

4-2003

"I Have Work to Do" Work Roles and Affirming or Marginalizing Experiences Among Women at Professor Rank

Florence A. Hamrick

Iowa State University, florence.hamrick@gse.rutgers.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Hamrick, Florence A., "I Have Work to Do" Work Roles and Affirming or Marginalizing Experiences Among Women at Professor Rank" (2003). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. 87.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/87>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Women in Educational Leadership by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

“I Have Work to Do”

Work Roles and Affirming or Marginalizing Experiences Among Women at Professor Rank

Florence A. Hamrick

Abstract

This qualitative study of women at professor rank at a Research Extensive university explored work roles as well as occasions and events that signified affirmation or marginalization to respondents as they performed their work. Three primary work roles emerged: disciplinary expert, mentor or model, and advisor or change agent. Although all respondents clearly identified themselves as disciplinary experts, the other two roles were often more complex. Respondents generally experienced affirmation 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 equity.

In terms of numbers as well as institutional climate and support, literature on female 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., Finkelstein, Schuster, & Seals, 1996; Simeone, 1987). In 1983, although 26% of full-time faculty and 10% of full professors in four-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 female full professors at research-oriented universities tend to be much lower than at smaller and less prestigious institutions (Moore & Sagaria, 1991). Although women accounted for 36.3% of all full time faculty members in 1998, almost half (49.9%) of public two-year college and 38.3% of public comprehensive university faculty members were women. These relatively large proportions are compared to public research institutions, where women comprised 29.5% of full time faculty members (Characteristics of Faculty Members, 2002).

Other studies have documented chilly climates for women in academe in terms of collegial relations and barriers to promotion (e.g., Hall & Sandler, 1983; Sandler, 1986) and explored how traditional academic norms and cultures are not inclusive of women (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Grumet, 1988). Recent site-level analyses of disproportionate laboratory resources and salaries have renewed attention on gender-related inequities and documented disparities not at entry levels but among senior faculty members at research-oriented institutions (e.g., Cox, 2001; Miller & Wilson, 1999). These analyses also focus attention on formulating appropriate institutional responses. Although the lack of female representation in senior faculty ranks is often attributed to external problems (such as pipeline supply) or individual choices (such as women’s differential career aspirations or career persistence), Park (1996) described culturally informed and systemic devaluation during promotion and tenure processes of women who disproportionately have been called on to perform the “women’s work” of a department (e.g.,

teaching and service). She also discussed how ascribed status that often accompanies earning senior rank for male faculty members is not concomitantly accorded female faculty members.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the work roles of women who hold professor rank at a research-oriented institution and explore the affirming and marginalizing experiences that have accompanied their carrying out this work. The findings of this study shed light, not only on articulating and enacting a combination of work roles, but also on recognizing and addressing environmental factors that can stymie the pursuit of this work. Due to the historic and continuing under-representation of women in senior faculty ranks and relative under-representation in the literature of women's experiences as senior faculty members, this research was theoretically framed using women's standpoint epistemology (Harding, 1986, 1991). This choice was made in order to avoid over-reliance on comparatively situated men's experiences (Harding, 1993) and to explore the relatively silent or potentially silenced lives (McLaughlin & Tierney, 1993) of female professors. Due to adoption of this theoretical framework, a primary goal of the study was to collect, present, and analyze women's stories of their own experiences and the meanings associated with those experiences. The present study of women who have successfully achieved professor rank can provide information and guidance to aspiring faculty members as well as to persons concerned with creating equitable institutional climates.

Methods

Data Collection and Analysis

At the time of data collection for this study, female faculty at the selected institutional site, a research extensive university that included a land grant heritage, accounted for 28.7% of all full-time faculty and 10% of full professors. This 10% of professors at full rank equated to 70 individual faculty members. Informal gatherings of all female professors had been initiated the prior year, and one gathering included an announcement that an interview-based study of female professors was planned for the following term. All 70 individuals were invited in writing and by phone to participate in the study, and 26 consented to be interviewed.

The interviews were semi-structured and involved questions in four primary areas: (a) promotion and tenure experiences, (b) institutional citizenship and belonging, (c) intersections between professional and personal lives, and (d) 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 4 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, 1985), 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, respondents were invited to attend one of two meetings to hear and respond to preliminary findings from the study. For respondents interested yet unable to attend one of the meetings, written drafts of findings were mailed to them. Two-thirds (18) of the respondent group participated in this post-interview member-checking.

The content analysis for this paper focused primarily on respondents' descriptions of their work roles and how their work has evolved since earning professor rank. Additionally, events or occasions that signaled affirmation or marginalization for the respondents were analyzed since these provide insight into the environments in which the respondents do their work and enact their work roles.

