ED 420 251   HE 031 303

AUTHOR   Hamrick, Florence A.
TITLE   "I Have Work To Do": Affirmation and Marginalization of
                Women Full Professors.
PUB DATE   1998-04-00
NOTE   33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April
                13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *College Faculty; *Educational Attitudes; Educational
                Change; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Promotion;
                Females; Higher Education; Mentors; *School Attitudes; Sex
                Differences; *Sex Role; Stress Management; Teacher Role;
                Tenure; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS   *Iowa State University

ABSTRACT
        This study examined the work roles and events that signified
affirmation or marginalization among female full professors at a research
university. Semistructured interviews conducted with 26 female full
professors at Iowa State University covered questions in four primary areas:
promotion and tenure experiences, institutional citizenship and belonging,
intersections between professional and personal lives, and stress. Three
primary work roles were identified from the interviews: disciplinary expert,
mentor or model, and change agent. It was found that while all respondents
clearly adopted the disciplinary expert role, patterns surrounding the other
two roles were often more complex and subtle. Affirmation was generally
experienced by respondents through student, collegial, and institutional
recognitions of expertise and effectiveness. Marginalizing experiences
included serving token roles on committees or other bodies and being a "lone
voice" on issues of gender equity. (Contains 16 references.) (MDM)

"I Have Work to Do"

Affirmation and Marginalization of Women Full Professors

Florence A. Hamrick
Assistant Professor, Higher Education
Iowa State University
N232 Lagomarcino
Ames, IA 50011
(515) 294-9628
fhamrick@iastate.edu

2

"I Have Work to Do"

Affirmation and Marginalization of Women Full Professors

Florence A. Hamrick, Iowa State University

Abstract

This qualitative study of 26 women full professors at a Research I university explored respondents' work roles and occasions and events that signified affirmation or marginalization to respondents. Three primary work roles emerged from the interviews with respondents: disciplinary expert, mentor or model, and change agent. While all respondents clearly adopted the disciplinary expert role, patterns surrounding the other two roles were often more complex and subtle. Affirmation was generally experienced by respondents through student, collegial, and institutional recognitions of their expertise and effectiveness. Marginalizing experiences included serving token roles on committees or other bodies and being a "lone voice" on issues of equity.

Introduction

This paper describes the work roles of women full professors at a Research I
university and reports on their experiences of affirmation and marginalization as
they perform their work. Data were collected in 1996-97 at Iowa State University as
part of a larger study of characteristics and experiences of faculty. Women senior
level faculty were invited to participate in an interview study of their experiences
and perceptions of faculty life. This study of women who have achieved full
professor rank is intended to provide information for women currently in the
academic pipeline and to provide suggestions for institutional and unit-level
administrators committed to achieving a climate of equity and diversity.

Theoretical Framework

In terms of numbers as well as institutional climate and support, literature on
women faculty reveals lingering uncertainties about women's full membership.
Demographic studies document some improvement yet consistent clustering of
women in less prestigious disciplines (Moore & Sagaria, 1991) and in lower ranks as
instructors and assistant professors at research universities (e.g., Simeone, 1987;
Finkelstein, Schuster, & Seals, 1996). In 1983, while 26% of full-time faculty and 10%
of full professors in 4-year institutions were women, 6% of full professors in
universities were women (Simeone, 1987). The proportion of women full professors
at four-year institutions grew from 10% in 1983 to 16% in 1992 ("The Nation," 1996),
and to 18% in 1995 (Schneider, 1998). However, proportions of women full
professors at research universities are much lower than at smaller and less

3

prestigious institutions (Moore & Sagaria, 1991). At the time of data collection for this study, women faculty at Iowa State University accounted for 28.7% of all full-time faculty and 10% of full professors (Office of Institutional Research, 1997).

Due to the historic and continuing underrepresentation of women in senior faculty ranks, this research was theoretically framed using women's standpoint epistemology (Harding, 1986, 1991) both in order to avoid overreliance on men's experiences (Harding, 1993) and to explore the relatively silent or potentially silenced lives (McLaughlin & Tierney, 1993) of women full professors. This framework implied that women's stories of their own experiences and the meanings associated with those experiences would be collected and presented.

