

2017

## **La Garza en Bicicleta: Perceptions of Latina Faculty on the Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on Tenure and Promotion at Research 1 Doctoral Institutions**

Julie Johanna Henriquez

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations)



Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Henriquez, Julie Johanna, "La Garza en Bicicleta: Perceptions of Latina Faculty on the Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on Tenure and Promotion at Research 1 Doctoral Institutions" (2017). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 4390.  
[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/4390](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/4390)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

LA GARZA EN BICICLETA: PERCEPTIONS OF LATINA FACULTY ON THE ROLE OF  
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS AND INSTITUTIONAL ENGAGEMENT  
ON TENURE AND PROMOTION AT RESEARCH 1 DOCTORAL INSTITUTIONS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development

by

Julie Johanna Henriquez  
B.S., Louisiana State University, 2003  
M.S., Louisiana State University, 2005  
May 2017

A Dios, y a mi familia, mi mayor bendicion, mi Norte y mi motivo para salir adelante.

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the culmination of a long path that began eighteen years ago, when I left the Dominican Republic to pursue my dreams of getting an American education. The journey has been long, yet fulfilling. I give thanks to God for His love, and for guiding me towards my life journey. I am extremely blessed to have had great support and love along the way. I am grateful to everyone who has contributed in some way along my journey.

First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Dr. Reid Bates, Dr. Tracey Rizzuto, Dr. Carlos Lee, and Dr. Yongick Jeong, for your time, guidance and support throughout the doctoral process. To my advisor, mentor, and role model, Dr. Petra Robinson, words will never capture my gratitude to you. You took me in and have molded me into a better scholar and professional than I ever thought I could be. Your encouragement and support got me through many moments of despair and doubt. Thank you for always believing in me.

I would also like to thank my professors and colleagues in the School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development. Thank you for challenging me to grow as a professional and individual. I will treasure your teachings and wisdom shared in our courses. Dr. Burnett, had you not taken a chance on me and admitted a scared undergrad sitting in your office into the HRE Master's program the day before graduation in May 2003, I would not be where I am today. I am forever grateful.

To my study participants, thank you immensely for giving me your precious time and for your honesty and vulnerability. I hope I have captured your stories, struggles, and *luchadora* spirit. You inspire me to become a scholar worthy to be in your ranks and call you colleague.

To the sisters I have met along the way, thank you. Maylen, hermana, if it were not for you this dissertation topic would have never come to fruition. Thank you for teaching me to be

bold and take risks; #tortillacode. Adri, I can't thank you enough for being my voice of reason, and for walking this path (and living) with me. Love you! Celena and Dani, I am so grateful to have had you as a partner through the craziness of Stats, the many late nights and marathon writing sessions. I am so happy we will get to walk the stage and close this chapter in our lives together. Monique, LEK, and KRock, thank you for believing in me; your support and wisdom have made me a better person. Chela Rae, your encouragement and support inspire me to grow, and to 'werk'!

Seth, thank you for all your help, advice, and friendship; I am thankful our paths crossed in the PhD program. Ray, *mira*, I wish I were truly half as great as you tell me I am, TQM. Amy, Brent, and Nora: you have seen me at my best and at my worst, and yet you have been here always. Thank you for your encouragement and for keeping me calm when I was close to giving up. To the rest of my Res Life family, it's been a wonderful journey, thank you for making LSU my home away from home.

*A mi familia: gracias por todos los sacrificios, por su apoyo incondicional, y por dejarme ir a seguir mis metas. Les debo muchos recuerdos y tiempo juntos. Aunque no estuve presente durante todos estos años, siempre estuve con ustedes en pensamiento y de corazon. Los amo. Le doy gracias a Dios que me bendijo con mi mas preciado tesoro: ustedes.*

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
College Enrollment and Completion .....	2
Faculty Diversity Challenges.....	3
Faculty Tenure .....	6
Faculty Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.....	7
Purpose of the Study .....	11
Conceptual Framework.....	11
Research Questions.....	13
Significance of the Study .....	14
Definition of Key Terms .....	15
Delimitations of the Study .....	16
Summary and Organization of Report .....	18
Chapter II: Review of Related Literature .....	19
Critical Human Resource Development .....	19
Diversity Climate .....	21
History of Higher Education.....	28
Faculty Diversity.....	32
Barriers to Increasing Faculty Diversity .....	40
Latinxs in Academia .....	47
Employee and Faculty Engagement.....	51
Summary .....	56
Chapter III: Methodology .....	58
Research Design and Methodological Approach.....	58
Conceptual Framework.....	59
Phenomenology.....	60
Population and Sample .....	61
Site Selection .....	63
Data Collection .....	64
Data Analysis and Management .....	66
Trustworthiness and Data Quality Control .....	67
Ethical Considerations .....	68
Researcher Positioning.....	69
Summary .....	70
Chapter IV: Findings .....	71
Participant Profiles.....	71
Presentation of Findings .....	105

Document Analysis .....	132
Summary .....	134
Chapter V: Summary, Discussion and Implications .....	135
Overview of Study .....	135
Discussion of Findings.....	136
Implications.....	143
Limitations of the Study.....	148
Recommendations for Future Research .....	149
Concluding Remarks.....	151
References.....	152
Appendix A: Sample Invitation to Participants .....	161
Appendix B: Invitation to Participants (Recommended by other Participants).....	163
Appendix C: Sample Consent Form .....	165
Appendix D: Interview Protocol.....	168
Appendix E: Biographical Survey Questions .....	175
Appendix F: Institutional Review Board Approval for Study .....	178
Vita.....	180

## **Abstract**

A predicted population shift will increase the number of underrepresented groups entering the workforce, with Latinxs accounting for the majority of employees. Consequently, the number of Latinxs enrolled in colleges and universities nationwide will increase. This shift in the college student body demographic will in turn call for an increase in the number of underrepresented faculty members to provide support and mentorship to students. It is concerning to see that only 2% of tenured faculty identified as Latina in 2013-2014. This number will need to increase in order to support the predicted increase in Latinxs pursuing higher education. The purpose of the study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect data for the study. The researcher interviewed ten female faculty members who identify as Latina, and are currently seeking or received tenure within the last five years from a Research 1 Doctoral institution.

Analysis of interview transcripts presented similarities in the participants' experiences related to the influence of institutional context in their connection to the institution, the important role their Latina identity played in their research and approach to tenure, and the overwhelming expectations they felt they had to meet. The findings also suggest a difference between participant involvement and engagement, with participants further along in the tenure process reporting more engagement than those who are starting the tenure process. The participants all highlighted the importance of their family and peer networks as a source of support. Document analysis of participant CVs and institutional tenure documents supported the participants' reported experiences.



## **Chapter I: Introduction**

The United States demographic is rapidly changing. By 2044, it is predicted that the United States will become a “majority- minority” nation, where no single group comprises more than 50 % of the population (Colby & Ortman, 2015, p. 9). According to US Census Bureau projections, the majority of the population will be composed of a combination of minorities of which Hispanics, or people with ancestry from Spanish-speaking countries, are predicted to become the largest minority population group (Colby & Ortman, 2015). The Hispanic population comprised approximately 10 % of the total US population in 1994 (Byerly & Deardorff, 1995), 17% of the total US population in 2014, and is estimated to continue to grow to comprise 29% of the total population by 2060 (Colby & Ortman, 2015). Although according to Colby and Ortman (2015), the non-Hispanic White demographic will account for 44% of the total population, this demographic will no longer be the majority, which may challenge the dynamic of an era where society and culture followed majority-centric predominantly White norms.

This population shift will signify a major social and cultural change in the United States, which will have implications for everyday practices and interactions among members of the population. Business practices and structures will have to adapt to meet the needs of the changing population and to reflect its demographic composition. Consequently, Human Resource Development (HRD) practitioners will have to lead organizations and employees through these changes and provide preparation, training, and organizational development interventions to successfully transition to the new workforce composition within different organizational contexts.

## **College Enrollment and Completion**

College enrollment will likely follow the general population demographic shift, thus implying that the number of students enrolling in colleges and universities who identify as Hispanic will increase. There is already evidence of the demographic shift in the basic education system. Already the “total percentage of minority students [...] is larger than the percentage of whites in public grade-school classrooms this year [2014]” (Williams, 2014, par.6). This is indicative of the shift that will arise at the college level with higher minority, especially Hispanic, student enrollment in the next 10 years.

This population shift will also reflect an increase in the number of Hispanics in the workforce, and creates the need for successful preparation and degree completion at the college and technical level for Hispanic students and workers. College persistence, or continued enrollment in a college or university beyond the first year, is essential for degree completion (Leppel, 2001, 2002). Therefore, colleges and universities should strive to maximize persistence and degree completion in order to provide strong members to the future workforce.

Among the main factors influencing student persistence in college is student integration to the university, both socially and academically (Leppel, 2001, 2002). Supportive relationships with faculty members facilitate students’ connectedness and sense of belonging to the university. More importantly, interaction with faculty is related to student persistence and success in college (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Faculty members invest time to support and develop students through mentorship and advising. Mentorship plays an even more instrumental role in underrepresented student persistence than it does for majority students. Blackwell (1989) pointed out that typically, faculty members select and mentor students with whom they share similar characteristics such as

race, gender, ethnicity, etc. Thus, in order to provide much-needed mentorship to underrepresented students, the number of faculty who share similar characteristics with students must be representative of the student population.

Unfortunately, the number of underrepresented faculty members is largely disproportionate to underrepresented student enrollment. This disproportion manifests itself in fewer opportunities for underrepresented student mentorship, which may lower student persistence and college completion rates. Additionally, current underrepresented faculty members are charged with providing support to students beyond their optimal student advising loads, which places an increased burden on faculty ability to meet the performance requirements imposed by their institutions (Boyd, Cintron, Alexander-Snow, 2010). It is imperative to increase faculty diversity, especially the number of Hispanic faculty, in order to support the growing Hispanic and underrepresented student population that will enter the workforce of the future.

### **Faculty Diversity Challenges**

One of the most obvious issues with institutional faculty diversity is the low number of faculty members who identify as minorities currently serving in academia. In 2013, 43% of students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions identified as a racial minority. In contrast, racial minority faculty members accounted for only 21% of full-time faculty positions; 22% of females identified as a person of color, while 20 % of male professors identified as a person of color (National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 2014a; NCES, 2014b). These statistics are significant because low underrepresented faculty presence limits the scope of their impact on the institution, hinders creativity, and constricts the expansion of research on underrepresented population-related issues (Taylor et al., 2010; Smith & Moreno, 2006; Fries-

Britt et al., 2011). However, closing the faculty diversity gap becomes a daunting task given the many challenges faced by underrepresented faculty members seeking to enter and progress through the ranks of academia.

The number of underrepresented faculty members in academia struggles to rise for various reasons. Often, new underrepresented faculty hires replace other underrepresented faculty members who leave the institution, thus resulting in a very small (if any) net increase in number of underrepresented faculty serving in institutions of higher education (Taylor et al., 2010; Smith & Moreno, 2006). The small number of underrepresented faculty, especially faculty of color, currently serving in academia fosters feelings of isolation among the underrepresented groups (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). Current faculty of color may perceive a lack of peers who may support them as they operate within a majority-centric institutional climate.

Additionally, underrepresented faculty members are typically in adjunct or instructor positions, which are positions that are typically cut when the economy suffers. As institutions downsize due to budget constraints, underrepresented faculty members are relieved of their duties as instructors or non-tenured faculty members (Taylor et al., 2010; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). Faculty members of color often face “perceived biases in the hiring process, unrealistic expectations of doing their work and being representatives of their racial/ethnic group, and accent discrimination” (Turner et al., 2008, p. 143). These issues have consistently emerged from research on the faculty of color experience in academia over the last 28 years (Turner et al., 2008). Many of the issues reported by underrepresented faculty members can be attributed to lack of a supportive diversity climate within institutions of higher education.

In an organizational context, diversity climate refers to “the degree to which a firm advocates fair human resource policies and socially integrates underrepresented employees”

(McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008, p. 352). It encompasses employee perceptions on how demographic and cultural characteristics influence practices and the social environment within their organization. Similarly, in the higher education context, perceptions of institutional diversity climate frame how faculty members perceive fairness and equity in everyday institutional functions and processes. Even though most institutions will report that they are equal opportunity employers as required by law, and have diversity as an espoused value, the reality faced by many underrepresented faculty members differs from the purported inclusivity touted by colleges and universities. The explicit norms presented by institutions are inclusive; however, the practices minority faculty members encounter at the same institutions are far from inclusive or supportive of underrepresented faculty members and their contributions to academia.

Underrepresented faculty members often report feeling that their work and research interests are undervalued compared to their majority peers (Turner et al., 2008). This is a symptom of an unsupportive diversity climate, where faculty members feel that they are not an equal and valued part of their institution, which is detrimental to faculty productivity and engagement within their institution.

Institutions of higher education face a diversity problem rising from the challenges faced by underrepresented minority faculty members. The magnitude and significance of this diversity problem in turn fuels a call for increased faculty diversity. The gender and racial gaps within the faculty population is a call to action to understand and propose initiatives geared toward minimizing the disparity among minority and majority faculty representation in the professoriate. One of the more obvious actions to take in minimizing the disparity between majority and underrepresented faculty experience is to increase the number of underrepresented faculty in tenured positions, which provides long-term professorial appointments to faculty members.

## **Faculty Tenure**

Tenure, or an extended faculty appointment that is often for the professional lifetime of a faculty member, provides job security for faculty members (Ceci, Williams, & Mueller-Johnson, 2006). Due to the prestige and security that are associated with being a tenured faculty member, many faculty members may want to seek tenure. Becoming a tenured professor marks the successful completion of a long probationary period where faculty members are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in research, instruction, and service. Faculty members are expected to produce and publish quality research; teach courses at the undergraduate or graduate level; and participate in service to their institution, discipline, and community at large, for example, through graduate student committee leadership and participation, and community outreach activities.

Individual institutions outline the challenging tenure process, and faculty members must meet requirements in order to be granted tenure. The tenure process, however, does not allow for consideration of different faculty group needs, and it is often the perception that underrepresented faculty have to out-produce their peers in terms of research and teaching loads to obtain the same outcomes (Antonio, 2002). Given the inequity in experiences, support and opportunities between majority and minority faculty members, minority faculty members may feel pressure to outperform their majority counterparts to meet the tenure expectations and receive the same amount of recognition from their institutions (Tate, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). In addition to a perceived higher expectation and standard for faculty of color in terms of tenure-related productivity, and due to the small number of underrepresented faculty currently in academe, those faculty members working in higher

education institutions tend to overcommit themselves to mentor underrepresented students and provide them with much-needed support through their collegiate experience.

This over-commitment is more pronounced in Research 1 Doctoral Institutions, defined in the Carnegie Classification system as institutions with the highest research activity (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2016). Faculty members at Research 1 Doctoral institutions are expected to produce extensive amounts of research yet, as faculty of color, they feel committed to serve underrepresented students and research agendas (Stuart, 2015). Underrepresented faculty members also experience the unwritten and unspoken expectations to serve as the minority voice within their departments/units and to perform discretionary tasks such as serving on diversity-related committees and advising that may not contribute directly to the tenure process. Due to institutional assumptions that minority faculty are best suited for these roles due to their race/ethnicity, underrepresented faculty members experience what Padilla (1994) defined as cultural taxation.

Participation in discretionary behaviors such as volunteerism, service to the community, and student mentorship contribute to the taxation of underrepresented faculty who are already stretched thin trying to meet the explicit tenure process requirements (Padilla, 1994; Canton, 2013; Roy, 2013). It is important to understand how often underrepresented faculty members participate in these discretionary behaviors, and how taxing these are on faculty engagement and productivity in order to understand the role they play in tenure attainment and faculty promotion.

### **Faculty Engagement and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Employee engagement is becoming increasingly popular as a strategy to improve organizational performance as a means to decrease turnover, absenteeism and other negative employee behaviors (Raina & Khatri, 2015). Although there is no consensus on the exact

definition or measurement of engagement, authors have generally defined it as a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral connection and commitment to one's organizational role and tasks (Kahn, 1990; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Gubman, 2004).

Employees who are engaged in their workplace are energized, positively focused, and feel a connection to their workplace that drives them to contribute to improving organizational performance in terms of increasing positive behaviors, such as productivity and participation, while decreasing negative behaviors, like absenteeism and workplace conflict. Therefore, organizations seek to foster employee engagement given the benefits of an engaged workforce on overall organizational performance.

Engaged faculty are likely to demonstrate some of the positive organizational outcomes seen in corporate settings: increased productivity, increased recognition for the institution, and more longevity in their role (Raina & Khatri, 2015). In the context of Research 1 Doctoral Institutions, faculty engagement would be demonstrated through higher research productivity, and increased teaching quality, involvement in institutional, community and professional service. The outcomes of an engaged faculty would seem to positively contribute to their productivity and tenure-related outcomes. However, tenure and promotion decisions are often influenced by the implicit requirements that are not openly shared with faculty members.

The successful promotion of individuals within organizations often depends on explicit job and process requirements, as well as implicit behaviors and unspoken requirements that employees must exhibit. Many of these implicit behaviors can fall under the category of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs), defined by Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system" (p. 3). In academe, examples of OCBs may include "working to establish



a collegial environment, providing constructive suggestions, attending major student events, and working to resolve disagreements” (Bergeron, Ostroff, Schroeder, & Block, 2014, p. 103). It is important to note that these activities are beyond the required workload of employees, and may not be explicitly recognized in promotion decisions.

Although these behaviors are not measured or recognized by the performance system, they still require effort from individuals, and can become quite taxing, especially if the individual perceives that they must perform OCBs in order to meet promotion expectations. Time spent on OCBs is likely taken from rewarded behaviors such as research productivity, and may therefore put employees who take on these additional assignments at a disadvantage against peers who focus on task-related and rewarded behaviors (Bergeron et al., 2014). An overtaxed individual may decrease their productivity and thus their evaluated performance and job requirements may suffer (Bergeron et al., 2014). Therefore, organizations should seek to understand the level of employee participation that maximizes employee engagement benefits, like productivity, without overtaxing individual employees.

Taxation and competing priorities are of particular importance in the successful completion of the tenure process and promotion to leadership positions of faculty members in higher education institutions. The faculty tenure and promotion process is very demanding, and a high level of productivity is expected from faculty members who are seeking to successfully achieve tenure. However, meeting real or perceived implicit expectations like performing OCBs also requires time, energy, and effort from faculty members. Therefore, it is important to understand the experience of faculty members related to OCBs as they navigate the tenure process. This can help policy makers (institutional administrators) develop guidelines for more focused and intentional processes that provide faculty with comprehensive expectations for

tenure attainment. Clear, well-defined policies would inform faculty on priorities, and would foster faculty engagement, which in turn would increase faculty productivity and institutional outcomes. Attempts to increase tenure attainment among underrepresented faculty groups should begin with an understanding of current underrepresented faculty experiences related to engagement and the tenure process.

Existing studies exploring faculty experiences and challenges have not focused on minorities, and research involving underrepresented minority faculty groups has tended to focus on women in academia, but not on tenured or tenure-track faculty (Boyd et al., 2010). Additionally, existing research on underrepresented minority faculty members primarily focuses on the African American experience (Boyd et al., 2010). Thus, it is imperative that we conduct further research related to the experiences of faculty and the tenure process. More specifically, we need a greater understanding of the dynamics of the underrepresented minority faculty experience and the effect of unwritten expectations, OCBs and taxation on tenure completion, especially among ethnically diverse faculty such as Latinas.

Many terms are used to label Spanish-speaking Americans and immigrants, and it is important to understand the definition of these labels and the differences among the terms Hispanic and Latinx when studying these demographic groups. The label Hispanic is used in the United States Census as an ethnic classification, and has been used interchangeably, albeit incorrectly as some argue, with the term Latino (Fernandez, 2013). The term Hispanic refers to a language commonality; it encompasses people whose ancestors are originally from a Spanish-speaking country. This includes Spaniards and people with ancestry in Latin-American Spanish-speaking countries (Fernandez, 2010; Fernandez, 2013). Those who identify as Latinx, or

descendants of people from Latin American countries, are by far the greatest portion of the Hispanic population.

In 2010, 93% of Hispanics in the United States were of Spanish-speaking Latin American origin (US Census Bureau, 2010). Given that the largest portion of Hispanics within the United States identify as Latinx, it can be inferred that the same proportion will also exist in the Hispanic student population enrolled in colleges. Therefore, Latinx faculty will be a key demographic that will need to grow in higher education. For this reason, this study specifically focused on the Latinx population. To address the gap in literature, this study focused on the Latina faculty experience, specifically on the perspective on OCBs and engagement of Latina faculty members who had recently completed or were currently in the tenure process at Research 1 Doctoral Institutions.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

### **Conceptual Framework**

A combination of diversity-based theories such as Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit), intersectionality theory, and the relational social exchange theory provided the conceptual framework for this study. Combining multiple theories allowed for a more rich analysis of the complex phenomena experienced by minority faculty members within their institutional contexts. Diversity has been known to be a complex phenomenon encompassing a multitude of layers that require profound analysis. For this reason, multiple theories are better at explaining complexities that lie beyond demographic characteristics rather than a single theory.

Demographic characteristics are typically at the forefront of diversity assessment within institutions of higher education. Institutions often represent their diversity as the percentage breakdown of gender, ethnicity, and race among its students, faculty, and staff. These characteristics are very important to consider when addressing issues of diversity. When examining issues such as faculty diversity in higher education institutions, it is essential to give equal importance to minority experiences relative to majority experiences, as institutional culture and climate (which typically influence minority faculty recruitment, hiring, and retention) are often set by majority institutional members (Dwyer, Richard, & Chadwick, 2003). Focusing on only majority perceptions would provide an incomplete understanding of the true nature of the issues and challenges faced by underrepresented faculty members and the institutional diversity climate in which they function. It was, and still is, important to understand and identify all the factors that directly or indirectly contribute to inequality among members of the institution.

The complexity of these inequalities increases when one considers that there are many facets to how underrepresented faculty members identify themselves within their professional environment. These socially constructed facets or identities (for example race, gender, and sexual orientation) only serve to categorize individuals and simplify “social fictions that produce inequalities in the process of producing differences” (McCall, 2005, 1773). For example, a faculty member may identify as a female, lesbian, Asian American, and may face challenges associated with each piece of her identity within her institutional context. Identity is a complex construct, made up of multiple socially-constructed facets that complement or conflict with each other to develop a lens through which individuals experience and view their situations in life (Jones & Abes, 2013). In the educational context, the intersections of the facets of identity

influence how individuals behave, and thus influence how they work with others and the climate in which they work.

Different features of individual and climate characteristics all contribute to the collective diversity climate of an institution. The institutional diversity climate influences faculty diversity to the extent that the climate allows for inclusive recruitment and retention policies and hiring practices (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). A truthful and realistic understanding of faculty diversity and its contributing factors can only be achieved through consideration of several theoretical perspectives that provide insight into the underpinnings of the factors that influence faculty diversity. Using only one analytical lens limits the richness of the experiences and intersectionality of faculty identities and forces driving diversity within the institutional context.

### **Research Questions**

Given the context of Latina faculty members in the periphery of the predominantly White faculty in Research 1 Doctoral institutions as suggested by LatCrit and Intersectionality Theory, this study was guided by the following research questions:

- How do Latina faculty members perceive their experiences in relation to completion of the tenure process?
- How do Latina faculty members describe their engagement in their institution during the tenure process?
- How do Latina faculty members describe the role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as a form of institutional engagement in successfully completing the tenure process?

## **Significance of the Study**

This study is significant for several reasons, which have been introduced in this chapter. First, the need for increased faculty diversity is evident in the low percentage of underrepresented faculty members in academia. The number of Latina faculty members in Research 1 Doctoral institutions is negligible when compared to White males and other faculty of color. This number will increase when more Latina faculty receive tenure in Research 1 Doctoral institutions. However, because the structures and practices at Research 1 Doctoral institutions are not conducive or supportive of Latinas navigating the tenure process, it is important to share their experiences and to shed light on the challenges Latina faculty face.

Secondly, given the complexity of the tenure and promotion process, it is important to understand how faculty engagement complements the tenure process requirements and expectations. With the over-taxation of underrepresented faculty members, it is vital to recognize how the time spent on volunteerism and service to the institutional community influences tenure completion. The findings of the study can help shed light on the activities and type of institutional engagement that is critical for Latina faculty to receive tenure and be promoted within the faculty ranks, and the role of OCBs in their engagement during the tenure process.

Although research has been conducted on the faculty of color experience, very few studies have actually examined the experiences of Latinas, and even fewer have looked at the experience of Latina faculty outside of Hispanic-serving institutions (institutions where at least 25% of enrolled students identify as Hispanic) or community colleges. Therefore, the Latina faculty experience in Research 1 Doctoral institutions still needs to be shared. The voices of the Latina faculty who have navigated and successfully completed the tenure process can serve to guide and encourage other Latinas who want to receive tenure in Research 1 Doctoral institutions

to persist and successfully complete the tenure process. The findings of this study can guide university administrators' and policymakers' efforts to research and develop practical strategies to facilitate Latina faculty tenure completion.

### **Definition of Key Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used throughout this report:

- **Diversity Climate:** refers to “the degree to which a firm advocates fair human resource policies and socially integrates underrepresented employees” (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008, p. 352). It encompasses employee perceptions on how demographic and cultural characteristics influence practices and the social environment within their organization.
- **Engagement:** “a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-related well-being that can be seen as the antipode of job burnout” (Leiter and Bakker, 2010, p.1-2).
- **Faculty:** “The teaching or research staff of a group of university departments viewed as a body” (“Faculty [Def. 2.1]”, n.d.)
- **Faculty Engagement:** “perpetual focused attention, enjoyment, and enthusiasm for the activities associated with faculty work through which the individual finds purpose, senses congruence with personal values and talents, is challenged to use knowledge and skills, and experiences productivity even during difficult times” (Livingston, 2011, p. 11).
- **Hispanic:** a person whose ancestors are originally from a Spanish-speaking country. This includes Spaniards and people of Latin-American descent (Fernandez, 2013).
- **Latina:** a woman whose ancestors are originally from a Latin-American country (Fernandez, 2013).
- **Latinx:** “the gender-neutral alternative to Latino, Latina and even Latin@” (Ramirez & Blay, 2016, Par: What Does Latinx Mean?).

- **Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs):** “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system” (Organ et al., 2006, p. 8). Examples of OCBs include volunteering for committee assignments, taking on additional course loads, and advising student groups.
- **R1: Doctoral Institutions** “institutions that awarded at least 20 research/scholarship doctoral degrees during the update year (this does not include professional practice doctoral-level degrees, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.)” (Carnegie Classification, Basic Classification Description, 2016, Doctoral Institutions section, par. 1); and encompasses institutions with the highest reported research activity (Carnegie Classification, Basic Classification Description, 2016, Doctoral Institutions section).
- **Tenure:** “an arrangement whereby faculty members, after successful completion of a period of probationary service, can be dismissed only for adequate cause or other possible circumstances and only after a hearing before a faculty committee” (“Tenure”, par.1).

### **Delimitations of the Study**

Baron (2008) defined delimitations as parameters set by the researcher(s) to delineate the scope of the study. For the purpose for the study, the researcher established several parameters, determined by the population of interest and time limits that would improve the quality of the data collected. In order to be included in the sample for this study, the participants had to meet the following criteria: identify as racially/ethnically Latina, currently work in a Research 1 Doctoral institution while navigating the tenure process, or have successfully completed the tenure process within the last 5 years. The tenure completion time criteria was important because faculty members who have just completed or are going through the tenure process would be more likely to easily and clearly recall their experience and be able to provide examples to



support their perceptions. The researcher chose to focus on tenured and tenure-track Latina faculty because of the desirability of the tenure status, and the position security associated with tenured faculty. Increasing the number of tenured Latina faculty at Research 1 Doctoral institutions will make contributions that are more lasting to closing the faculty diversity gap, thus the researcher's interest in this specific population. Furthermore, this study did not seek to generalize the findings of this study to any population outside of the parameters set for this study, but to uncover the experiences of its participants as they sought tenure.

### **Researcher Role**

This qualitative study contributes to filling existing gaps with details that are beyond the scope of quantitative or descriptive statistics. As such, great responsibility is placed on the researcher to collect, analyze, and interpret common themes among the participants' experiences. As an instrument through which data is interpreted, the researcher is charged with conveying the experiences of the participants to the reader. Therefore, the researcher's background will influence the interpretation of data collected, adding a source of bias to the data analysis. However, disclosure of the researcher's role and background related to the study will inform the reader of the perspective through which the participant experiences were analyzed and interpreted.

The researcher in this study was a Latina doctoral student who is seeking a position in academia upon completion of her degree. The researcher has a professional background in Higher Education (Student Affairs and Administration) and Human Resource and Leadership Development. The researcher is familiar with the challenges faced by Latinas in the administrative function of Higher Education, having experienced several challenges herself in

her professional career. The researcher sought to understand the experience of Latina faculty with the tenure and promotion process at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

### **Summary and Organization of Report**

This first chapter provided the background and rationale for the study by describing how a population shift will drive changes in the American workforce and consequently in college enrollment. This college population shift also highlights the need for faculty that is representative of the student body demographics, and the existing lack of faculty diversity. The purpose of the study, research questions, and significance of the study were also presented.

Chapter II will provide a comprehensive review of literature related to faculty diversity and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors within the context of institutions of higher education. The review of literature will illustrate the experience of underrepresented faculty members in general, and more specifically of women of color and Latinas within the institutional context. Chapter III presents the methodology proposed to address the research questions and fulfill the purpose of the study. The research design, sample population, data collection, and trustworthiness are discussed.

The findings of the study are presented in chapter IV. The chapter begins with a narrative profile on each of the study participants, and emergent themes are defined and supported with rich, relevant quotes from the participants. Lastly, chapter V provides a summary of the study, connects the findings with the research questions, and presents the implications of this study on theory and policy development, directions for future research, and recommendation for improving current practices related to Latina faculty members and the tenure process.

## **Chapter II: Review of Related Literature**

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

Chapter II presents a review of existing literature related to organizational diversity climate and its importance to organizational effectiveness. This chapter provides a general perspective of diversity climate and its role in supporting organizational effectiveness. Within the context of this study, organizational effectiveness is connected to the ability of universities to prepare and graduate students who will enter the workforce.