Site and Respondents

The selected institutional site is a Carnegie-classified Research Extensive, land grant university with emphases on sciences and applied sciences such as agriculture and engineering. Larger proportions of faculty members across campus are affiliated with science-related disciplines and fields; the 70 potential respondents and the 26 actual respondents were distributed across four broad disciplinary categories:

Table 1
Disciplinary Distributions Among Respondent Group and Population

	Population (N = 70)	Respondents (N = 26)
Arts and Humanities (AH)	26% (18)	19% (5)
Biological and Agricultural Sciences (BAS)	17% (12)	19% (5)
Physical and Mathematical Sciences & Engineering (PMSE)	(6%) (4)	4% (1)
Social Sciences and Education (SSE)	51% (36)	58% (15)

The respondent group was 37% of full professors and represented all discipline areas. However, arts and humanities faculty members were considerably under-represented in the respondent group as, to a lesser extent, were biological and agricultural science faculty. Social sciences and education faculty members were over-represented in the sample.

Although institutional data provided dates of institutional tenure and promotions, these data provide only partial demographic information since many in the target group and sample 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, the group of female full professors at the 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, similar to the population of full professors at the university. However, more respondents earned their terminal degrees earlier than did women at full rank at the institution.

A caution associated with this research is that the following themes and discussion cannot fully characterize all female 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 perspectives. In the following analysis and discussion,

Frye's (1990) "prevailing winds" in the data are presented along with a variety of perspectives that also emerged.

Results

Work Roles

Respondents discussed three work roles: disciplinary experts, mentors or models, and advisors or 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 female colleagues. As advisors and/or change agents, they work to improve campus conditions and opportunities for women and persons from traditionally underrepresented or non-dominant groups within higher education or within their disciplines. These thematic roles are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Disciplinary expert. "That's my identity—has always been—to be a professor and a scholar," stated one Social Science and Education (SSE) respondent. A Biological and Agricultural Sciences (BAS) 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 respondents. In fact, as the two passages above indicate, the identity of disciplinary expert is an identity that faculty members had internalized much earlier in their careers. Certain milestones such as promotions, appointments, and recognitions perhaps had *affirmed* this expertise, but the milestone events were not perceived as *conferring* expertise.

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 BAS 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 BAS 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 fieldwork. 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 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 a kind of intrusive or formal relationship or systematic advising that can be associated with the term “mentoring.” Rather, they spoke of significant people they respected who had modeled key professional behaviors, opened doors, offered opportunities, or otherwise responded favorably to respondents’ inquiries and ambitions. Indeed, one SSE respondent described creating her own 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 promotion to professor. For some, this has been explicitly asked of them, as was the case for one Physical and Mathematical Sciences & Engineering (PMSE) respondent who came to the university at professor rank. She said, “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 BAS respondent, these contributions were primarily focused on her 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.

A PMSE respondent primarily directed her generative contributions 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 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 (AH) respondent who maintained: “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. One SSE respondent characterized this particular disadvantage of her status as professor: "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." 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.

Advisor and change agent. One SSE respondent echoed many with her remark, "The department chair periodically will ask me questions of how I think about some procedure or something along that line." Although these consultations 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, or for one's status as a senior institutional member. Invitations for these informal consultations did not often happen at senior administrative levels, however. Another SSE 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 opportunities may have more to do with the prestige or perceived centrality of one's discipline to the institution. However, since larger numbers of women faculty at this university tend to be clustered in the less prestigious and less well-funded disciplines and units, as at many research-oriented universities, female faculty members are less likely to be among the ranks of those informally consulted.

Although respondents did not discuss many occasions in which senior institutional administrators informally solicited their input or perspectives, more formal and institutionalized opportunities for providing input, such as invitations to serve on committees or ad hoc groups, were abundant. Respondents discussed service on numerous college-wide and university-wide committees and representative bodies, and they were particularly pleased when the charges of the committee coincided with their own expertise and/or interests. For example, one SSE 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.

Another SSE 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 . . . that was valued.” In fact, respondents often selected specific service opportunities that capitalized on their interests, expertise, and goals for change. The same SSE 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.” A PMSE respondent was invited to address a conference of young women in the state:

I was so impressed by these 400 girls from all over the state—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 outcome of some respondents’ concerns about the campus climate for women and minorities, they have become more committed to being agents for change. One BAS respondent noted:

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 AH 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 were overlapping and the boundaries were 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 and contributed to their development. For most of the respondents, the role of advisor and change agent was not particularly distinct from the other two roles. Providing input and impacting change, however, most often occurred through their participation in formal institutional channels that were, in principle, available to all similarly situated faculty members. Although some of the respondents have adopted a more vocal and dissent-oriented 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 involved concomitant expertise on issues of equity and diversity. According to one SSE 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 indicated that they were well positioned to offer their expertise, but were not invited to do so. One individual said that her race precluded her from being taken seriously for her expertise. The SSE 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 to institutionally based committees or task forces, or 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 acknowledgement of their accomplishments as faculty members—primarily recognitions of their research or 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 powerfully felt affirmations. Collegial respect was also a key affirmation for respondents. Collegial respect was signified by, for example, representing one's department, unit, or discipline on influential committees, representative bodies, or disciplinary associations.

