs needed to confront the challenges of the academy that could be fostered early on in the individual's educational experience especially if they were not a part of their earlier home environments.

The Process Toward Becoming a Bicultural Professional

The faculty achieved success within the academy due to the combination of their early educational experiences and upbringing, their individual traits, and the influences of family and mentors. The bicultural professional developed from the combination of variables discussed here. The third model generated from the analysis is graphically depicted in Figure 4 (p. 107). The diagram shows the interrelationship in the findings and the progression of influence that occurred for the faculty. The degree to which each individual becomes a bicultural professional corresponds to the type of experiences available to them at critical points during their upbringing. The variables have been previously discussed and listed in Figure 2 (p. 97) showing the four important periods of development: the early years prior to college, college, academic recruitment, and retention/tenure. The earlier the exposure to the variables that influence the development of a bicultural professional, the more adept the person seemed to be at cultural "code switching".
Figure 4. The Development of Bicultural Skills for Success in Academia
As depicted in the bicultural skills model (see Table 4, p. 107), the aspiring student is influenced by four key variables: parent role models, cultural experiences, family background, and international experiences. The richer the experiences during this early stage of development, the greater the bicultural skill level that is acquired. Parents that act as role models for their children such as being a teacher themselves or encouraging academic and professional aspirations, initiate the development of self-confidence and provide an enriching environment for the students to excel. When the traditional culture is valued and there are opportunities to explore other cultures, these cultural experiences open the door for consideration of two world views. Exposure to parents from two cultural backgrounds allows the child to begin the process of “code switching” as early as language develops. The background of the family in terms of socio-economic status, class, and parents educational level also plays a part in the initial stages of bicultural skill development. The chance to visit other cultures during family vacations or attend school with the host culture community furthers the level of exposure.

The bicultural student then enters college with these bicultural skills. The bicultural skills enable the student to pursue a college degree because the socialization toward the dominant culture has been initiated prior to entrance into the academic subculture of the academy. The student is then exposed to quality schooling, graduate assistantships, advisors, and later sponsorships that lead to success as a bicultural professional and success in the academic world. Without the bicultural skills, the aspiring student may be unable to access the organizational supports available to them because of the cultural conflicts experienced when introduced to the dominant world view of the U.S. university system. The difference between a white student growing up in a familiar culture and an ethnic and racial minority student entering a culture that is secondary to their traditional culture is often an issue of access to resources and opportunities. The commonality expressed by the faculty represented here is their bicultural awareness that provides them an entrance into the foreign U.S. culture and subculture of the academic life. They remain minorities within the university setting but are respected by themselves and others for their
individual accomplishments and their ability to conform to the rigors of research, teaching, and community service. These faculty are able to excel in the professoriate despite their ethnic and racial differences due to their self-confidence, determination, and the bicultural attitude and skills they possess.

Implications for Theory and Research

This study has examined the career histories of nineteen ethnic and racial minority faculty to look for the commonalities influencing their success in academia. Variables have been identified at critical periods during the faculty's career developmental stages that groomed them for a profession in academe. One of the major themes that emerged during the course of the analysis of the data was the bicultural attitude described by the majority of the faculty interviewed. The bicultural construct may be a valuable consideration for future studies that examine retention of minority students in academia. The following section discusses the implications of the findings presented.

Attribution theory has provided a lens for examining the way ethnic and racial minority faculty attribute their career choice and success. Attributions for success resembled patterns found with non-minority groups. Success was subscribed to a constellation of primarily internal variables of drive and self esteem and interpersonal skills combined with the more peripheral influence of environmental factors including family supports and a strong value of education. Future studies considering the application of attribution theory as the guiding principle may want to include more global paradigms such as acculturation theory to identify predictors of faculty success from a social perspective. As evident in this study, limiting the guiding conceptual construct to attribution may not provide the researcher with a complete picture of the internal and external variables influencing success.