Other studies have documented chilly climates for women professors in terms of collegial relations and barriers to promotion (e.g., Hall & Sandler, 1983; Sandler, 1986) and explored how traditional academic norms and cultures have not been inclusive of women (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Grumet, 1988). While some studies explain the lack of senior representation by women as problems of pipeline supply, differences in career aspirations, or individual attrition, Park (1996) described instead a systematic devaluation of women who do "women's work" (e.g., teaching and service) in the promotion and tenure process and how earned rank and ascribed status are often not concomitantly accorded women faculty. The present study of women who have successfully achieved full professor rank can provide information and guidance to aspiring faculty as well as to persons concerned with current university climates for women.

Design and Methods

According to Spring 1996 institutional data, 10% of all full professors at Iowa State University were women (Office of Institutional Research, 1997). This proportion was equivalent to 70 individual faculty members. Informal gatherings of all women full professors had begun in Fall 1995, and one Spring 1996 gathering included an announcement that an interview study of women full professor was planned for Fall 1996. Early in the fall semester, all 70 faculty members were invited in writing and by phone to participate in the study, and 26 consented to be interviewed.

Interviews were semi-structured and involved questions in four primary areas: promotion and tenure experiences, institutional citizenship and belonging, intersections between professional and personal lives, and stress. Through prompts and silence, opportunities for interviewee-guided talk were provided to encourage respondents to name and describe their own experiences, thoughts, and conclusions (Reinharz, 1992). The interviews ranged from 50 minutes in length to approximately four hours. All interviews were transcribed to facilitate systematic analysis. The constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was used to identify common themes and concepts (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) across the interviews.

To ensure trustworthiness of data and interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1986), probe questions and summarizing of responses were utilized during interviews, and all respondents received copies of their transcripts with a request to check for accuracy. Additionally, two meetings were held in which preliminary findings were presented and respondents provided feedback and reactions. For respondents

interested yet unable to attend a one of the meetings, written drafts of findings were mailed to them. Two-thirds of the respondent group (18) participated in post-interview member-checking.

Analysis for this paper focused primarily on the respondents' descriptions of their work settings and how their work has evolved during their academic careers. Additionally, I consulted respondents' responses to questions about events or occasions that signaled affirmation or marginalization of them and their work.

Respondent Group

The formal name of Iowa State University is Iowa State University of Science and Technology, reflecting its land grant heritage and emphasis on sciences and applied sciences such as agriculture and engineering. Larger proportions of faculty across campus are affiliated with science-related disciplines and fields, and the 70 potential respondents and the 26 actual respondents were distributed proportionately in the following broad disciplinary categories[1]:

	Potential (70)	Actual (26)
Arts and Humanities	28%	19%
Sciences	10%	13%
Social Sciences	11%	15%
Applied Sciences	33%	38%
Professions	18%	15%

[1] Confidentiality guaranteed to respondents included not revealing college, department or program affiliation of respondents. Therefore, the use of broadly aggregated affiliations is necessary.

6

The respondent group was reasonably representative by disciplinary category of the group of women full professors on campus, with the notable exception of faculty in the arts and humanities. These professors were considerably underrepresented in the respondent group, and science-related faculty members were somewhat overrepresented. One practical limitation is that the response patterns may be more representative of the dominant disciplines on campus.

Although there are institutional data available on dates of ISU tenure and promotions, these data do not provide much reliable demographic information since many in the population were tenured and/or promoted elsewhere. Some indication of career length can be ascertained, however, by examining dates of receipt of Ph.D. or other terminal degree. According to an analysis of institutional data (Office of Institutional Research, 1997), women full professors at Iowa State University received their terminal degrees between 1950 and 1988. The mean completion date was 1975, the most frequently occurring date (mode) was 1981, and the middle date of the range (median) was 1976. Among respondents, the range was 1950-1986 with a mean of 1974, a mode of 1975, and a median of 1975. Although a similar range was evident in the respondent group, more respondents were clustered in earlier dates than in the population.

A caution associated with this research is that the following themes and discussion cannot fully characterize all women full professors' experiences or perceptions--much less the experiences of everyone in the respondent group. Not surprisingly, respondents did not speak with one voice or share all of the same

7

perspectives. In the following analysis and discussion, I attempt to chart Frye's (1990) "prevailing winds" while also reporting a variety of perspectives to include dissenting voices.

Results

Work Roles

Three roles, designating different types of work, were cited by respondents: disciplinary experts, mentors or models, and change agents. As experts, their role is to advance knowledge in their respective fields; as mentors and models, they support new colleagues and prospective colleagues--often but not exclusively women colleagues; and as change agents, they work to improve campus conditions and opportunities for women and traditionally underrepresented others. These roles are discussed in more depth in the following sections.

