5-11-2012

Women's Experiences of the Tenure Process: A Case Study at a Small Public Southeastern University

Debra J. Cody
Georgia State University, dcody1@student.gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/eps_diss

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES OF THE TENURE PROCESS: A CASE STUDY AT A SMALL PUBLIC SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, by DEBRA JENNINGS CODY, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the Student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____   _____
Philo A. Hutcheson, Ph.D.   Jennifer Esposito, Ph.D.
Committee Chair   Committee Member

_____   _____
Jodi Kaufmann, Ph.D.   Donna A. Breault, Ph.D.
Committee Member   Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
William L. Curlette, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies

_____
R. W. Kamphaus, Ph.D.
Dean and Distinguished Research Professor
College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation, which involves potential financial gain, will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____
Debra Jennings Cody

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulation prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Debra Jennings Cody
145 Kiara Lane
Stockbridge, GA 30281

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Philo A. Hutcheson
Department of Educational Policy Studies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

VITA

Debra Jennings Cody

ADDRESS: 145 Kiara Lane
                     Stockbridge, GA 30281

EDUCATION: Ph.D.   2012   Georgia State University
                                        Educational Policy Studies
                     M.S.   1985   Georgia State University
                                        Nursing
                     B.S.N.   1976   Mississippi University for Women,
                                        Columbus, MS
                     A.S.N.   1971   Northeast Mississippi Junior College
                                        Booneville, MS

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
     2010 – present   Assistant Professor, School of Nursing, College of Health,
                         Clayton State University, Morrow, GA
     2001 – 2009   Assistant Professor, Health Care Management Department,
                         Clayton State University, Morrow, GA
     1995 – 2001   Assistant Professor and Junior Level Coordinator,
                         Baccalaureate Nursing Program, Clayton State University,
                         Morrow, GA
     1993 – 2007   Clinical Associate and Clinical Examiner, Southern
                         Performance Assessment Center Atlanta, GA Site of
                         Excelsior College, Albany, New York
     1992 – 1995   Assistant Professor and First Level Coordinator, Associate
                         Degree Nursing Program, Clayton State University,
                         Morrow, GA
     1991 – 1992   Director of Nursing and Vice President of Clinical
                         Services, Southwest Hospital and Medical Center,
                         Atlanta, GA
     1978 – 1991   Associate Department Chairman and Instructor, Georgia
                         Baptist School of Nursing, Atlanta, GA
     1978   Acting Director, Associate Degree Nursing Program,
                         Itawamba Junior College, Fulton, MS
     1976 – 1977   Instructor and Coordinator of Maternity Nursing, Itawamba
                         Junior College, Fulton, MS
     1973 – 1974   Clinical Instructor, Northeast Mississippi Junior College,
                         Booneville, MS
     1971 – 1973   Staff/Charge Nurse, North Mississippi Medical Center,
                         Tupelo, MS

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS:

   National Scholars Honor Society
   Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society in Education
   Golden Key International Honour Society
   Pi Lambda Theta International Honor Society and Professional Association in
      Education
   American/Georgia Nurses Association
   National League for Nursing
   Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing
   Professional Registered Nurse, Georgia, RN53549

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

   School of Nursing Research Seminar, Clayton State University
   Georgia State University Doctoral Fellows Symposium and Inaugural Issue
   Forty-Third Business and Health Administration Association International
         Conference
   Midwest Business and Health Administration Annual Conference
   Sigma Theta Tau International 39th Biennial Convention
   Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing, Region 7 Conference
   Southern Nursing Research Society 21st Annual Conference

ABSTRACT

WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES OF THE TENURE PROCESS: A CASE STUDY AT A
SMALL PUBLIC SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
by
Debra Jennings Cody

The purpose of this study was to describe women's experiences and challenges encountered during the tenure process at one institution, if and how they overcame those challenges, and if the challenges are consistent with those that appear in the literature. Higher education is comprised of a majority of male faculty members and administrators, but data show that women have surpassed men in earning doctorate degrees. Nevertheless, the rate at which women achieve tenure is not equal to that of men. Most of the literature on tenure is based on institutionalized power, gender inequities, policies, criteria, and the experiences of males, while providing limited information about women and their experiences during the tenure process. Furthermore, information about tenured women provides little discussion of how women navigate the tenure process. This lack of information demonstrates that there is a gap in the literature about women's experiences in academia, especially during the process of achieving tenure. Therefore, this study explored women's experiences with the tenure process through the lens of institutionalized power informed by gender and feminism.