The review of literature then moves to the specific context of this study: higher education. A brief history of higher education and the role of faculty diversity within the institutional context is presented. The review of literature illustrates the experience of underrepresented faculty members in general, and more specifically of women of color and Latinas within the institutional context. Lastly, faculty engagement and its role in tenure attainment is defined and discussed.

### **Critical Human Resource Development**

As Human Resource Development practitioners, we are called to serve as change agents within the workplace by developing, implementing and evaluating training and development, organization development, and career development interventions. Torraco (2016), points that as Training and Development and Organization Development have grown and adapted to historical, economic and social changes, they have not “strayed from the humanistic, inclusive, and developmental values they share” (p. 448). Torraco (2016) utilizes this historical perspective to contend that this adherence to inclusive values will not change as the field continues to evolve.

With the expected population shift that will drive changes to the current workforce demographic, the role of HRD professionals in creating organizational culture changes to support the new workforce is often debated (Byrd, 2014; Rocco, Bernier, & Bowman, 2014; Gedro, Collins, & Rocco, 2014). Traditional approaches to HRD research in the last 20 years were heavily geared towards performance and efficiency (Bierema, 2010). Missing from much of the research is the application of a critical lens to analyze and understand the underpinnings of organizational culture that promote a majority-centric environment, and that looks at diversity beyond a performance-driven perspective (Bierema, 2010; Byrd, 2014; Gedro et al., 2014). Amid the diversification of the workforce, Gedro et al. (2014) point that the field of HRD cannot make assumptions that interventions will be equally effective across all groups, a mistake which may be costly for organizations.

A more critical approach to HRD research implies the application of critical theories, like Critical Race Theory, LatCrit Theory, and Intersectionality to look beyond existing organizational power structures and dynamics, and further understand the experiences of underrepresented groups in majority-centric environments (Byrd, 2014; Rocco et al., 2014). As agents of change, HRD professionals “must take the lead and expose the role of race in organizational decisions and policy setting in areas such as recruitment and selection, compensation, organizational culture, and employee relations” (Rocco et al., 2014, p. 465). In order to bring identity-related inequities in employees’ experiences to light, we must consider the narratives of under-represented employees in majority-centric organizational contexts, as sought in this study of Latina faculty as they seek tenure. When considering the experience of underrepresented faculty in the predominantly white, male culture of academia, one must

understand the diversity climate in academia, as well as the historical context that shaped the culture of academia, and the positioning of Latina faculty within this setting.

### **Diversity Climate**

Many of the challenges faced by underrepresented faculty members stem from faculty perceptions of unsupportive diversity climates within their institution and the overarching field of academia. Therefore, in order to understand the Latina faculty experience related to tenure attainment, it is important to understand what diversity climate is, how it relates to organizational effectiveness and practices, and how diversity climate affects faculty diversity within higher education institutions.

Cox (1994) defines culture as “the system of values, beliefs, shared meanings, norms, and traditions that distinguish one group of people from another” (p. 161). Similarly, organizational climate and culture are characteristics of the organization that guide how employees interact with each other and with leadership teams when performing work and non-work related functions. Schneider, Ehrhart, and Macey (2013) conceptualize organizational culture as the values and norms of the organization, while organizational climate refers to the shared perceptions of organizational policies and practices. Although these practices and norms can be explicit and set by the top leadership of the organization, the individuals who implement the mission of the organization on a daily basis drive and cement the true organizational practices and norms.

Through daily interactions and interpretations of explicit norms, implicit (unspoken, operationalized) norms also develop. Because of the integral contribution of different levels of the organization to climate, all levels within the organizational structure should be considered when assessing climate, especially as it relates to the diversity of the organization (Dwyer et al., 2003). Not only is it important to study the top leaders who set the organizational norms, but

also employees' experiences, and organizational practices that shape the true manifestation of diversity climate.

Diversity climate refers to “the degree to which a firm advocates fair human resource policies and socially integrates underrepresented employees” (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008, p. 352). It encompasses employee perceptions on how demographic and cultural characteristics influence practices and the social environment within their organization. One of the most popular theorists regarding diversity climate, Cox (1994) highlighted the importance of interactions between individuals and their work environment in shaping diversity climate in organizations. Cox (1994) suggested that diversity climate is composed of personal, group and organizational-level factors that influence individual outcomes, which in turn influence organizational-level outcomes and overall effectiveness.

### **Contributions of a Positive Diversity Climate to Organizations**

At the individual outcomes level, a positive diversity climate provides individuals with a sense of belonging that fosters job satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Cox 1994; Taylor et al., 2010). Underrepresented groups who perceive positive diversity climates also show more positive work attitudes (Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000; McKay et al. 2008). Individuals who perceive a positive diversity climate are more likely to report lower absenteeism and lower intent to leave the organization (Cox, 1994; McKay et al., 2007). In terms of achievement outcomes, the affective outcomes for individuals that perceive a positive diversity climate will likely drive performance improvement, and thus could result in higher compensation and promotions within the organization (Cox, 1994). Improved performance at the individual level drives improved organizational level outcomes in terms of increased productivity, enhanced

customer satisfaction, and sales potential (Cox, 1994; McKay et al., 2008; McKay et al., 2009; McKay et al., 2011).

The influence of diversity climate on organizational effectiveness conveys its importance to organizations. A positive diversity climate leads to creativity, increased problem solving abilities and increased workgroup cohesiveness and communication (Cox, 1994). Consequently, this translates to increased organizational profits, goal attainment and increased customer satisfaction and market share (Cox, 1994; McKay et al., 2008; McKay et al., 2009). In the academic context, institutional climates that support and celebrate its faculty members' diversity should theoretically foster an environment where underrepresented faculty can thrive, and increase their productivity measured in terms of research, teaching, and service output, the prized outcomes of academia.

### **Challenges related to fostering a positive diversity climate**

The benefits of a positive diversity climate on organizational effectiveness encourage organizations to pursue practices and develop policies that support diversity (Cox, 1994; Groggins & Ryan, 2013). The following sections will discuss each of the challenges and their influence on fostering a positive institutional diversity climate.

**Role of top leadership.** An existing challenge with creating a positive diversity climate is that it typically follows top leadership's personal values (Bajdo & Dickson, 2001). Herdman and McMillan-Capehart (2010) found that the values of the management team responsible for implementing diversity-related programs and practices have a significant influence on the effectiveness of the programs and practices in shaping employee perceptions. Thus, when the top leadership structure of an organization is homogeneous in demographics (most leaders are

white males) and does not actively engage in practices to promote diversity, it may be challenging to foster a positive diversity climate and to change employees' climate perceptions.

In order to foster a positive diversity climate, organizational leaders should hire and retain a demographically mixed and diverse group of managers (Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000). Given that the top leadership in institutions of higher education are still predominantly white males, in order to foster a more inclusive diversity climate, the representation of minorities at the decision-making levels of universities (Deans, Provosts, Vice-Presidents and Presidents) must increase. However, this representation seems to be an insurmountable challenge when the number of underrepresented faculty entering the ranks of academia who would one day hold a leadership role is so disproportionately low.

**Differential treatment of employees.** Although a positive diversity climate is beneficial to organizational effectiveness, there is potential for negative consequences to emerge from a diverse organization. Communication issues, as well as intergroup conflicts due to differing goals and resource allocation may arise between minority and majority employees (Cox, 1994). Women and racial/ethnic minorities may be more aware of differential treatment in terms of promotion and career development, and “may be less involved in their jobs” (Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000, p. 328).

Perceptions of incongruity between organizational values and diversity practices may lead to frustration, feelings of isolation, and lack of trust and investment on behalf of employees who feel negatively affected by organizational practices (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). The negative effects of diversity climate can be offset by fostering a supportive organizational context (Dwyer et al., 2003). Although many institutions of higher education espouse diversity



as part of their core values, the low number of underrepresented students and faculty hint toward perceived incongruities between organizational values and practices.

### **Recommendations for Fostering a Positive Diversity Climate**

In order to foster a positive, supportive diversity climate, organizations need to consider whether organizational practices and descriptive or explicit norms align with injunctive, or implicit, norms (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Jacobson et al., 2015). If organizations seek to promote a positive diversity climate, the leadership team setting diversity-related goals and strategies, as well as the management team that implements said goals need to be diverse, and engage in recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce (Hicks-Clarke & Iles, 2000; Dwyer et al., 2003). Recommended practices to improve diversity climate within organizations revolve around the recruitment and retention of underrepresented employees, as well as promoting organizational norms that increase collaboration, participation, and teamwork (Conklin & Rollins-McNeish, 2006; Taylor et al., 2010). This is especially important within the context of higher education, where increasing the number of underrepresented faculty members is essential to the recruitment, retention, and graduation of minority students in an increasingly diverse national population.

**Fostering a positive diversity climate within higher education.** All aspects of the recruitment process, from the job description to selection of the search committee and advertising of vacancies are important when recruiting diverse employees or faculty members in the educational context (Conklin & Rollins-McNeish, 2006; Taylor et al., 2010; Smith & Moreno, 2006). It is often the case that majority administrators design recruitment processes, and thus these processes may be biased in favor of majority applicants (Cox, 1994). Conklin and Rollins-McNeish (2006) recommend that search committees be structured in a manner that

reflects diverse demographics and perspectives, so that underrepresented faculty members also have the opportunity of being selected. Additionally, Smith and Moreno (2006), suggest that position descriptions should be written in a manner that does not favor majority candidates, is inclusive of the new competencies and skills needed by faculty, and does not limit underrepresented faculty members' professional interests. Lastly, Conklin and Rollins-McNeish (2006) suggest that job vacancies are advertised through venues that encourage the application of underrepresented candidates, such as professional associations and publications geared toward underrepresented faculty groups.

Taylor et al. (2010) point out that one of the most effective tools in recruiting underrepresented faculty is the current institutional underrepresented faculty population. Current faculty members can reach out to peers who share similar demographics and encourage or dissuade them from applying for vacant faculty positions. In a positive diversity climate, current faculty members are more likely to be pleased with their work environment and recruit other minorities to their institution.

In an institutional setting within higher education, Ortega-Liston and Rodriguez Soto (2014) suggest that institutions should seek to hire and retain a faculty group that is representative of its student body, as this develops affinity between students and faculty, and allows students to have demographically similar role models and thus be more likely to remain at their institutions. Similarly, organizations whose employee base is reflective of its clients may be more responsive to client needs and therefore see higher customer satisfaction (McKay et al., 2008).

In addition to inclusive recruitment and hiring practices, one of the challenges of maintaining a diverse climate is the retention of underrepresented employees. Organizations

should seek to develop comprehensive organizational training and cultural acclimation processes to allow employees to understand and embrace the organizational culture and practices (Cox, 1994). Providing mentorship opportunities by pairing identity-similar tenured faculty to new faculty members can provide a resource for both support and information regarding the organizational culture and practices (McKay et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2010; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Fries-Britt et al., 2011). In a study conducted by Zambrana, Ray, Espino, Castro, Cohen, & Eliason (2015), on the experience of underrepresented faculty members, the authors reported that “about half the participants reported that inadequate mentoring had impeded their career growth (p. 49); , and that they perceived that they had fewer opportunities for research collaboration with senior mentors. This is significant because this perceived lack of support may influence underrepresented faculty members’ feelings of connectedness and fit within their institution, and intent to stay in their current positions and even in academia.

Lastly, organizations should clearly articulate their values and beliefs related to organizational diversity, and more importantly, practice and reward positive behaviors that promote an inclusive diversity climate (Taylor et al., 2010; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). Hicks-Clarke and Iles (2000) found that career and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be affected by policy support. Smith and Moreno (2006) also highlight the importance of embedding diversity in core institutional processes. Therefore, organizations should clearly outline and convey the values and policies related to diversity to its faculty, staff and students.

While clearly articulating values is important, actually implementing processes and practices that convey the value of diversity is of greater importance. Jacobson et al. (2015) found that injunctive (implicit) norms were more powerful than explicit (descriptive) norms

when conveying value placed on diversity. Similarly, Kossek and Zonia (1993) found that positive perceptions of diversity climate were related to the equal provision of resources and support to underrepresented racioethnic groups when compared to their majority counterparts.

Offering career development and advancement opportunities to both majority and underrepresented faculty groups would improve perceptions of a positive diversity climate, which may in turn contribute to underrepresented faculty members' retention. Retaining current underrepresented faculty members in academia, as well as recruiting and hiring underrepresented faculty members, is an integral part to closing the existing and troubling faculty diversity gap, a chasm which is seeded deep within the historical context of the current higher education system.

### **History of Higher Education**

The American Higher Education system was modeled after the English educational system. British universities like Cambridge and Oxford provided the blueprint for the development of colleges and universities in the United States. Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Columbia, and Dartmouth were some of the first institutions of higher education in colonial United States (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008; Thelin, 2004). These universities intended to educate privileged, young white males in the colonies. Although envisioned for wealthy men like in Europe, American universities did allow the sons of middle and lower class workers to attend, usually for payment in goods and services. However, an impoverished, war-torn country after the Civil War forced the few working class students to return home to help provide for their families (Thelin, 2004). This meant that access to higher education was limited to the rich, thus setting the foundation for an elitist, selective educational system that perpetuated the wealth and prosperity of those who had money (Thelin, 2004). College attendance was not allowed for women and people of color, who were seen as second-class citizens in colonial America.

The number of colleges in the United States grew rapidly in the nineteenth century, where colleges were seen as generators of revenue from endowments and tuition charged to students (Thelin, 2004; Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). The curricula in these institutions centered on mathematics, religion and Latin (Thelin, 2004). In 1862, The Morrill Act approved federal funding for institutions of higher education, which fostered the growth of technical colleges where students learned more practical skills in scientific and technological fields, and agricultural & mechanical colleges (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). This expansion in the number of colleges facilitated even more segregation within the student body, with colleges limiting and employing blatant discriminatory practices in admitting students (Thelin, 2004).

As a response to this discrimination, colleges that catered to the needs of different demographic segments (i.e. Historically Black Colleges and Universities, HBCUs; and Hispanic Serving Institutions, HSIs) emerged (Thelin, 2004). However, these discriminatory practices had established a precedent for inequality in educational and professional experiences of minority students and faculty members. This problem is still evident and problematic in today's society, as reflected by the low number of underrepresented faculty members in academia. The gap in access, opportunities and representation of minority populations in academia is not a recent issue, and will therefore require time and active, intentional efforts to close.

### **Women in Higher Education**

It was not until 1836, surprisingly in the more conservative South, when women were first conferred "higher degrees" (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008, p. 65). Even though women were allowed to enroll in college, the quality of education they received was inferior to that of males due to poor secondary education available to women and lax admission standards geared toward increasing enrollment (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). Colleges who accepted women expanded in

the Midwest, where many states had more than one college for women (Thelin, 2004). Some of the curricula for women focused on home management and finishing school topics (Thelin, 2004). The entrance of women into college was opposed by many who felt that admitting women would “take away from the honorific position of the dominant class” of white, affluent males (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008, p. 65).

Women were also marginalized when they tried to pursue careers in teaching at the post-secondary level. Thelin (2004) offers two reasons why, even though women enrollment in colleges increased, the number of women in faculty positions was minimal: “women students were often pigeonholed and thwarted in the curriculum and in campus life; and...those who completed advanced degrees encountered blatant discrimination in the academic job market” (p. 143). The disparity between men and women in terms of educational access, quality, and opportunity to pursue careers in academia continued to grow, and are still present today, as illustrated by the low number of women in general and women of color specifically who are faculty members at institutions of higher education.

### **People of Color in Higher Education**

People of color were even more marginalized by the social and educational systems. In the early years of the colonial era, it was a crime to teach a person of color how to read and write (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). Therefore the extremely low number of Black students and even lower number of graduates, only 28 in 1860, is not surprising (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). After the Civil War, Northern teachers took on the task of educating the millions of freed slaves who had, prior to the Civil War, not had any education, and were at most semiliterate (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). In 1950, the activism efforts of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) yielded federal legislation that began the desegregation of colleges

and universities (Brubacher & Rudy, 2008). It is startling that less than 70 years ago, people of color were not allowed to share the same educational spaces as white students; at the same time, the relative youth of desegregation compared to the long history of discrimination in higher education provides an explanation for the existing underrepresentation of minority faculty in all levels of American Higher Education. Currently, with the call for increased student education on diversity and a decrease in the social and economic inequality among communities, faculty members' role in student success and college completion is instrumental in preparing students for the workforce.

### **Role of Faculty in Student Success and Persistence**

Among the main factors influencing student persistence in college is student integration to the university, both socially and academically (Leppel, 2001, 2002; Tinto, 2012). Supportive relationships with faculty members facilitate students' connectedness and integration to the university. More importantly, interaction with faculty is related to student persistence and success in college (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 2012). Faculty members invest time to support and develop students through mentorship and advising. Mentorship plays an even more instrumental role in underrepresented student persistence than it does for majority students. Blackwell (1989) pointed out that typically, faculty members select and mentor students with whom they share similar characteristics such as race, gender, ethnicity, etc. Thus, in order to provide much-needed mentorship to underrepresented students, the number of faculty who share similar characteristics with students must be representative of the student population.

One of the common reasons identified in the literature for the importance of a diverse faculty body is the notion of representativeness of the faculty in comparison to the student body.

The student population enrolled in colleges and universities is becoming more diverse, thus the case for more diverse faculty members to serve as role models for students is a valid one made by many scholars (Antonio, 2002; Nuñez & Murakami-Ramalho, 2012; Ponjuan, 2011; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Smith & Moreno, 2006; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014).

The representative bureaucracy theory proposed by Kingsley (1944, as cited in Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014) can provide insight into the representativeness of faculty diversity when compared to student diversity. The theory outlines that “democracies based on equitable representation must be proportionately staffed with professionals sharing common attributes with the clients they serve” (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014, p. 286). The practical application of this theory provides support for the call for greater faculty diversity, and representation of Latinas as faculty to represent and support the interests of Latinx students who need mentorship and role models from faculty who share their identities.

Unfortunately, the number of underrepresented faculty members is very disproportionate to underrepresented student enrollment. This imbalance manifests itself in fewer opportunities for underrepresented student mentorship, which may lower student persistence and college completion rates. Additionally, current underrepresented faculty members are charged with providing support to students beyond their optimal student advising loads, which burdens faculty ability to meet the performance requirements imposed by their institutions. It is imperative to increase faculty diversity, especially the number of Hispanic faculty, in order to support the growing Hispanic and underrepresented student population entering the workforce in the future.

### **Faculty Diversity**

The lack of faculty diversity is very evident in higher education institutions in general, where in 2013-2014 racial minority faculty members accounted for only 21% of full-time faculty



positions; 9% identified as Asian, 4.5% identified as African American, 3.5% identified as Hispanic, while 3% identified as belonging to one or more races, or did not disclose their race (Myers, 2016). This disparity in representation is even more salient when looking at the different institutional types, as classified by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. This system classifies 4-year degree-granting institutions into eight categories:

- R1: Doctoral Institutions – Highest research activity;
- R2: Doctoral Institutions – Higher research activity;
- R3: Doctoral Institutions – Moderate research activity;
- M1: Master's Colleges and Universities – Larger programs;
- M2: Master's Colleges and Universities – Medium programs;
- M3: Master's Colleges and Universities – Smaller programs;
- Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences Focus; and
- Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields

(Carnegie Classification, 2016, “Basic Classification Description” section).

Table 1 shows the tenured faculty racial breakdown as a percentage of total tenured faculty at each type of institution for the 2013-2014 academic year. The underrepresentation of faculty of color is evident in all institution types, and the Hispanic tenured faculty of color is significantly underrepresented in Research 1 Doctoral Institutions (Myers, 2016; Zambrana et al., 2015). It is greatly important to increase faculty diversity across all institutional types, however, increasing representation in the Research 1, 2, and 3 Doctoral Institutions should be a priority, as most of these are large, public universities with very high enrollment, their sheer size and affordability may attract a large percentage of students seeking a college education.

Table 1. Percentage of Tenured Faculty (TF) by Race, by Carnegie Classification Institution Type for the 2013-2014 Academic Year.

Institution Type	White TF (%)	Asian/PI TF (%)	African American TF (%)	Hispanic TF (%)	Native American TF (%)	2+ Race TF (%)	Race Unknown TF (%)
R1 Doctoral (91, 189)	79.0	12.0	3.1	3.4	0.3	0.4	1.8
R2 Doctoral (38, 248)	77.5	10.3	4.1	3.4	0.4	0.5	3.8
R3 Doctoral (14, 298)	74.0	9.0	9.2	3.3	0.4	0.9	3.2
M1 Master's (54,025)	79.5	8.7	5.0	4.0	0.4	0.6	1.8
M2 Master's (12, 152)	79.0	7.0	6.0	3.0	0.5	0.6	3.9
M3 Master's (5, 221)	77.2	6.0	8.0	3.0	0.4	0.6	4.8
Baccalaureate Arts & Science (17, 265)	83.3	5.2	4.5	3.2	0.2	0.7	2.9
Baccalaureate Diverse Fields (8, 614)	85.0	5.3	5.4	2.1	0.3	0.4	1.5

### Conceptual Framework

In order to understand the complexity of the issues facing faculty diversity, especially the number of Latina faculty who receive tenure in academia, it is important to uncover those experiences and analyze them through a critical theoretical lens. Critical Race Theory (CRT), LatCrit Theory, intersectionality theory, and social exchange theory provide the analytical frame through which this study was approached.

### Critical Race Theory

Race is one of the most salient elements of identity, that is, race is one of the characteristics that people notice most about others, regardless of whether individuals identify

themselves by their race (Jones & Abes, 2013). Critical Race Theory (CRT) developed from the inequality that still existed in the treatment of minorities within the legal context after the Civil Rights Movement (Tate, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998). CRT places race in the heart of matters of equity, and looks at how race influences people's experiences and access in comparison to their majority counterparts.

Although many affirmative action and race-neutral policies purport to support minorities, through narratives and storytelling Critical Race theorists highlight how many of these policies in fact reaffirm white privilege (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Tate, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Villalpando, 2004). In many cases, affirmative action policies have shown more benefit to White women, and in turn, the White households they support (Ladson-Billings, 1998). The gap between the minority and majority experience continues to widen due to the poor implementation of policies geared toward closing the gap, and CRT provides a lens through which this gap can be further understood.

CRT will be useful in dissecting and understanding the many layers of influence that racial backgrounds and the experiences of faculty of color can exert in the context of their work engagement and opportunities for advancement within the institutional climate. Faculty of color may have had less access to development and opportunities than their majority counterparts. They must also work harder than their majority peers to overcome stereotypes, and to prove their abilities (Tate, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish 2006). Faculty of color may experience stress and frustration because of this perceived burden. These challenges related to faculty racial identification influence the perception of faculty of color productivity within the institution. Therefore, CRT can provide a lens through which the complex effects of race on diversity climate and faculty diversity within an institution can be analyzed.

## **Latino Critical (LatCrit) Theory**

Although CRT considers the influence of race, it does not suffice to consider all the intersections of faculty identity. Different ethnic groups have additional factors that influence the quality of their experiences relative to majority counterparts. For example, Latinxs not only contend with racial issues; they also face disparate treatment and oppression due to their immigration status, ethnic origin, language, and culture (Villalpando, 2004; Delgado Bernal, 2002). More focused theories would be useful in understanding the specific experiences of other racial minority groups.

A derivative of CRT is Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit), which specifically focuses on the racial inequalities in policies and practices affecting Latinxs. LatCrit differs from CRT in that it also considers issues particular to Latinx experiences, such as “the intersections of immigration, migration, human rights, language, gender, and class, (Hernandez-Truyol, as cited in Villalpando, 2004). CRT did not provide enough depth into understanding the crucial issues faced by Latinxs, therefore LatCrit developed in order to offer a more thorough analysis of the salience of Latinx identity and consequences on the experiences of Latinxs in different contexts. These issues are of importance when researching the diversity climate within an institution and in developing an equitable understanding of the circumstances that shape faculty members (Villalpando, 2004; Delgado Bernal, 2002; Conklin & McNeish, 2006). It is important to be purposeful and mindful of all factors that may influence Latina faculty experiences; therefore, LatCrit is well-suited to document the tenure-and-promotion-related experiences of Latina faculty at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

Following a LatCrit analytical perspective when exploring faculty diversity and Latina faculty experiences will provide space for issues related specifically to Latina identity to emerge.

Through this lens, the voice of Latina faculty will be expressed, and not covered or suppressed by majority-supporting theories that neglect to consider the importance of Latinx identity in shaping how Latinxs experience different phenomena, in this case the successful completion of the tenure process and promotion through the faculty ranks in academia.

### **Intersectionality Theory**

As is the case with more recent theories, Intersectionality Theory developed from a lack of a theory to explain fully the complexity of experiences of individuals who may be categorized in more than one marginalized identity group. Crenshaw (1989) introduced the term *intersectionality* when she sought to shed light on the concept that an individual who shares the same sex or race as another individual will have different experiences due to the intersection of their sex and gender. For example, Crenshaw's essay on domestic violence highlighted that Black women had experiences different from White women and Black men because they faced oppression due to being both a woman and a person of color (Garcia, 2015).

The emergence of intersectionality theory stemmed from criticisms of Feminist Theory as relating to the experience of White, heterosexual women and not encompassing the voices and experiences of racial minority groups such as Black women and Latinas (Garcia, 2015; Walby, Armstrong, & Strid, 2012). Other scholars, like McCall (2005), and Hancock (2007) have expanded intersectionality theory research by analyzing and proposing different approaches to conducting intersectionality studies within social sciences while considering how identities intersect without neglecting the importance of each individual identity (Walby et al., 2012).

In terms of this study, it is evident that Latina faculty may report different experiences than their White female and even African American counterparts. LatCrit theory suggests that Latinxs face inequities that surpass race due to their ancestry, language, and cultural

characteristics. Additionally, Latinxs may also express a racial identity, for example White, Black, AfroCaribbean, etc., introducing more levels of complexity to their Latinx identity and consequently, experiences. Furthermore, as women, Latinas also face gender-related discrimination. However, it is not enough to consider these facets of identity individually to explain the perceptions and experiences of Latina faculty through the tenure process. It would be remiss to understate how race and gender intersect to shape experiences; therefore, intersectionality theory will provide a frame through which to capture the full depth and complexity of the Latina faculty experience as they navigated the tenure and promotion process at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

### **Social Exchange Theory (SET)**

In addition to identity-related differences, diversity climate and faculty diversity are also influenced by other factors. For example, the level of engagement of faculty within the institution can depend on the faculty's perception of their fit to the organization (Livingston, 2011) which may be influenced by perceptions of diversity climate and institutional support for faculty productivity and interests. Faculty engagement may suffer in environments where faculty do not feel appreciated or valued (Conklin & McNeish, 2006). If underrepresented faculty members do not feel energized and engaged in their institution, their relationships with peers, students, and the institutional community as a whole may suffer.

Relationships between individuals and groups are influenced by individuals' perceptions of organizational climate (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). Understanding these relationships and the actions of individuals is of importance when studying diversity climate and its influence on faculty diversity. Social exchange theory (SET) "comprises actions contingent on the rewarding reactions of others, which over time provide for mutually and rewarding transactions and

relationships” (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 890). SET can provide a framework to delve deeper into organizational dynamics that drive faculty actions, in an attempt to understand how faculty engage and participate within the organizational context. For example, if faculty perceive a favorable diversity climate, they may feel more compelled to participate in discretionary behaviors that promote organizational productivity, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs), demonstrated in terms of service, volunteerism, and promoting the organization to community members beyond meeting requirements of the tenure process. SET can guide a deeper understanding of the exchange dynamics among faculty, students, and administrators, in essence, furthering the understanding of the institutions’ diversity climate and how it influences faculty experiences and changes in faculty diversity that are instrumental in closing the faculty diversity and representation gap.

A comprehensive examination of the faculty diversity and diversity climate of an institution should collectively look at a series of variables such as demographics, relationships, and the representativeness of the faculty body in serving the student body. Analyzing faculty diversity from only one theoretical perspective would limit the richness and intricacies of the different components and relationships that make up the institutional diversity climate and therefore affect faculty diversity (Dwyer et al., 2003). Each piece of individuals’ identity can present disparity in experiences, and make the individual “more vulnerable, more marginalized, and more subordinate” (Davis, 2008, p. 71). CRT, LatCrit, Intersectionality, and Social Exchange theories will provide a more comprehensive lens to understand the complex factors that affect faculty diversity and foster inequalities that contribute to the existing gap in representation of minority groups in the faculty body of prestigious Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

## **Barriers to Increasing Faculty Diversity**

Many authors highlight the need to close the faculty diversity representation gap (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Turner et al. 2008; Smith & Moreno, 2006; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Taylor et al., 2010), and the benefits of a diverse faculty body on both student learning and institutional outcomes (Zambrana et al., 2015). In practice, the challenge has been in eliminating the barriers that hinder progress toward closing the representation and diversity gap.

Conklin & Robbins-McNeish (2006) identified four main barriers to increasing faculty diversity within institutions of higher education: a) organizations resist change, b) published vs real rules, c) hiring, retention and upward mobility, and d) a difficult environment. These barriers, further discussed below, are present even today and it is important to understand them within institutional contexts in order to overcome them and increase faculty diversity.

### **Organizations Resist Change**

Given the current number of underrepresented faculty members of the professoriate relative to student body demographics, the dearth of underrepresented group representation within institutional leadership is an issue of concern. Lack of representation, and furthermore proportionate representation, affects institutions twofold- minority voices are not represented in decision-making, and minority students lack mentors and role models who share their demographic characteristics (Smith & Moreno, 2006; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014). The silenced voice of underrepresented groups and the issues they face has implications on the support and access students and faculty receive from decision makers. If the groups who are already marginalized do not have a voice at the decision-making table, there is very little



opportunity for improvement of the status quo to promote the growth and advancement of both student and faculty diversity.

One of the main factors that influence faculty diversity is institutional culture (Smith & Moreno, 2006; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Taylor et al., 2011). Often, top leadership provides the direction for institutional culture. Currently, most institutional leaders are White males, which perpetuate a majority perspective on issues of diversity (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). The values of these white males inform and influence institutional values, and unintentionally favor majority issues or concerns.

Creating change in majority-favoring environments is challenging, but can be initiated through diverse representation in leadership positions throughout the institution. It is necessary that top leadership is representative of the institutional population so that the voice of minorities is also included and considered in decision-making and policy setting (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014). Only when minority voices consistently have champions and space at the decision-making table will there be any opportunity to change the current minority group experience, especially in Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). Efforts to hire and promote representative leaders will demonstrate institutional commitment to their espoused diversity values, which serves to support a positive institutional diversity climate.