Disciplinary expert: "That's my identity--has always been--to be a professor and a scholar," stated one Social Science respondent. An Applied Sciences respondent noted: "Certainly being promoted to full professor and getting my first opportunity to function at a fairly high level in our national [professional] organization, I began to feel like, you know, this is where I belong, and people are recognizing my abilities." The role as disciplinary expert was overwhelmingly the central work role and identity discussed by respondent. In fact, as the two passages above indicate, the identity of disciplinary expert is an identity that faculty members had internalized much earlier. Certain mileposts such as promotions, appointments, and recognitions perhaps had affirmed this expertise, but the milepost events were not perceived as conferring expertise.

9

Although some respondents recalled being somewhat tentative about their expertise, particularly earlier in their careers, more often the respondents' remarks about identity as a scholar and disciplinary expert echoed this passage from a Sciences respondent: "I've been very comfortable, maybe arrogant, as some people might put it, but comfortable with what I think I could contribute and what I could do and what I was doing." Respondents consistently expressed confidence and comfort with their justifiable status as disciplinary experts and authorities.

Mentor or model: Most respondents spoke, sometimes at great length, about people who had encouraged, supported, and challenged them in their careers, although the word mentor was not often used. As one Science respondent and longtime faculty member recalled:

> I had graduated [with a B.S.] at the end of winter quarter, and I was working for one of the faculty members in the department, and I continued to work for him after I graduated. Our agreement was, you know, that I would work through that summer with him, or at least helping him out with laboratory and field work. I was walking down the hall one day, and the department chair looked at me and said, "You weren't in class today." I said, "I'm not registered for any classes." He said, "Well, you're supposed to be in my graduate course." I said, "I'm not in graduate school." He said, "Well, go over and get into graduate school." So I went over and enrolled in graduate school and showed up at class the next day. . . . I had thought, well, you know, I'll just work for the spring quarter, sort of get my life together, and then decide what

9

I wanted to do. I was thinking in terms of whatever change I would make, it would probably be in the fall, so it just got pushed forward a bit.

In most cases, respondents did not describe the kind of intrusive or formal consulting and advice-giving activities that have become associated with the term "mentoring" recently. Rather, they spoke of significant people who they respected and who had modeled key professional behaviors, opened doors, offered opportunities, or otherwise responded favorably to respondents' inquiries and ambitions. Indeed, one Social Sciences respondent described "creating" her role model:

> I've always been this incredibly ambitious person, so my goal was always to be a nationally recognized scholar. That's what I shot for when I looked at models in terms of individuals. I was more abstract. I saw individuals, and there were pieces about those individuals that I liked, and I thought that's what I want to be part of. So there's not one individual in particular, but there are pieces of many individuals that I have admired over the years that I pulled together and created my own kind of model of what I was aspiring to.

Respondents in turn spoke of serving as mentors and models for students and new colleagues. Although mentoring students--and especially graduate students--is something they have regularly done in their careers, respondents

reported that an increased focus on mentoring has accompanied their full professor rank. Sometimes, this has been an explicit expectation of them, as was the case for one Professional College respondent who came to ISU at full professor rank: "One of the things that the [former] dean said to me: 'We're hiring you as a full professor. I'd like you to mentor all the other women in the college.' And he was serious."

More often, the increased mentoring of graduate students was internally motivated and constituted a heightened interest in "giving back" through nurturing future scholars and professionals. For a Sciences respondent, this "giving back" was primarily directed toward the discipline:

> [Being a full professor] actually means a responsibility to me more
> than anything else. I have a lot of students come through, probably
> 50% of my students are female. I feel I have the same responsibility to
> females as the males, but it really is a responsibility to people. . . . It's
> interesting because you don't start out in science thinking that you're
> going to be a people manager or a people developer, but that's really
> what you are.

An Applied Sciences respondent primarily directed her "giving back" to the institution and local individuals:

> I feel a responsibility to be a role model for women in the department
> who are coming up and for other women who are in the department
> who are in other positions. I am the only [woman] in this department
> who is a tenured faculty member, which means that my position may

11

be a little different from departments where there are other women who are in similar kinds of positions.

Respondents were particularly proud of their students' accomplishments and their supportive role on behalf of the students, including one Arts and Humanities respondent who asserted: "There are clearly [graduate] students . . . who may not have fared as well or been as productive if they had not worked with me, so I feel good about that."

With senior status in their respective fields and departments, respondents saw themselves as more involved and committed to encouraging new talent. In a few cases, however, faculty who voiced this commitment were disappointed that they did not have more opportunities to work with graduate students. They had associated this opportunity with full professor rank, only to receive increased service commitments or, in some cases, an increased teaching load, instead of more graduate student teaching or contact.