Beyond attributions for success, these ethnic minority faculty were acculturated toward the academy. Many experienced a very stable and positive home environment that valued their ethnic culture as well as pursuing educational opportunities within a Western system. Faculty
growing up in the U.S. mainland recognized racial inequities in their upbringing but also learned how to effectively cope with differences through the development of bicultural skills. Faculty that benefited from a positive ethnic and racial minority experience demonstrated the capability of switching between cultural belief systems in order to deal effectively with incongruencies evidenced between their ethnicity of origin and the dominant culture. Their early experiences influenced their later academic success.

The findings discussed here have potential application in continuing the exploration of ethnic and racial minority faculty success and expanding the small recruitment pool currently available. The group interviewed for this study represent a very small percentage of the faculty ranks. In order to better understand the success of ethnic and racial minority professionals in academe, it is critical to identify the variables presented here in a larger sample of minority professionals. Due to the fact that the faculty selected were from an elite group of highly successful, tenured professionals, studying the success variables evident with new academic recruits and cohorts at community colleges would provide a larger base from which to generalize. Interviewing or surveying ethnic and racial minority students in undergraduate and graduate programs would be a suggested course of study to measure whether they possess the key variables identified in this study to influence career choice and success. The variables described in this study could be arranged in a survey format and administered to select classes of undergraduate and graduate students or to minority faculty nationally. The analysis could then be expanded by quantifying the variables. Because Hawaii offers the researcher such a unique and ethnically diverse ethnic community both within the overall state population and within the university system, conducting a comparative study of a research university in the mainland U.S. might further delineate the dichotomy in cultural repertoires existing for ethnic and racial minority faculty.

There are several directions future research endeavors might explore to enhance the findings presented in this study. A comparative attitudinal study of white faculty would measure
whether success is defined and pursued in the same manner. The survey could be designed to measured the attitudes of all faculty in a particular department. Using faculty from the same discipline would control for any differences found in particular fields, especially those that have a higher number of ethnic and racial minority faculty such as education or ethnic studies. A separate study could focus on examining the career histories of a particular minority group such as the survey of Latina faculty members conducted by Wolf and Ingle (1993). The researcher could then control for cultural differences as well as highlight any unique characteristics of the culture that might influence the faculty. Disaggregating the data in this study was impossible due to the matter of confidentiality. Restricting the study to one cultural group would provide the researcher with a larger sample size that would allow for the recording of similarities and differences in the variables influencing success in academia such as SES, generational status, type of school attended, etc.

This study did not analyze the data for gender differences because of the small sample size and the potential breach of confidentiality due to the very limited numbers of certain female ethnic and racial minority faculty on campus such as Blacks, Filipinos, Native Americans, Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders. Studying the experiences of ethnic and racial minority women to explore the double minority proposition would further the delineation of the influence of sex as an intervening variable and race on success in the academy. Selecting a specific ethnic and racial group and interviewing or surveying both men and women would allow for a comparison between genders. Including a control group of white cohorts would enable a more thorough analysis of potential differences.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The study reported here has relevance for university policy and practice concerning ethnic and racial minority students, recruits, and faculty. Although the faculty interviewed here represent a very small ethnic and racial minority group at a major research university, the fact that they have been successful in their academic endeavors suggests the possibility of expanding the
minority candidate pool. University scholars generate new knowledge that influences the adherence to new policies and practices at the societal level. Ethnic and racial minority faculty have unique perspectives to offer to the formulation of multicultural considerations across the campus and the globe. Allowing them access to the university decision-making core will inevitably change the established norms and standards for academics. Securing tenure is the means by which minority faculty may attain social parity. To accomplish this major task, minority faculty fare better when they have internalized a bicultural way of thinking and behaving.