### **Published vs. Real Rules**

Institutions need to be mindful of the alignment of their practices and policies with their written values on diversity. A positive diversity climate is instrumental in recruiting and retaining faculty, and thus institutional practices should align with institutional values. Sometimes, underrepresented faculty members express frustration because espoused institutional diversity values and practices are different (Taylor et al., 2010). This frustration can lead to

faculty members reporting lower job satisfaction and potentially leaving their institutions (Taylor et al., 2010). If institutions focused on living up to the values they claim to hold when recruiting students and faculty, great strides would be made toward closing the existing diversity gap.

Given the important role that minority faculty members play in recruiting other minority faculty, institutions should seek to minimize faculty perceptions of an unsupportive diversity climate.

### **Hiring, Retention, and Upward Mobility**

Current issues with faculty diversity affect both recruitment and retention practices.

However, often institutions focus on recruiting and hiring underrepresented faculty, but fall short in providing needed resources and support to retain and engage those faculty members within the institution. Less money is dedicated to support underrepresented faculty members' career development and research interests, which feeds the in- versus out-group mindset among faculty members, creating a divisive environment where there should be collaboration and support of research interests in order to provide a holistic educational experience to students (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). The lack of institutional support for minority faculty research agendas and interests further contributes to the disparate experience of minority faculty in higher education, thus contributing to minority faculty dissatisfaction with their institution and to negative perceptions of institutional diversity climate.

Mentorship has been identified as an important factor in retention of underrepresented faculty members (Taylor et al., 2010; Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Stuart, 2015; Zambrana et al., 2015). The low number of underrepresented faculty in full professor or leadership roles limits the availability of mentors for underrepresented faculty members. Therefore, increased faculty diversity will be useful in the retention of underrepresented faculty members.

## **A Difficult Environment**

Underrepresented faculty groups have different experiences within the institutional environment. Often these different experiences are minimized, and underrepresented faculty are expected to conform to the existing institutional climate, albeit this climate not recognizing or supporting minority faculty needs and challenges. Additionally, resistance from majority-identifying faculty who may perceive that “any effort to focus on the unique problems of faculty of color might undermine the tenure process, which is presumed to be impartial and based on merit” (Delgado-Romero, Manlove, Manlove, & Hernandez, 2007, p.44) continues to foster the majority-centric environment. Women and racial minorities have experiences that differ greatly from each other, and from their majority counterparts. Environmental issues specific to underrepresented groups are discussed below.

**Women in academia.** Currently, women are obtaining more doctoral degrees than men; in the 2014-2015 academic year, 52% of doctoral graduates were women (NCES, 2016). Still, women represent a smaller proportion of the professoriate (NCES, 2014b). Gender identity is also the source of disparate treatment among individuals, and to this day gender inequality remains a barrier to the increase of faculty diversity (Pasque & Errington Nicholson, 2011). In 2014, there was a 21% wage gap between men and women faculty; this gap was even more salient for women of color. African American women earned \$0.63 to every dollar earned by white males, while Hispanic women earned \$0.54 (American Association of University Women, 2015). This discrepancy illustrates a long-standing issue of inequality between the sexes, where men are consistently rewarded at a higher rate than their female counterparts. Furthermore, women enter and exit the workplace more frequently due to family responsibilities and spousal

moves than their male counterparts (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014). These disparities highlight the many issues with access, recruitment and retention of minorities, especially women, in higher education (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014).

The low number of women in academia is of great concern because Conklin & Robbins-McNeish (2006) found that the presence and support of female faculty mentors most accurately predicts female undergraduate student success. Also, “those who attend women’s colleges earn two to three times the number of advanced degrees as those who attend coed schools” (p. 27). With an increase in the number of women enrolling in college, the low representation of women faculty is of concern (AAUW, 2015). Institutions of higher education should strive to increase female faculty rates within their faculty body to improve the likelihood of female degree completion and pursuit of advanced degrees. This would benefit institutions in many ways, namely in improving graduation rates, and possibly in contributing more women faculty as more women pursue advanced degrees.

Women in academia face many challenges while trying to achieve tenure. Boyd et al. (2010) point out that typically women tend to “spend a disproportionate amount of time in teaching, advising, and service activities, which negatively impacts research productivity” (p. 3). Research productivity is the greatest priority for tenure attainment in Research 1 Doctoral institutions, and unless women faculty shift their priorities to focus more on research, or the institution shifts the priority placed on research to encompass and reward teaching and service, women will consistently receive tenure in much smaller number than males. Secondly, women in academia perceive themselves as being outside the informal political networks of their departments, which contributes to perceptions of disconnect and an unwelcoming climate by

women faculty (Maranto & Griffin, 2011). This translates to women feeling excluded from the very important informal networks that influence tenure and promotion success and decision-making.

Women of color in academia face additional challenges. They are often “presumed incompetent as scholars, teachers, and participants in academic governance” (Harris & Gonzalez, 2012, p. 1). Peers may minimize the work done by women faculty of color, and label it as less rigorous or even less important than their peers’ work. This is very concerning in a culture that purports meritocracy as the basis of tenure, but where personal networks and connection influence tenure process outcomes (Padilla, 2003). If the work of women faculty of color is devalued, then their ability to receive tenure is compromised by perceptions of lower quality and lower quantity of work productivity. The questions on the value of their research place women of color in a position where they must constantly defend their worth and justify their seat at the table. The energy expended on justification detracts from the productivity of these women, which in turn makes tenure attainment even more difficult.

Teaching, although secondary to research at most Research 1 Doctoral institutions, is an important piece of the tenure equation. Teaching evaluation scores often quantify the quality of teaching in the ‘merit-based’ tenure system (Lazos, 2012). However, subjective evaluations for women of color are typically lower than for white faculty; not because of their teaching ability, but of the biases and emotions they elicit in their students by simply being a woman of color teaching a ‘controversial’ subject (Delgado-Romero, Flores, Gloria, Arredondo, Castellanos, 2003; Flores Niemann, 2012). This further compounds the challenges that women of color, the most underrepresented demographic in Research 1 Doctoral institutions, face as they navigate the tenure process.

**Intersection of identities among underrepresented faculty.** When faculty members identify as one or more minorities, the intersectionality, or crossing, of identities adds additional sources for possible oppression and discrimination. Faculty members may experience oppression under more than one of their identity characteristics, thus leading to stronger feelings of disenfranchisement and lack of appreciation, accent discrimination in the case of Latinos, and tokenism, where faculty members are selected as the spokespeople for their minority group. Because of this lack of job satisfaction and belonging, faculty members may respond by leaving their institutions and even academia (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006; Taylor et al., 2010; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014).

Women of color are especially sensitive to issues related to identifying as more than one minority (McCall, 2005). Faculty members who identify as women of color face both gender and racial inequities and subordination. Women of color report feelings of isolation within their institution, lack of support for their research agendas, and lack of mentors who can guide their career progression (Boyd et al., 2010; Zambrana et al., 2015). Because they can relate with the experience of students, especially other women of color, faculty express an added responsibility for helping other minorities succeed (Taylor et al., 2010; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Fries-Britt et al., 2011). The perceived additional mentorship workload and role of being the “diversity voice/hire” carried by women of color further contributes to taxation and over commitment that enables their service mindset and focus, thus distracting time and energy from the tenure process expectations of research productivity (Boyd et al., 2010).

As women of color, Latina faculty are vulnerable to the challenges described above, along with other challenges attributed to the cultural values and priorities of being a woman and caretaker in Latino culture. Understanding these challenges and the Latina faculty experience in

detail will provide guidance for recommendations and initiatives geared toward supporting and improving the Latina faculty experience with the tenure process, and consequently, increasing the number of tenured Latina faculty in Higher Education.

### **Latinxs in Academia**

One of the least represented groups in academia is Latinxs. In 2013, Hispanic students represented 15% of students enrolled in postsecondary education; Hispanic faculty members are lagging, at only 3% representation in full professorships (NCES, 2014b). Latinos are the second smallest demographic in terms of full-time faculty (3 %), and Latinas only account for 2% of full-time faculty positions (NCES, 2014b). Given current immigration issues and a fast-growing Hispanic student population, these faculty members need support and encouragement to remain in academia: “Latinos are worthy of much larger political and social consideration” than what they have received in the past (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014, p. 288).

Overall, Latinxs are earning less doctorates than other minorities, and because of the important role of faculty in mentoring and role modeling for students with whom they share demographic characteristics, it is time for “proportional representation by Latina/o professors in higher education” (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014, p. 288). As the Latinx student population in college increases, there must be a commensurate increase in the number of Latinx faculty who can mentor and support students to persist and graduate from college. The quality of the future American workforce is dependent on the appropriate preparation and successful college completion of Latinxs who will represent a larger percentage of the total workforce in the coming years.

Verdugo, (2003), identified two different hypotheses for the status of Latinx faculty in academia: “one argues that structural barriers, such as discrimination, impedes the status...”

while the other “that it is the individual behaviors and choices that determine status” (p. 252). Verdugo, (2003), found that merit, or the individual behaviors argument, did not significantly predict a Latinx faculty member’s status. This is important, because it disproves the individual behaviors argument, thus pointing to structural barriers (tenure processes, discrimination, etc.), as more likely explanations for the status attainment of Latinxs in academia.

Padilla (2003) identified the available supply of faculty, the role of personal networks in hiring decisions, paradigm fit between the faculty member and institution/department, and personal clashes among junior and senior faculty as macro- and micro-level influences on tenure attainment. Although most faculty members will experience some of the effects of the aforementioned influences during the tenure process, Latinx faculty experience these in a differential way that puts them at a greater disadvantage than their majority-identity peers.

The number of Latinxs receiving doctoral degrees, which limits the supply of Latinx faculty even eligible to seek tenure-track faculty positions, is lower than the number of other minorities. Secondly, personal networks among faculty making hiring decisions continue to encourage the ‘good ol’ boy’ network, which means Latinxs with less social capital are at a disadvantage to even getting hired as a faculty member. When Latinxs are hired, their access to existing social networks within their new institutions is limited (Padilla, 2003; Ibarra, 2003). Cultural and unspoken rules are sometimes shared in informal settings where Latinxs are not openly invited, which makes it difficult for them to be privy to said unspoken rules.

The influence of paradigm fit between junior faculty and their senior faculty peers/academic departments and institutions is very salient in the experience of Latinxs with the tenure process. Typically, Latinx faculty have research agendas that explore the Latinx population, which may not fit in with more mainstream research agendas at large research



institutions. In addition, many Latinx faculty are in social sciences and use a qualitative methodology, sometimes perceived to be less rigorous and valid than quantitative research methodology. Because critical research, especially on underrepresented populations, challenges the long-held assumptions of the mainstream, Latinx faculty who dedicate their time to researching these issues are seen as less successful than peers whose research lines up with a traditional, mainstream research agenda (Padilla, 2003; Ibarra, 2003).

### **Latinas and Academia**

Latina women face multiple types of discrimination based on their gender, race, and ethnic inequities, as do other individuals who have more than one minority identity (Hale, 1987, as cited in Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014). As a result, many Latina faculty members suppress one or more aspect of their identity in order to feel more accepted. By suppressing parts of their identity, Latina faculty members limit to some extent their productivity, creativity and contributions that they can make in terms of research and mentoring given their experiences (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Fries-Britt et al., 2011; Boyd et al., 2010). Additionally, given the traditional gender roles associated with Latino culture, women are often expected to serve as primary family and household caretakers. This places an additional load on already overcommitted faculty members who are also mothers, and married. Latinas report a lack of institutional support for family-related issues, which make it challenging to achieve a healthy work/family life balance (Boyd et al., 2010; Harris Canul, 2003). The importance of family to Latina faculty members heightens the severity of the work/family life conflicts reported by Latina faculty. Therefore, institutional support for family-related issues is even more important where Latina faculty retention is concerned.

Another challenge that Latina faculty have reported is disconnect between the collectivistic nature of Latino culture and the individualistic, competitive culture within their institutions (Boyd et al., 2010; Harris Canul, 2003). Latino culture fosters collaboration between community members, and support for the benefit of the group as a whole, not for individual advancement and promotion. Individual gains and promotion are not the driving force for Latinos, and therefore, having to self-promote and “aggrandize [their] own achievements...particularly for promotion and tenure is deeply uncomfortable” (Boyd et al., 2010, p. 15) for Latina faculty. Likewise, the collectivistic nature of Latino culture feeds the need for support and connection within a group, so the lack of institutional support networks and mentors also harbors feelings of isolation among Latina faculty (Boyd et al., 2010; Arredondo & Castellanos, 2003; Harris Canul, 2003; Zambrana et al., 2015). The cultural disconnect between Latina faculty and their institutions is especially troubling when the need for Latina faculty to remain in academia is so great, and the personal/institutional values conflict may hinder Latina faculty willingness to survive in a system that is counter to their cultural priorities.

It is challenging to quantify all issues that currently influence faculty diversity. Many institutions struggle to define their meaning of diversity, and many rely on demographic ratios to describe the diversity of their faculty. However, Smith and Moreno (2006) argue that diversity encompasses far more than numbers: “diversity is a matter of equity in hiring and retention, as well as a central component of higher education’s ability to develop more relevant and varied forms of knowledge...it is essential for creating a work environment that is attractive to people from different backgrounds” (p. 65). According to Antonio (2002), faculty of color differs from white faculty in that they show:

lower publication record with respect to journals and books, higher commitment to research activities, stronger support for educational goals that encompass the affective,

moral, and civic development of students, and in the more explicit connection they make between the work of their profession and service to society. (p. 594)

The contributions of a diverse professoriate are essential to institutional success and effectiveness. Institutions should strive to diversify their faculty members, through the development of inclusive recruitment, hiring, and retention practices that encourage underrepresented groups to remain and be active contributors to their institutional outcomes (Fries-Britt et al., 2011). These inclusive practices are essential components of a positive diversity climate (Taylor et al., 2010). A positive diversity climate is critical for institutions of higher education to increase underrepresented faculty engagement, and consequently, their commitment to their institutions.

### **Employee and Faculty Engagement**

Employee engagement is becoming increasingly popular as a strategy to improve organizational performance as a means to decrease turnover, absenteeism and other negative employee behaviors (Raina & Khatri, 2015). Although there is no consensus on a single definition or measurement of engagement, authors have defined it as a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral connection and commitment to one's organizational role and tasks (Anitha, 2014; Gubman, 2004; Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Kahn, 1990). More specifically, Leiter and Bakker (2010) define work engagement as "a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-related well-being that can be seen as the antipode of job burnout" (p.1-2).

Furthermore, Schaufeli & Bakker (2010) note that practitioners' definitions of engagement allude to engagement having two dimensions: "(1) organizational commitment, more particularly affective commitment (i.e., the emotional attachment to the organization) and continuance commitment (i.e., the desire to stay with the organization), and (2) extra-role behavior (i.e., discretionary behavior that promotes the effective functioning of the

organization)” (p. 12). Essentially, engagement has a cognitive/affective component, which is manifested through a behavioral component, through participation in extra-role behaviors, like Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs).

Even though researchers struggle to agree on a common definition of employee engagement, there is agreement on its positive influence on employee performance. Anitha (2014) found employee engagement to be a significant predictor of employee performance among low- to mid-level managers in small firms, providing further evidence of the importance of employee engagement in the workplace. Fomenting employee engagement is a strategy to increase employee connection to their organization, thus decreasing turnover, absenteeism, and increasing their likelihood of retention to the organization. Therefore, identifying current levels of employee engagement is a crucial step in increasing the measure and consequently employee performance and retention.

A commonly-used instrument for measuring work engagement is the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), which identifies three distinct factors within the construct of engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). Vigor refers to “high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010, p. 13). Dedication, the second factor of engagement, “refers to being strongly involved in one’s work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010, p. 13). Lastly, absorption “is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010, p. 13). The level of vigor, dedication and absorption reported by employees provide a measure of employees’

perceived engagement. These three factors served as basis for development of questions to assess participants' engagement within their current institution and through the tenure process.

### **Faculty Engagement**

At the crux of discussion among researchers is the role of engagement in the faculty tenure and promotion process. One of the challenges in exploring and understanding faculty engagement is the way in which researchers of faculty in academia use the term engagement. Engagement is used interchangeably with similar terms, like participation and involvement, which do not encompass the affective and cognitive dimensions of engagement. Some researchers also define engagement as a connection to, and involvement in the community served by the academic institution. For example, in their study of tenure and promotion documents to identify the activities in which faculty members are involved as publicly engaged scholarship, Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer (2011) refer to engagement as participation in activities and as development of connections within the community. When applied to the context of faculty in academia, Livingston (2011) defined faculty engagement as:

perpetual focused attention, enjoyment, and enthusiasm for the activities associated with faculty work through which the individual finds purpose, senses congruence with personal values and talents, is challenged to use knowledge and skills, and experiences productivity even during difficult times (p. 11).

Further confounding the issue of assessing engagement during the tenure process is the issue of identifying the contribution of faculty engagement to the equation of research, teaching, and service, especially at Research 1 Doctoral institutions that have a responsibility to serve their community (Glass et al., 2011).

Livingston, (2011), categorized faculty engagement into four dimensions: research, teaching, service, and fit to the organization. These dimensions align with the very important triad of productivity for tenure attainment: research, teaching, and service. The last dimension,

fit to the organization, relates strongly to the affinity between faculty members and their institution. If a faculty member does not feel that they are valued and that their beliefs, values, and priorities align with the institutional mission, the dimension of organizational fit will be weak, thus limiting faculty members' perceived potential for engagement.

Livingston's (2011) definition of engagement reflects personal fulfillment and satisfaction because of the work produced by faculty members. Therefore, faculty members who find their work meaningful and impactful should be more engaged within their institution, and consequently report higher job satisfaction and less intent to leave their current organization. This highlights the need for an organizational culture that supports and embraces faculty diversity, where underrepresented faculty members can experience a sense of belonging and connectedness to the institution.

Given the concern with the current number of tenured underrepresented faculty members in Research 1 Doctoral institutions and the positive organizational outcomes of engagement, it would seem beneficial for institutions of higher education to develop strategies that support and encourage faculty engagement, especially among faculty of color. Specifically, it is important to understand the factors that contribute to faculty engagement and how this engagement promotes tenure attainment among Latina faculty members.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Engagement and Tenure**

Even when considering engagement as defined by existing faculty-related research in terms of participation and involvement, it is important to note that underrepresented faculty report differential experiences related to their involvement and productivity requirements. Minority faculty members report having to publish more, take on greater teaching loads, and perform more service than their majority counterparts (Tate, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998;

Conklin & Robbins-McNeish 2006; Boyd et al., 2010). Stuart (2015) also noted that underrepresented faculty members tend to place a high value on service, whereas their institutions place more value on research and instruction. The difference in value placed on research, teaching, and service among underrepresented faculty compared to the institutions they serve, places underrepresented faculty members at a disadvantage when seeking tenure. Underrepresented faculty members who are more drawn to service may struggle with the demands of the research and teaching loads they are expected to complete, while still participating in service they are intrinsically called to perform.

Although by definition Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs), or discretionary behaviors not directly tied to the formal reward system (Organ et al., 2006) do not explicitly contribute to the tenure and promotion process, underrepresented minority faculty members may feel that engagement in OCBs is mandatory for them. Minority faculty members feel that they are at a disadvantage to their majority counterparts (Antonio 2002), and may see participation in OCBs as a means to compensate for the higher expectations on minority faculty that could result in an improvement in their career progression. By volunteering to take on additional teaching loads, serve on more committees, or take on more student advisees, junior faculty members may feel that they are demonstrating a commitment to the university. However, by nature, OCBs are not explicitly rewarded, therefore in essence, participation in OCBs, rather than being an asset toward tenure and promotion, becomes a hindrance by adding to the taxation and over-commitment faced by the low supply of minority faculty members needed to meet the demand of colleges and universities today. A clear picture of how minority faculty members perceive the role of OCBs in tenure and promotion will help draft policies and practices that could help close the diversity gap by better informing faculty of expectations and rewarded behaviors and by

demonstrating to institutions the value that minority faculty place on institutional and community engagement through service.

If indeed, the experience of underrepresented faculty throughout the tenure process is one of over commitment and burnout due to institutional expectations not aligning with the faculty members' interests and passion, then this may be a contributing factor to the low number of underrepresented faculty successfully receiving tenure. Underrepresented faculty may need to realign their efforts in order to increase the number of them who receive tenure. Therefore, it is important to have a deep understanding of the experiences of underrepresented faculty members through the tenure process. This need for rich, descriptive information that can help us understand the real underrepresented faculty experience with the tenure process calls for a qualitative research design that delves into individual experiences and finds common themes across these experiences to shed more light on the true issues facing underrepresented faculty members seeking tenure at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

### **Summary**

Chapter II began with a review of existing literature related to organizational diversity climate and its importance to organizational effectiveness. The researcher provided an overview of diversity climate, and the influences of diversity climate on organizational effectiveness. The review of literature then moved to the specific context of this study, higher education, and presented a brief history of higher education and the role of faculty diversity within the institutional context. The review of literature illustrated the experience of underrepresented minority members within the history of higher education, providing valuable insight into the factors that contributed to the current gap in faculty diversity and minority representation in academia. Specifically, the role of discrimination and segregation on delaying access to colleges



for minority groups was identified. The literature review also yielded several common experiences and challenges of minority faculty in general, and more specifically of women of color and Latinas within the institutional context. Lastly, the researcher presented a definition and discussion of faculty engagement, organizational citizenship behaviors, and their role in tenure attainment.

### **Chapter III: Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

Chapter III presents the research design and methodology for this study. The rationale for a qualitative design and phenomenological approach are discussed. Descriptions and support for the selected sample, data collection, analysis, and quality control measures complete the chapter.

#### **Research Design and Methodological Approach**

Research design should be determined by the purpose of the study and research question(s) of interest. The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions. This purpose was best achieved by utilizing a qualitative research design, where data collection provides rich information that identifies key experiences and contexts that shape the perspective of the participants (Creswell, 2013). A qualitative approach “pays special attention to subjective experience, and how this experience is dependent on one’s social location” (Warner, 2008, p. 461). Qualitative research design is appropriate when the researcher seeks to “understand a phenomenon, uncover the meaning a situation has for those involved, or delineate process” (Merriam, 2002, p. 11). When looking at a particular group’s experience with a phenomenon, a subjective approach captures the unique perspectives that differentiate the group’s experience from the collective population’s experience. These perspectives and differences are of great interest to the researcher and the purpose of this study, which made a qualitative approach more suitable for this study.

The use of a quantitative design did not provide the depth of data required to answer the research questions that guided this study. A qualitative research design was implemented to gather the information that would answer the research questions for the study. In order to gain an understanding of the perspective of Latina faculty members, qualitative data proved more useful and descriptive than quantitative data.

Qualitative data allowed the researcher to focus on the individual experiences of participants in a natural setting, rather than in experimentally controlled environments. Interviews allowed for fluid communication between the researcher and participant(s) and for clarification to be sought where needed, unlike data collected using survey instruments where the researcher is not able to probe and follow interesting concepts that emerge during the data collection process. Lastly, qualitative data provided a richer and more holistic representation of participants' experiences with the phenomenon of seeking tenure, and provided a more comprehensive picture of all factors that influenced participants' experiences (Merriam, 2002). Although quantitative data can help to quantify the relationship between OCBs and Latina faculty tenure completion and career progression, the depth of information derived through a qualitative research design better served to answer the more complex questions posed by the purpose of this study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The scarcity of research on the experiences of Latina faculty, and the importance of understanding these experiences on increasing the number of tenured Latina faculty members, called for a qualitative study design that could provide rich, descriptive information on Latina faculty experiences with tenure and promotion.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Critical Race Theory (CRT), LatCrit Theory, Intersectionality Theory and Social Exchange Theory provided the analytical framework for this study. CRT and LatCrit

specifically position race and other identity characteristics at the center of analysis, and acknowledge that marginalized people's experiences convey a counter-story to the dominant narrative of our history and systems (Fernandez, 2002). Intersectionality theory explores how the intersection of identities shapes the experiences of underrepresented groups. These theories, "methodologically, they direct us to capture the stories, counter-stories, and narratives of marginalized people" that are missing from existing research (Fernandez, 2002, p. 46). As a marginalized group, the voices of Latina faculty seeking tenure at Research 1 Doctoral institutions are not readily represented in existing literature. In order to present those voices, the different narratives of these women must be collected and shared. The experiences of the participants will shed light on the reality faced by Latinas as they navigate the chilly waters of academia, and challenge the majority-centric perspective that is rife in the existing literature. A qualitative methodology allows the use interviews and other data collection methods to gather and disseminate the stories of the participants related to their experiences with the tenure process within the predominantly white structure of academia.

### **Phenomenology**

This study followed a phenomenological tradition approach. According to Creswell, (2013), "a phenomenological study describes the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon" (p. 76). Ultimately, the purpose of a phenomenological approach is to describe the experiences of participants and develop common themes related to a particular phenomenon, in this case, the tenure process and promotion of Latina faculty members (Creswell, 2013).

Moustakas (1994) identifies eight major systematic, procedural steps in conducting phenomenological research. The preliminary steps involve a) selecting a topic or phenomenon

of interest, determining whether phenomenology is the best approach to the research problem; b) conducting a thorough review of related literature; and c) identification of co-researchers and delineation of researcher roles and responsibilities. The research design moves on to what Moustakas (1994) calls the methods of collecting data, which include the development of questions to guide the data collection process. Typically, extensive interviews are conducted, and other sources of data collection, such as document analysis and observations, are orchestrated to support the outcomes of the interviews. Moustakas (1994) suggests that participants should be asked two questions, “what have you experienced in terms of the phenomenon?” and “what contexts and situations have typically influenced or affected your experiences of the phenomenon?” (as cited in Creswell, 2013, p. 81). Other questions formulated from the research questions may be included as part of the interview protocol. The data analysis then follows, where the researcher compiles significant statements that illustrate participants’ experiences and develops a formulated meaning from the statements. Lastly, the formulated meanings are gathered into themes. The themes are used to describe the essence of participants’ experiences through textural (experiences) and structural (context) descriptions (Moustakas, 1994). The ensuing research design followed these procedural steps.

### **Population and Sample**

Qualitative research relies on much smaller sample sizes than quantitative research (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2013). In contrast with quantitative research random sampling, qualitative studies rely heavily on purposive sampling. Through purposive sampling, participants are carefully identified and selected, based on the contribution of participants’ experience to the study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Two types of purposive sampling, criterion and snowball sampling, are recommended to identify the participants of the study. Criterion

sampling refers to selecting participants who meet one or more criterion developed by the researcher. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), this type of sampling establishes a basis of comparison among participants. In order to be included in the sample for this study, the participants had to meet the following criteria: identify as racially/ethnically Latina, currently work in a Research 1 Doctoral institution, and be currently navigating the tenure process or have successfully completed the tenure process within the last 5 to 10 years. The tenure completion time criteria was important because faculty members who just completed or are going through the tenure process would be more likely to easily and clearly recall their experiences and be able to provide examples to support their statements.

Creswell (2013) proposes that not only is sample size important in qualitative research, but the depth of detail collected is also important. For a phenomenological study, Creswell (2013) recommends conducting extensive interviews with a sample size of approximately 10 participants. Initial participants were identified through purposive sampling, and additional participants were then identified using a snowball sampling technique. Snowball sampling involves asking participants in the study to refer other people who they feel would have rich information and insight to contribute to the study (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2013).

A total of ten Latina faculty members participated in the study, although the researcher invited a total of thirty-three Latina faculty members to participate in the study. Initial participants for the study were identified through the NASPA (professional association for Student Affairs practitioners) Latino/a Knowledge Community network. The researcher sent out an e-mail call to identify Latina faculty at Research 1 Doctoral institutions. Additionally, the researcher directly emailed 14 Latina faculty found by searching Research 1 Doctoral institution websites for Latina women. The researcher received six recommendations from the initial call.

The researcher then sent a formal invitation for participation via email to the recommended faculty members. Three of the six faculty members contacted agreed to participate in the study. Using snowball sampling, the first participants in the study were asked to identify one or more faculty members who would be suited for this study and those who met the criteria were invited to participate in the study. The participants' recommendations provided another four participants. The last three participants were identified by the researcher via emails sent to Latina faculty members located through the internet searches for Latina faculty at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

**Participant Demographics.** Of the ten women participated in this study, eight are ranked as Assistant Professors, while two have already received tenure and are ranked as Associate Professors. Three of the eight participants who have not received tenure have not made it to the third-year review, while five expect to apply for tenure in the next two years. All but three participants identified as first-generation college students. Seven participants are in higher education-related fields, and all are in humanities/social sciences-based colleges. Lastly, all participants' research agendas center on underrepresented populations and issues of equity.

### **Site Selection**

Faculty diversity inequalities exist and need to be addressed in all institutional contexts. However, the unwritten prestige and elitist status attributed to Research 1 Doctoral institutions make faculty positions in Research 1 Doctoral institutions highly coveted and pursued. Given the desirability of tenure positions in Research 1 Doctoral institutions, the researcher was interested in understanding the Latina faculty experience related to tenure completion at these institutions. The findings of the study may provide rich, useful information that can be used to develop recommendations to improve the tenure attainment rate of Latina faculty in Research 1

institutions, thus increasing the representation of this small demographic in the more prestigious ranks of academia.

The participants in the study serve as faculty in ten different Research 1 Doctoral institutions. One participant is in the Pacific Northwest, four in the Midwest, three in the Southeast, one in the Northeast, and one in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The location of the participants covered a wide range of institutions and regions that provided a richer, more comprehensive look at Latina faculty experiences in different areas of the country.

### **Data Collection**

Data for this study was collected via different data collection techniques. Implementing multiple data collection techniques in qualitative research provides the researcher with different sources of data that can serve to confirm and establish the credibility of findings (Patton, 1999). The data collection strategy for this study consisted of completion of a brief biographical survey, interviews, and document analysis of the participants' Curriculum Vitae (CV) and institutional tenure and promotion documents. Participants were asked to complete a brief survey to gather demographic information in an attempt to maximize the time available for the interview. A copy of the interview protocol and the biographical survey are included in Appendix D and Appendix E respectively. A review of the tenure and promotion documents from each participant's institution was compared to the participants' reported experiences to explore the extent to which their engagement followed their institutional tenure and promotion expectations. Participants were asked to provide their institution's tenure and promotion documents, if available, for the purpose of the document analysis described above. The researcher conducted an online search to collect tenure and promotion documents for the institutions where the participants did not provide the document.