A Professional College respondent characterized this "down side" of full professor status: "When you get in these higher ranks, especially if you're a woman, they want you to be on this, that, and the other thing, so there's a lot of this menial stuff. . . . I mean, it's like you're this little rat on these little treadmills." Perhaps one of the major disappointments voiced by respondents was not being able to work more with graduate students once full professor rank had been achieved.

<u>Advisor and Change agent</u>: A Social Science respondent echoed many respondents with her remark, "The department chair periodically will ask me

13

questions of how I think about some procedure or something along that line." Although these gestures were often small in scope, having colleagues and administrators informally solicit their input and ask for their counsel was an occasion that signified being brought into a larger informational and influence "loop" out of respect for one's abilities, expertise, and judgment. Invitations for these informal consultations did not often happen at higher institutional levels, however. One Applied Sciences respondent recalled:

> My impression is that the engineering college or at least faculty in
> engineering get a lot of respect. And I know that individual faculty
> members have been called over to the president's office, or to the
> provost's office to consult about something, and I thought, "Wow, you
> know, people actually do that?" You know, I was amazed and thought,
> "I don't know anybody who ever gets called over to the provost's
> office." And so that was, I guess, an example of when I thought, "Oh,
> maybe [this department] really doesn't count very much."

According to this respondent, such informal consulting may have more to do with the extent to which one's expertise is viewed as relevant to institutional-level decision making. As on many campuses, larger numbers of women faculty at Iowa State University tend to be clustered in the less prestigious and less well-funded disciplines and units.

Although respondents did not discuss many occasions in which their input was informally sought by individuals at high administrative levels, more formal

and institutionalized opportunities for providing input, such as invitations to serve on committees or ad hoc groups, are abundant. Respondents reported service on numerous college-wide and university-wide committees and representative bodies, and were particularly pleased when the charges of the committees coincided with their own expertise and commitments. For example, one Applied Sciences respondent attributed a key campus contribution to her committee involvement: "On a broader scope, when I did feel significant here, I think it began with getting out of the department and doing things I felt like really made a difference. With the athletic council, you know, female athletes have opportunities that wouldn't be there had we not fought so hard, so that was significant." A Professional College respondent described her service on "the committee that developed the requirement for multicultural education and the international diversification of the curriculum. When I was on the committee, I felt the [Faculty] Senate valued input, and I had an area of expertise [along with a departmental colleague] that was valued."

Commitments are often selectively made to capitalize on one's interests, expertise, and goals for change, as the same Professional College respondent indicated: "I think I try to do things that are associated with things I really care about, like this women professors group. . . . I'm hopeful that we can maybe collectively become a voice that can work for better opportunities for women on campus." Another Professional College respondent was invited to address a conference of young women in the state: "I was so impressed by these 400 girls from all over Iowa--9th through 12th graders. Nobody--no other place I had been was

doing anything like that, and they asked me to speak on my personal reflections, and I kind of teared up at one time."

As an expression of some respondents' concerns about campus climate for women and minorities, they have become more committed to a role of change agent. One Applied Sciences respondent asserted:

> There was a young woman in the other day complaining of having gone to a meeting and some things that the men in the meeting were laughing at that she thought they shouldn't have laughed at, and I think that every women in this whole organization--department, college, university--has a responsibility to make sure that women or minorities, people with different sexual preferences, or whatever, are treated with respect.

Other respondents have reflected on their own experiences with the promotion and tenure process and have lent this reflection to examining outcomes of these processes. An Arts and Humanities professor used the pipeline metaphor in a summary of her remarks before a group convened to study promotion and tenure: "You can't say that women are in the pipeline and, put them in and they'll turn out these full professors, because they don't. That's not what happens. They get stuck at associate, and they just sit there, and just putting them in pipelines is not enough, not unless you take some action to make sure that they get through."

For the majority of respondents, the three work roles are overlapping and the boundaries are often indistinct--particularly for the roles of disciplinary expert and mentor/model. Respondents described their participation in activities designed to

recognize and enable new colleagues in much the same way as some of their senior colleagues had acknowledged them. For most of the respondents, the role as consultant and change agent is not terribly distinct from the other two roles. Providing input and effecting change are most often directed through formal institutionalized channels that are in principle available to similarly-situated faculty members. Although some of the respondents have adopted a more vocal and public presence on campus to address and challenge issues of diversity and equity, the majority of respondents have not.