Because of their small numbers, minority faculty cannot be expected to provide the adequate mentoring and sponsorship needed for the upcoming student recruits to significantly increase the numbers of minority professionals at the university level. Minority faculty are burdened, not only with an overload of student advisement responsibilities, but also with the potential risk for conflict of interest that might result from their intimate involvement in minority advocacy programs that may differ in philosophy from the policy makers and research grant funding authorities. However, these accomplished scholars will continue to confront the challenges of the professoriate and will inevitably touch the lives of a few determined minority students. Without additional mentors versed in cross-cultural sensitivity, other potential student candidates may not continue their academic journey because of the lack of supports and role models mentioned here as impinging on their career choice and success. As colleagues, these minority professionals could act as cross-cultural trainers and role models for their non-minority counterparts in the academy. Their bicultural skills are an example of the type of background that future higher education professionals will need in order to be successful in the increasingly diverse college community. A policy could be instituted that requires each newly hired faculty to attend an orientation session on cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity training. Faculty could be encouraged and rewarded to perform a community service activity involving an ethnic or racial minority group. New ethnic and racial minority recruits could be assigned mentors that have participated in this type of training and are willing to assist the faculty member in learning the
university system and tenure requirements. Granting of tenure could be contingent on whether the majority faculty has teamed up with minority faculty when seeking out research opportunities, especially if the work supports the examination minority issues. This would lend credibility to the minority cause while increasing the non-minority faculty's awareness of cross-cultural issues. Bicultural faculty should be included in the development of policy relating to recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty.

The organizational structure needs to provide the graduate assistantships and financial supports necessary to insure student success in an academic career. In the current times of budget cutting and program downsizing, the value of small education grants, work study programs and graduate assistantships must be emphasized to administrators in order that they are maintained on college campuses. Students from ethnically diverse backgrounds will require monetary help as well as career guidance during their college years. Teaching experiences including team-teaching and supervised instruction must be included as important parts of the student's coursework. Many of the faculty interviewed in this study highlighted the value they placed on teaching others. Providing a setting where this value can be realized and developed, such as a student teaching activity, would increase the numbers of students that might consider entering the teaching profession.

If the cultural experiences of potential student recruits are devoid of a supportive family setting and key academic advisors, then they may need training in cross-cultural awareness in order to gain the necessary set of tools to address inconsistencies encountered when faced with the novel and sometimes hostile environment of the dominant culture and university subculture. Exposure to other cultures and the methods by which sojourners learn how to cope with the nuances of new cultures, that are documented extensively in the literature, could be offered as potential resources during the orientation period for new students. Most of the faculty studied here already possessed the bicultural sensitivity that aided in their effective pursuit of their career goals. Ethnic minority students would benefit from the factors that have influenced the success
of the ethnic minority faculty interviewed. For many students growing up in today's society, the breakdown of family and cultural value systems may be a detriment to their career success. This must be taken into consideration when attempting to groom potential faculty for the challenges of the academy. As mentioned by one of the faculty interviewed, he was instrumental in providing a supportive educational environment for a minority student who was failing in the graduate program in which she was enrolled. Once the student was offered guidance and training in the techniques of moving through the university system, she went on to become a very successful role model for other students. Without the intervention provided by the faculty advisor, this student would have inevitably failed due to her lack of "savvy" concerning the educational process. She needed an insider's view of the system in order to effectively cope and manage the system for her own benefit. This example depicts the importance of minority faculty possessing the bicultural skills necessary to manage the university subculture for accomplishing their own career goals and the transferring the knowledge base of cross-cultural methods to aspiring student recruits in order that they may achieve academic success.