For the purpose of this study, I adopted a qualitative case study approach. The primary source of data collection was semi-structured phenomenological interviews with three women who were tenured within the last five years. This case study investigated tenure, institutionalized power, and gender at a small public university. I abstracted themes from the data by applying an interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) technique to analyze and describe the results of the study. Results show that the

participants felt stressed out and unsure about the criteria for tenure. Data also show that finding a mentor and beginning the process early are important. This study will add to the body of knowledge about women's experiences with the tenure process in higher education.

Key Words: tenure, institutionalized power, gender

WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES OF THE TENURE PROCESS: A CASE STUDY AT A
SMALL PUBLIC SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
by
Debra Jennings Cody

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Policy Studies
in
the Department of Educational Policy Studies
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia
2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Tenure requirements in higher education have changed over the last several

decades. The organization and structure of the academy appear to promote advancement

for some faculty members while marginalizing others. Since the majority of individuals

in the academy who hold administrative positions, tenure, and faculty positions are white

males, white women and minorities are the groups that have been marginalized to the

greatest extent. Achieving success in the academy has been challenging for these groups

since the academy was first established. As tenure criteria become more rigorous, faculty

members seeking tenure are under more pressure in their efforts to achieve tenure than

ever before. Institutionalized power and gender are influenced by social, political, and

economic challenges that affect the process of achieving tenure, as well as the number of

successful individuals. These challenges are especially critical for women. Thus,

institutionalized power informed by gender provides the framework for this study within

the context of institutions of higher education. This study addresses the intersection of

institutionalized power and gender, including women's perceptions of political, social,

and economic issues as they progressed through the tenure process. Specifically, I asked,

"What are the experiences of women during the tenure process?"

Priorities in tenure criteria, expectations, and evaluation are not consistent

nationally and there is discussion concerning whether the focus should be on research,

teaching, and service which represent the traditional criteria, or a model that is based on

high levels of productivity in research and teaching that reflects the importance and

nature of faculty work. Focusing on women's experiences with the tenure process, I state

the problem, explore tenure requirements and expectations, the theoretical framework of institutionalized power informed by gender, and how the intersection of institutionalized power and gender in the academy affects women politically, socially, and economically. While minorities may be male or female, in the academy females are at a disadvantage, as even minority males enjoy more recognition and are treated with more respect (Fairweather, 2002; Crocco & Waite, 2007; Premeaux & Mondy, 2002; Schoening, 2009; *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2009, Table 254). In the academy, gender appears to have greater influence on tenure success than race, and while the intersection of race and gender is addressed, institutionalized power informed by gender is the major consideration for my study.

Historically, higher education has been structured in such a way that institutionalized power is influenced by patriarchal practices that have been in place for decades. Barriers and inequality have existed since women first attempted to enter the post-secondary teaching profession, and many individuals in positions of institutionalized power, usually males, were opposed to higher education for women. This opposition was evident in the policies and decisions that were made to create barriers. Achieving the rank and status of tenure is a process that women navigate, but not at the same rate as men, even though more women than men are now earning doctoral degrees. In addition, the nature of the academy in higher education, including tenure requirements and expectations, has been evolving, which adds to the complexity of the tenure process in general.

During my years of teaching in higher education, and as I observed women enter tenure-track positions and work toward achieving tenure, I developed a personal interest

in their experiences for several reasons. First, upon completion of the doctoral degree, I will be faced with the decision to remain in a non-tenure track position or move to a tenure track position. Second, my observations of women seeking tenure include recognition of the differences between women and men in status and institutionalized power regarding political, social, and economic issues in the academy. Finally, as I completed an assignment on tenure criteria and policies early in my doctoral program, my findings in scholarly literature regarding institutionalized power and how women in the academy are marginalized ignited my interest in how women experience the tenure process. In this study, specifically, I asked, "What are the experiences of women during the tenure process?" This question also represents inquiry into my personal interests regarding women who seek tenure in the academy.

This study is focused on three women who have achieved tenure at a small public university. The quantitative data show that women are underrepresented in the rank of tenure in the academy even though they have made great strides attaining doctoral degrees in the last several decades (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 2009). In addition to the numerical descriptions of tenured women in higher education, there is a significant amount of research that includes an historical analysis (Solomon, 1985; West & Curtis, 2006; Umbach, 2007), challenges of women seeking tenure (Hornig, 1980; Schoening, 2009), experiences of tenured women (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), gender inequality in higher education (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Jacobs, 1996; Perna, 2005), and women in positions of institutionalized power in the academy (Scott, 1979; Toren, 1991; Palmieri, 1995). While these issues are important, it would also be helpful to investigate

specifically how women experience the tenure process in higher education relative to institutionalized power and gender.