Interviews have “become the main data collection procedure closely associated with qualitative, human scientific research” (Englander, 2012, p. 13). Furthermore, interviews are appropriate in phenomenological research “due to [the researcher’s] interest in the meaning of a phenomenon as it is lived by other subjects” (Englander, 2012, p. 14; Wilson & Washington, 2007). In this study, the researcher was interested in the lived experiences of Latina faculty as they navigated tenure and promotion at Research1 Doctoral institutions, therefore conducting in-depth interviews with Latina faculty who have completed the tenure process was an appropriate data collection strategy. The researcher took copious notes during the interview to provide supplemental notes for the purpose of interview transcription and transcript coding. The different data collection techniques allowed the researcher to validate the data through comparison of the information gathered through the different sources.

The researcher contacted faculty members via e-mail to establish whether each faculty member was willing to participate in the study. Due to geographic constraints and the timeline for the study, most interviews were conducted via recorded telephone call using a conference call service, freeconferencecall.com. One of the participants was relatively close to the researcher, so an in-person interview was conducted with that participant.

**Interview protocol.** The researcher followed the recommended procedures for this type of study, and developed a semi-structured interview protocol, where the researcher has open-ended questions, but leaves room for open discussion with participants (Creswell, 2013; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The protocol was developed based on the following research questions:

- How do Latina faculty members perceive their experiences in relation to completion of the tenure process?

- How do Latina faculty members describe their engagement in their institution during the tenure process?
- How do Latina faculty members describe the role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as a form of institutional engagement in successfully completing the tenure process?

The researcher included definitions of the main concepts, i.e. OCBs, to ensure that the participants all shared a common frame for their experiences and understanding of what the researcher sought. Telephone interviews were recorded using a conference call service, freeconferencecall.com. The in-person interview was recorded on two separate iOS devices to avoid losing data. The interview recordings allowed the researcher the opportunity to focus on the participants' responses and to be able to probe, ask for clarification, or seek more detail when needed, instead of solely focusing on taking interview notes.

### **Data Analysis and Management**

The interview data was transcribed, and data was coded to identify emerging themes within the data. The researcher reviewed all interview data several times to compile significant statements that illustrate individual participants' experiences. The researcher analyzed the data utilizing a priori coding established through the literature review (For example: role of mentorship, perceptions of diversity climate, and unwritten expectations). Other codes emerged during the data analysis (for example changes in institutional philosophy, advice, and family support and challenges). The researcher then developed a formulated meaning from the significant statements. Lastly, the formulated meanings were gathered into themes, which contain textural and structural descriptions that capture the essence of participants' experiences

(Creswell, 2013). The researcher manually coded the data, and utilized Atlas.ti, a data and coding management software, throughout the data reduction process.

### **Trustworthiness and Data Quality Control**

In any study, the researcher should be able to demonstrate that the research design and data analysis were conducted in a thorough manner and that high quality, trustworthy findings are presented (Patton, 1999). The trustworthiness of the data should be reported so that readers can determine the value and applicability of the information presented by the researcher to similar contexts. Lincoln and Guba (1985) identify four standards for the validation of qualitative studies: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

**Credibility.** The credibility of the study refers to the authenticity of the findings and data collected. The researcher ensured the credibility of this study through triangulation of the data and member checks where participants in the study were asked to confirm the transcriptions and meanings derived by the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Triangulation refers to collecting data from different sources, using different methods, analyzing from different theoretical perspectives, and the interpretation of several investigators (Creswell, 2013). In this study, the researcher conducted interviews and document analyses for 10 participants, thus meeting the call for different sources and methods as part of triangulation. The researcher looked at the raw data and made individual interpretations, which were validated by the Dissertation Committee Chair (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Transferability.** The transferability of a study refers to whether the results of the study transfer to other contexts/situations. Although the reader most often makes this decision, the researcher utilized rich description to provide enough detail about the selection of participants

and the context of their experiences to allow readers to make an informed decision about the applicability of the findings to other contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Dependability.** Field notes from interviews and journals kept by researchers or participants can serve to support the dependability, or consistency of the study. Dependability corresponds with the reliability of a quantitative study. Researchers should provide notes from the entire process, from research design to data analysis and interpretation, so that another researcher replicating the study would have a clear picture of how the research process unfolded, as well as any challenges or changes the researchers made throughout the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher kept field notes and journal entries from the study in order to fulfill the dependability validation for this study.

**Confirmability.** Lastly, the confirmability of the study refers to the extent to which the data collected and existing literature support the findings of the study. To this end, the researcher kept accurate records and copies of all raw data collected, in addition to conducting a thorough review of existing literature related to the topic of the study and its participant demographics (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

### **Ethical Considerations**

The researcher has a responsibility to report information accurately and truthfully. The researcher made every effort to minimize any potential risk to the participants in the study. Prior to conducting the study, the research study was submitted to the Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. The researcher requested an exemption from full IRB review because there was minimal risk to participants in the study. The IRB approval form for the study is included in Appendix F. The IRB waived the need for signed consent forms as interviews were conducted via telephone. The researcher provided a consent form for the in-

person participant. Participants received a copy of the IRB approval along with the initial invitation for participation in the study. The researcher reviewed data use, security, and confidentiality measures for the study with participants. The researcher personally transcribed all interviews, and only the researcher and Dissertation Committee chair reviewed and accessed the transcripts to maintain the confidentiality of the information collected. Participants selected a pseudonym prior to the interview, in an effort to maintain participants' anonymity.

### **Researcher Positioning**

In qualitative research, "analysis is a creative process, depending on the insights and conceptual capabilities of the analyst" (Patton, 1999, p. 1190). The researcher serves as an instrument through which data is collected, analyzed, and meaning derived from the data (Patton, 1999; Merriam, 2002). It is important for researchers to provide their background, philosophies and the lens through which they are interpreting the data collected. The researcher in this study is a Latina doctoral student who is seeking to obtain a faculty position in academia upon completion of her degree. The researcher has a professional background in Higher Education Student Affairs Administration and Human Resource and Leadership Development. The researcher is familiar with the challenges faced by Latinas in an administrative function of higher education, having experienced several challenges herself in her professional career. Struggles to balance work and home commitments, tokenism, and lack of resources and mentorship were all present in the researcher's career path. In a transition to the academic function of higher education, the researcher was interested in understanding how discretionary behaviors influence the tenure process completion since the researcher expects to navigate the tenure process in the near future, and thus sought to know how other Latinas have experienced the tenure process, successfully completed it, and advanced in their career progression. The researcher sought to

understand the experience of Latina faculty members as they progress through the tenure process, and to identify the factors that influence tenure attainment.

### **Summary**

The researcher conducted a qualitative, phenomenological study to explore and understand the perspective of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on tenure and promotion of Latina faculty members at Research 1 Doctoral institutions. This purpose was best fulfilled by utilizing a qualitative research design, where data collection provided rich information that delved deep into participants' experiences to allow for themes and patterns among their experiences to emerge.

The researcher conducted ten interviews with Latina faculty who met the criteria for the study. The women encompassed a variety of research interests, disciplines, and were located across the different regions of the United States. The diverse backgrounds and environments provided rich, descriptive data that illustrated the experience of these women with engagement as they navigated the tenure process at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

## **Chapter IV: Findings**

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 (R1) Doctoral institutions.

Chapter IV presents the findings that emerged from the study's data analysis. The first section of the chapter presents a brief profile of each of the study participants; a narrative on each participant's backgrounds, a synopsis of their history and journey through their professional lives, and how these have shaped and influenced their experience with the tenure process. The second section defines, supports, and illustrates the themes that emerged from the data collected using direct quotes from the interviews with participants. Specifically, the findings will be connected to the research question they address. Lastly, a summary of the findings and themes identified completes the chapter.

### **Participant Profiles**

Ten women participated in this study. Seven of the participants were born in the United States, and three were born in a Latin American country and migrated to the United States at different stages in their lives. Four participants are under the age of 35, five are between the ages of 35 and 44, and two are over the age of 45. Seven participants are married, and the remaining three are single and in a relationship. Four women still have dependent children. Only two participants completed post-doctoral research work prior to seeking Assistant Professorships, and six are first-generation college students.

Two of the participants are Associate Professors who have received tenure. The eight remaining participants are all Assistant Professors on the tenure track. Two of the eight will

submit their tenure portfolio for review within the next two years, and the rest are within the first three years of their tenure path.

All ten women's stories are very compelling, and demonstrate their strength and persistence in the face of many adverse situations that marked their formative years and professional journeys. The participants are identified by a pseudonym they each selected prior to the interview. Two participants did not provide a pseudonym, so the researcher assigned them a pseudonym. The participant profiles that follow are organized in alphabetical order by name (pseudonym).

### **Diana**

Diana was born in Mexico City, Mexico. At a young age, Diana and her family migrated to the United States, after living in Europe, where she reports that she developed a broad view of the world and its issues. Diana and her family returned to Mexico where she attended primary school, and completed her undergraduate college education. With a Bachelor's degree in hand, Diana migrated to the United States once more, and worked with a firm in her discipline, in the Southwestern United States. Diana worked as a professional for a couple of years, before the fallout of the economic recession of 2008-2009 hit her field. Left in a vulnerable situation and looking toward her future, Diana sought a means to have more job security in the future, and found it in education. Diana was in the first year of her Master's program when she explained that things hit rock bottom in her field due to the economic crisis, and she was laid off. She pursued her degree full time, and struggled to navigate a higher education system that was very unfamiliar to her given her undergraduate experience in Mexico. As she navigated this new educational path, she met a faculty member, whom she credits with introducing her to the world of academia, who guided her through the program:



So, ah [her faculty mentor] actually reached out to me and said “oh you know, if you ever have any questions about what's going on around you, in other words my graduate program, please feel free to come and ask me any questions you may have”. Um, and to me that was interesting and useful. I didn't know what the benefit of that could be at that point but I thought wow, like that's really nice that she made that offer; and so when I had a question I took her up on the offer.

As Diana contemplated the bleak options available to her after she completed her degree program, her faculty mentor suggested she seek a Ph.D. given that the job market was almost nonexistent in her field. Diana took the leap of faith and applied to the Ph.D. program at her university:

So I applied, now again, I think with a very poor understanding of what I was getting myself into- but with a big ally and advocate on my- in my court. Undeniably so. Like, that one, I did feel like I was jumping into the unknown but I had the parachute attached to me already. Like somebody with like a gate valve or like somebody who I could trust that was on my side, that wouldn't be recommending- recommending this if they didn't think it was in my best interest. So that is how I got into the Ph.D.

Her faculty mentor supported and groomed her throughout the Ph.D. process, and planted the seed of an academic career for Diana, who admits she did not consider that pathway as a possibility. In her effort to find a job and stability, Diana remained open to a career in academia, but also asked her mentor to remain open to Diana seeking a professional job in her field. Diana realized that her “heart [was] not set on becoming a faculty member”, and was honest about this with her mentor. Diana wanted to keep as many doors open as she looked into the future. Her mentor agreed, but asked Diana to trust her mentor when it came to preparing to become a faculty member:

As somebody who understands how academia works, “you're going to have to trust me when I tell you that there are certain things that you must do if you don't want that door- the- the academic door to close on you. So, examples of this was like, if I tell you that you should participate and attend conferences, that I need you to understand that I'm telling you that if you- in order to keep that door open. If you don't follow that advice, that- eventually that door might just close.

Diana followed her mentor's advice. She conducted research projects with her mentor, attended and presented her research at national conferences. When her mentor suggested she "publish something on [her] own before [she] graduate[d]", Diana took heed. Upon completion of her coursework and completion of a draft of her dissertation, Diana entered the academic job market, and was unsuccessful. Her record was not solid- she had not defended her dissertation, and had no publications. At that point, Diana was prepared to shut the door on an academic career, but her mentor encouraged her to try one more time. During that year, Diana worked on improving and defending her dissertation, and was able to have papers published, giving her a much stronger portfolio. Diana accepted a job offer as an Assistant Professor at a Research 1 institution in the Northwest, where she is pursuing tenure. Diana's research focuses on issues of equity and access in her field, both nationally and internationally.

Her identity as a Latina has influenced her educational and professional trajectory, especially in her role as a researcher:

I do feel that as a Latina, I can make um, hmm, a better case, a more informed case, when it comes to understanding even just in my area of expertise, for example. Um, I have- I do feel that I can contribute to that part of it at- in particular as a Latina, or because I am a Latina.

In the classroom, Diana's Latina identity is very salient, especially for underrepresented students who see her as a role model:

I've had students that like hug me and tell me like, "oh my God, it's so great to have a Latina professor" and you know, [...] all those things I think that we study, and say, read about like oh it's good for students to have representation in the faculty [...] and so these students come up to me and tell me like, it's so great to know that one of us can become a professor; like literally, with all those words.

Although she has a strong sense of commitment and purpose in her career as a faculty member, she has also experienced many challenges that test her resolve to persist and continue in her path to tenure. Diana's challenges are shared by the remaining participants in the study, and will be discussed within the emergent themes later in this chapter.

## **Erandi**

Living the American Dream and better opportunities drove Erandi's parents to migrate with their families from a Latin American country to the United States. Erandi was born in a large city in the Southwestern United States. She learned the value of education from her parents, who did not have any college preparation. However, she "always knew [she] was going to college". Erandi had a cousin who attended college, and she invited Erandi to visit her at college when Erandi was a young teenager. This was Erandi's first taste of higher education, and it grew her interest in attending university.

Volunteer work and spending a year abroad in several Latin American countries during her undergraduate career opened Erandi's eyes to the many inequalities in how immigrants were treated within the United States, and the opportunities available in the United States compared to less wealthy countries. At the same time, she observed a high level of bureaucracy within her discipline, and realized that she did not want to pursue a career burdened with administrative and political struggles. These experiences led her to consider a career in academia, where she could continue to research, explore, and analyze the inequities she identified and lived. Erandi applied to graduate school and attended a large public university in her home state.

Unlike other participants, Erandi was not fortunate enough to have a faculty mentor guide her early on in her career. Even though she wanted to become a professor, Erandi had to find her way on her own for the first few years: "I didn't know what getting a PhD entailed; I stumbled

through the first three and a half years of graduate school, learning what it meant to be a faculty member [...] and grappling with like, “do I want to do this?”. It was not until her fourth year in graduate school when she found a mentor who advised her through the professional development process; “and that's when I realized I really could do this and I really was good enough to do it and I liked research”. Her mentor helped develop her portfolio to make her competitive in the academic job market. However, because her focus had been on surviving graduate school, she did not have a strong publication record to enhance her resume. Erandi applied for jobs in many schools, and accepted a teaching job at a regional institution while she developed her publications and strengthened her curriculum.

Erandi later received two tenure-track job offers, one at a well-known Research 1 institution in the Northeast, the other, at a smaller university in the South. It seemed the natural choice for her to accept the offer in the Northeast, however, an incident that happened during her interview, made Erandi question whether the institution would be a good fit for her. Erandi recalled that during her interview, a White, male senior faculty member questioned whether the position she was applying for was needed, and why she, as a Latina, should be hired. After that interaction, she was very affected; “I went back in my room and I cried and I had not cried about racial microaggressions in the academy in years”. The incident really marked her, but Erandi considered her future, and accepted the job offer at that institution. The incident during her interview foretold what Erandi's experience has become. She has encountered a very hostile environment within her department, and because of her Latina identity, she was assumed to side with the women faculty of color in an ongoing power struggle within her department, regardless of her personal beliefs and/or feelings:

And the assumption is that I have to fall in line with them, and I have to agree with them no matter what. And the other assumption is that the white men [...] scholars will hate me and they think I'm not on their side.

Now further along in her tenure track, Erandi recognizes the toll the power struggle and resulting work environment have had on her and her productivity. It has become burdensome and counter-productive as she works hard to meet the tenure process expectations laid out for her, explicitly and implicitly:

I've had a really hard time—I'm having a very hard time, like right now, as we speak. I would say that the racial microaggressions were not something that I expected [...] And I thought that that wouldn't affect me and I could keep my head down and it wouldn't affect me, but I didn't take...I didn't expect.... I don't know why I thought it wouldn't affect me. But it has affected me.

Erandi points out that even though she struggles to keep afloat in a toxic work environment, she still feels that she is in a position of privilege as a professor:

One of the easiest things for me to go to is "oh, this isn't hard, my parents crossed the border which isn't that hard, my grandmother is illiterate." But that is something trying to serve- to undercut what I'm experiencing. Because it makes me feel like "just suck it up" right? Like, but what I'm experiencing isn't that hard.

The feeling of guilt associated with expressing her hardships, coupled with the joy and purpose Erandi receives from working with her students, move her to persist, and overcome the surmounting pressures she faces every day:

I feel like when I work with grad students and we are doing the work of figuring things out and discussing theories and trying to figure out answers to social phenomena, when I help them refine their research methods, I find that really fulfilling. Yes I actually I don't need anything else to make me happy. I have no existential questions of whether I should be an academic or not. It makes me happy. I like research, I like sitting by myself and writing, that's very fulfilling to me.

Focusing on her work with students, serving the Latinx population on her campus, and publishing her research provide an outlet for Erandi to maintain the joy and passion she feels towards her profession.

### **Gabrielle**

Born in a rural part of the Southwestern United states, Gabrielle was raised in a low-resource community. Her parents always instilled in her the importance and value of education, especially in developing better opportunities for the future. They did everything they could to ensure that Gabrielle pursued an education. However, the presumed lower ability and special needs of a Latinx student were imposed on Gabrielle very early on in her educational journey, when she started elementary school:

I remember being like sort of in the middle of this doorway and I remember the teacher saying like “oh we'll be able to place her in special education”. You know like, or be able to find a place for her in special education. And my mom and dad, you know they- they made the choice, whether consciously or not, to- to not really raise me speaking Spanish, because they knew that there would be, you know, potential consequences for that. And so my parents had to like tell her like, “what are you talking about? Like, the only language she has is English, and she's already reading a little bit and she knows her numbers and, you know, she knows her basic addition”. I remember my parents having to like immediately like, kind of tell her “no that's not necessary” and, you know, there are several sort of racist incidents that would occur until we decided to leave. And we decided to leave because, um, you know my parents decided to move our family because the level of racism that I was facing in my classroom among my peers was really bad.

As a first generation college student, Gabrielle struggled to navigate the college preparation and application process, relying on her classmates for guidance. She was not aware of the nuances of college selection, and decided to remain close to home and her family for her undergraduate years:

And so my selection process to go to [regional state school] was really, um, based on, you know, sort of proximity to home. I didn't really want to go far from my family; and, um, they gave me the best scholarship like I really didn't

have to pay for anything. And also I just- I don't think I really had a sense of how many, um, like how many colleges and universities there really were because you know, I'm a first generation college student. So I think I just sort of had a sense that there were some universities and colleges like around my state, and of course I had some sense of the big places, you know, like I had heard of Berkeley; I had heard of Stanford, Harvard, but those seemed completely out of my reach.

Gabrielle worked very hard in college, working “usually more than one job while I was in school”. Additionally, she felt that she had to work harder academically, because she lacked a solid foundation and preparation from her high school years. Gabrielle would take summer courses to supplement and strengthen her knowledge base, and continued to study and work throughout her undergraduate career.

In the classroom, she met her faculty mentor, who opened the doors to research opportunities for Gabrielle:

[Her undergraduate faculty mentor] was really critical to my development because um, although- although I was a very poor writer in terms of like mechanics, and I didn't know how to like cite things, um, he knew that I had good ideas. And he knew that I was like inclined to ideas. And so he just sort of swept me up and took me sort of under his wing so to speak.

Her mentor took time to work with her and develop a paper that she submitted to her first conference. Gabrielle's paper was accepted, and she flew for the first time to attend the conference and present her paper. The scholarly discussions and generation of ideas really called to Gabrielle, and she wanted to be able to work in that intellectual space. At the same time, she was introduced to feminist scholarship through another faculty member who also saw Gabrielle's potential. Her faculty and staff mentors further helped her explore and understand the option of attending graduate school. Gabrielle applied to two schools, and received offers from both, opting to attend a school that was further from home, but in a location where she and her family felt that she would be safe.

Gabrielle received an assistantship for her Masters' program, however, the funding was limited, and she had to cover most of her expenses, which meant that again she had to work multiple jobs while completing her degree. Unexpectedly, a personal event made her last year of her Master's program unusually challenging, and she deferred her entrance into a Ph.D. program for one year. During that year, Gabrielle had the opportunity to work with the public school and court system, which drew her attention to the many inequities and family values within the educational system, and which sparked her interest in understanding more about those issues:

I started to understand that the reason that I hadn't encountered a lot of, you know, faculty of color, particularly women of color, Latinas/ Hispanic professors, however they want to identify- um, was more than the idea that they don't want to do that. I began to understand very like, at a systems level, how identity was intersecting with systems [...] very much like sort of a very macro/ global system sort of perspective.

Consequently, her research agenda is focused on critical analysis of the systems of higher education and the professoriate.

Gabrielle started her career in academia in a well-known institution in the Southeast. However, the community environment was not very welcoming, and Gabrielle and her family experienced covert racism, which led to Gabrielle seeking a new faculty position. Gabrielle's portfolio was robust enough for her to negotiate tenure as she began her new position, but her new institution asked to see at least one year of her performance before considering her for tenure. Although she is at a Research 1 Doctoral institution where research is very much a priority, she notes that teaching is also a priority within her institution. "So here, teaching matters, and I think, in a way that is evident in our faculty meetings, [...] we have like informal coffee once a month where it's all about how to improve teaching, what people are struggling with in teaching, online teaching".



Gabrielle also recognizes that there is great expectation from her faculty peers for colleagues to be visible, present and involved within the institution:

It's very much expected that you show up, obviously you know, to your department meetings, but it's also very, very, much expected that you are showing up to informal or or, you know, learning opportunities in the department- that you're contributing to, you know, different activities...

With such high expectations and priorities on numerous elements of her role as a faculty member along with her commitment to serve her field, Gabrielle balances a very large workload, in addition to her role as a wife and mother. However, she battles through her many challenges because she recognizes the importance and value of representation, and feels strongly that she needs to be present for underrepresented students:

And it's about me being able to be in a classroom in front of, you know, a student of color who might be like "oh she looks like me, and oh she has a background kind of like me; oh I can do this too". That matters a lot to me.

The feeling of purpose and sense of selflessness that motivates Gabrielle, is shared by all the participants of the study. The sacrifice and hardships these faculty members encounter are worth it when they realize the impact that their presence in the classroom and within the ranks of academia has on underrepresented students and on attempting to change the status quo of the professoriate.

## **Irene**

Irene is the eldest of two sisters, who grew up in a very traditional home in a Latin American country. She had a good childhood, and felt loved by her parents and extended family. Although she was fortunate to attend a private school due to governmental benefits her father received for serving in the military, she was not a very dedicated student, until she started high school. She reflected on what changed in her life at that point, and the only thing she can credit with this shift in her priorities was the trust placed on her by a teacher when she was in 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

The teacher left the classroom, and left Irene in charge: “and she said, “*Irene, continua con la clase*” (Translation: “Irene, continue with the class/lesson”). And I don't know that comment, that trust, I think, did something to me. That summer I said “I'm going to school, I need to become a good student”. After that defining moment, Irene became an exemplary student:

I really became a teacher's pet in high school. My teachers asked me, “Can you be responsible for decorating the classroom? Or, can you stay behind and clean the blackboard?” But for me it was neat because I was able to speak to them by myself, there was no one in the room. And they would ask me, “Did you understand that, did you have questions?”

Irene's formative experience in high school led her to become an Honors student in college. Her most salient memory of her undergraduate years is her study abroad experience. Irene came to the United States for a year during her undergraduate career. Attending an American university was a large culture shock for Irene, whose conservative upbringing sheltered her from many harsh realities:

...but college is a big shock in terms of things that we thought we were used to- but the pressure in terms of values, and what we know what we should be doing, or what we're doing, or are exposed to; you know. There are things that still to this day I haven't shared with my parents about my experience as an exchange student.

“It was the first time I was by myself. I was outside of my environment. It was also the first time that I dealt with racism; someone- my roommate- called me a nigger”. The struggle to reconcile her experiences and her value system took a toll on Irene, and her academic performance suffered. Emotionally, Irene battled with depression and anxiety related to her environment. Irene returned to her home country, where she completed both her undergraduate and Masters' degrees. At the time, the highest degree offered in her country was a Masters, so Irene had to convince her father to let her return to the United States to pursue a Ph.D.

When Irene arrived in the United States, she settled in the Northeast. She worked in low-income areas, offering her professional expertise to community members. Eventually, the constant exposure to pain and suffering overwhelmed Irene, and she sought refuge in a college setting. Irene worked as a staff member in a state university, where she met a mentor who saw potential in her to become an administrator within higher education:

She was very influential in my development in Student Services. She thought that I was intelligent [...], she would say, Irene, you have to go experience Administration. I think you are very good at organizing [...] She sent me to all kinds of committees, and I liked it.[...] And it was because of this vice president, a black woman that [...] gave me so many opportunities that I felt like, oh I like this; I'm good at organizing things. That's how it started.

Irene became very involved in her institution. Her participation in on-campus activities allowed her to connect with influential people on campus, who witnessed her work performance.

Through those connections, she met the president of the university. When the president was leaving for a position at a university in the Midwest, he offered Irene a job at his new institution, which she gladly accepted. As her professional competence in the field grew, Irene's potential to become a leader and decision-maker within her field became evident. Her boss recognized this potential and encouraged her to advance further in the field. Irene realized the political environment of her profession, and knew that she would need to have the credentials afforded by a Ph.D. for her to advance professionally.

Irene left the Midwest to pursue a degree in a large, public university in the Southeast where her academic preparation and socialization positioned her for success in her field. She became very involved in the professional associations in her discipline, and was eventually tapped to develop a graduate program in her field at a large, public university. By the time she started her career as a professor, Irene had married and had a child. She reminisces about the many sacrifices she made in her family life to progress professionally. "There was this

contradiction between the tenure process and all those long hours that you have to work, and motherhood”. As she grappled with unclear tenure expectations, she became very aware of the political power dynamics that influenced tenure decisions, which facilitated her receiving tenure.

Driven by the need to be closer to her aging parents, Irene left her institution and returned to the East coast, to work at another prestigious Research 1 Doctoral institution. When Irene was hired at the new institution, she attempted to negotiate to maintain her tenure status. Her new Dean told Irene that the university did not allow anyone to come in with tenure, which meant that Irene would have to seek tenure for a second time, now at her new institution. A short time after Irene started her new position, she found out that she had been deceived; the university did allow faculty to negotiate tenure for faculty tenured at other institutions. However, Irene was hired under a minority hire initiative, where the Provost funded her compensation for up to three years, so the Dean had an incentive to not grant her tenure. “[The Dean] trampled over my sense of integrity and my trust. *Abuso de mi confianza*. (Translation: abused my trust- took advantage of my trust in them)”. Irene recounts having to endure many situations where the Dean and her peers undermined her as a professor, including promoting a less qualified faculty member over her to chair her department.

Irene attributes the hostile environment at her institution partly to changes in philosophies of the purpose of the university and role of faculty in developing students:

The university has changed dramatically, and I am experiencing all that because in my mind- at the beginning, I didn't know how much the society, our nation, the university has changed. And it is only now, today, that I say “Oh my God we are at a different place”. And when I behave in the modality of a faculty with prerogative and autonomy, that doesn't exist anymore. That doesn't matter.

As she looks back on her career trajectory, Irene does so with a bitter taste in her mouth. She feels that her hard work, accomplishments, and family sacrifices have been tainted by her

experience in the last few years. As she grapples with her role within the new university business model, she feels defeated. Yet, she also recognizes how she has influenced her students:

I am very privileged. I have met so many students, so many young people in turn searching for dreams and I know that because I have been able to be in the classroom some students have felt validated. Not only the [racial and ethnic] minority students, but first generation.

Irene's experience is a great example of how shifts in institutional culture and priorities affect how faculty members perceive their role and fit within the institution, and how a lack of fit very negatively influences minority faculty experiences and perceptions of achievement and merit.

## **Jam**

Resilient is a great word to describe Jam. She was born in a low-income, under-resourced community in the Southwest. Her mother had been homeless and relied on federal assistance to support herself and her children. Jam's mother was determined to overcome her challenges, and enrolled in college in order to obtain an education that would afford her better opportunities: "And all the way up to like high school, I would go to classes with my mom. She went to a community college and then transferred to a four-year college. So she um, I feel like I pretty much did undergrad when I was a kid". Because they were dependent on government assistance, Jam's family experienced a lot of hardship and uncertainty as she grew up. Jam recalls a particularly salient experience that significantly marked her. When Jam was in high school, she and her family had to move out of their apartment and were left homeless. With very few options, Jam and her mother and brother moved into a small room attached to a friend's house in the neighboring city:

And it was small, and you know the three of us had to sleep together in a cot-like an army cot, and you know it was colder. I mean, California's not that cold, but you know at night it would get cold. I developed like some health problems because of that; like my ears- I would get like really sick, and get a lot of ear infections; and um, missed a lot of school and you know there was a lot of gang violence and like now I find myself having a lot of- I've been diagnosed with

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder because just sort of the violence that I witnessed um, as a kid in that environment.

Jam did not understand her family's situation at the time. She grappled with how little her family had despite her mother having a college degree, while others had more means and no education:

So you know it's sort of like- my mom has a college degree, we're not immigrants, we're not undocumented, but you know, we're having to live with people that- or you know, have like by- by societal standards, have less than, but they had more than us. And so that made also the dynamic, the like, immigrant status very salient to me. Like I was confused, like you know, we're not- we're not immigrants, but you know like we're kind of- we kind of are racialized and have the same experiences and struggles as immigrants.

Despite Jam's volatile living environment, she received the best education she could have, thanks to her mother's diligence and foresight to send her children to the best high school in their city. After Jam moved to the neighboring city, she continued to attend the same high school, even though it required tremendous sacrifice and effort from Jam:

But nevertheless you know I stayed the course. I stayed in that high school I would take like, a bus, you know- two, three buses, you know, your classic- 2, 3 buses at 5 in the morning. You know coming home at eight o'clock at night, and then I would take another bus to go to the library to go find a computer because you know at that point computers were becoming like a thing where people had to write on computers; like your teachers wouldn't accept handwritten essays anymore. You know, so I would say like, I mean if anything, I'm damn resilient.