As has been shown in previous studies (Exum et al, 1984; Harvey, 1991; Menges and Exum, 1983), faculty control admissions, curriculum development, and hiring and firing. One of the informants in this study described her experience in being groomed by a Dean who recognized her potential and encouraged her to pursue academia as a career. The Dean held power in the university setting and by offering the minority student an entree into the university culture, this particular individual was able to apply her abilities and training in order to achieve success within the university and proceed into a faculty position. The support, advice and direction she received from the Dean was the critical turning point for her as an academic professional. Without the acceptance and guidance provided by the Dean, this academic may have never fulfilled her academic potential, or in turn, had the opportunity to become a mentor for other ethnic minority students.
The majority of faculty interviewed here indicated an enjoyment and commitment to teaching others. At the same time, they became aware of the need to balance the three aspects of a faculty career: teaching, research and community service. Their success in academia depended on their ability to recognize the importance of scholarly writing in their attainment of tenure. They were able to effectively balance their work focus to include all three components of productivity. Some of the faculty viewed their research activities as a way to strengthen their teaching skills through the ongoing advancement of knowledge. Previous studies have noted that ethnic minority faculty have placed more value on teaching and community service than research (Bourguignon, et al, 1987; de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Higgerson and Higgerson, 1991; Lessow-Hurley, 1989; Menges and Exum, 1983). This preference for the teaching and community service aspects of their job becomes problematic when attempting to satisfy application and tenure requirements that tend to place higher value on scholarship activities. Mentors need to assist new recruits in learning the techniques of research and the importance of scholarly writing when being considered for a faculty position and later tenure advancement. Research experiences offered during their undergraduate and graduate years would allow these students to strengthen their qualifications. Without adequate research activities and publications, students considering academia as a career will lack the key ingredients for successful entrance and continuation in a faculty position.

The faculty interviewed in this study discussed the importance of mentoring and guidance. When an advisor or sponsor is available to students, there is more likelihood that they are urged to demonstrate aptitude, self-confidence, commitment, and drive in order to learn the higher education system and face the challenges they will encounter in pursuing a career in academia. Providing advice and support to students at critical career selection times is vital in assuring that they continue the arduous educational journey to an academic profession. Due to the cultural differences many of these students encounter when attempting to adjust to an environment that requires good communication skills and a willingness to ask for assistance, many
of them do not survive the demands of the university setting. Dealing with the ambiguous requirements is a challenge to them without someone privy to the system providing direction and assurance. The story of the student that received guidance from one of the faculty interviewed here is a case in point. She was on the verge of failure when referred to the faculty mentor who then recognized her potential and groomed her for success within her educational program and later faculty career. Once she learned the system, her educational abilities blossomed. Without guidance and financial support from the institution, students may not be able to build the networks among peers and advisors that will enable them to survive in an educational setting.

Furthermore, once graduates enter the faculty ranks, the requirements and expectations for a successful faculty career remain informal and unclear. New recruits must continue to adjust to this aspect of university life and become adept at learning the subtleties of the tenure process. As explained by Exum et al. (1984), ethnic and racial minority faculty must possess self-confidence in their work efforts and must demonstrate their abilities through research productivity to remain in the academy. The faculty interviewed in this study discussed their biculturalism as the method for successfully balancing their traditional beliefs and values with the opposing university subculture in order to attain success. Working harder than their white, male counterparts, moving beyond discrimination experiences and playing the tenure game were choices made in order to survive. Coping mechanisms were derived from their early upbringing and expanded upon as they became more aware of cultural differences and how to address incongruencies in perceptions about people's behaviors and attitudes. They did not lose sight of their cultural values but integrated them into the foreign value system that placed more importance on the individual as opposed to the community. The realization was made that in order to progress through the university system, acceptance of an individual focus on work activities was mandatory. Teaching others, although not secondary in the minds of most of the faculty interviewed here, was balanced with the primary need to be productive in research areas in order to achieve tenure. The "code switching" skill of seeing situations from different perspectives and applying the appropriate
behaviors to each experience became an integral part of surviving and succeeding in a faculty position.

**Conclusion**

The study suggests that there are factors that influence career choice and success of ethnic and racial minority academics. There was a tendency on the part of the faculty interviewed to attribute career choice to external factors such as opportunity, the availability of strong advisors and recognition early on that they had potential for academic endeavors. However, attribution theory only explains one aspect of career choice and success and is limited when attempting to understand the career paths selected by these ethnic and racial minority faculty and the determinants that lead to their choice of academia as a profession. Therefore, attribution theory is enhanced when considering a more global paradigm of acculturation toward the profession in general and the variables that interplay to influence the career outcomes of these faculty. The findings suggest that societal influences early on such as the value of education and parent role models as well as organizational supports such as financial aid and teaching experiences influenced the later success of these academic professionals.