One blurring of the roles that seemed particularly troubling for two respondents was the situation in which their disciplinary expertise included expertise on issues of equity and diversity. According to one Professional College respondent, the line between researching and proposing action based on one's research is an especially tricky one to negotiate:

> Sometimes some women who research in areas of diversity are not granted tenure because that's not viewed as authentic research, so in that sense I have been rewarded [in the promotion and tenure process] for what I do. I've walked a fine line, I guess, between doing just enough research and writing that is institutionally validated and that which I find is more transformative and critical of the institution, so I think I've balanced it out fairly well.

Similar to the status of a prophet in one's own country, however, these respondents did not feel they were not particularly well-positioned to offer their

expertise. In one case, this was perceived as an emphasis on her race which precluded her being taken seriously for her expertise. The Professional College respondent continued:

> Those of us in this college who have [multicultural] expertise--I mean, that's what we teach and do and research--are not asked or not included. Those of us who are white who have expertise and long years of knowledge and long years of service in this area are rarely recognized as multicultural experts and, now, that negates a feeling of having contributed here.

Not being able to offer their expertise at "home" to committees or task forces, and having their expertise neutralized in the process, was a significant frustration for these respondents.

Experiences of Affirmation

As the respondents performed their work on campus, several experiences were noted as particularly affirming ones. These included recognition of their accomplishments as a faculty member--primarily in their roles of research and teaching. Such recognitions most often took the form of formal awards and designations within the university or their respective disciplines. However, informal acknowledgment by students and former students (particularly graduate students) appeared to be the more powerful affirmations. Collegial respect, also a key affirmation for respondents, was signified by selecting the person to represent the department or unit on key committees and representative bodies.

17

In terms of formal recognitions, many respondents had received teaching and research awards throughout their careers, and some respondents had been awarded an additional designation of "Distinguished" or "University" as part of their professorship in honor of their noteworthy contributions. Respondents expressed pride in the formal awards and recognitions they had received. According to one Applied Sciences respondent: "I think that receiving the university teaching award early on in my career was a real boost. I got that in '74, and I just started working in '71, and to get the university -- that was a --. I can still remember, for example, where my photo was taken, you know, so that says something." One Social Sciences professor remarked: "Being named a distinguished professor was part of what I was aspiring to, and that recognition by the university for all of your hard work that you've done felt very appreciated."

The majority of respondents also emphasized the affirmation and recognition they received from students and former students. One Professional College respondent stated:

> I think most of that [affirmation] I get from my students, you know. Like last week, I worked with this woman who I had been working with on and off for about three years, and she has what I think would be fair to say is an abusive coach. . . . What she said to me was, 'I could never have gotten through this without you. I couldn't have, you know?' A lot of times in an educational setting, I get that, but I don't get it quite do immediately. . . . I think most of the rewards that I get at

this stage of my career that I value are from the students with whom I work. They're not from the department or the college.

Collegial respect was also a strong affirmation for respondents. For one Applied Sciences respondent, this was associated with her colleagues' solicitation of her to represent them: "I did also serve three years on the Faculty Senate. . . . Some of the faculty in my department asked me if I would run, so they could elect me to represent them, and I did that." Working collectively with colleagues to advance shared objectives--and being effective in that work--was also a personally affirming experience for respondents, as in the case of this Arts and Humanities professor: "I was one of the founding members of the representative assembly in the college that we set up, and helped bring about certain kinds of requirements, certain kinds of goals. And I think that would have taken a lot longer without my having been involved at that point in time, so that made me feel I made a difference." And, an Applied Sciences professor adds:

> You know, when somebody from the president's office calls you and says, 'Would you be on this committee?' I suppose to me that was an indication that they know who I am, and out of all the faculty members here, you know they've picked a handful of people. . . . You could look at it negatively, but assuming they wanted to have a good committee, it meant that they thought I would be a good person.

In the course of their careers, however, respondents had also had experiences that signified marginalization to them. These experiences are presented and discussed in the following section.

Marginalizing Experiences

Overtly hostile acts like facing verbal aggression or threatening behaviors were reported by only a few respondents. Most of the negative episodes that respondents reported were more subtle, and had to do with serving as token women on committees, serving as a "designated hitter" to voice equity or fairness perspectives, and being asked to provide opinions and perspectives in situations where respondents felt that the decisions had already been made--rendering the request for input perfunctory.