All the hardship and struggles that Jam faced while growing up drew her attention to issues of equity and social justice. The inequities she witnessed fueled her dream to eventually go to law school and help minority populations in under-resourced areas. Thus, for her undergraduate degree, Jam applied and was accepted to attend a well-known large, public, predominantly white Research 1 Doctoral institution.

During her undergraduate career, Jam met a woman who would be very influential in directing Jam towards a research career:

When I was at [her undergraduate university], um, I found a mentor who- she was an African-American woman. And [her mentor] would say, you know- you know the- the J.D. is great, it's also a doctorate, but you know, she kind of explained to me that that's more of a practitioner degree. And so she kind of exposed me to a Ph.D., which is what she had as a faculty member at [the university].

[Her mentor] kind of came out of nowhere, I really owe so much to her; and intervening in my experience as an undergrad she um, you know she really said here's what a Ph.D. is, and, you know, here's what you could do with it.

Her mentor introduced her to the McNair program, and often pointed Jam in the direction of different developmental opportunities that provided funding:

McNair just sort of serendipitously came and that's how I sort of learned more about the- the professoriate and the Ph.D. so I would say even in undergrad, I was groomed for the tenure track route; that's what McNair emphasized.

Jam completed her undergraduate degree in four years, and immediately started her Ph.D. program at the same institution. Jam worked on campus during her Ph.D. program, and completed her degree at a time when job prospects were slim. Jam knew that finding a job would be a struggle. However, the day after her dissertation defense Jam was hired as a post-doctoral researcher at a nearby public institution, conducting research on Black and Latino male persistence. The post-doc assignment opened several paths that Jam could pursue:

So I took this post-doc, and I said, OK, do I want to do like you know, do I want to- I can pretty much- pretty much I bought myself some time, like, because it's an academic post-doc. I can say I was doing a postdoc doing research for a faculty position, or I could say hey I am working in Student Affairs, I am a Student Affairs Director in the making. You know, some sort of like [her mentor]. Like, some Student Affairs practitioner. Or, it's in an Assessment and Research- IR (Institutional Research) office, so I can also go that route.

While working as a post-doc researcher, Jam also accepted a full-time job conducting Institutional Research at a community college in the city where she grew up. Jam had a very busy schedule and worked sixteen-hour days for eleven months. She would work on writing

articles for publication early in the morning, and then she would go to her job at the community college until 5pm. After her workday ended, she would work on her post-doc data collection, conducting several focus groups daily, well into the night.

Through a colleague's connection, Jam learned about a faculty position in a Midwestern public institution. Jam describes her finding this position as "serendipitous":

It just all clicked. Like, what they wanted was exactly what I had. Someone who had professional experience, who had worked- actually worked at a community college, and had quantitative experience, qualitative experience. Everything that they wanted, I um, I have; and everything that they have, was what I wanted, and what they have. So, it just became like the perfect fit.

Jam is currently an Assistant Professor at this institution. She is in a tenure track position. When discussing her tenure process expectations, Jam points out that the true expectations are not reflected in her institution's tenure process document:

I have no idea what is expected of me for tenure, um, in terms of like, I think there is a stated expectation, and I think there is actual expectation. And so what those actual expectations are, I have no idea. But, um that's not to say I don't have like an actual like reference that I can like, I'm sure that- like I have a file that I can look at it and see what it actually lays out. I don't really know how many ideally they expect. I have a general sense of what they are; I have a document that I can refer to that says exactly what they are, but I know I'll be judged based on something above those expectations.

Jam, however, is very clear that she will have to publish more articles than is expected. "What are they really probably asking for, more like? They probably want somewhere around three; so I'll probably pump out somewhere around five".

Jam is very aware of the existence of an unspoken, hidden curriculum in academia. She points out that the hidden curriculum applies to every faculty member, even majority-identifying faculty. However, faculty members of color are disadvantaged because they do not have access to the networks and power structures where those hidden expectations are shared:



So like, the way that is unveiled or made- made obvious to some is differentiated by race, class, gender, all these things. It's just a matter of how people talk to me, how people treat me, how people like don't- they don't know how to talk to me; they don't know how to like- they don't know how to like be around someone that's different from them.

Jam provided an example of this by sharing her experience while having dinner at a faculty colleague's home. Jam found it very difficult to relate to the guests as she was younger than the rest of the group, and given her childhood experiences, had seldom attended dinner parties. Her colleagues did not realize their level of privilege compared to her experiences as they struggled to connect with her:

The level of privilege that people have, they don't even know; like they don't even realize. It's like- like, oh my kid is trying to pick what college. I'm like um, yeah, yeah. Like, if your struggle is to pick a college, you know, if that is the struggle, ok.

Her familiarity with struggle and need have made Jam very resilient, and she is not afraid of challenges. Moreover, she knows she will be tested throughout the tenure process, but she does not want the obstacles and difficulties to minimize her experience or compromise the quality of her research:

And I know tenure's probably the next mountain for me, but I don't want it to feel like all the other times I've climbed mountains, if that makes sense. I don't want it to feel like, yet another thing I have to like, achieve to like, make sure I'm not homeless again. I don't want it to be something that I don't enjoy.

As Jam looks forward to the journey ahead, she looks beyond the challenges because she feels academia is where she is intended to be, and where she can contribute to improving conditions for underrepresented communities.

So I feel like I'm just kind of exactly where like I literally was born to be. Um, I've never felt such like a strong alignment with my like purpose as I do in this role that I now have, um, it just feels like a such a blessing.

The purpose and fulfillment Jam derives from her job, along with her family's support and encouragement fuel her persistence. As she has demonstrated in the past, she has the resilience to overcome any challenges she encounters along her path to tenure.

### **Julisa**

Julisa migrated to the United States from a Latin American country when she was very young. Her family relocated to the Pacific Northwest, where Julisa grew up and remained until her high school years. Julisa was the only Latina in her school, but her peers all belonged to a cultural minority group. As a result, the school's academic curriculum included cultural elements, which Julisa related to, and made her less of an outsider. As she completed high school, her family moved again, this time to the Midwest. Julisa knew that her mother valued education, and expected Julisa to attend college so that she would have greater opportunities than her mother had. Her family's move greatly influenced her college search, and she only applied to universities near her family.

Julisa completed her undergraduate program at a large, public institution within a few hours' drive from her parents' home. Julisa experienced a great culture shock when she stepped on campus. Julisa became very aware of her Latina identity within a predominantly white university, and struggled to connect in a non-diverse campus. However, she found peer support through joining a Latina sorority. Julisa studied the history of Latinxs in the United States in her classes, and discovered that Chicana Feminism really resonated with her world perspective. She became an activist on campus, voicing the inequities faced by students of color at the university. Upon graduation, Julisa worked in the federal government, and quickly realized that it was not a good fit for her professionally, and that she wanted to pursue other paths.

As Julisa discerned her path, she sought advice from one of her mentors, who encouraged her to pursue a career in Student Affairs. Julisa completed her Masters' program in higher education administration. After working in that field for a few years, Julisa enrolled in a Ph.D. program at her undergraduate alma mater. Her faculty mentor groomed her to become an administrator within a specific institutional context, and Julisa did not consider seeking a career as a faculty member. However, Julisa's path shifted toward the professoriate when she received a research fellowship geared towards developing faculty members in her field. "And then once I saw other women, and other women of color particularly, start to talk about being a faculty member, I started to really entertain that as a viable option for myself". Julisa then completed a post-doc under the guidance of a popular Chicana scholar:

So working under the direction of another Chicana scholar and feeling really empowered by her own experience and her own story as- you know, of a girl that grew up on the border and ended up going to get a Ph.D. at [Midwestern university] in the era where you know, it was really super hard for anybody of color in [Midwestern state]; for me, having her as my mentor through this journey has been extremely empowering for me.

During her post-doc experience, Julisa fully committed to pursuing a career in academia.

An integral part of her career preparation entailed defining her scholar identity:

The preparation just came from trying to really solidify what kind of scholar did I want to be. You know, I wasn't trying to package myself so I can appease any kind of institution. I wanted the institution to want me for who I was, not who I was pretending to be. So I really had to be my authentic self and come at it from, you know, my research.

Additionally, her mentor provided valuable insight towards becoming a successful faculty member:

I think she prepared me in the sense of like what it's going to take in terms of the rigor of the writing that I need to do, and how to make myself a daily writer; but also really cultivate my own niche in the field.

With a strong research portfolio stemming from her post-doc experience, Julisa entered the job market, and accepted a position at an urban institution serving primarily first-generation college students. Julisa enjoyed her new position, and the ability to support underrepresented students. However, due to changes within the university system driven by state politicians, Julisa felt very vulnerable seeking tenure at that institution, so she sought employment elsewhere.

Julisa accepted a job at her current institution as part of a cluster hire. She was hired along with other faculty members as part of a departmental effort to diversify their faculty and research agendas. Julisa appreciates being part of a cluster hire, because she feels supported by her peers as she navigates the tenure process:

I feel like I have [...] other people as my cohort members in the academy. Right now we're all going through the tenure track and [...] we collaborate on research together, and that has made my experience with this process a lot more tolerable for me. It's less isolating, [...] we're just sort of like a little group of siblings that work with each other and support each other through the tenure process.

Julisa recently had a pre-tenure review, where her current publication record was evaluated. Although Julisa has had several publications and book contributions, she was told she had to increase her peer-reviewed journal publications. As a result, she has focused her attention on journal articles, and has turned down offers for books, book chapters and other types of publications. Julisa teaches two courses per semester, chairs seven doctoral committees and serves on another seven, and is very involved in professional associations in her field. With these overwhelming productivity expectations, in order to rise above the burden, Julisa does not let the pressure of achieving tenure rule her life:

But I've really at this point stopped worrying about tenure. I mean it's very toxic to allow it to really control your mind and control your body because it's out of your control. So for me it's about, you know, doing what I do, at the best that I can do it. And at the end of the day, if it's not enough, you know, there's a lot of things that I can be doing with my life.

In addition to the support of her faculty cluster, Julisa also relies on a support network of what she calls her “Sister Scholars, and these are women that have been with me since grad school who are um, my strength, my pillars. These are women who’ve been with me at my worst, and at my best, and that’s how I get through this”. Julisa recognizes that the productivity expectations and taxation due to service requirements become overwhelming. However, even in the face of this adversity, Julisa perseveres and finds fulfilment in her work and students:

I think that's what makes this job so fulfilling is the people that I mentor and work with, you know, have really situated themselves in my life and enriched me by providing me a grander purpose of what I want to do in the academy.

### **Laura**

Laura was born in the Southern US, in a rural, almost all-white community. She was a very gifted student, and was fortunate to attend a school in a strong school district that challenged her and allowed her to maximize her abilities. By the time Laura completed high school, she had enough college course credits to start college as a junior. Laura received a very prestigious and coveted national educational scholarship that fully funded her undergraduate and graduate studies:

So that was really instrumental in my going to college, my getting a Master’s and then finally getting a Ph. D. and I am quite sure that I would never have received my Ph. D., and definitely not as soon as I did, if it had not been for the financial aid that I received.

With this financial assistance, Laura was able to attend a regional comprehensive university, focused on teaching for her undergraduate studies. For her Master’s program, she left her home state and attended a large, public, Research 1 Doctoral institution in the South. Upon receiving her Masters’ degree, she returned to her home state to complete her Ph.D. program at an elite, public Research 1 Doctoral institution closer to her family and home.

Laura's interest in research and in becoming a faculty member bloomed during her Masters' program, when she realized that being a researcher was more appealing than being a practitioner in her field. Laura realized that her new interest would require a shift in her career plan, and she sought help from her faculty mentor to redirect her efforts:

So I immediately went to one (laugh) of my mentors and I was like help. I don't fit, what am I to do? Did I make a bad decision? What do I do? And luckily, she was in her first year as a faculty member. So I think that was amazing that she was, she was like- well how about you get involved in research.

Research was appealing to Laura, who had conducted research and presented an undergraduate thesis under the direction of her undergraduate faculty mentor. This mentor allowed her to ask questions, and take risks which taught her the "skills that I have now in terms of like sheer endurance um, in research that I think is really necessary to be a faculty member".

During her Master's program, she continued to refine her research skills and define her career aspirations. Laura started her Ph.D. with very clear goals. This allowed her to focus her efforts on maximizing her experience and positioning herself competitively in the job market:

I went in very clearly into my Ph. D. knowing that I wanted to be a faculty member from day one. Um, and so because of that, I went in immediately attached to a research team and within about a year I was leading the research team, so, a research team of approximately fifteen people [...] Um and so I was uh, really functioning, even as a second year doc student, as an assistant professor. And I think that, out of anything, is what made me most marketable.

In her Ph.D. program, Laura also learned valuable skills from her mentor, who taught her how to navigate the political and funding networks of academia:

[Her mentor] showed me how to go get grant money. [Her mentor] showed me how to like, get data, how to get consulting gigs, um things that just- most doc students do not learn those things and do not get those opportunities. Um, and [her mentor] was just really good at just saying like- hey you're my colleague, you're my friend, let's do this; and never treating me like a child.

Her mentor also connected Laura with influential people in the community college network, the educational context in which Laura conducted research. By the time she was on the job market, Laura was very familiar with key players in the community college system, which opened doors for her.

Selecting an institution was a very deliberate process for Laura. She had clear expectations of the type of support and work environment in which she would thrive:

Something that was really important to me as I job searched was the collegiality and the support for pre-tenure; that was very important to me.[...] I very much was looking for a place that was very supportive to pre-tenure people and this institution had pre-tenure support both in the department, at the college level, and at the university level.

Laura found an institution that met her support expectations, and has been an Assistant Professor in a large, public Research 1 Doctoral institution in the Midwest. As is the case for most other women in this study, the research, teaching, service formula at Laura's institution was 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. However, as Laura reflects on her experience, she points out that the priorities at her institution are research/publications and securing grant funding. "The expectation to publish is very high. I've unofficially been told like two a year [...] that is peer-reviewed journal articles [...]; they're looking for hard core journal articles, [...] at least publish one to two in high level journals".

As she nears her mid-year review, Laura is not concerned about meeting the tenure review expectations. Her first years have been very productive; she has had publications, secured a grant, and served on several student, university, and professional committees. However, she is very mindful of how she chooses to get involved outside of her current commitments: "I try to protect my time as much as possible, because I feel- see so many other people who are just drowning in service, and you can't write if you're drowning in service".

Laura does feel that she is at a disadvantage compared to her peers in terms of how valuable and novel her research is considered to be. She has to justify to her peers why she focuses on the Latinx population, and her research methodology: “and I'm just like no, like this is the work that I do. This is the population I care about, like and I don't care about control groups because I'm called a qualitative researcher”. Laura realizes that the energy put into justifying her research is burdensome: “and so it is, it is, like a kind of taxation of the mind to have to constantly be talking about like, why intersectional identities matter”.

Laura's commitment to understand and improve the experiences of Latinx students is very strong and guided by her own exploration of her Latina identity, and her contribution to the network of Latinx scholars and peers in the field:

And that is huge [the connectedness of Latinx scholars], like for the work that- that I do, the work that we do as a community; that we are like family [...] as a family we share opportunities and we share joy, and sadness, and accomplishment, and failures. You know, and I think that like in terms of how it affects the tenure process- like I write about identity and it's been a very cathartic, um, processing people's identities and how they are working their identities.

Laura relies on her family, her spouse and her sister scholar network to persevere and continue on her path to tenure. She is aware of the responsibility assigned to her as a Latina in academia, especially her position as a role model for other Latinas, and understands that she is now “a role model for young women of color now. Like that is [her] role; that is [her] life”.

## **Lucia**

Born in the Southwestern United States to a military family, Lucia moved around frequently as a child. She had great aptitude throughout her school years, typically placing into gifted and talented programs. Her ability to excel in school positioned her well when she applied for college. Although she was not very familiar with the college application process, even as a



first-generation college student she did understand that several institutions were more prestigious than others, and wanted to attend a prestigious university.

Rather than attending a regional, public institution in her hometown at the time, she opted to attend a religious, liberal arts university in her home state. Lucia received a full scholarship for her undergraduate program. As the only person from her area attending that university, she did not know anyone else, and connected with other students through student activities and leadership opportunities at her university:

After that I got involved with the programming board [...] I applied to be an Emerging Leader, which was the first year Leadership Program; and that's where I met a bulk of the friends who would be with me throughout college. And then I decided to become an orientation leader, so I got very involved.

As Lucia increased her co-curricular experiences and involvement, her grades in her core classes suffered, and she lost her scholarship after her sophomore year. Lucia's parents had to get a loan to help her pay for her remaining years at college.

Lucia's involvement in student activities led her to pursue a career as a Student Affairs administrator; "because of the wonderful experience I had in undergrad, I knew I was going to go work as a university administrator and I went and got my master's degree and- and then just, you know, started working at a school in the [South]". Seeking to progress professionally, Lucia understood that she would need to have a Ph.D. in order to become a senior leader in her profession. After five years of working in her field, she decided to pursue a Ph.D. Lucia completed her doctoral program at a large, public Research 1 Doctoral institution in the Southwest. Her research focused on minority-serving institutions, a research agenda which led to her co-authoring a book chapter with her advisor. The collaboration process with her advisor really solidified her the desire to continue researching, and eventually become a faculty member:

We worked all summer long on the manuscript and watching [her mentor] like process through with me how to do that, you know, like all of the kind of cultural capital involved in submitting a manuscript and like you know-how to write, all of that, I learned from [her mentor]; all of [their] habits like how [they], you know [they were] very much...[Her mentor] was someone who was a very good role model in terms of how you create balance with your family and your- you know, life.

Lucia continued to delve into her research, and received several awards that covered her expenses in her doctoral program. Her faculty mentors were instrumental in giving Lucia opportunities for growth, and in supporting her as she pursued a job as a faculty member. Lucia recognizes how influential her faculty mentors were in validating her decision to become an academic: “part of that was knowing that I had mentors in grad school who really believed in me [...] even until this day, my faculty are invested in me”. Lucia had a strong portfolio as she went into the faculty job market, and was able to secure a tenure-track position in a very well-known large, public, predominantly white Research 1 Doctoral institution in the Southeast. Lucia’s parents, who are a constant source of support for her, helped her move across the country.

Lucia felt ready for her new position; however, she was not prepared for how being the only faculty member of color in her department would affect her productivity and connection to the institution. Reflecting back on that time, Lucia points out she was:

Not as productive as I should have been during those four years for a variety of reasons but I think the biggest one was just being on the only faculty of color. It's amazing how much emotional energy and emotional labor you have to produce and so when you're doing that in trying to survive. It's very difficult to want to sit down and write a manuscript.

Lucia had to deal with microaggressions and racist incidents regularly. Like many underrepresented faculty members at predominantly white institutions, Lucia struggled to keep afloat given the emotional and intellectual taxation she experienced within an unwelcoming

institutional culture. Lucia's situation became unsustainable, and she left her institution looking for a healthier, supportive environment.

The years Lucia spent at her first institution were not considered when she started the tenure track at her current institution. However, Lucia thrived in the new environment, and within her first months was able to surpass her total research and publication productivity from the previous years. "I mean, that's the difference when you're not necessarily dealing with, like, racism and that kind of pressure on a daily basis". Lucia's current program is very diverse in terms of faculty backgrounds and identities, and so she has had a much better experience as she navigates the tenure process.

Lucia is also very involved in professional associations within her field. Lucia recruits students at professional conferences, which also contributes to her institutional service responsibilities. However, Lucia welcomes this involvement as she recognized the impact she is having on shaping future professionals: "It helps us to recruit for our program, but then it also helps people to see there's Latino faculty out there who are invested in cultivating the next generation of scholars and um, and scholar-practitioners".

In terms of the tenure process, Lucia is expected to have a strong publication record in top tier journals, teach two courses per semester, and serve on graduate and institutional committees. Lucia will seek tenure in the next two years, and even though her research, teaching, and service records are outstanding, she is not completely certain that she will receive tenure. She fears that politics and informal networks may negatively influence her, due to some arguments she has had with peers in her department over funding opportunities. In addition, the last tenure-track Latina faculty member from her department did not get tenured, "so that's always present in [her] mind". Despite these challenges, Lucia loves her job and her

contribution to the development of scholars and scholar-practitioners; “I love putting my ideas together. I love inspiring people to persevere- like, those are things that matter to me”.

## **Maria**

Maria is from a large city in the Southwestern United States. Her introduction to academia happened at a very young age, when her father, a college professor, would bring her with him when he taught his classes. Her parents were very involved with the Latino community in several service roles, which ignited in Maria a passion for community engagement. Maria was a high-achieving student, placing into gifted and talented programs in elementary school. After attending a college preparation private high school, Maria received a scholarship to a prestigious, nationally known university in her home state. Her natural ability for scholarly work was evident in her undergraduate years; she was allowed to take graduate-level courses in her senior year, and she wrote an award-winning honors thesis. Her undergraduate faculty mentor was very supportive and nurturing, and encouraged Maria to go to graduate school. Graduate studies in Maria’s discipline were only offered at four institutions in the country, and Maria opted to attend an Ivy League university for her Master’s and Ph.D. programs.

Despite Maria’s academic achievements, in her Ph.D. program Maria’s Latina identity influenced how her faculty and student peers perceived her competence. She was in a predominantly white, male program, and when she voiced her concerns about the narrow focus of a course’s curriculum, she was chastised by her professor:

When I- I already had a publication in hand from a major journal when I got into grad school [...]. By the time I was finishing up coursework I was taking this one seminar in (her discipline), and it was very white, very male, very- the theory that we were learning, and the approach was, I felt were not very representative. I made my voice heard in the seminar, and the professor approached me, asked me to come to his office hours and told me that he didn't think I knew enough English to pursue a career in academia. And I said well I'm sorry, I have actually several publications; but I, even I- I still remember that to this day [...] so even if you- no

matter how you demonstrate through publications, or through professionalization or actual- like, evidence, like test scores [...] there is still the perception, you know, of this otherness, of this Latinidad (“*Latinicity*”); and being a woman and Latina, you're just not capable of doing this work.

Yet Maria persisted. She forged her path through graduate school, relying on her own knowledge and instinct to gain experience in teaching, because her alma mater did not provide opportunities for graduate students to teach during their graduate program. However, Maria’s research and publication record were so substantial that she was offered two Assistant Professor positions prior to defending her dissertation. With a job contract in hand, her institution allowed her to teach during her last year. Once she completed her Ph.D., Maria accepted a job at a Research 1 institution in the Northwest, which allowed her to be closer to her family. However, the position was not a good fit for Maria. She encountered a hostile institutional climate; she was harassed by some of her male students, and received very little support from her academic department:

I had very hostile students in my classes. These men were so hostile that we had to have security guards come to the class. They were not only hostile towards me, but towards other women in the class, but I couldn't throw them out of the class or remove them. I had people- students harassing me, slipping under my office doors pornography, of women of color, things like that to kind of- I felt very harassed and I didn't have any- it was a toxic environment and I didn't have a lot of support.

Additionally, Maria was restricted, due to political pressures from senior faculty members, from teaching courses in her area of research expertise. These reasons, coupled with the declining health of her mother, drove Maria to pursue a position at another institution. Maria moved across the country to the Southeast, and accepted an offer to work at a public university. “I also had friends here that were about ready to retire, so it was this very nurturing environment and people wanted me to be here so I decided to take this job”. This built-in support system, as well as proximity to the region she was researching, facilitated Maria’s integration into her new

institution. She sought and received tenure at this university, and she has been an Associate Professor at the same institution for five years.

Maria's experience during the tenure process bears many commonalities to those of the other participants in this study. She has had to navigate institutional politics, overwhelming performance expectations beyond the tenure requirements, and minimization of her accomplishments and accolades:

[Her Dean] always found a way to like make my successes sound less than what they were, right? So I felt like I felt very demoralized by having to do better than everybody else, or not even getting the credit. And I remember when I did get the Ivy League college Grant, that the chair at the time, the one who told me I had to have my book, she did- a lot of people- there were full professors who have since left, [...] asked her why didn't you make an announcement, and she said oh I just didn't want other people to be jealous of her or something.

Although she has some protection as a tenured faculty member and is more selective about her service, Maria still feels some of the same pressures to serve her department and institution:

I have only now, after like five years of being tenured, I just feel like, like I can say no, now; and I still feel a little bit of - ooh, am I going to get penalized or whatever if I don't accept this onerous committee [...]?

However, she remains steadfast in making bold decisions in her professional development. She is willing to serve and support her department and institution, but she is also very aware of the precedent that she is setting, especially for other faculty of color, especially Latinas, that will follow in her path. She recognizes that she cannot fulfill service roles where she is not valued or rewarded equally to white peers:

So I've been kind of very selective in terms of, in terms of- I'd rather teach because at least that way I feel compensated for that because that's what I'm doing rather than take a service- because the Deans now see those positions as service, not administration.

"I feel that as the only Latina I am a role model in this department, I cannot allow myself to do more work for less. It's an ethical thing right?" And in the face of these challenges, Maria

perseveres for her students, and dedicates her energy and passion for connecting people and sharing their stories to developing her students into critical thinkers and future researchers.

## **Sofia**

Sofia was born and raised in a Southern state with strong ties to the Latino community. Education and teaching have been part of Sofia's life from birth. Sofia comes from a family of educators. Her mother was a high school teacher for many years, and other family members are also teachers. When time came for Sofia to attend college, she tried to leave her home state. However, her parents were adamant that she was not leaving the state. Sofia struck a compromise and went to a well-known school that was a few hours away from her home, but still within her state.

As Sofia embraced her newfound freedom away from her strict parents, she struggled to manage her time and responsibilities, and her grades suffered greatly. At the end of her first year, Sofia's grade point average was so low that she would not be able to transfer successfully to another institution. Having no other option, Sofia returned to her institution to improve her GPA. Sofia switched majors, and found support through campus resources and involvement, primarily through her membership in a Latina sorority. This new support system helped Sofia flourish; she improved her grades and started developing interest in helping student who struggled like she did in her first year become successful students. However, she was not aware at the time of the academic path that led to a student support role. One of her mentors approached her and ignited the idea of Sofia pursuing a Masters' degree:

one of them who was like "Have you ever thought about working with college students? There's a master's in higher education administration starting at the university". And I was like no, no I never heard of this thing, you know. I never knew I could work with college students. And so for me, it was also a way for me to help students who were like me, you know, who did well but maybe were the first in their family [to attend college].

Sofia wanted to provide support for first generation college students who were struggling to integrate into the collegiate culture. This desire to help was strengthened by Sofia's own challenges in applying to graduate school with no guidance from her family, as she was the first member of her family to pursue a graduate degree.

Sofia was accepted into the Masters' program at her alma mater. She admits to feeling out of place during her first year:

It was terrifying, I was like terrified and I felt like everybody understood things better than I did and um, then I knew I had to like sound smart and say things. I was just like trying to understand what it was I was reading, it was so much to comprehend and take in at the same time.

Sofia worked very hard and received her Masters' degree. Upon graduation, she accepted a job at the institution, working with underrepresented students. After a few years in that position, the call to further her education hit Sofia. She started considering that perhaps there were different ways in which she could support students outside of working in Student Affairs. Sofia let this thought drive her search for a graduate program, and she was accepted into a Ph.D. program at an elite public institution within her home state. Sofia met her faculty mentor, and he took her under his wing and guided her research efforts.

An academic career was a possibility for Sofia, but she was not tied to the sole idea of becoming a faculty member. When she completed her Ph.D. she entered the job market under the guidance of her mentor, and accepted a position in a post-doctoral program at a sister institution. Sofia welcomed the opportunity to continue her research, and to experience the academic world before deciding whether she wanted to continue a career as a faculty member or administrator. Two tenure-track positions became available at her post-doctoral program institution; Sofia applied and accepted one of the Assistant Professor positions.



Currently, Sofia serves as an Assistant Professor, and is midway through the tenure process. Sofia has received a lot of institutional support as she navigates the tenure path. Through her connections at the institution, she developed a relationship with a very influential Latina who has served as her mentor and guide:

[This woman] kind of became like my informal mentor; and she was over the faculty mentoring program for the university, and she was over the faculty development for the university. So when she learned that I was also now tenure track, she kind of took me under her wing. She guided me through this process including faculty writing groups and mentoring programs [...] that helped supplement the process.

In addition, Sofia has a very supportive supervisor who advocates for Sofia in terms of maintaining appropriate service loads in order to allow her time to focus on research and publication. Sofia admits that she has had a smooth experience with the tenure process, but she is aware that others, even within her same institution, have had more challenging and overwhelming experiences. Sofia's persistence through the challenges of the tenure process is driven by the purpose she finds in her work, and the energy she derives from her research and students:

I still feel like I'm in the challenge, every study brings about new things to investigate or understand, and so that's exciting and I can see different threads, you know, lines of inquiry is happening and how there related to each other. And so for me it's still exciting.

However, as Sofia starts a new role as a mother, she expects that there will be a re-shifting of priorities as she adjusts to the new demands on her time and energy.

### **Presentation of Findings**

This section presents the common themes that emerged from the interview data analysis. Several main themes and subsequent subthemes are discussed and supported with examples from the participants' account of their experience. Some themes were consistent among all

participants, yet others only emerged in a number of interviews. The frequency of incidence in participant interviews will be noted in each discussion. Lastly, a summary of each theme will complete each thematic section. The first theme discussed is institutional context. The subthemes that support this theme are challenges related to: a) changing institutional philosophies; b) navigating espoused vs. actual institutional values; and c) political and power structures.

### **Institutional Context**

The first theme conveys the important influence of institutional values and political structures within the institution on faculty members' experiences and connection to the institution. The context in which these women are trying to work and succeed is fluid, and any changes within the institutional context drive shifts in institutional philosophies, values, culture, and political structures, all of which have been identified as instrumental in setting a climate supportive of diversity within the academic environment.

**Changes in institutional philosophies.** Over the last few years, many colleges and universities have suffered drastic budget cuts and reduced federal and state funding. As a result, colleges and universities have had to reconsider how they manage their operations, which in many cases includes increasing tuition rates for students, and pushes to increase student enrollment. These changes in institutional philosophies regarding the role of universities in developing students significantly affect the faculty experience, especially for faculty members who entered academia prior to the current philosophy of commoditizing higher education and degree attainment.