Beyond the constellation of variables presented in the findings, the faculty interviewed described themselves as bicultural professionals adept at retaining the values of their traditional cultures while functioning within the majority culture of the U.S. and the subculture of the academic world. Part of their attributions for success related to their capacity for biculturalism. Ethnic and racial minority individuals that were born and raised in the U.S. were exposed to more episodes of discrimination than those growing up outside of the U.S. context. However, due to their early exposure to the dominant world view, they were able to adjust to the rigors of the academic culture based on the bicultural style they learned early on to cope with growing up in two distinct cultural milieus: the U.S. culture and the minority culture. The development of bicultural skills does not presuppose that once adapted to the dominant culture, minorities will automatically lose the identity of their ethnic and racial background. As described earlier,
Berry (1980, 1990) conceptualized acculturation as a bidirectional construct involving the degree of adjustment to the host culture and the degree of maintenance of the minority culture. Measuring the process by degree allows one to assume that different people are at different phases of biculturalism due to some of the factors raised in the findings reported in this study. The bicultural model has been supported by the results reported here.

The foreign born faculty held very strong belief systems concerning their traditional cultures and also developed a bicultural way of thinking. However, the foreign born and raised informants in this study tended to have less acceptance of the U.S. culture they experienced. They appeared to be in a different phase of developing the "code switching" skills needed to comfortably accept the nuances of one culture while preserving the unique aspects of their ethnic origin's customs and values. Two of the foreign born faculty selected to leave the University to return to their home culture. The examination of the influence of generational status on the acculturation process has revealed inconsistencies in whether the amount of time in the host culture relates directly to generational status (Nagata, 1994). Although the sample is too small to generalize this finding, it is worth exploring further.

The future for recruiting and retaining ethnic and racial minority faculty will remain dim unless more effort and energy is focused on their academic and social growth and development. This study has presented the critical influences that affect the success of a sample group of ethnic and racial minority faculty at a state research university. The common experiences voiced by these scholars can be considered in future recruiting efforts and policy development regarding inequities in the work and educational arenas. Involving these professionals in changing the attitudes of their faculty colleagues is critical to increasing the numbers of minorities in the university setting. The faculty interviewed in this study possess the cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity to the subtleties of discrimination and racism found in the majority subculture of post-secondary education. It is imperative that the majority now recognize their value and expertise in cross-cultural effectiveness in order to change the attitudes of university administrators and
faclely regarding the entrance of minorities into the academic ranks. Ethnic and racial minority faculty are specialized in their academic fields and their cross-cultural frame of reference. They are more well-rounded academics due to their bicultural stance then are their non-minority colleagues.

The time is crucial for expanding the numbers of ethnic and racial minorities in faculty positions. It cannot be expected that the few minority faculty can assume the responsibility of mentoring all of the minority students in undergraduate and graduate programs toward a career in the academic setting. The dominant/non-minority faculty should be made aware of the mentoring role they need to play in encouraging ethnic and racial minority student potential. Cross-cultural sensitivity and awareness training should be a requirement for all university personnel. The benefits of becoming more sensitive to the multifaceted nature of culture and cultural differences and the demands of the university culture have been demonstrated by this exploratory study.

The responsibility for expanding the world views of all university faculty rests with the faculty and administrative leaders of the profession. Without the cross-cultural realization for all, the minority pools will remain small, and sexism and racism will continue to be subtly harbored in the halls of academe.