An Applied sciences professor discussed her reactions to what she perceives as tokenism:

> Occasionally an invitation [to serve on a committee] will come, and it's
> just clear or I think it's clear to me that it wasn't really relevant to me,
> and sometimes I'll explore the issue with the person giving the
> invitation, 'Why are you asking me? I can't see my connection to the
> what you're trying to fill.' And then the answer might come, 'Well, we
> really needed a woman on that committee,' in which case I have
> sometimes volunteered my secretary to go. I say, 'Well, she will fill
> just as well as I will, it that's your criterion.' And when something like
> that happens, when I realize that they were looking at my

21

involvement for something that I was born with and not for something that I've achieved as a professional, then that becomes--I see that as a very disempowering type of a relationship to take place.

With so few women in the senior faculty ranks, many respondents spoke of being overcommitted to committees, governance, and service work because there were fewer full professors--or fewer women full professors--to "go around." One Applied Sciences respondent discussed evaluating her service commitments:

> A lot of things I've done out of my hide. So I think now I'm more apt to look at 'Is this truly valued, or is it just somebody they need to do this?' What says to me 'This is valued.' What are they willing to put forward for this, or is it just me doing another task that needs to be done, you know. And I think a lot of times the women are in that role.

In many ways, the negative aspects of tokenism are related to the work role of disciplinary expert. Treating respondents primarily as women and secondarily (if at all) as content experts minimized or ignored their expert role, which is at the core of their professional identities. This underutilization of their talent and expertise also meant that their input and influence in these service roles were curtailed due to their appointment without regard to demonstrated expertise. However, one Applied Sciences respondent, as she discussed serving on a key university committee, described an effective strategy that served to minimize feelings of tokenism or temptations to dismiss others' input:

It took me a long time there to get a voice. I was intimidated. There were definitely male professors, not the administrators, but male professors who were not at all interested in what I had to say and were really interested in gaining the floor and hearing themselves talk--a lot. And I thought [the chair] did a really good job. He began by having us go around, and every person had to talk. I had never been in a university meeting where that would happen, and many times what I found was at that level it would be women and students--if they were there--who were not talking, and there were male professors who were used to clearly having this voice and being in charge. . . . And what I learned from that was that there were many people who would have never said a word who had these valuable things to contribute, but then there were some people who really objected to that procedure, didn't like it at all.

Another type of negation was experienced when respondents were not invited to serve on committees or bodies that were clearly relevant to their expertise areas. One Arts and Humanities professor recalled:

The department was choosing to hire in [my specialty area] and didn't invite me even to be part of the search. . . . I thought, 'Wow, you know, what have I been doing all these years?' You know, I have an international reputation in this field. I'm taken seriously all over the world, and within my own department, I'm not even consulted.

22

This respondent then proceeded to explain that her department was quite large, preventing broad awareness of departmental colleagues' expertise, but this episode nonetheless signified to her that her expertise was overlooked at a time when her input and guidance within her department could be pivotal.

Other respondents spoke of episodes in which they were (or in many cases, continue to be) a lone voice, out on a proverbial limb with respect to issues of equity, fairness, or new approaches or experiments. One Applied Sciences professor discussed: "sitting on a committee and having this really great idea, offering it, and it's passed over, and nobody pays any attention. . . . I think it's a fairly normal feeling that you're sort of out in left field and no one agrees with you." An Arts and Humanities respondent added: "Every time I've ever been on a university-wide committee, my sense is that I've always, always been on the periphery, not at the center, as far as most of what I though was important to do is not what other people thought was important to do."

One Professional College respondent added a special case of the lone voice-- the role of "designated hitter" on issues of equity or fairness. She recalled being on a tour of campus recreation and athletic facilities with other members of the campus athletics board:

> They showed us the locker rooms, and the men's baseball team had
> this big sauna thing, and the women's didn't. And so the men on [the
> campus athletics board] are going, "You're not going to let that go by,
> are you? I mean, you're not going to stand for that, are you?" So I said,
> "Well, where is the [women's sauna]?"

23

No one else in the group spoke up to question the disparity, but instead waited for her to raise these points--a tacit role assignment she found infuriating yet not surprising.

As may have been the case in the above situation, other respondents spoke of the tacit support they believed to exist for their efforts or for issues, even though the support was not publicly verbalized. One Sciences respondent recalled her efforts to initiate an interdisciplinary program: "Let's put it this way. I think that in this department, as in many others, there's a big silent majority, and they support it but they don't really come out and say so, partly because the detractors are often very vocal."