In terms of formal recognitions, many respondents had received teaching and research awards throughout their careers, and some respondents had been designated Distinguished Professor or University Professor in recognition of their noteworthy contributions. Respondents were proud of the formal awards and recognitions they had received. According to one SSE 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. . . . I can still remember, for example, where my photo was taken, you know, so that says something." Another SSE 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 SSE 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 so 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 BAS 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 AH 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, as one SSE professor added:

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 were marginalizing. These experiences are presented and discussed in the following section.

Marginalizing Experiences

Only a few respondents reported experiencing overtly hostile acts like verbal aggression or threats. Most of the negative episodes 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 their input perfunctory.

A BAS professor discussed her reactions to what she perceived 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 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, if that’s your criterion.” And when something like that happens, when I realize that they were looking at my 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 overwhelmed by committee, governance, and service work because there were so few female professors available to serve on committees restricted to members at professor rank. One SSE respondent discussed re-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?" 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 these individuals primarily as women and secondarily (if at all) as content experts minimized or ignored their roles as content experts, which is a core professional identity. The 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 BAS 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 AH 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.

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 BAS 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 AH 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 thought was important to do is not what other people thought was important to do."

One SSE respondent added a special case of the lone voice—the role of "designated hitter" on issues of equity or fairness. She recalled touring campus recreation and athletic facilities with other members of the university's 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]?"

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 that angered but did not surprise her.

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 BAS 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 to address, or assumed by others to address, issues of equity, fairness, or new initiatives. This may constitute acknowledgment that as women they may be in a better position to perceive problematic issues and offer new perspectives. However, as the athletic facilities tour makes clear, assigning this responsibility to women faculty may also effectively remove responsibility from others on campus for perceiving, questioning, and addressing issues of equity or diversity.

An additional area that respondents characterized as marginalizing was administrators' soliciting faculty input despite the perception that a decision had already been made. An AH 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.

One SSE respondent characterized decision-making in her college as:

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 discussed the hyper-visibility of women and minority faculty that accompanies their small numbers on the faculty and particularly within full professor rank. According to a BAS 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.

In addition to these experiences of tokenism and negation of expertise, a few respondents also discussed some freeing aspects that came with their marginal positioning, such as taking risks to surface their opinions and perspectives and persuading the majority to act—if not immediately, then eventually. One AH 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 SSE respondent provided an example with respect to equity for varsity women athletes:

We had this data that showed that we [the university] 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 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 directly addressing discomfiting and potentially embarrassing institutional issues.

Conclusions and Implications

In many ways, respondents' experiences of affirmation and marginalization on campus can be linked with the three work roles of disciplinary experts, mentors or models, and advisors or change agents. 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, respondents also enacted variations of the other roles and these were 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. As an example, one BAS 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 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 [the university].

However, when some respondents attempted to work on behalf of the institution to try to improve climate and circumstances, their offers of expertise were rebuffed and their contributions ignored, overlooked, or taken for granted. Although the idea of a change agent may connote an image of an external agitator, this was clearly not the case for most respondents. Most of the respondents instead used institutionally sanctioned, existing channels for faculty input as they adopted primarily an insider stance to effect change, with the primary motivation being improvement of the institution of which they consider themselves to be senior members.

Second, status appears to be affected by the respondents' particular choices or patterns of work emphasis. Respondents in this study have all achieved the formal rank designating full faculty membership, yet many also reported 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 BAS 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 SSE 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 remain 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 many affirmations are strong and rewarding for these respondents, the marginalizing responses echo some much 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 individually have donned layers of proverbial sweaters to deal with an underlying chill as they pursue their work as experts, mentors or models, and advisors and/or 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 experiences among others, and affirming the various types of work they perform to benefit their institutions.

References

- Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Characteristics of faculty members with teaching duties by type of institution, Fall 1998. (2002, August 30). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 31.
- Cox, A. M. (2001, January 31). Nine research universities pledge to treat female scientists better. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on January 17, 2003 from: <http://chronicle.com/daily/2001/01/2001013101n.htm>.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Schuster, J. H., & Seals, R. K. (1996). *The American faculty in transition: A first look at the new academic generation*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Frye, M. (1990). The possibility of feminist theory. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Grumet, M. R. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). *Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1993). Starting thought from women's lives: Eight resources for maximizing objectivity. In J. S. Glazer, E. M. Bensimon, & B. K. Townsend (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 35-44). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McLaughlin, D., & Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and the process of educational change*. New York: Routledge.

- Miller, D. W., & Wilson, R. (1999, April 2). MIT acknowledges bias against female faculty members. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 17, 2003 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v45/i30/30a01801.htm>
- 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.), *Women* (pp. 185-200). Norwell, MA; Kluwer.
- The nation: Faculty and staff. (1996). *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue*. Retrieved January 17, 2003 from: <http://chronicle.com/che-data/infobank.dir/almanac.dir/96alm.dir/facts.dir/fac4.htm#ftfaculty>
- Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(1), 46-84.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. 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 two-year colleges. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14-16.
- Simeone, A. (1987). *Academic woman: Working towards equality*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

About the Author

Florence A. Hamrick is Associate Professor in the Higher Education program at Iowa State University, where she teaches courses in student development theory and research methods. Her research interests include non-dominant populations in higher education settings and outcomes of higher education.