This study shows that although in the minority, there are ethnically and racially diverse faculty that have been successful in a university post despite the challenges they faced along their career paths such as typecasting, stereotyping and discrimination. There is value in diversifying the ranks of the academy to be more representative of today's increasingly diverse student body. Delineating the factors that influence the faculty's career choice and success in this sample offers future researchers the basis for further study. The commonalities among these faculty, including their individual determination and their bicultural skills, have been documented through the study of ethnic and racial minority faculty's career histories. The faculty interviewed are truly dedicated, exceptional professionals in their respective fields. Their accomplishments are particularly impressive considering the challenges they faced in positioning themselves for
success in the professoriate. Future ethnic and racial minority professionals have exceptional role models to emulate.
APPENDIX A: FACULTY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Semi-structured Interview Schedule
Successes of Ethnic Minority Faculty

DATE:_________________________ code #____

Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A/PAC</th>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>ISL.</th>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A/PAC</td>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>ISL.</td>
<td>HIS AMER</td>
<td>OTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT'S SES</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of years in academia:</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of years in other jobs:</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th>Ed.D.</th>
<th>MA/MS BA</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>other and TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges Attended</td>
<td>RES. U.</td>
<td>STATE PRIV.</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Supports</td>
<td>FINC. AID</td>
<td>SCHOLAR.</td>
<td>SPONSOR</td>
<td>RELATIVES</td>
<td>OTH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse Ethnicity</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A/P</th>
<th>P. IS</th>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employment</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>B. Collar</td>
<td>Oth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
Interview Guide

Greeting:
Hello, I am Kathleen Curry, doctoral student in Educational Administration. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to talk with me again today. As I mentioned to you over the phone, this second follow up interview will last approximately one hour. I would like to tape record our session to eliminate the need to take copious notes. Is that all right with you? I would first like to discuss confidentiality issues with you before we get started.

Confidentiality:
I am very concerned about the issue of confidentiality due to the small numbers of participants in this study. No individual names will ever be associated with individual responses. Any personal identifiers that could possibly compromise confidentiality (e.g., ethnic background or area of specialty) will be removed from the report results.

Introduction:
During the Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study interview you participated in, we discussed variables that ethnic minority faculty identify as barriers to the tenure process. I would like to take this opportunity to discuss some of the issues you brought up during that first session more in depth with you. I would also like to hear more about your past career goals and future career plans.
Questions:

General probe-
When did you first decide to pursue academia as a profession?
What influenced your choice?
How did your parents and family upbringing influence your choice?
What were the important incidents that occurred during your lifetime that influenced your current accomplishments?

Specific success/failure probes-
What were the supports that helped you complete your educational degrees?
What are some of the accomplishments you have made that have influenced your career goals?
What is it about you as a person that influenced your achievements?
What are some of the obstacles you have encountered in pursuing a faculty career? How did you overcome them?
What brought you to Hawaii?
What is the most important part of your job?
What is the most rewarding part of your job?
What is the most frustrating part of your job?
How do your other colleagues impact on your work here?

Ethnic probes:
What challenges did you face as a non-white student and then, faculty member, during your academic career?
Did you feel that your graduate school training prepared you for entering the world of academia?
How did your graduate school experience compare with the experiences you have had here at University of Hawaii?
How did your ethnic background influence the kind of challenges you faced?
What values does your culture place on education?
Are you considered a role model for your community? Does that role come with added responsibilities?

Closure:
What are your future career goals?
What recommendations would you have for undergraduates that may want to pursue academia as a career?

Again, thank you for your time. I have enjoyed the opportunity to talk with you in person.
If you would be interested in the results of this study, I would be happy to provide you with a copy when completed.
**Appendix B: BARRIERS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

*Semi-structured Interview Schedule*

Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study - Ethnic Minority Faculty

DATE:________________________ code #___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: CH J H A/PAC PAC ISL. HIS B F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality: CH J F A/PAC PAC ISL. AMER OTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: M F Marital Status: Mar Single Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENT'S SES: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order: First Second Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment History:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of years in academia: 1-5 6-10 10-15 15-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of years in other jobs: 1-5 6-10 10-15 15-25 TYPE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Held: Ph.D. Ed.D. MA/MS BA Prof. other and TYPE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges Attended: RES. U. STATE PRIV. OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Supports: FINC. AID SCHOLAR. SPONSOR RELATIVES OTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Ethnicity: CH J H A/P P.IS HIS B F AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employment: Prof. B. Collar Oth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
**Greeting:**
Hello, I am Kathleen Curry, research assistant for Dr. Linda Johnsrud. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to talk with me today. As I mentioned to you over the phone, the interview will last approximately one hour. I would like to tape record our session to eliminate the need to take copious notes. Is that all right with you? I would first like to discuss confidentiality issues with you before we get started.