Many respondents reported that they were tacitly assigned or assumed by others to address issues of equity, fairness, or new initiatives. On the one hand, this may constitute acknowledgment that as women they may be in a better position to perceive problematic issues and offer new perspectives. On the other hand, as the athletic facilities tour makes clear, such designation of this role to women faculty may also effectively remove responsibility from others on campus for perceiving, questioning, and addressing such issues.

An additional area which respondents characterized as marginalizing was administrators' soliciting faculty input despite faculty perception that the decision had already been made. An Arts and Humanities professor spoke of a senior level administrative staff member:

> He's on every major university committee as an ad hoc person, and
>
> he's really running them all. And what he does when you're on any of

those committees is he talks a great deal, and everybody goes to sleep,

and in the end we do what he had planned to do anyway. I mean, well,

what do you need faculty here for? . . . . I don't want to be part of that.

A Professional College respondent characterized decision-making in her College by
the following:

I feel like sometimes there's an agenda, and they [administrators] say,

'Oh, well, do this because it is faculty stuff.' And then you spin your

wheels, and it doesn't really matter [because decisions have already

been made]. . . . I just wish they'd tell me up front, because I have other

things I would be doing with my time that I care more about.

In addition to the various experiences of tokenism described above, some

respondents also echoed the hypervisibility of women and minority faculty that

comes with small numbers on campus. According to a Professional College

respondent:

So I think we're [women and minority faculty] kind of in a bind. It's

kind of like this double, catch-22. You're very visible. . . . Sometimes

[visibility's] good, but then it's a double-edged sword because it will

highlight the good things you're doing, but if you ever, you know,

aren't doing the good things or something is misconstrued, that also

gets amplified, so you can't really go hide in a corner somewhere.

25

In addition to these experiences of tokenism and negation of expertise, a few respondents also discussed some freeing aspects that came with marginalization, such as taking risks to surface their opinions and perspectives and helping convince the majority to act--if not immediately, then eventually. One Arts and Humanities professor described such an experience with respect to curriculum change.

> In the [Faculty] Senate I proposed that we put in a diversity requirement [to the undergraduate curriculum], and I was the only person who voted for it. . . . And even though I lost that particular time, two years later it did pass, and I didn't even have to be that involved two years later. I mean, I was involved in that I put up important motions on the floor, you know, that I think helped it pass. . . . So anyway, I think that it started the ball rolling, you know, and it made people maybe realize that things were not as good here.

One Professional College respondent provides an instance with respect to equity for varsity women athletes:

> We had this data that showed that we [ISU] were really biased against women in terms of the number of scholarships, the types of scholarships, the teaching limits of coaches, the perks that they had, and we just had a lot of stuff. And so I said to my little subcommittee, "Are we going to present it to the [athletics board], which has all the reporters?" So I said, "You know, maybe we should go see a university lawyer first just to apprise them of this." So he listened to us and

26

looked at our little tables. . . . [By negotiating through the university

lawyer], we got informal limits on out-of-state scholarships for women

in softball. We got more release time for women coaches. We got

more scholarships. I mean, we got quite a bit."

The centrality of the change agent role in the above episodes is apparent, although

the changes were hard-won, requiring adoption of more overt political tactics in

combination with going out on a limb in addressing unpopular and potentially

embarrassing issues.

Conclusions and Implications

In many ways, respondents' experiences of affirmation and marginalization

on campus can be linked with the three work roles discussed earlier. For example,

many of the affirmations focused on one's expert status as acknowledged by the

institution and colleagues, and the senior rank brought with it a heightened

emphasis on mentoring and modeling, which was acknowledged and affirmed in

tributes from students and former students. Although the disciplinary expert role

was clearly the central role identity among respondents, variations of the other roles

were also assumed by respondents, and these were also perceived as legitimate

faculty work responsibilities. Respondents described their own combinations and

patterns of work focus and roles, and understood this work role identification to be,

within reason, at their discretion. One Sciences respondent remarked:

I guess I'm assuming they [the university] will trust me to evaluate

what I think are significant things in my own professional areas and

28

that are significant things for me to do in terms of my research areas and the general areas that are involved. . . . I do a fair amount of I guess what would be called extension-type things, . . . so that's not the thing which possibly would look like it would be part of my professional time, but it is, and it's a very interesting contact, and I think it's a useful contact for Iowa State.

However, when some respondents attempted to work on behalf of the institution to try to improve climate and circumstances, in many cases their offers of expertise were rebuffed and their contributions ignored or overlooked. Although the idea of a change agent may connote an image of an outside agitator, this was clearly not the case among these respondents. Most of the respondents instead relied on traditional, existing channels for faculty input as they adopted primarily an insider stance to effect change, with the primary motivation to improve the institution of which they are a part.