Studies by Vanda (1989), Jacobs (1996), Helvie-Mason (2007), and Reimer (2009) point out how academic institutions are structured based on gender, how such structure is reinforced, and how women's interests are devalued. The pre-tenured experiences of women are also labeled significant as women try to advance in the academy. Furthermore, Bonawitz and Andel (2009) declare that further research needs to be done on the number and age of tenured women and their time in the pipeline to tenure.

As women seek to gain recognition and status in the academy, it is possible that the Matthew Effect (Merton, 1988) continues to prevent them from attaining the status and recognition they deserve, including tenure. Women may be productive, scholarly researchers, yet remain in the shadow of well-known men that they work with. As Rossiter (1993) points out, the accomplishments of women need to be illuminated so that the gap that exists between women and men in the rank of tenure can perhaps begin to be diminished. This deliberate presentation of women's successes is called the Matilda Effect and is named for the American suffragist Matilda J. Gage, who experienced and articulated this phenomenon in the late nineteenth century. With the Matilda Effect, the intention is for women who achieve success that is similar or equal to that of men to also receive similar reputations or recognition (Rossiter, 1993). The forces of institutionalized power and gender serve to affect all aspects of the academy, especially from a political, social, and economic view. As men hold the institutionalized power in most institutions of higher education, it may be difficult for women to navigate the tenure process without encountering challenges specifically related to such power and gender. The accumulation

of advantage harnessed by men could begin to be equalized if the Matilda Effect (Rossiter, 1993) was more broadly accepted and practiced. In addition, we need to acknowledge that women may have vastly different experiences during the tenure process than men, and therefore we need more of their stories to be documented in the literature. The purpose of this study was to explore three women's experiences with the tenure process at a small public university.

In this chapter, the rationale for the study is discussed, the problem is defined, and the purpose of the study is explored. The problem is that women in higher education are underrepresented in the rank of tenured faculty members. More specifically, recent data show that at public four year higher education institutions in the U.S., the majority of tenured faculty members were male (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 2009, Table 264; *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2010, Table, 274). The purpose of this study was to provide a contribution to the literature by using qualitative methods to research the experiences of women during the tenure process in higher education. By utilizing a phenomenological case study approach, I used open-ended questions for exploring the research question: How do women describe their experiences with the tenure process?

Chapter two will examine the literature focused on the theoretical perspective of power informed by gender in the academy. I will also discuss how historical notions of institutionalized power and gender intersect in the academy to affect women and present challenges for women. The intersection of race and gender, the academy, and tenure requirements are discussed, as well as the political, social, and economics that women encounter when seeking tenure. Inequalities in each of these areas continue to have

significant effects on the progress and success of women in the academy, including the

rate at which women are tenured.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I present scholarly literature as evidence that women faculty members have faced issues of institutionalized power and gender since they gained access to higher education as faculty members. Traditionally, men have held positions of institutionalized power, and thus, control in the academy. I begin this chapter with a discussion of how power and gender intersect to provide the theoretical framework for this study. Institutionalized power is constructed and interpreted by those in positions of power, others who may be affected, and institutionalized power is also influenced by gender and feminism. I then present a discussion of the academy, tenure requirements and expectations, followed by challenges that women encounter during the tenure process. I explore how historical notions of institutionalized power and gender intersect in the academy to affect women politically, socially, and economically. While power and gender provide the framework for the study, I also discuss the intersection of race and gender in the academy.

Scholarly literature regarding institutionalized power in the academy, tenure, and female faculty members informs my understanding of women in higher education. The academy is an organization that has existed for many years with males in dominant roles. Institutionalized power issues are embedded in the organizational structure and these issues, accompanied by male domination, overshadow all areas of the academy. Women in the academy may be subject to institutionalized power that is overt or covert and not easily recognized. Rather than impose theories of power and gender on study participants and their perspectives, the lens through which I viewed the challenges that women face as

they experienced the tenure process in academia is based on institutionalized power and gender issues in the academy. For these reasons, institutionalized power informed by gender and feminism provided the theoretical framework for my study.