When analyzing the experiences and testimony of the two participants who are tenured, it was interesting to find that both women expressed similar concerns related to shifts in

institutional philosophies toward a view of the university as a business, and a college degree as a commodity. For example, Maria expressed that she has witnessed this shift in philosophy at her institution. She now has to answer to her leadership team regarding the outcomes of her teaching:

In the face of a university that is being run more like a business, what is the outcome? What are the commodities that you are offering? What are the students buying? What are the skills that you're kind of generating- and that's in terms of the teaching component.

Minority faculty members with diversity or minority-related research agendas not only have to articulate the value of their research within academia, but now must also illustrate the value and contribution to students' skillsets. Even Maria, who is in an interdisciplinary position, struggled with this challenge:

I had to translate [her research ] into something that maybe people who are not culturally curious would understand. What is the value of looking at culture, you know, [...], what is the value of, you know, kind of validating everyday people's [...]experiences, or their oral histories- [...] in the face of a university that is being run more like a business?

Moreover, this shift has rippled and disrupted the role and power of faculty members within the university, thus forcing faculty with traditional views of education to redefine their role and position within the institutional structure. Irene grappled with borderline feelings of remorse when she realized that the university culture, as she knew it, was becoming outdated:

I sacrificed all this and this university that I thought I was working for the idea of the university is no longer so. The university of the future and the future is now it's not the university that I attended. I think that when we speak of the university of the future it's almost like a business.

What most concerned these two women in terms of these shifting institutional philosophies are the implications for faculty trying to succeed in academia with these different expectations, and

also the limitations imposed on faculty in terms of their ability to challenge students to think critically, especially given the current political climate:

Now that's the kind of why I'm concerned about this kind of anti-intellectual climate that we're in. That it's really like, more and more, that it's- it's thinking broadly and widely, and differently has now become uh, more of an issue [...] it's more important that we give them [students] a space where they can do that work.

The participants seem to suggest that changes in institutional philosophies affect the core function of the university, and consequently influence the role of faculty within the institution. If the role of faculty within the institution changes, faculty performance expectations may change, thus making it more challenging for faculty to successfully meet tenure criteria.

**Navigating espoused vs. actual institutional values.** Five of the women interviewed expressed witnessing disconnect between their institution's diversity values statements and actual diversity-related practices. Julisa noted "(diversity) is very much part of our rhetoric and part of our discourse. It's much harder to see that in practice". The institutional statements of diversity portray an image of dedication to fostering diversity, but the participants have felt firsthand the lack of institutional support for plurality. Julisa expanded on her previous comment:

It's almost like this is what we believe and these are our values, and what we stand for; but they have no idea how to drive the car to where it needs to go. They may know where it needs to go, but they don't have the competency or capabilities to take us there. So they hire us, they bring us here, but they don't have the capacity to help us be successful because you don't even have the mechanisms for us to be successful. So you have to forge your own way.

This disconnect presents a challenge for faculty of color who accept positions at institutions that espouse a commitment to diversity, but find a very different reality once they are on campus. If the diversity climate is not welcoming and supportive, faculty members are left to themselves and need to work harder to fit into a less receptive institutional culture. Irene had a particularly difficult time with this issue. Her institution touts to support and foster diversity, however, she

feels that she is ignored or made to feel invisible on campus when she chooses to express her Latina identity:

So for the last year I have worn some of the beautiful textiles and dresses of some of our countries. I go around the university dressed like this- *con el traje de los* (native Mexican group) *en Mexico* (Translation: With the dress of the (native Mexican group) in Mexico). Do you think that most people will approach me to say oh that's gorgeous? And say oh well you look like Rigoberta Manchu or Frida Kahlo, even in a joking way? Nada. I know that I am not invisible, but they are treating me- when I'm trying to really expose the beauty of who we are by the way I have done my hair and the dresses that I'm wearing, they are behaving as if I don't exist.

In addition, when espoused and actual values differ, and faculty are expected to perform certain tasks to support the institutional values, the confusion and expended effort can be taxing on already overextended faculty of color. Diana, for example, is very involved in community collaboration and service. However, she is not certain her efforts in this context will be valued:

So we are an urban-serving institution, which means that, in principle, our institution values community engagement. I say in principle because until I get reviewed, this first time for example, I won't be able to tell you like "oh my gosh, they really were like impressed with the fact that I was doing so much community engagement" or not; I don't know about that.

The uncertainty created when institutional values and practices differ is a very real challenge for faculty, especially underrepresented faculty navigating the tenure process. If faculty members work towards fulfilling espoused institutional values, but institutional practices support different values, faculty members waste time, energy and resources in efforts that will not be rewarded or considered under the tenure process.

**Political power structures.** The last subtheme under the Institutional Context category refers to the formal power networks and politics that (in)directly drive tenure and promotion decisions. All participants acknowledged that there were power and politics issues within their departments and institutions that could influence their success in seeking tenure. Erandi is very

clear on the role that politics and internal power networks play in her success, and knows she has to be cautious in her interactions with her peers:

That's really scary because I'm supposed to like not piss anybody off right, like that's part of getting tenure. Like, you don't piss anybody off.; but I know that like it's not right [...] I'm tired of carrying it around.

In Maria's department, the political and power plays even influenced who received recognition for their work:

Somebody might publish an article or do a conference paper and there's a big to-do about it; and I had an edited volume that came out and was nominated for an award and there was very little, you know, kind of spoken about that. So there's this kind of minimizing- there's definitely a hierarchy of what's the- the output, you know, who's- who's appropriate to celebrate and who's not.

It is interesting to note that the participants who were further along in the tenure process, or who had more experience as faculty members expressly identified the challenges posed by power dynamics within their departments, whereas less experienced faculty members did not. Irene, the most experienced participant, discussed politics several times: "I was very aware of the politics of my department. And I knew that those two senior faculty members really wanted me to be successful". She added:

But it is political. If I get anyone here upset, I don't know what they're going to do. So I was always very careful with not burning bridges and I think that I did some of that by becoming very visible.

Irene even understood that by being connected within her university, she had positioned herself in a more secure place when it came to her tenure review: "So I knew that politically it was going to be difficult, if I had the minimum, to say no to my tenure process. I had the support also of other people in Student Affairs".

One of the participants also highlights the experience differential. Julisa stated that the older faculty members within her department were hindering the momentum of younger faculty

who were ready to challenge the status quo by adhering to existing power structures and political networks. Julisa even emphasized the frustration and struggle she feels regarding institutional and departmental politics. However, she notes that she has to respect the power structures if she wants to be successful:

I have to tell myself that I have to play this game by their rules. And it sucks, because it makes the game unbearable at times. And aggravating, you know. I keep thinking of the ways when I can belong to that club, you know, ways that I can disrupt it, but I have to be at that table to disrupt it.

Power structures are very influential in tenure process decision-making. The participants have learned to survive by following the “rules” within their departments and institutions. They realize that in order to change the current political structures they need the power that tenure affords them.

**Summary.** The study participants’ narratives illustrate the influence of institutional context on their experiences with the tenure process. Institutional philosophies, values, and power structures all shape the institutional context in academia. The fluidity with which they may change makes these very influential. Changes in institutional philosophies, values and power structures, will shift the institutional context that faculty members must navigate. However, navigating these institutional forces requires effort and time that detract from the productivity of faculty members, especially faculty of color who must engage in this majority-driven context as a minority group.

## **Tenure**

Under the theme of tenure, the researcher presents the commonalities in participants’ experiences. Every participant expressed challenges with the subthemes of a) overwhelming productivity and performance expectations, b) meeting unwritten expectations, and c) tenure vs. purpose tradeoff.

**Overwhelming productivity and performance expectations.** Consistently, the participants shared that one of the biggest challenges they have faced in terms of the tenure process is the sheer volume of work and effort they expend in meeting the minimum expectations for tenure.

**Teaching expectations.** In terms of teaching expectations, all participants are required to teach two courses per semester or quarter, in Diana's case. However, some have had the advantage of securing course buy-outs or releases. Julisa shared that she has yet to teach her full course load due to course buyouts: "since I've been here I've been on a one- on a one-one load. So I've gotten three course buyouts [...]. Next semester will be the first one where I'll teach two classes a semester". Erandi and Sofia have had the benefit of an institutional policy that affords all junior faculty members reduced course loads during their first years on the tenure track. Erandi noted, "I have a teaching load of 2-2 and we get one semester off as part of our time here; like all junior people do in [her department] at some point. So I had a semester off [...] last year". In Sofia's case, "[her institution] gave you a lesser teaching load your first year, so [she] had a one-one instead of a two-two (course load), and they really feel- they really want you to focus on your research productivity".

Not all institutions provide options for automatic course releases or buy-outs, so participants who want reduced teaching loads have to bring in grant funding to buy out of teaching their courses, negotiate it as part of their contract, or participate in additional service to their department to secure a course release. For example, Diana "negotiated when I started this position for a course release as part of my initial- my initial package". Maria received a course release in exchange for service to her department: "when I was Associate Chair, I got a course release. Um, I've been offered several positions that would offer me a course release, but not



offer compensation. And these are positions that used to have compensations”. It is concerning that even though Maria received the offer of a course release, she was offered less compensation and reward for service than her majority-identifying peers who had served in the same role prior to her offer:

So for example, in [her department], being the Graduate- what is it, the director of [her department’s graduate program] the year before it was offered to me, the person who did the job got \$10,000 more per year and they got 2 course releases.

Even though teaching expectations are an important part of the tenure review process, they are by far the least daunting of all performance and productivity expectations related to tenure. Jam, for example, is not concerned at all about meeting her teaching requirements: “I don’t care about teaching [...]; that’s going to get met, no matter what. Like, by nature as you can tell, like I’m a talker, I’m engaging, like I am going to blow teaching like out of the water”. Expectations in terms of research and service are more responsible for participants’ perceived overwhelming performance loads.

**Research expectations.** Institutional priority on research and publication productivity is the golden rule of Research 1 Doctoral institutions. Institutional prestige and funding in terms of grants depend heavily on their contribution to the body of knowledge. “And the things that are highly thought of are publications and the (grant) money”, said Laura when speaking about her tenure experience. Therefore, tenure track faculty members are expected to produce and publish quality research. However, the experience of the study participants denotes inconsistency regarding clarity in research expectations, in terms of quantity of publications and quality of the journals where they are published. Jam shared that she has a written document that outlines the tenure process, yet it is not very clear:

So in terms of research expectations, um, I know the expectation like in the pamphlet or whatever [...] I would say- I think I was told an average of 1.5 publications per year, with no indication of what tier those are supposed to be in”.

Laura, on the other hand, is very clear on what is expected of her: “The expectation to publish is very high. I’ve unofficially been told like, two a year is really what they’re looking for; um, and that is peer reviewed journal articles”. She is also expected to publish in top tier journals.

Sofia was also able to articulate her research expectations: “We’re expected to have- the department guidelines are one to three publications a year”.

Julisa’s experience during her mid-tenure track review highlighted the importance of clarity in these expectations:

My tenure meeting was more about the number of publications, and the quality of publications. They only focused on peer reviewed articles, not my chapters or the book I have. So it was very clear to me that I needed the number- that it didn’t matter where, it was just the quantity that they needed. So now I’m trying to put my work in middle-of-the-road journals, and not top tier journals, because one, I don’t have time. And two, you know, I got the message that I need to bring my numbers up, so I’m not going to do any more book chapters and I’ve declined book offers, and it’s all about focusing on the peer-reviewed journals.

Julisa is limiting her publication options and opportunities to meet her institutional tenure expectations. This is difficult to see, as the potential influence and reach of her research is restricted given her very specific publication focus. For those who have not had a mid-tenure track review, it is very stressful to balance the ambiguity of what is expected of them, and what will count towards their performance review. Gabrielle’s advice for managing this ambiguity is:

I would make sure to say, make sure that you have, you know, a good four or five solid peer reviewed publications in journals- in decent journals, and then maybe think about doing a chapter. Like I would you know, be very, very, serious about that.

This advice seems practical, however, the effort, energy, and time it takes to conduct and publish quality research is very high. Therefore, faculty efforts must be focused on meeting clear

expectations, not on making productivity assumptions and unnecessarily overextending themselves. Faculty members often juggle over five projects at one time in order to have material to produce a high volume of publications. When Jam made the decision of seeking a career in academia, her faculty mentor warned her about the commitment she would have to make to writing and publishing:

He told me, “If you want to be a faculty member, you need to be prepared to lock yourself in a dark room, write ten manuscripts- you know, that’s what I wrote. So, I mean, you may not write ten, but [...] be prepared like to lock yourself in a dark room and just do nothing but produce manuscripts. Like, be prepared to be disconnected from the community, from where you come from, and like, just be ready”.

The time spent working on publications beyond those required for tenure detracts from time that could be spent on other faculty performance responsibilities, like teaching and service.

**Service expectations.** Often, faculty service expectations are considered the last priority within the tenure review equation. However, the Latina faculty who participated in this study, consider service a large part of their responsibilities. The participants reported extensive service to their students, department, institution, and profession. Only participants who are in their first three years of teaching reported that they serve on less than 10 Masters’ and Doctoral student committees, whereas those with longer careers reported being on up to 15 student thesis and dissertation committees, as either Chair or committee member. Gabrielle reported one of the largest student committee service loads:

I have five advisees that I’m their chair, like I’m their major advisor, most likely continue on being their- their chair; that’s at the doctoral level. In terms of Masters advisees, I have another one, two, three, four, five. I have another five Masters advisees. And then in terms of like me sitting on other committees, I think I’m on about- I think I’m on about like fifteen other committees.

In addition to student committee service, the participants also serve on several departmental and institutional committees, ranging from student admission review committees to

diversity and strategic planning committees. Despite the amount of institutional service the participants are expected to perform, most find great reward and satisfaction in serving their profession. The women are very active assisting as journal reviewers and leaders within their professional associations. Lucia shared: “You know I’m on two editorial board committees for journals and, you know like, I review for [academic and professional associations]. I also I’m involved with one of the student affairs associations because I think it’s important”. Gabrielle is very involved in her field:

At the level of the field, I’m pretty involved in like our major professional associations. Like um, I serve on three editorial boards. I have served on the program committee for a major professional organization three times- actually four times- and right now, um I was just recently asked to sit on the executive committee for [a diversity-related professional association] executive committee.

Gabrielle also works in a department where her colleagues expect faculty members to be visible and involved in the university. For example:

We have an annual picnic. People- people try to see if you’re there. So I don’t know if that’s so much so service as it is like, kind of, what’s the word- putting in face time, yeah, is a better way to describe it. People expect you to have like face time, for sure.

In order to meet all these expectations that pull faculty members in so many different directions, the participants have to put in many hours of physical and intellectual work. Laura expressed the burden of trying to meet these overwhelming expectations:

You know like I start my days at 5am. So you know I do one shift from like five to two [...] and I take a break. And then there’s a second shift, and then like sometimes I’ll go home and I’ll work a third shift, [...] there’s a lot to do.

Even though Laura is disciplined in her approach to meeting her performance expectations, “the other challenge is just being tired, continuously tired all the time. Like I am so tired, and I have gotten more sleep than I ever had before, but I am so tired”. Unfortunately, being tired does not facilitate writing and productivity. Irene, a very experienced faculty member points out:

“Writing requires a clear head. Crystal clear thought processes. And if you're using a lot of your energy with all of this political mumbo jumbo, you're not going to be successful”.

Therefore, the written requirements of being granted tenure are forces that counter each other, and impede productivity in terms of institutional priorities. This automatically sets up faculty for a difficult, challenging journey where conflicting interests and priorities supersede the quality and contributions made by the participants’ research agendas.

**Meeting unwritten expectations.** When asked whether they felt unwritten expectations were part of the tenure process at their institution, all participants overwhelmingly agreed.

Laura, when discussing her institution, said:

I think the entire tenure process period is unwritten rules; um, because nothing is really written, not really, because it [her institutional tenure document] doesn't really say anything [...] I think there's an unwritten rule of why you need to become prestigious and you need to be nationally known in order to get tenure.

I mean it's like no one tells you to bring in money, which is funny because like we all know that that's the case now; like we just do. I think another unwritten rule is around just like priorities- like your priority needs to be your research.

The participants expressed that the lack of clarity regarding expectations often led to people making assumptions about expectations, which develops a sense of there being a hidden curriculum for the tenure process, which especially disadvantages faculty of color. Jam feels that the ‘hidden curriculum’ is not unique to underrepresented faculty members:

I would say any single faculty member you ask, anywhere or any place is going to say yes. That's the nature of academia. The nature of academia, as like anyone will tell you, that there's like this- like hazing process that is premised on this idea that like only the most elite scholars can create knowledge. And you know they then select the next generation of like thinkers, and then these thinkers come up and then they select the next generation. So it's like you know, by nature it's [...] it's really weird. Yeah. Academia is weird. So, therefore, I think it's pretty- I mean, not really insightful that there are like unwritten rules about everything, and like yeah, everybody knows it. And um, I wouldn't say like that's a product of like- that's not something unique to or I wouldn't say that's something that contributes to like, exclusion of- [the Latina experience].

However, she goes on to say that where the unwritten rules become exclusionary of underrepresented faculty members is in “the way that those unwritten rules are enacted, is how Latino faculty or people of- faculty of color are excluded”. Often, Latina faculty are not invited to be part of the informal networks within departments where these unwritten expectations are shared and discussed. The limited access to these informal power networks hinders underrepresented faculty members’ ability to successfully navigate said unwritten expectations.

For example:

I think the experience of- of- of me maneuvering against those rules; that is different. So maybe there’s a situation where like someone else had a conversation about this and was able to tell this person, yeah, 1.5 (the expectation on the number of publications per year) doesn’t mean 1.5. But like, me being a Latina woman, I might not be invited into that room for coffee where that’s being said.

The remaining participants alluded that not only are there unwritten expectations for everyone, but they are enacted differently on underrepresented faculty members. Maria sees this play out at her institution: “So I do see that there is a double standard, kind of, in like, what’s expected of people in terms of tenure. [Women of color are] expected to do more service still, so I think that unspoken rule is still there”.

Diana offered a different perspective than Jam when discussing unwritten expectations:

Objectively, the answer is no; because when I read those requirements, [...] they are all so very vague, that- but it’s there, you know? It said you needed to do service; it said you had to contribute to X, Y; it said you have to do research; so I don’t think they are unwritten. I think it’s more of a very good variation in the amount of- how much we understand what that’s going to take to do as individuals.

She does recognize that she may have a very idealistic view of the situation:

I think that I would be better poised to answer that question with more- more facts, or more evidence once I go through the process. Um, right now I might just be naïve and optimistic in saying “no, it’s all written out. It’s pretty clear”.

Even though the participants each express and identify the unwritten rules of the tenure process differently, they all recognize that these unwritten rules and expectations exist, and that they hinder the ability of Latinas to successfully navigate the tenure process.

### **Tenure vs. Purpose Tradeoff**

The participants of the study are very attached to their research agendas, to their commitment to support underrepresented groups, and to challenging and improving inequities they discover through their research. As a result, they serve on institutional committees that address issues of social justice and diversity, as well as providing external service to the community and their professional associations. However, many of the participants revealed that they engage in service and other tasks that are not necessarily valued or rewarded as part of the tenure review process. For example, Erandi identified three different instances where her work related to service has not been counted towards her tenure portfolio:

I also read applications for these grants we have for grad students but that's not officially anywhere on my form. That's just work I did that's nowhere on my form, I don't know why.

We took our students to a local high school and then my class hosted sixty students at a local high school for a college day that I oversaw. That doesn't count as service I guess but I did that with my class.

I'm on the Executive Board of another organization that's local and Latino based which my discipline colleagues don't think matters.

The time and effort Erandi dedicated to these activities are not reflected in her review, and are not considered in terms of her productivity towards tenure.

Consequently, Erandi and the remaining participants often have to weigh the practicality of pursuing their research interests in ways that are purposeful and fulfilling to them, or in ways that will enable them to receive tenure. This is a concern, as many women reported that they have had to decline excellent opportunities for professional development in order to ensure they

are meeting their tenure requirements. Laura has turned down opportunities to lead groups: “they asked me to be president of the [Latino] group and I was like I can't do that. Sorry. [...] that doesn't count for nothing on tenure, so I can't do that yet”. Similarly, Diana has turned down opportunities to collaborate on international research: “Working on international stuff today while- sure it's not a bad thing, it might not be as important as it would be later in my career; and right now I have other things on my plate”.

Lucia has had to table her desire to get involved and help change her campus environment:

I'm much more invested in my discipline and less invested in wanting to get really active on campus. And I think part of that was just based on my previous experiences at my other institution. And just realizing I have to take care of myself and so if it's taking time away from the work that I know is going to advance my career.

Prioritizing involvement in terms of participation in service and collaborations, although discouraging, is easier to do than having to discern between following your research agenda and approach to teaching to fit the more mainstream approaches students expect to see in the classroom. Presenting a critical approach to issues in the classroom is often deemed offensive by majority-identifying students, who reflect their discontent in their teacher evaluation ratings. This presents a problem, because teacher evaluation ratings are an important part of the tenure review process. Underrepresented faculty members often receive lower scores, which affects their tenure review. Julisa struggles with the tradeoff between being authentic in her teaching and trying to engage her students:

The difference is that I can't turn off my Critical paradigm in the classroom. I have to bring that in the classroom just like I bring it in my research. You know. And that is also taxing because it's just like they've never had experience with this, and granted, these are first year doctoral students and for the most part they're sort of like deer in headlights right now, with like 'oh my god, White



fragility, what the heck?’ you know, but at the same time, I cannot be anything but this authentic self.

She knows though, that she risks negative evaluations because of her determination to pursue her research and teaching authentically:

I’m actually a fantastic teacher, but I know that this is going to be- they’re going to look at my scores and think, ‘oh, this has always been consistently very good’ but that time isn’t and these scores are going to get a question. You know if I was a White man doing this work I would be congratulated. But I’m not.

The participants acknowledged the tenure vs. purpose tradeoff, and recognize that as underrepresented faculty they must often put aside their purposeful work to be able to receive tenure and have a seat at the institutional decision-making table, where they can have greater influence on changing organizational culture and the experiences of underrepresented students and faculty alike.

**Summary.** The tenure process was different for all participants given institutional differences and requirements. However, every participant expressed burden related to overwhelming productivity and performance expectations, and challenges in having to articulate the importance and value of their research agenda to peers and institutional leaders. The participants also felt that they were held to higher expectations, especially with respect to service commitments. These challenges are burdensome and taxing, and hinder the women’s engagement within their institution.

### **Seeking Tenure while Latina**

Faculty members all have very different experiences as they navigate the tenure process. These differences are attributed to several things: their institutional expectations, their personal approach to research, teaching and service, and their interpretation of both explicit and unwritten expectations. Overarching these differences are much larger factors that influence faculty

experiences, including institutional culture and climate, and endemic marginalization of certain groups in higher education. Faculty identity is a factor that bridges the juxtaposition of individual and contextual influences on the faculty experience through the tenure process.

**Role of Latina identity.** Study participants' Latina identity greatly influence their experience with the tenure process. From guiding their research agenda to their approach to teaching, the women all recognized that their Latina identity is present in their work. Sofia shared that in her case, her identity shaped: "my academic interest and what I research, and how I allocate my time on or focus on populations in terms of the whole research agenda". Julisa feels her Latina identity also leads her to a greater calling:

I think my cultural identity is very much, um, you know, the pillar that I lean on for not only support, but also understanding that, what is it- like 2% Latinas in the academy? So we're like unicorns, and so for me it is mostly about paving the way for other Latinas and Chicanas to be in this space you know? Because one it's freaking lonely, and two, the more of us that are in the academy, it's going to help shift things.

An important aspect of their Latina identity that influences their approach to tenure is the collectivistic aspect of Latina culture. These women persist through the hardships of seeking tenure not only for themselves, but to pave the way for other underrepresented faculty, especially Latinas, in academia.

The calling to serve as a role model to other Latinx students, and the commitment to support their community through service and publishing research related to the inequities affecting the Latinx population all emerged in the interviews. Diana's efforts are validated by her students: "these students come up to me and tell me like, it's so great to know that one of us can become a professor; like literally, with all those words". Irene was also motivated by being an inspiration for other Latina students and scholars:

And they may think if she made it, then I can make it too; but that's part of me being a Latina- *porque todos estamos juntos en esto* (Translation: Because we are

all in this together), it's for our country, for the world. *Y yo no creo que otros grupos tengan ese mismo valor* (Translation: and I don't think other groups have that same value).

Jam's background and upbringing drive her calling to serve:

Because of where I come from right, like it matters to me that Latino students, you know, you know, are not being screwed over here. It matters to me like, you know, faculty of color are not screwed over. So it's like, by the very nature of who I am, like I'm going to serve in some way.

Lastly, several participants recognized that if they, as Latina scholars, did not research the Latinx population, their issues would remain invisible and overlooked by other scholars. Laura expressed that she has “the feeling that like I have to do this research or it won't get done”.

Likewise, Erandi engages in service “because I wanted to, like it's my commitment to like the Latino community. I didn't do it...I know my colleagues were never going to care about it”.

**Challenges related to Latina Identity.** As these Latina faculty navigate the tenure process, they encountered several challenges attributed to their Latina identity. In some instances, the participants faced a very hostile climate within their department and institution, some have experienced multiple instances of microaggressions, and others have had to challenge peer and student perceptions of their competence as faculty members.

**Hostile diversity climate.** Erandi's first experience with her current institution was marked by a very negative interaction related to her identity. A senior faculty member within her department articulated that he did not see the value of having her position in their department, and made a very derogatory comment regarding the Latinx population that Erandi still carries with her. This experience has been very reflective of the climate Erandi has had to deal with during her time at her current institution. She noted how salient this hostility has been in her tenure process:

I feel like the racial microaggressions have been heavy and taking time off my clock and yeah, like my record isn't great and to be told to be second guessed consistently about that, it's like really not helpful. So I've had a really hard time.

The effects of their institutional and departmental diversity climate on their experience and perceived institutional fit were also salient across all participants' accounts. However, their perceived institutional diversity climate ranged from extremely toxic and volatile like Erandi's, to supportive and positive, like Laura's and Gabrielle's accounts. It was not surprising to note that the women who perceived a positive diversity climate reported a smoother, less traumatic tenure experience. However, it was very interesting to hear accounts of how much a negative and toxic environment hinders productivity, as measured by the participants' volume of publications.

Even when Irene tried to fight back against the hostile environment she experiences in her department, her concerns were not received. When discussing her challenges with an equity and diversity officer at her institution, she received the following response:

[The officer] said, "Well your main contention is based on microaggressions". And you know what [the officer] said to me? [The officer] said "we cannot fight microaggressions in court, they don't exist!". And I said "Listen, this whole concept comes from Critical Race Theory; that was not developed in the academy, but in law school"[the officer's field].

A perceived lack of institutional support in addressing these concerns fosters perceptions of a hostile environment, which drives faculty to leave their institution, mostly prior to completing the tenure process. Irene shared the story of a Latina colleague at her university who left her position, and more importantly academia, due to her negative experiences as a result of an unsupportive diversity climate. Julisa indicated that institutional climate is a contributing factor to the low number of Latinas in the academy:

In order to increase the numbers you need to do something about your environment. You can't just welcome them (underrepresented faculty) and

have it be a battlefield, right? There has to be some real serious discussions about the lack-just like White supremacy in our institutions as part of like, the culture; [...] these conversations are probably what's going to shift the climate.

I think compositional diversity is important, but in addition to that, you need to address these rooted issues that are so engrained in our institutions.

**Challenging student and peer perceptions of competence.** In addition to the challenges of facing microaggressions and diversity-related challenges at the macro-level, Latina faculty must also face unwarranted challenges to their competence as faculty members from both students and peers. The women in the study revealed that often they have had to deal with hostile students in the classroom. Diana attributes this to “a lack of trust, that’s the best way I would explain it; because it’s the trust of the- the- that I am actually- that I actually come with a plan”. Additionally, this perception of incompetence also stems from the subject that these women teach, which often challenge the mainstream narrative by offering critical analytical perspectives. Julisa shared an experience where a White male student felt threatened in one of her courses. She was expected to meet with the student and process his feelings in her class. Julisa indicated that this type of work is what makes tenure attainment challenging for faculty of color, as White faculty typically do not have to deal with this type of issues:

I’m angered by it because I lost writing time, and I lost research time, and it’s these instances that really derail me from the tenure process; that the teaching part, and teaching how I teach- it would be so easy to teach for an hour, with PowerPoint, with you know, the straight, vanilla [...]theory; but that’s not me. So that’s the hardest part. I feel like what I’ve been trying to navigate is that you know, while there are students that are like ‘wow I love this stuff, I’m learning so much, and thank you very much’ there are others that are like ‘You challenged me, and I feel shame because you corrected me in class’. You know, where it’s like you see a Chicana professor doing this, offering a different perspective, and that’s what’s bothering you.

As a response to this student dynamic, Irene feels that she must assert herself in her classroom in order to set a tone of respect for herself as a faculty member: “I feel like the first day of classes I have to make it very clear that this is my classroom. I know my field, I claim this expertise”.

Sometimes, faculty peers also question the legitimacy of Latina faculty. These questions are enacted when faculty members are not asked to teach courses in their areas of expertise, or peers discount their service, or challenge the quality of their research agenda. Erandi has been affected by these questions of her competence:

I spent way too much time in like a psychologically- like telling myself “hey it's OK that they told you that you're not- you can't teach those(courses in her area)”. One, because it's really hard and then they asked your three other junior colleagues to do it and they wouldn't let you do it... It's like psyching myself out and telling myself like, “It's fine”. I just felt...I felt really disrespected.

**Summary.** The participants' Latina identity plays a critical role in their experience with the tenure process. Their Latina identity shaped research agendas and approaches to teaching and service. Challenges related to hostile diversity climates, the questioning of their competence within academia, and the value of their research agenda plague these women as they try to navigate the complex process of tenure. However, a sense of responsibility to serve as role models for underrepresented students and faculty, and a commitment to serve and address the inequities within the Latinx community serve as a compass that guides them to persist in seeking tenure.

### **Engagement vs Participation**

Engagement in this study was measured in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption. Fully engaged people typically report high levels of all three. All women reported being very actively involved with their students, department, university, and profession. They expend countless hours and energy participating in service activities that seemingly demonstrate that

they are very ‘engaged’ in their role as faculty members. However, a more in-depth analysis that considered the level of vigor, dedication, and absorption showed that this was not always the case.