**Confidentiality:**
We are very concerned about the issue of confidentiality due to the small numbers of participants in this study. The information you share with me today will be held in strictest confidence. No individual names will ever be associated with individual responses. Any personal identifiers that could possibly compromise confidentiality (e.g., ethnic background or area of specialty) will be removed from the report results. The final draft of the report will be available for your critique and review prior to publication.

**Introduction:**
The Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study conducted in 1990-91 by Dr. Linda Johnsrud, Principal Investigator, and Chris Atwater, Research Assistant, Educational Administration Department pinpointed several key variables that faculty identified as barriers. A tentative analysis of under-represented ethnic minority faculty as an aggregate, revealed substantial differences in the perception of the early academic years. Due to the small numbers of ethnic minorities represented in the 82-88 cohort, the report recommended further investigation of the potential barriers experienced by ethnic minority faculty.

After discussing methodological considerations with several focus group interview participants and our advisory group, we have designed a collaborative research process involving you as a researcher as well as informant. We are selecting several under-represented ethnic minority faculty to interview, in order to further our understanding of the problems faced by these groups. Although the survey portion of the study targeted probationary and recently tenured faculty, this phase will be an exploratory period of tenured faculty perceptions in order to guide future studies of under-represented ethnic minority faculty.
Questions:

General probe-
What has your faculty experience been like here at U.H. Manoa?
What was your faculty experience like at other universities?
What are three words that come to mind when you think about your experience as an ethnic minority faculty member at U.H. Manoa?
Are there any incidents that you can recall that are pivotal for your decision to stay or leave U.H. Manoa?

Specific factor probes-
What was the tenure process like for you?
What kind of tenure pressure did you experience? How does that experience differ from non-minority tenure experiences?
One of the barriers identified by the survey and focus group participants is chair and department relations. What are the relationships with your dean, chair, and/or other colleagues like for you?
Another issue for some faculty was intellectual isolation. How did this factor influence the tenure process?
How do responsibilities such as student mentoring, teaching and community service affect your research efforts?
How does your family and personal life influence your career?
Do you feel satisfied with your experience at U.H. Manoa? Why?
What are the frustrations you have encountered here?
What keeps you here?
What would be the reasons for leaving?

Ethnic probes:
Do you face any particular challenges working at this institution?
What are they?
Do you feel your ethnic background influences the kind of challenges you face? How?
Are there biases evident in the tenure process? What are they?
How did you cope with them?
What kind of advice would you offer new faculty to cope with the biases?
Are there any recommendations you have about different approaches to study the experiences of ethnic minorities?
Factor Probes:

Organizational: Structural Discrimination, Workload Balance, Institutional Support, Tenure Pressure

Professional/Interpersonal: Chair/Dept. Relations, Personal Discrimination, Student Demands

Professional/Individual: Time Pressure, Role Preparation, Autonomy

Personal: Time for Personal Life, Quality of Life, Emotional Security

Closure:

Again, thank you for your time. I have enjoyed the opportunity to talk with you in person. Would you be willing to do another interview with me that focuses more on your career history? I am interested in how faculty members build a career. In conjunction with the Barriers to Retention and Tenure Study, I am pursuing a doctoral dissertation study. I am choosing two people from each ethnic minority represented on our campus and you were recommended to me. I would also like to interview____________. This is part of a snowball sampling technique. Do you have any recommendations?
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