Second, status appears to be affected by the respondents' particular choices or patterns of work emphasis. Respondents in this study have all reached the formal rank designating full faculty membership, yet many also report continuing instances in which their status among colleagues and within the institution is not concomitant with senior rank. Consistent with Park's (1996) work, although rank has been successfully achieved, women professors' prestige may be jeopardized at a research university when they deviate from a more or less exclusive emphasis on their role as disciplinary expert. A Sciences respondent spoke more or less directly

to this issue: "There really wasn't very much support for anything except go into the lab and do the research. Now, I was balancing those with other activities, and that was not--that's not the traditional way, and that was not very well accepted." A Professional College respondent also remarked:

> You know, I do the publications and presentations, but I can still go after things I care about. I mean, I can work with the [students], even though I can't get a publication out of them, you know, because I value that. And I can try to do things to better women's opportunities on campus, and these women's groups--[even though] that's not going to get me anywhere.

What may be largely unexamined are the institutional benefits that could be realized through a multi-faceted faculty role with combinations of roles and role emphases to complement increasingly complex institutional mission statements and goals.

Finally, although the affirmations are strong and rewarding for these respondents, the marginalizing responses echo much of the earlier work that identified elements of a chilly climate on campus for women (Hall & Sandler, 1983; Sandler, 1986). When faced with evidence of a chilly campus climate for women and other underrepresented persons, institutions can assume a responsibility for turning up a proverbial thermostat of affirmation and welcome. In these respondents' experiences, it has more often been the case that they have donned layers of proverbial sweaters to deal with an underlying chill as they pursue their work as experts, mentors, and change agents. Institutions -- as personified by

colleagues as well as administrators -- could go far towards creating an inclusive campus climate by validating women's status as disciplinary experts, discovering and accepting diverse others' experiences, and affirming the various types of work they perform on behalf of the institution.

References:

    Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). <u>Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove</u>. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

    Finkelstein, M. J., Schuster, J. H., & Seals, R. K. (1996). <u>The American faculty in transition: A first look at the new academic generation</u>. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

    Frye, M. (1990). The possibility of feminist theory. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), <u>Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference</u>. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

    Glaser, B., G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). <u>The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research</u>. Chicago: Aldine.

    Grumet, M. R. (1988). <u>Bitter milk: Women and teaching</u>. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

    Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). <u>Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead</u>. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women.

    Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). but is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In D. D. Williams (Ed.), <u>Naturalistic evaluation</u> (New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 30) (pp. 73-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

    McLaughlin, D., & Tierney, W. G. (1993). <u>Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change</u>. New York: Routledge.

    Moore, K. M., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (1991). The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic power. In G.P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.), <u>Women</u> (pp. 185-200). Kluwer.

    Office of Institutional Research. (1997). <u>Fact Book, 1996</u>. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Author.

    Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? <u>Journal of Higher Education, 67(1)</u>, 46-84.

    Reinharz, S. (1992). <u>Feminist methods in social research</u>. New York: Oxford University Press.

    Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). <u>Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandler, B. R. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Schneider, A. (1998, March 13). More professors are working part time, and more teach at 2-year colleges. Chronicle of Higher Education, A14-16.

Simeone, A. (1987). Academic woman: Working towards equality. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

32

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
"I have work to do." Affirmation and marginalization of women full professors.

Author(s): Florence A. Hamrick

Corporate Source: Iowa State University	Publication Date: AERA Presentation: 4/98

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

↑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: *Florence A. Hamrick*	Printed Name/Position/Title: Florence A. Hamrick Assistant Prof., Higher Education
Organization/Address: N232 Lagomarcino Iowa State University Ames, IA 50011	Telephone: 515-294-9628	FAX: 515-294-4942
	E-Mail Address: fhamrick@iastate.edu	Date: April 9, 1998

(over)

ERIC®

Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation

University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742-5701

Tel: (800) 464-3742
(301) 405-7449
FAX: (301) 405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
http://ericae.net

March 20, 1998

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA[1]. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a printed copy of your presentation.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality. You can track our processing of your paper at http://ericae.net.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can drop off the copies of your paper and Reproduction Release Form at the **ERIC booth (424)** or mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 1998/ERIC Acquisitions
University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742

This year ERIC/AE is making a **Searchable Conference Program** available on the AERA web page (http://aera.net). Check it out!

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

---

[1]If you are an AERA chair or discussant, please save this form for future use.

CUA

The Catholic University of America