**Vigor.** In terms of vigor, all participants expressed a higher level of vigor when working with students and conducting their research, compared to when they completed administrative tasks. The participants derive energy and strength to persevere from their work with students and with the community. For Julisa, “I think what’s energizing are my meetings with my students and with my cluster group. That’s what’s energizing. I love doing that”. Maria perseveres “because I have the responsibility to look out for my students”. Erandi “felt energized by several things about being in Latino studies. [She] loved the fact that [she] taught”. However, expectations for the women to serve on departmental and university committees, takes time away from involvement in the energizing activities they enjoy, which counters the energizing aspect of true engagement.

**Dedication.** In terms of dedication, all participants indicated that they felt pride in their work, and felt that their work was purposeful and fulfilling. Most women spoke of how their role as a faculty member allowed them to influence the development of students and future scholars. Jam indicated that her work is impactful and purposeful, because “[She] get[s] to define for [her]self like what [her] contribution to this world is. And hopefully it’s a good one, albeit small”. Lucia finds purpose in her work because she “get[s] to cultivate the next generation of practitioners who need to come in with the social justice bend”. Gabrielle takes great pride in her work, and wants to produce work of the highest quality that is not considered lesser work because of her identity. “I don’t know that I want to do more in terms of quantity, but I will ask hard questions. I want my work to be very rigorous; I want it to be challenging and

complex”.

**Absorption.** Absorption reflects the attachment individuals feel towards their work. Most of the participants indicated that they feel much attached to their occupation and their research. For example, Gabrielle shared that she was “very present in [her] work [...] so yeah, [she’s] very, very, attached to it”. Maria, on the other hand, expressed a different, more taxing attachment to her work:

Because to tell you the truth, it doesn't end when I leave campus. At home, it's just all consuming, all the time. And sometimes it's necessary to who I am, but sometimes it feels like an invasion of- of the profession into every part of my life.

The latter expression of absorption was more common among early tenure-track participants.

**Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) vs. taxation.** Early tenure-track participants were more involved in service than their senior peers. Some of the work they are involved in is not energizing, and they do not see it as purposeful; Julisa, for example, described additional service and participation as “draining and burdening. It is going through the motions. That is not energizing at all”.

The participants also recognized that as women of color- sometimes the only person of color in their department- they are charged with responding to and supporting students through race-related issues and research. Maria was one of three faculty of color in her department, and she often dealt with identity-driven additional service:

That is- before we hired some more people of color, it was just me and two other people, and we were on every committee to do with people of color. And also yeah, there is this idea of “Can you speak to this? Can you do this work? Can you teach this class?” because, “isn't it your responsibility?” You're a person of color”. In all the different realms, I think that's very much the case.

Laura referred to the taxation that faculty of color often experience, both physically and emotionally:



I would say that the taxation that we as people of color have as faculty members is that- so for instance, last week Donald Trump- all this stuff, you know. We are having to shoulder in a very different way than you know, like my White colleagues. I think students are coming to them in a very different way than they're coming to me. And they're like sharing more with me and like dumping more on me. So it's more about like an emotional tax more than anything, I think. [...] I don't know what to do with this feeling.

This taxation is perpetuated by participants' commitment to supporting their students, especially students of color who seek their advice and mentorship. Service that seems to be voluntary, that is not rewarded or recognized in the tenure review, by definition an OCB, is actually burdensome and taxing, which are counter-behaviors to OCBs.

The tenure track process is a time for both the institution and the faculty member to determine if they are a good fit for each other. Therefore, it is hard for faculty to feel fully connected to their university and engage in OCBs out of a sense of loyalty and commitment.

Laura described this discernment period using the following analogy:

I like to think about the tenure process as we are dating. And the university and I are dating and we are trying to figure out if we like each other. At the end of the day, like, it might not work out. And I shouldn't act like I'm married to an institution that I'm only dating.

A negative institutional diversity climate hinders faculty members' connection with, and full commitment to their institution, which inhibits the motivation of organizational loyalty for the faculty members to engage in OCBs.

**Summary.** It was not surprising to find evidence of cultural taxation among the participants of the study, but it was interesting to unveil that even though Latina faculty are overly involved in their institutions and professional fields, their involvement does not classify as OCB. The taxation the participants experience from said activities makes it difficult to describe their participation and involvement as true engagement. By definition, engagement energizes

and motivates individuals to persist in the face of adversity. As such, the researcher would argue that the participants in this study are engaged in their research, but only involved in their university. This is an important distinction, as it would behoove universities to foster an environment and culture where faculty members can connect to and support the university. The benefits of engaged faculty would result in better outcomes in terms of productivity and service for the university.

### **Support Networks**

In facing all the challenges and adversity related to the tenure process, the study participants all identified family and peer networks as sources of support.

**Family Support.** For Latinas, family is a strong force that guides their path and encouragement through difficulties. “My family is 100% supportive of me, I’m like the shining star”; “my mom is seriously my biggest fan”; “they’re just kind of- they’re just proud”; are examples of how much support Jam, Laura and Maria receive from their families. It is also interesting to note that almost all participants said their families do not understand exactly what they do, or what the tenure process entails, but they are supportive regardless. For some, that support comes in the form of words of encouragement, and in some instances prayer, offered by family members. Erandi shared that:

[Her] family has always been very supportive in the sense of like “you do it mija”, you know? Like “you can do it, we believe in you”. So that’s the extent that they would support me. They don’t really understand the way it works.

For other participants, like Julisa, their family is present in every experience they encounter:

Being a professor for me is a humbling experience because you know it’s- it’s a privileged space. And so I always have to remember that I carry my family as my backpack in this experience.

Regardless of the level of involvement in their professional journeys, family support is instrumental in the participants' persistence.

**Peer Network Support.** In addition to family support, the study participants rely heavily on their colleagues for support as they navigate the tenure process. Although some shared that they received support from peers in their university, others have a network of Latina faculty, who they call "Sister Scholars". Lucia seeks support from her Latina faculty peers more so than from her university colleagues:

I find my own networks outside of my department, outside of my immediate colleagues. I mean my sister scholars are... they are the three other women, there's four of us, who without a doubt I cannot live without. They... Because we're not just about you know one dimensional- we're not only looking at our careers. This is the one group of people that I can rely on.

The participants recognize the strength of the connections among Latinx faculty in academia; and how influential that strong network has been in their professional growth and development.

Laura noted:

I started realizing that the Latino community of researchers is vastly just an interconnected web of people. Like we all know each other. Like we have connections. Like everybody is somebody else's friend, you know, that kind of thing. And I would dare say that all of the opportunities that have come to me since I started my Ph.D. have been as a result of the Latino connections I have. Every single one of them. Every single opportunity.

Laura shared that she feels the support of this network of scholars differentiates her experience from that of other women of color in her department:

I think if anything the only thing that might be different is like I feel like I have a network of Latina scholars that are really strong and I'm not sure about- like, one of my colleagues. She's Asian American. I don't know that she has that sort of strength behind her.

This powerful network could be instrumental in increasing the number of Latina faculty in academia. The strong connections can serve to lay the foundation for a support system that can foster the interest and trajectory of Latinas seeking to join the professoriate.

**Summary.** Family and support from peer networks consistently emerged as sources of motivation and encouragement for participants. The women rely on the strong network of Latinx scholars in academia to seek guidance, collaboration, and learn about opportunities for development and career progression in the field.

### **Document Analysis**

Participant Curricula Vitae (CVs) were analyzed as a secondary source of data regarding the study participants' involvement and accomplishments throughout their tenure process. This analysis served two purposes, to contribute to triangulation of the data, and to allow for more time during the interview for discussion, rather than collecting the data included in the documents. Institutional tenure documents submitted by participants and collected from university websites were also reviewed.

A review of the participant CVs confirmed the level of productivity and involvement of the participants in terms of research output and publications, teaching, and service to students, their institution, and their profession. All the women were extremely involved, and presented evidence of extensive publications and conference presentations. In the last year alone, the women reported an average of 7 publications (published or under review), averaged service on 5 student committees, delivered an average of 2 conference presentations, and served on an average of 8 committees (institutional and professional committees). It was interesting to note that although the women were involved in service related to their Latina identity, for example, serving on minority faculty councils, they were also involved in other departmental and

institutional committees. The CV review confirmed the reported participant involvement, and provided evidence of very high levels of involvement that could become overwhelming for the participants to manage and thus hinder their productivity in terms of tenure review expectations.

The tenure process document analysis demonstrated that the frustration and lack of clarity over tenure review expectations expressed by the study participants was valid. The tenure process documents ranged from one-page diagrammatic representations of the tenure process, to over forty-page documents. There was also a wide range of variability in the complexity of the documents. Some were very detailed institutional policy statements, while other were more manageable quick guides for faculty. Many of the requirements in the documents were described broadly, and very few offered specific quantities of publications/ service projects, but rather expressed ‘excellence’ and ‘high standards’ as the expected performance outcomes. Several of the documents also conferred academic departments and disciplines discretion in the requirements and expectations for their specific faculty members. This is problematic, in that actual measures of ‘excellence’ and ‘high standards’ are left to the interpretation of academic departments, tenure committees, and decision makers. More consistent, clear procedures and expectations would make the tenure review process more transparent for all faculty seeking tenure, and would serve to limit the hidden curriculum and unwritten expectations that often negatively affect underrepresented faculty on the tenure track.

**Summary.** The secondary data source analysis of participant CVs and institutional tenure documents confirmed the accounts of participants during the interviews. The CVs demonstrated a very high level of involvement and accomplishment in terms of research, teaching, and service. The tenure documents illustrated unclear tenure expectations, sometimes lost in the midst of long, dense documents. The analysis also showed that the tenure review

process, although intended to be objective, afford discretion to departments/disciplines which ultimately translates to subjective tenure review processes.

### **Summary**

Chapter IV presented the findings that emerged from the study's data analysis. This chapter began with the profiles of the study participants. The participants' educational and professional journeys were shared in order to provide a picture of each woman, and how their background influences their approach to the tenure process. Although the participants in this study have had unique experiences in different institutional environments, a thorough analysis of the data indicated several common themes exist among the women's experiences.

The first theme discussed is Institutional Context. The subthemes that support this theme are challenges related to: a) changing institutional philosophies; b) navigating espoused vs. actual institutional values; and c) political and power structures. The second theme discussed was the Tenure experience. Overwhelming productivity and performance expectations related to teaching, research and service; meeting unwritten expectations; and tenure vs. purpose tradeoff were the subthemes that emerged under tenure experience. The third theme, Seeking Tenure while Latina, described the role of the participants' Latina identity in how they approached the tenure process and challenges specific to them because of their Latina identity were discussed.

Evidence of engagement and an argument for classification of involvement as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors or taxation were presented, supported by the participants' reported experiences. Family and peer network support emerged as a theme related to motivation and encouragement for the participants as they navigate the tenure process. Lastly, analysis of the participant CVs and tenure process documents supported the accounts given by participants in their interviews.

## Chapter V: Summary, Discussion and Implications

In Chapter V, the researcher provides a brief overview of the study, including its purpose, research questions, and methodology. A thorough discussion of the findings that emerged from the data analysis, and how the research questions were answered follow the overview. Lastly, the researcher discusses theory, policy, and practical implications as well as recommendations for future research based on the findings of this study.

### Overview of Study

*La Garza en Bicicleta: Perceptions of Latina faculty on the role of organizational citizenship behaviors and institutional engagement on tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions* was a qualitative study exploring the Latina faculty experience while seeking tenure within a specific organizational context. The purpose of the study was to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on their tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

The research questions that guided the study were: (1) How do Latina faculty members perceive their experiences in relation to completion of the tenure process? (2) How do Latina faculty members describe their engagement in their institution during the tenure process? And (3) How do Latina faculty members describe the role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as a form of institutional engagement in successfully completing the tenure process?

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect data for the study. The researcher interviewed ten female faculty members who identify as Latina, and are currently seeking or received tenure within the last five years from a Research 1 Doctoral institution.

Data analysis yielded the following themes: (a) the influence of institutional context, (b)

the tenure experience, (c) seeking tenure while Latina, (d) engagement, and (e) family and peer networks as a source of support. Document analysis of participant CVs and institutional tenure documents supported the participants' reported experiences.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The study participants' narratives illustrated the influence of the institutional context on their experiences with the tenure process. Institutional philosophies, values, and power structures all shape the organizational culture within the university. Changes in institutional philosophies, values and power structures will shift the context and diversity climate that faculty members must navigate and are thus very influential in how faculty members perceive their experiences and fit to the institution.

The participants in the study indicated that they have noticed a shift in organizational priorities towards more business-centered practices, and as a result, their role as faculty members has changed. In the new model, faculty are more accountable for skill development rather than intellectual development. Faculty who were groomed to serve in the intellectual model are struggling to find their place in the new institutional model, and expressed feelings of isolation within their workplace. This is consistent with existing literature, which suggests that perceptions of incongruity between organizational values and practices may lead to frustration, feelings of isolation, and lack of trust and investment on behalf of employees who feel negatively affected by organizational practices (Conklin & Robbins-McNeish, 2006). Therefore, it is important that organizations plan change management strategies that communicate any major institutional changes in priorities/philosophies and cultural acclimation initiatives that support current faculty members, in order to facilitate their transition to the new institutional policies,



rather than creating a sense of isolation that may lead to perceptions of a negative institutional climate (Cox, 1994).

Another salient finding from this study is that the participants often felt espoused diversity values and practices within their institutions were disconnected. Several participants articulated that their institutions said they valued diversity, but the existing climate was not supportive of a diverse student or faculty body. This disconnect contributed to their frustration and perceptions of a potentially hostile environment for them as they function within the university, which is consistent with other research on the subject (Taylor et al., 2010). This finding also supports Jacobson et al.'s (2015) conclusion that implicit norms were more powerful than explicit norms when conveying the value placed on diversity. Given that norms guide practices, this would suggest that daily practices would more accurately portray institutional value placed on diversity. Similarly, Kossek and Zonia (1993) found that positive perceptions of diversity climate were related to the equal provision of resources and support to underrepresented racial-ethnic groups when compared to their majority counterparts.

Several women in the study provided examples highlighting their perception that their research was less valued than research conducted by their majority peers, especially when allocating internal funding for research projects. These challenges within their institutional context resulted in perceptions of a hostile, unsupportive climate in some instances. This presents a problem, especially when faculty members have to grapple with feelings of lack of institutional fit. Navigating these feelings of isolation within the institutional context requires effort and time that detract from the productivity of faculty members, especially faculty of color who must engage in this majority-driven context as a minority group.

The tenure process was different for all participants given institutional differences and requirements. However, every participant expressed challenges with overwhelming productivity and performance expectations, and challenges in articulating the importance and value of their research agenda to peers and institutional leaders. The participants also felt that they were held to higher expectations, especially with respect to service and advising commitments, due to their minority status. These challenges were expected, as they are consistent with existing literature (Boyd et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2010; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Fries-Britt et al., 2011). The challenges these women have faced during the tenure process relate directly to their Latina identity, which contributes to their perceptions of differential treatment from their majority peers and other minorities.

The participants perceive that their Latina identity plays a critical role in their experience with the tenure process. Their Latina identity shaped research agendas and approaches to teaching and service. As a result, all the study participants' research topics related to the Latinx or other underrepresented populations, typically from a critical paradigm. The women reported that students and peers challenged their ability to conduct high quality research and guide student development through their teaching and mentoring. Because of their research interests and minority identity, students and colleagues who stereotype these faculty members as less able than majority peers often question their competence. Sadly, this is common; Harris and Gonzalez (2012) noted that this was often the case with women faculty of color. The participants must often expend additional effort and time to articulate the value of their research agenda and critical perspectives in the classroom to colleagues and institutional leaders; otherwise, as indicated in the research literature, they may be seen as less productive and effective than their majority peers (Padilla, 2003; Ibarra, 2003). Some of the participants also expressed concern

over receiving unfavorable teaching evaluations from students who felt threatened or attacked by materials and discussions taking place in their classes. These are valid concerns, as several authors indicate that women faculty of color receive lower teaching evaluation scores based on the subjects they teach (Delgado-Romero et al., 2003; Flores Niemann, 2012). Having to justify their research agenda and competence to students and colleagues adds additional stress and work to women who must meet already overwhelming performance expectations.

However, a sense of responsibility to serve as role models for underrepresented students and faculty and a commitment to serve and address the inequities within the Latinx community serve as a compass that guides them to persist in seeking tenure. As is demonstrated in the literature, because they can relate to the experience of students, especially other women of color, faculty express an added responsibility for helping minorities succeed (Taylor et al., 2010; Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Fries-Britt et al., 2011).

It was not surprising to find evidence of cultural taxation as described by Padilla (1993) among the participants of the study. However, it was interesting to unveil that even though Latina faculty are overly involved in their institutions and professional fields, their involvement does not classify as OCB. The taxation the participants experience from said involvement makes it difficult to describe their participation and involvement as true engagement. By definition, engagement is fulfilling, energizing, and motivates individuals to persist in the face of adversity (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). As such, the researcher would argue that the participants in this study are *engaged* in their research, but only *involved* in their university. Furthermore, the findings of the study suggest that women who have received or are close to receiving tenure reported more autonomy in selecting their service involvement, which led them to select opportunities that were more purposeful to them, and thus they derived more fulfilment from

their involvement. The higher levels of fulfilment and purpose in service could translate to higher engagement. The suggested relationship between career stage and engagement is worthy of further exploration. The distinction of levels of engagement in research versus institutional engagement, and possible relationship between career stage and engagement are important. It would behoove universities to foster an environment and culture where faculty members can connect to and support the university. The benefits of engaged faculty would result in better outcomes in terms of productivity and service for the university.

Family and support from peer networks consistently emerged as sources of motivation and encouragement for participants. The women rely on the strong network of Latinx scholars in academia to seek guidance, collaboration, and learn about opportunities for development and career progression in the field. The collectivistic characteristic of Latino culture provides some explanation for the support Latina faculty derive from their peer network and family (Boyd et al., 2010; Harris Canul, 2003). This powerful network could be instrumental in increasing the number of Latina faculty in academia. The strong connections can serve to lay the foundation for a support system that can foster the interest and trajectory of Latinas seeking to join the professoriate.

### **Addressing the Research Questions**

The conceptual framework for this study was based on Critical Race Theory (CRT), LatCrit theory, Intersectionality Theory, and Social Exchange Theory. The findings provide evidence that CRT, LatCrit, and Intersectionality Theories are all applicable in the context of this study. The faculty members who participated in this study reported different experiences from their non-minority peers; the difference in experiences is greatly due to their identity as Latina in

the predominantly White field of academia. A discussion of the findings related to each research question follows.

**Research question 1.** The first research question guiding this study was related to the participants' overall experience with the tenure process, more specifically:

- How do Latina faculty members perceive their experiences in relation to completion of the tenure process?

To answer this question, the researcher asked participants to begin by sharing their institutional workload expectations, in terms of research, service and practice. The researcher then asked the participants to share the challenges they faced during the tenure process, and to discuss whether they perceived that as Latina women they had differential experiences from other minority faculty groups within their institution.

As the researcher thoroughly dissected and analyzed the interview transcriptions, several themes emerged across all participants' narratives. Overall, the women perceived a difficult, taxing experience with the tenure process. Perceptions of a negative diversity climate fostered feelings of isolation and disconnect from their institution. They experienced overwhelming performance expectations in terms of their research, teaching, and service loads, and very few had a clear understanding of what evidence of productivity they were required to present for their tenure review. Many had to withstand unfair and harsh criticism of their competence from students and colleagues alike; and had to justify the value of their work and research to institutional constituents who minimized their value and impact.

**Research question 2.** The second research question delved deeper into the engagement aspect of participants' experiences:

- How do Latina faculty members describe their engagement in their institution during the tenure process?

The interview questions related to this research question were formulated using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale measures of engagement of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). The participants were asked several questions, including whether they found their work to be purposeful and fulfilling.

Given the participants' responses, the researcher determined that although Latina faculty are overly involved in their institutions and professional fields, as evidenced in their CVs, their involvement does not particularly classify as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The taxation the participants experience from said involvement makes it difficult to describe their participation and involvement as true engagement. True engagement energizes and motivates individuals to persist in the face of adversity. As such, the researcher would argue that the participants in this study are engaged in their research from which they derive purpose and fulfilment, but are only involved in their university.

**Research question 3.** Lastly, the researcher sought to gather the perceptions of Latina faculty regarding the role of OCBs in the tenure process, more specifically:

- How do Latina faculty members describe the role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as a form of institutional engagement in successfully completing the tenure process?

During the interview, the researcher provided the participants with Organ et al.'s definition of OCBs, and asked them whether they felt that engaging in OCBs influenced success

through the tenure process. The participants shared their perception that involvement in additional service plays a big role in the tenure process. This is evident in the amount of service these women were involved in as they navigated the tenure process. However, the women expressed that their participation in additional service was not out of a sense of loyalty toward their institution, but more out of a need to meet the perceived expectations of them as women faculty of color seeking tenure.

### **Implications**

The lack of representation and the forces that perpetuate the low number of Latina faculty in the workforce are concerning, given the increasing need for more Latina faculty in academia. This study was conducted to explore the perceptions of Latina faculty on their experience with the tenure process. Implications, illustrated by the findings and related to theory, policy and practice in academia are discussed.

#### **Implications for Theory**

Critical Race, LatCrit, and Intersectionality theories emerged from a need to analyze the identity-driven differential experiences of marginalized groups within a majority-centric society. The shared experiences of Latina faculty in the predominantly white context of academia provide support that the marginalization of minorities that is central to CRT, LatCrit and Intersectionality theories is present in academia. These findings support the need for critical theories that focus on marginalized populations, and raise a call for continued theory development related to specific marginalized identities.

This research also sheds light on existing Latina faculty challenges as they navigate the tenure process. Given the need to increase Latina representation in the faculty body, models should be developed to illustrate the relationship among factors that contribute to Latina

advancement in the workplace. These models could help leverage efforts and guide practices that support Latinas who are seeking tenure and career advancement as they navigate majority-centric work environments.

### **Implications for Policy Development**

Mentorship and role modeling from faculty members who share similar identity characteristics with students are some of the main contributors to student retention in college (Blackwell, 1989; Kuh et al., 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 2012). Therefore, expected increased representation of Latinx students in college highlights the need for increased Latinx faculty presence in academia.

As this study showed, Latina faculty face daunting challenges as they seek tenure, especially in Research 1 Doctoral institutions. Unless we challenge exclusive structures in academia, Latina faculty representation will not reach critical mass. Current policies in academia must change to be more inclusive of underrepresented groups. The priority in terms of policy changes is in developing a pipeline to funnel underrepresented students toward careers in the professoriate. The number of underrepresented students seeking careers in academia must increase in order to increase minority faculty representation. Therefore, it is imperative that educational leaders establish policies to support programs that increase Latinx and other minority student enrollment and completion from high school through graduate school. For example, providing funding for programs that encourage students to learn about teaching and research, and allowing students to shadow faculty members in the classroom may increase interest in careers in the professoriate.

Secondly, universities must commit to reviewing existing institutional policies from a critical perspective to identify sources of bias against underrepresented faculty and ways in



which existing practices disadvantage underrepresented faculty. We must understand exactly how the current systems limit access to and career development within the professoriate. Furthermore, institutions must commit to redesigning policies in a way that makes them more inclusive of minority faculty. Sometimes, underrepresented faculty members express frustration because espoused institutional diversity values and practices are different (Taylor et al., 2010). This frustration can lead to faculty members reporting lower job satisfaction and potentially leaving their institutions (Taylor et al., 2010). For example, if universities espouse diversity as an institutional priority, they should develop practices that support that value in terms of resource allocation and mechanisms for underrepresented faculty to integrate into the institutional culture. Underrepresented faculty research agendas should receive the same consideration as mainstream agendas when funding and productivity decisions are made.

Lastly, tenure process policies need to be clearer, and lay out consistent expectations for all faculty members, regardless of their identity. Allowing subjectivity in interpretation of tenure policies provides a gateway for personal biases against underrepresented faculty to influence tenure decisions. Universities must also develop mechanisms for sharing tenure and promotion policies with all faculty members in order to ensure transparency and minimize room for unwritten expectations to cloud the tenure process.

Implications for policy entail developing systems that support underrepresented student college completion and pursuit of a career in academia. Tenure policy clarification and communication are imperative, and should be more inclusive of underrepresented faculty. These policies should guide institutional practices that support underrepresented faculty as they seek tenure.

## **Implications for Practice**

One of the main factors contributing to the study participants finding their path into academia was faculty and staff mentorship through their college experiences. Several mentors recognized the promise, passion, and talent in these women to be academics and researchers. However, with faculty expectations centering on productivity in terms of research, faculty members may not have the time needed to foster these relationships with students. Consequently, as a profession, we need to assess and determine professional values and priorities, and realize that faculty members fuel the student pipeline and grow the profession. In a field that is not as glorified or recognized as STEM fields, Medicine, Law, etc., institutions must place extra effort into developing future academicians.

However, placing the responsibility of increasing the number of students entering the professoriate on faculty members taxes already overworked faculty with filling this pipeline. A recommendation would be to recruit staff or faculty advisors who can guide these students. If a faculty member identifies a student with potential to be a faculty member, they could rely on the staff advisor to recruit and present a pathway and opportunities for entry into the professoriate for the students. The faculty could then serve as mentors for the students who commit to research at the undergrad level, then more intentionally at the graduate level. Institutions could offer course releases for any faculty members who wish to actively serve in the staff advisor role and guide students throughout their college career towards a career in academia.

When talking to the study participants, the women identified at least one person at every stage of their journey towards the professoriate who served as a mentor for them. These mentors were instrumental in developing the women's confidence in their ability to succeed in academia, and in providing them with opportunities that furthered their career development. Mentorship

has been identified as an effective way for women to learn to navigate male-driven cultures, and as possibly essential in women's advancement in their careers, given the many obstacles they face in the workplace (Logan & Crump, 2007; Linehan & Scullion, 2008). Mentors are often "higher-ranking, influential, senior organizational members with advanced experience and knowledge" (Linehan & Scullion, 2008, p. 30). Many institutions have developed formal mentorship programs, led by senior faculty members or department chairs, to support underrepresented junior faculty members, especially women, in the workplace. However, a couple of the study participants suggested that these programs were not truly helpful to their development and acclimation to the university, especially when the person assigned as their mentor was also their supervisor. A dictated, one-size-fits-all model of mentorship sometimes feels like a safety net for institutions to espouse support for their underrepresented faculty members, which may not support underrepresented faculty members.

In reviewing the interview transcripts, the researcher identified that the women, more so than one single mentor, had a network of people who guided and supported them in different ways. For example, some had at least one colleague within their institution who provided mentorship in dealing with institutional politics and policies, mentors who helped them increase their research productivity by co-authoring manuscripts with them, and other faculty of color who processed and provided advice related to diversity-related issues. In essence, the women had an ally network that included departmental and institutional colleagues, but also involved other individuals selected by the faculty member outside of the university. The researcher recommends that institutions identify senior faculty members within their departments who could serve as institutional allies, and provide their underrepresented faculty with opportunities to network and identify other faculty within their institution with whom junior faculty could

develop relationships. This would allow junior faculty to have ownership in identifying and selecting mentors, rather than having one imposed on them by the institution. Junior faculty would have autonomy over developing their ally networks, and may increase their investment in fostering strong relationships with their mentors.

The implications resulting from this study call for a critical evaluation of the value system within institutions, and then using the evaluation results to guide policy changes that could shift the majority-centric culture of academia. Practices that support these policy changes would indicate a true institutional commitment to increasing minority faculty representation, and would consequently contribute to fostering a positive diversity climate, which would provide more support structures for underrepresented faculty members.

### **Limitations of the Study**

This study focused on the experiences of 10 women faculty who identify as Latina, and who have completed the tenure process in the last five years in large, public, Research 1 Doctoral institutions. It was important to study this population due to the marked lack of Latina faculty members in Research 1 Doctoral institutions. Although the faculty diversity problem spans institutional types, the faculty diversity issue is magnified in the more highly regarded and prestigious Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

The findings of this study expand existing research by dedicating time and effort to gaining a deeper, more critical insight into the experiences and challenges Latina faculty members face while seeking tenure at Research 1 Doctoral institutions. However, the limitation of this study lies in that the findings and experiences described may not be representative of all Latinas seeking tenure at R1 Doctoral institutions.

Lastly, the role of the researcher in a qualitative study may be a limitation to this study. As a Latina doctoral student, the researcher felt a deep connection to this study and the data it yielded. The researcher related with many of the challenges presented by the participants, which may have influenced how the researcher saw themes emerge in the study.

Although the design of this study presented limitations, the outcome and valuable, descriptive information gathered through the study contribute to the limited existing literature related to the topic. Qualitative studies are crucial in understanding the Latina faculty experience while seeking tenure, specifically at Research 1 Doctoral institutions.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

The findings of this study answered the research questions developed by the researcher. However, the outcomes of this study also suggest the need for additional research relate to this topic. Presented below are recommendations for future research related to Human Resource Development and then more specifically to Latina faculty.

#### **Future Research Related to Human Resource Development**

One of the challenges when conducting research related to engagement is the lack of agreement on one definition and operationalized measurement of engagement. The challenge is even greater when measuring engagement within a qualitative study as the researcher set out to do in this study. Future research related to engagement should seek to identify and validate one definition of engagement, and continue to explore engagement within different organizational contexts. Additionally, the findings in this study suggested a relationship between level of engagement and career stage. Future research is needed to determine whether there is a relationship between these two constructs, and if there is a relationship, explore the nature and

strength of said relationship. The findings of such a study would be useful for organizations seeking to increase their employees' engagement.

The population trends discussed in this study will have implications for Latinxs beyond the context of higher education. The proportion of Latinxs in the workforce is expected to increase, and consequently, existing organizational structures that are majority-centric may not adequately support a more diverse workforce. Similar to the academic context, these Latinxs in the workforce will perceive differential experiences compared to their majority-identifying counterparts based on their Latinx identity. Future research to understand the challenges that Latinxs face in corporate and other organizational settings is needed in order for organizations to develop cultures that are inclusive and supportive to the needs of the changing workforce.

### **Future Research Related to Latina Faculty in Higher Education**

Within the specific context of this study, several interesting findings emerged that call for further research. One of the main sources of support for the participants was their connection to other Latinx scholars within their peer network. Identifying this network, and understanding how it influences Latinx faculty persistence through the tenure process would be instrumental in leveraging the representation of Latinx faculty in academia. Social network analysis could prove helpful in furthering research related to the role of support networks within the Latina faculty community.

Secondly, given the important role of mentorship in faculty development, more research is needed to determine the optimal structure and type of mentorship that would be supportive of Latinx and underrepresented faculty in the professoriate. This research should include a comprehensive inventory of existing mentorship program structures and an evaluation of their effectiveness in supporting and developing underrepresented faculty members.

One of the policy development implications of this study was the development of structures to support a Latinx pipeline of students into the professoriate. In order to develop these structures and policies, it is important to map the existing Latinx faculty pipeline from high school through the professoriate. This mapping would provide a clearer understanding of the current practices and systems in place to foster interest in research and in academia in young Latinxs, especially Latina women. Policies to develop and/or expand existing structures could be derived from analysis of the existing structures that guide students into careers in academia.

Lastly, this study could be replicated to explore the experience of Latinx men, in order to capture their experience as an underrepresented group. This study could also be developed into a longitudinal study that would reconnect with the study participants post-tenure, to see how their experiences continued to develop and whether their perspectives related to the tenure process changed as they advanced in their profession and were in later stages in their careers.

### **Concluding Remarks**

This study served the purpose of exploring the perceived experiences of Latinas as they navigate the tenure process at Research 1 Doctoral institutions. The findings demonstrated that Latina faculty, as well as other underrepresented faculty groups, are not set up for success within the predominantly White male-dominated professoriate. Years of institutional inequities in access and support for minority groups continue to foster an exclusive environment that limits increased representation of minorities in the professoriate. Although this study met its purpose, it exposed several areas that require further study in order to activate change that will question existing structures and processes, and move towards a more equitable model of higher education for both underrepresented students and faculty members.

## References

- American Association of University Women. (2015). The simple truth about the gender pay gap. *American Association Of University Women*, Fall 2015. Retrieved November 20, 2015, from <http://www.aauw.org/research/the-simple-truth-about-the-gender-pay-gap/>
- Anitha J., (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63 (3), 308-323, doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 582-602.
- Arredondo, P., & Castellanos, J. (2003). Latinas and the professoriate. In J. Castellanos, & L. Jones (Eds.). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (179-204). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Bajdo, L. M., & Dickson, M. W. (2001). Perceptions of organizational culture and women's advancement in organizations: A cross-cultural examination. *Sex Roles*, 45(5-6), 399-414. doi:10.1023/A:1014365716222
- Baron, M. A. (2008). Guidelines for writing research proposals and dissertations. *Division of Educational Administration: University of South Dakota*, 1-52.
- Bergeron, D., Ostroff, C., Schroeder, T., & Block, C. (2014). The dual effects of organizational citizenship behavior: Relationships to research productivity and career outcomes in academe. *Human Performance*, 27 (2), 99-128.
- Bierema, L. L. (2010). Resisting HRD's resistance to diversity. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34 (6), 565-576.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe*, 75(5), 8-14.
- Boyd, T., Cintron, R., & Alexander-Snow, M. (2010). The experience of being a junior minority female faculty member. Forum on Public Policy.
- Brubacher, J., & Rudy, W. (2008). *Higher education in transition* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Byerly, E. & Deardorff, K. (1995). *Current population reports*. National and state Population estimates: 1990 to 1994. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/1/pop/p25-1127.pdf>



- Byrd, M. (2014). Diversity issues: Exploring “critical” through multiple lenses. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 16 (4), 515-528.
- Canton, C. (2013). The “cultural taxation” of faculty of color in the academy. *California Faculty Magazine, Fall 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.calfac.org/magazine-article/cultural-taxation-faculty-color-academy>
- Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2016). Basic Classification Description. Retrieved from [http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification\\_descriptions/basic.php](http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php)
- Ceci, S. J., Williams, W. M. & Mueller-Johnson, K. (2006). Is tenure justified? An experimental study of faculty beliefs about tenure, promotion, and academic freedom. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 29(6), 553-569.
- Conklin, W., & Robbins-McNeish, N. (2006). Four barriers to faculty diversity. *Diversity Factor*, 14 (4), 26-33.
- Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). *Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014 to 2060*. Population Estimates and Projections, Current Population Reports. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf>
- Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 140, 139-167.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five traditions*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal Of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Cullen, K. L., Gentry, W. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (2015). Biased self-perception tendencies: Self-enhancement/self-diminishment and leader derailment in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 64 (1), 161-207.
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword. *Feminist Theory*, 9 (1), 67-85.  
doi: 10.1177/1464700108086364.

- Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 105-126.
- Delgado-Romero, E. A., Flores, L., Gloria, A. M., Arredondo, P., & Castellanos, J. (2003). Developmental career challenges for Latina/o faculty in higher education. In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.), *The Majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (257-283). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Delgado-Romero, E., Manlove, A., Manlove, J., & Hernandez, C. (2007). Controversial issues in the recruitment and retention of Latino/a faculty. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6 (1), 34-51.
- Dwyer, S., Richard, O. C., & Chadwick, K. (2003). Gender diversity in management and firm performance: The influence of growth orientation and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(12), 1009-1019. doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00329-0
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.
- Englander, M. (2012). The interview: Data collection in descriptive phenomenological human scientific research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43, 13-35.
- Faculty [Definition 2.1]. (n.d.). In *Oxford Dictionary online*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/faculty>
- Fernandez, L. (2002). Telling stories about school: Using Critical Race and Latino Critical theories to document Latina/Latino education and resistance. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8 (1), 45-65.
- Fernandez, S. (2013). Hispanic vs. Latino: What's the difference? Hispanic Houston.com Retrieved from <http://hispanichouston.com/hispanic-vs-latino-whats-the-difference/>
- Fernandez-Morera, D. (2010). Ask a Scholar: What is the true definition of Latino? National Association of Scholars. Retrieved from [https://www.nas.org/articles/Ask\\_a\\_Scholar\\_What\\_is\\_the\\_True\\_Definition\\_of\\_Latino](https://www.nas.org/articles/Ask_a_Scholar_What_is_the_True_Definition_of_Latino)
- Flores Niemann, Y. (2012). Lessons from the experiences of women of color working in academia. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. Flores Niemann, C. Gonzalez, & A. Harris (Eds.). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (446-500). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

- Fries-Britt, S. L., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Perna, L. W., Milem, J. F., & Howard, D. G. (2011). Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity. *Journal Of The Professoriate*, 5(1), 1-34.
- Garcia, J.D. (2015). Intersectionality. *Research Starters: Sociology (Online edition)*.
- Gedro, J., Collins, J., & Rocco, T. (2014). The “critical” turn: An important imperative for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 16(4), 529-535.
- Gedro, J., & Mizzi, R. C. (2014). Feminist theory and Queer theory: Implications for HRD research and practice. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 16(4), 445-456. doi:10.1177/1523422314543820
- Glass, C., Doberneck, D., & Schweitzer, J. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15 (1), 7-29.
- Groggins, A., & Ryan, A. M. (2013). Embracing uniqueness: The underpinnings of a positive climate for diversity. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 86(2), 264-282. doi:10.1111/joop.12008
- Gubman, E. (2004). From engagement to passion for work: The search for the missing person. *Human Resource Planning*, 27 (3). 42-46.
- Hancock, A. (2007). When multiplication doesn’t equal quick addition: Examining Intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5 (1), 63-79.
- Harter, J., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.
- Harris, A., & Gonzalez, C. (2012). Introduction. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. Flores Niemann, C. Gonzalez, & A. Harris (Eds.). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia (1-17)*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Harris Canul, K. (2003). Latina/o cultural values and the academy: Latinas navigating through the administrative role. . In J. Castellanos, & L. Jones (Eds.). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education (167-175)*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Herdman, A. O., & McMillan-Capehart, A. (2010). Establishing a diversity program is not enough: Exploring the determinants of diversity climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(1), 39-53. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9133-1

- Hicks-Clarke, D., & Iles, P. (2000). Climate for diversity and its effects on career and organisational attitudes and perceptions. *Personnel Review*, 29(3), 324-345.
- Ibarra, R. (2003). Latina/o faculty and the tenure process in cultural context. In J. Castellanos, & L. Jones (Eds.). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (207-219). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Jacobson, R. P., Jacobson, K. L., & Hood, J. N. (2015). Social norm perceptions predict citizenship behaviors. *Journal Of Managerial Psychology*, 30(8), 894-908. doi:10.1108/JMP-12-2013-0408
- Jones, S. R. & Abes, E. S. (2013). *Identity development of college students: Advancing frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kossek, E. E., & Zonia, S. C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(1), 61-81.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature*. Commissioned Report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Lazos, S. (2012). Are student-teaching evaluations holding back women and minorities? The perils of “doing” gender and race in the classroom. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs, Y. Flores Niemann, C. Gonzalez, & A. Harris (Eds.). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (164-185). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Leiter, M. P., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Work engagement: Introduction. In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.) *Work engagement* (1-9). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Leppel, K. (2001). The impact of major on college persistence among freshmen. *Higher Education*, 41 (3), 327-342.
- Leppel, K. (2002). Similarities and differences in the college persistence of men and women. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25 (4), 43-450.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). [\*Naturalistic inquiry\*](#). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Linehan, M., & Scullion, H. (2008). The development of female global managers: The role of mentoring and networking. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(1), 29-40. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9657-0
- Livingston, J. (2011). *Defining and measuring faculty engagement: Validation of the faculty engagement survey*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations [3467979].
- Logan, K., & Crump, B. (2007). The value of mentoring in the value of mentoring in facilitating the retention and upward mobility of women in ICT. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 15(1), 41-57.
- Maranto, C., & Griffin, A. (2011). The antecedents of a 'chilly climate' for women faculty in higher education. *Human Relations*, 64 (2). 139-159.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs*, 30 (3), 1771-1800.
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Liao, H., & Morris, M. A. (2011). Does diversity climate lead to customer satisfaction? It depends on the service climate and business unit demography. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 788-803. doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0550
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2008). Mean racial-ethnic differences in employee sales performance: The moderating role of diversity climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 349-374. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00116.x
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2009). A tale of two climates: Diversity climate from subordinates and managers perspectives and their role in store unit sales performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(4), 767-791. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01157.x
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., Morris, M. A., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2007). Racial differences in employee retention: Are diversity climate perceptions the key? *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), 35-62. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00064.x
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*, 1, 1-17.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Myers, B. (2016). Where are the minority faculty? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Retrieved April 17, 2016 from <http://chronicle.com/interactives/where-are-the-minority-professors>

- National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. (2014a). Fall enrollment of males and females and specific racial/ethnic groups in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by control and level of institution and percentage of U.S. resident enrollment in the same racial/ethnic group: Fall 2013. In *Digest of Education Statistics 2013*. Retrieved November 16, 2015, from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14\\_306.40.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_306.40.asp)
- National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. (2014b). Full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2009, fall 2011, and fall 2013. In *Digest of Education Statistics 2013*. Retrieved November 16, 2015 from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14\\_315.20.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_315.20.asp)
- National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. (2016). Doctor's degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student: Selected years, 1976-77 through 2014-15. In *Digest of Education Statistics 2016*. Retrieved March 6, 2017 from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16\\_324.20.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_324.20.asp)
- Núñez, A., & Murakami-Ramalho, E. (2012). The demographic dividend. *Academe*, 98(1), 32-37.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ortega-Liston, R., & Rodriguez Soto, I. (2014). Challenges, choices, and decisions of women in higher education: A discourse on the future of Hispanic, Black, and Asian members of the professoriate. *Journal Of Hispanic Higher Education*, 13(4), 285-302.
- Padilla, A.M. (1994). Ethnic Minority Scholars, Research, and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues. *Educational Researcher*, 23(4), 24-27.
- Padilla, R. (2003). Barriers to accessing the professoriate. In J. Castellanos, & L. Jones (Eds.). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education (179-204)*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). New York, NY: Open University Press, McGraw Hill Education.
- Pascarella, E .T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pasque, P.A., & Errington Nicholson, S. (Eds). (2011). *Empowering Women in Higher Education and Student Affairs: Theory, Research, Narratives, and Practice from Feminist Perspectives*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

- Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189–1208.
- Ponjuan, L. (2013). Recruiting and retaining Latino faculty members: The missing piece to Latino student success. *Education Digest*, 78(5), 64-68.
- Raina, K., & Khatri, P. (2015). Faculty engagement in higher education: Prospects and areas of research. *On the Horizon*, 23(4), 285-308.
- Ramirez, T. L., & Blay, Z. (2016). Why people are using the term Latinx. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/why-people-are-using-the-term-latinx\\_us\\_57753328e4b0cc0fa136a159](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/why-people-are-using-the-term-latinx_us_57753328e4b0cc0fa136a159)
- Rocco, T., Bernier, J., Bowman, L. (2014). Critical Race Theory and HRD: Moving race front and center. *Advances In Developing Human Resources*, 16(4), 457-470.
- Roy, L. (2013). Faculty diversity: We still have a lot to learn. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved April 17, 2016 <http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Diversity-Still-a-Lot/143095/>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A.B. Bakker & M.P. Leiter (Eds.) *Work engagement* (10-24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Schneider, B. H., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 361-388.
- Smith, D. G., & Moreno, J. F. (2006). Hiring the next generation of professors: Will myths remain excuses? *The Chronicle Of Higher Education*, 53(6), 64.
- Stuart, R. (2015). Mentorship crucial to recruitment of Hispanics in higher ed. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*.
- Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 195-247.
- Taylor, O., Apprey, C. B., Hill, G., McGrann, L., & Jianping, W. (2010). Diversifying the faculty. *Peer Review*, 12(3), 15-18.
- Tenure. (n.d.). In American Association of University Professors Tenure Issue. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure>.
- Thelin, J. (2004). *A History of American Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Torraco, R. (2016). Early history of the fields of practice of training and development and organization development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 18(4), 439-453.
- Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1 (3), 139-168.
- US Census Bureau. (2010). *U.S. Census 2010: Hispanic/Latino Population*. Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0779064.html>
- Verdugo, R. (2003). Discrimination and merit in higher education. In J. Castellanos, & L. Jones (Eds.). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education (179-204)*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Villalpando, O. (2004). Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students. *New Directions For Student Services*, (105), 41-50.
- Walby, S., Armstrong, J., & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality: Multiple inequalities in social theory. *Sociology*, 1-17. doi: 10.1177/003803851146164
- Warner, L. R. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. *Sex Roles*, 59(5), 454-463.
- Williams, J. P. (2014). *College of tomorrow: The changing demographics of the student body*. Retrieved April 21, 2016 from <http://www.usnews.com/news/college-of-tomorrow/articles/2014/09/22/college-of-tomorrow-the-changing-demographics-of-the-student-body>
- Wilson, D. W., & Washington, G. (2007). Retooling phenomenology: Relevant methods for conducting research with African American women. *Journal of Theory Construction & Testing*, 11(2), 63.
- Zambrana, R., Ray, R., Espino, M., Castro, C., Cohen B., & Eliason, J. (2015). Don't leave us behind: The importance of mentoring for underrepresented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52 (1), 40-72.



## **Appendix A: Sample Invitation to Participants**

Dear Dr. X,

Greetings, my name is Julie Henriquez, and I am a Doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I am pursuing a PhD in Human Resource and Leadership Development. My research focus is on organizational development and diversity. Your experience as a tenured Latina faculty member at a Research 1 Doctoral institution is very important and relevant to my dissertation topic, which focuses on the experiences of Latina faculty members and the tenure process.

The purpose of my study is to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on tenure and promotion of Latina faculty members at Research 1 (R1) Doctoral institutions. I am conducting a qualitative study where I hope to interview several tenured Latina faculty member. I would welcome the opportunity to interview you for my study. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you are willing to participate in the study, we will set up a time that is convenient for you to conduct a Skype interview. As a participant, your responses will only be reported under a pseudonym of your choosing to maintain your anonymity. Your institution will not be mentioned by name. I have attached a consent form and approval for the study from the LSU Institutional Review Board to this correspondence for your reference.

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you and learn about your experience with the tenure process. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or need for additional information as you consider participating in this study. I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

Julie Henriquez

## **Appendix B: Invitation to Participants (Recommended by other Participants)**

Dear Dr. Y,

Greetings, my name is Julie Henriquez, and I am a Doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I am pursuing a PhD in Human Resource and Leadership Development. My research focus is on organizational development and diversity. Your colleague, Dr. X, recommended you as a possible participant in my study given your experience as a tenured Latina faculty member at a Research 1 Doctoral institution.

The purpose of my study is to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on tenure and promotion of Latina faculty members at Research 1 (R1) Doctoral institutions. I am conducting a qualitative study where I hope to interview several tenured Latina faculty member. I would welcome the opportunity to interview you for my study. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you are willing to participate in the study, we will set up a time that is convenient for you to conduct a Skype interview. As a participant, your responses will only be reported under a pseudonym of your choosing to maintain your anonymity. Your institution will not be mentioned by name. I have attached a consent form and approval for the study from the LSU Institutional Review Board to this correspondence for your reference.

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you and learn about your experience with the tenure process. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or need for additional information as you consider participating in this study. I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

Julie Henriquez

## **Appendix C: Sample Consent Form**

### **Study Consent Form**

1. Study Title: La Garza en Bicicleta: Perceptions of Latina faculty on the role of organizational citizenship behaviors and institutional engagement on tenure and promotion at Research 1 Doctoral Institutions
2. Performance Site: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College
3. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study:  
  
Julie Henriquez, Doctoral Candidate, (225) 620-6181, jhenri1@lsu.edu  
Dr. Petra Robinson, Assistant Professor, (225) 578-5753, petrar@lsu.edu
4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to explore and understand the perspectives of Latina faculty members on the role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) and Institutional Engagement on tenure and promotion of Latina faculty members at Research 1 (R1) Doctoral institutions.
5. Participant Inclusion: Adult individuals (18 years of age and above), who identify as Latina and currently work at a research-intensive institution as a tenured Faculty member, and who do not report psychological or neurological conditions.
6. Number of participants: 10-15
7. Study Procedures: The study will be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, participants will meet with the investigator to complete a 60 minute interview. In the second phase, the participants' CV will be compared to institutional tenure process to identify tenure and non-tenure related engagement at their institution.
8. Benefits: The study may yield valuable information about Latina engagement and career progression in Higher Education.
9. Risks: The only study risk is the inadvertent release of sensitive information found in the interview transcriptions. However, every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your interview responses. Files will be kept in a secure location to which only the investigator has access.
10. Right to Refuse: Participants may choose not to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might be entitled.
11. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Participant identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

12. Signatures:       The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about participants' rights or other concerns, I can contact Dennis Landin, Institutional Review Board,(225) 578-8692, [irb@lsu.edu](mailto:irb@lsu.edu), [www.lsu.edu/irb](http://www.lsu.edu/irb). I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Participant Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

Date:\_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix D: Interview Protocol**



<b>Interview Protocol</b>	
<b>Research question</b>	<b>Corresponding Interview Question</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Greetings, thank you for taking time to meet with me and share some of your experiences as a Latina faculty member. I have a few questions to ask you regarding your experiences as a Latina navigating through the tenure process. Do I have your permission to take notes and record our interview for future analysis?</p> <p>Do you have any questions about the study, or the interview before we begin?</p>
<b>Demographic questions (asked in a pre-interview survey in the interest of time during interview)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where were you born?</li> <li>• What is your family's country of origin?</li> <li>• What is your age range?</li> <li>• Marital status</li> <li>• Do you have children?</li> <li>• What is the highest level of education obtained by your mother?</li> <li>• What is the highest level of education obtained by your father?</li> <li>• What is the highest level of education obtained by your spouse/partner?</li> <li>• What is your current faculty rank?</li> <li>• When did you receive tenure?</li> <li>• Did you complete any post-doctoral research programs prior to seeking a faculty position?</li> </ul>
<b>Introductory questions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please tell me about yourself.</li> <li>• Please describe your educational journey.</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Career history</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When did you know/decide that you wanted to be a faculty member/pursue a career in academia?</li> <li>• How did you prepare for the faculty position job search?</li> <li>• Who mentored you through the process? Who supported you?</li> <li>• Did your family support your career interests?</li> <li>• How did you decide where you wanted to work?</li> <li>• What factors did you consider when selecting the institutions where you applied for employment?</li> <li>• What factors did you consider when accepting this job offer?</li> </ul>

<p><b>Research question 1:</b></p> <p>How do Latina faculty members perceive their experiences in relation to completion of the tenure process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your institution's tenure process?</li> <li>• What sorts of activities are rewarded through the tenure process?</li> <li>• Please share with me your experience as you navigated the tenure process:</li> </ul> <p>What were some of the challenges that you faced?</p>
<p><b>Research question 2</b></p> <p>How do Latina faculty members describe their engagement in their institution during the tenure process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How involved were you at your institution during the tenure process?</li> <li>• What activities were you engaged in, in terms of research, instruction and service?</li> <li>• What was your typical instruction workload?</li> <li>• How many research projects were you leading/participating in during tenure? How many publications did you work on?</li> <li>• How many university/departmental committees did you serve on during the tenure process?</li> <li>• Do you feel that there are unwritten requirements at your institution for faculty as they seek tenure?</li> <li>• Did you ever feel that you had to do more than your peers as you completed the tenure process?</li> <li>• What role does your cultural identity play in your experience with the tenure process?</li> <li>• How are your experiences as a Latina different than other minorities, especially women of color seeking tenure?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Research question 3</b></p> <p>How do Latina faculty members describe the role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) as a form of institutional engagement in successfully completing the tenure process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizational Citizenship Behavior is individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system (Organ et al., 2006). Examples of OCBs include volunteering for committee assignments, taking on additional course loads, and advising student groups. What is the role of OCBs in the tenure process, in your experience/opinion?</li> <li>• Did you engage in OCBs during your tenure journey? Please give me examples.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What drove/motivated you to participate in the activities that you did?</li> </ul> <p>OCBs require that faculty expend additional energy and time toward these activities. How did your engagement in OCBs affect your productivity/ workload?</p>
<b>Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you feel energized and motivated, or burdened by your additional involvement?</li> <li>• Do you feel that the work you do is fulfilling/purposeful? Are you proud of your work?</li> <li>• Are you inspired by your job? What about your job inspires you?</li> <li>• How attached are you to the work you do?</li> <li>• How do you persevere/keep yourself going in the face of adversity?</li> </ul>
<b>Diversity Climate and Underrepresentation of Latina faculty</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please tell me about the diversity climate at your institution.</li> <li>• How does your institution support underrepresented faculty members in general? Throughout the tenure process?</li> <li>• What is your experience with cultural taxation (having to take on the minority advocate ally/advocate) in addition to your job responsibilities?</li> <li>• How can the number of underrepresented faculty, especially Latina faculty increase?</li> <li>• What advice would you give a Junior faculty Latina as they start their professional journey to achieve tenure?</li> </ul>

## **Interview Protocol**

### ***Childhood and Educational background***

- Please tell me about yourself
- Please describe your educational journey

What motivated you to attend college?

Did you follow the traditional education path (directly to college from HS)?

### ***Career in Academia***

- When did you know/decide that you wanted to be a faculty member/pursue a career in academia?
- How did you prepare for the faculty position job search/make yourself marketable?
- Who mentored you through the process? Who supported you?
- Did your family support your career interests?
- What factors did you consider when selecting the institutions where you applied for employment?
- What factors did you consider when accepting this job offer?

### ***Institutional Tenure Process and Experience***

- What is your institution's tenure process? What sorts of activities are rewarded through the tenure process? R/T/S load?
- Please share with me your experience as you navigated the tenure process:

How involved were you at your institution during the tenure process?

What activities were you involved in, in terms of research, instruction and service?

- What was your typical instruction workload?

- How many research projects were you leading/participating in during tenure? How many publications did you work on?
- How many university/departmental committees did you serve on during the tenure process? Dissertation committees?
- What were some of the challenges that you faced?
- Do you feel that there are unwritten requirements at your institution for faculty as they seek tenure?
- Did you ever feel that you had to do more than your peers as you completed the tenure process?
- What role does your cultural identity play in your experience with the tenure process?
- How are your experiences as a Latina different than other minorities, especially women of colour seeking tenure?

### ***OCBs***

- Organizational Citizenship Behavior is individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system (Organ et al., 2006). Examples of OCBs include volunteering for committee assignments, taking on additional course loads, and advising student groups. What is the role of OCBs in the tenure process, in your experience/opinion?
- OCBs require that faculty expend additional energy and time toward these activities. How did your engagement in OCBs affect your productivity/ workload?
- What is your experience with cultural taxation? (having to take on the minority advocate/ally role) in addition to your job responsibilities?
- Do you see your additional activities as organizational citizenship behaviors or do you see it as taxation?

### ***Engagement***

- Do you feel energized and motivated, or burdened by your additional involvement?
- Do you feel that the work you do is fulfilling/purposeful? Are you proud of your work?
- Are you inspired by your job? What about your job inspires you?

- How attached are you to the work you do?
- How do you persevere/keep yourself going in the face of adversity?

*Diversity Climate and Underrepresentation of Latina faculty*

- Please tell me about the diversity climate at your institution.
- How does your institution support underrepresented faculty members in general?  
Throughout the tenure process?
- How can the number of underrepresented faculty, especially Latina faculty increase?
- What advice would you give a Junior faculty Latina as they start their professional journey to achieve tenure?

## **Appendix E: Biographical Survey Questions**

## **Biographical Survey Questions**

Thank you for participating in my dissertation study. Please answer the following questions prior to our interview. This information will be used to develop your participant profile. I look forward to speaking with you soon!

### **Biographical Information**

**Q1** Where were you born?

**Q2** What is (are) your family's country(ies) of origin?

**Q3** What is your age range?

- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59

**Q4** What is your marital status?

- ☐ Single, not in a relationship
- ☐ Single, in a relationship
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed

**Q5** Do you have children or dependents living with you?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**Q6** Are you a first-generation college student?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No



## **Biographical Survey Questions Continued**

### **Career and Institutional Information**

**Q7** Did you complete any post-doctoral research programs prior to seeking a faculty position? If so, where and for how long?

**Q8** What is your current faculty rank?

**Q9** When did you receive tenure or when do you anticipate receiving tenure?

**Q10** How many tenured/Tenure Track faculty members are there in your academic unit/department?

**Q11** Thinking of your academic unit/department, what is the tenured/Tenure Track faculty member gender breakdown?

**Q12** Thinking of your academic unit/department, what is the tenured/Tenure Track faculty member racial breakdown?

**Q13** How many non-tenured/Tenure Track faculty members are there in your academic unit/department?

**Q14** Thinking of your academic unit/department, what is the non-tenured/Tenure Track faculty member gender breakdown?

**Q15** Thinking of your academic unit/department, what is the non-tenured/Tenure Track faculty member racial breakdown?

**Q16** Do you have a written document with your departmental/institutional tenure requirements/process outlined? If so, would you mind sharing the document with me?

- ☐ Yes, and I am willing to share the document
- ☐ Yes, and I do not wish to share the document
- ☐ No, I do not have the requested document

**Q17** Please describe the diversity climate at your institution. Does your institution practice what they publish in their diversity statement (if there is one)?

**Q18** How does your institution support underrepresented faculty members in general? Throughout the tenure process?

Lastly, please provide a pseudonym by which you would like to be referred to in your participant profile and interview transcription:

## **Appendix F: Institutional Review Board Approval for Study**

ACTION ON EXEMPTION APPROVAL REQUEST



TO: Julie Henriquez  
Human Resource Education

FROM: Dennis Landin  
Chair, Institutional Review Board

DATE: May 5, 2016

RE: IRB# E9931

TITLE: La Garza en Bicieta: Perceptions of Latina Faculty on the Role of Organizational  
Citizenship Behaviors and Institutional Engagement on Tenure and Promotion at Research 1  
Doctoral Institutions

Institutional Review Board  
Dr. Dennis Landin, Chair  
130 David Boyd Hall  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
P: 225.578.8892  
F: 225.578.5983  
[irb@lsu.edu](mailto:irb@lsu.edu) | [lsu.edu/irb](http://lsu.edu/irb)

New Protocol/Modification/Continuation: New Protocol

Review Date: 5/5/2016

Approved X Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

Approval Date: 5/5/2016 Approval Expiration Date: 5/4/2019

Exemption Category/Paragraph: 2a,b

Signed Consent Waived?: Yes

Re-review frequency: (three years unless otherwise stated)

LSU Proposal Number (if applicable):

Protocol Matches Scope of Work in Grant proposal: (if applicable)

By: Dennis Landin, Chairman 

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING –

Continuing approval is **CONDITIONAL** on:

1. Adherence to the approved protocol, familiarity with, and adherence to the ethical standards of the Belmont Report, and LSU's Assurance of Compliance with DHHS regulations for the protection of human subjects\*
2. Prior approval of a change in protocol, including revision of the consent documents or an increase in the number of subjects over that approved.
3. Obtaining renewed approval (or submittal of a termination report), prior to the approval expiration date, upon request by the IRB office (irrespective of when the project actually begins); notification of project termination.
4. Retention of documentation of informed consent and study records for at least 3 years after the study ends.
5. Continuing attention to the physical and psychological well-being and informed consent of the individual participants, including notification of new information that might affect consent.
6. A prompt report to the IRB of any adverse event affecting a participant potentially arising from the study.
7. Notification of the IRB of a serious compliance failure.
8. **SPECIAL NOTE:** When emailing more than one recipient, make sure you use bcc. Approvals will automatically be closed by the IRB on the expiration date unless the PI requests a continuation.

*\*All investigators and support staff have access to copies of the Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance with DHHS, DHHS (45 CFR 46) and FDA regulations governing use of human subjects, and other relevant documents in print in this office or on our World Wide Web site at <http://www.lsu.edu/irb>*

## **Vita**

Julie Johanna Henriquez is a native of La Romana, Dominican Republic. Julie received her Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees from Louisiana State University in 2003 and 2005 respectively. Thereafter, Julie worked for seven years as a Student Affairs professional before returning to pursue a Ph.D. in Human Resource Education, with a concentration in Human Resource and Leadership Development. Julie is a candidate to receive a Doctor of Philosophy degree, and anticipates graduation in May 2017. Upon receiving her degree, Julie will pursue a career in academia and hopes to expand her dissertation research in the future.