<div align="center">Institutionalized Power in the Academy</div>

In this study, institutionalized power is defined as a concept endorsed by the master narrative (men) to maintain consensus and unity in order to control political agendas and decision-making (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Lukes, 1974). Institutionalized power may be viewed in a number of ways. Parsons (1957, 1963) defines the concept of power as a mechanism used to effect changes in the action of other individuals or collective units, in the process of social interaction. Authoritative decisions are imposed in order to advance collective goals and secure the performance of binding obligations by units in an organization. Thus, Parsons' (1963) concept of power is associated with authority and consensus, and depends on the institutionalization of authority to mobilize collective action. Another concept of power is put forth by Arendt (1970) who contends that power belongs to a group and exists only as long as the group remains together. Arendt (1970) also declares that all political institutions (organizations) are materializations and manifestations of institutionalized power and cease to exist when the living power of the people fail to uphold them. Therefore, Arendt's (1970) view of power is also consensual and derives legitimacy from unity. While women have entered the professorate in institutions of higher education in greater numbers over the past several decades (Freeman, 1977; Hornig, 1980; Gibbons, 1992; Perna, 2005; Marchant, Bhattacharya, & Carnes, 2007; Lerner, 2008)), they still do not achieve tenure at the same

rate as their male counterparts and therefore have less institutionalized power in the academy.

Bensimon and Marshall (2003) declare that "conventional policy analysis is incapable of undoing the power asymmetries that characterize relations between male and female academics" (p. 338). Their view of power in the academy focuses on the master narrative (men's interests) and efforts to maintain the status quo. When institutionalized power in the academy is challenged by women, it provokes emotional responses such as fear, disapproval, antagonism, and hostility, which may be masked by the rhetoric of provisos, qualifiers, indirectness, and feigned alliance. These challenges are often characterized as complaints, which is one of the ways men of the academy have devalued the work of academic women. Elimination of institutionalized power asymmetries and domination that structure relationships between women and men in the academy requires gender-based appraisals of academic structures, policies, and practices (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003).

According to Lukes (1974), power is value-dependent and arises out of and operates within a particular political and moral perspective. This concept of power is relevant to the situation of women in the academy. Women's lack of institutionalized power in the academy may be explained by Lukes' (1974) third dimensional view of power which asserts that there is a focus on control over political agenda, decision-making, issues and potential issues, covert or overt latent conflict, and also subjective and real interests. Since the academy is dominated by males, they have control over the third dimension of power as described by Lukes (1974). Political agendas are set by administrators, deans, and department heads who also have the primary responsibility of

making decisions at many levels. Issues and potential issues are carefully monitored by the same individuals to try to avoid conflict within the academy. The interests of the organization are protected on all levels and may be quite subjective relative to disciplines. While women are often not in positions of institutionalized power in the academy, their interests may be overlooked, not considered and kept out of decision-making processes, whether through the operation of institutional practices and social forces, or through individuals' decisions (Lukes, 1974). As Lukes (1974) states, this may cause latent conflict, which consists of a contradiction between the interests of those exercising institutionalized power and the real interests of those they exclude (women). Women in the academy may not express or even be conscious of their interests; however, those interests are easily identified, especially as they relate to advancement and tenure in the academy.

In earlier works, traditional patterns of institutionalized power in academia were addressed by a number of scholars. For example, Kelly and Slaughter (1991) asserted that inequalities in higher education continued to persist. While women increased their presence in higher education, they did not make the same gains in terms of job opportunities and advancement, and men continued to outnumber women in privileged and professional positions, including tenure. Institutions of higher education also remained dominated by men who served as administrators and professors and held authority and institutionalized power in the institutions. Even when women held the same degrees as men, they usually reaped differential rewards and lower positions, including tenure. Having the same qualifications as men did not mean that women had similar life chances (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991). As Eliou (1991) declared, the pyramid of

the university hierarchy demonstrated that "women are crowded into the lower ranks and remain there forever, or particularly if they are married and have children, are promoted much more slowly than men" (p. 160). As previously stated, Toren (1991) reported that the average number of years it takes faculty members to progress from the lowest to the highest rank in academe is 12 years for men, and 16 years for women. Institutionalized power in the academy was exercised in numerous positions such as department head, dean, administrator, academic governance bodies (faculty senates), task forces, advisory boards, including the preeminently important committees that review faculty candidates for promotion and tenure (Moore & Sagaria, 1991).

More recent studies that address patterns of power in the academy also point out the continuation of the same patterns of institutionalized power in the academy. For example, a study by Premeaux and Mondy (2002) shows that female faculty members believe that they are not awarded tenure on an equal basis as men and suggest that there is a growing tenure gap between women and men in U. S. universities. In their study, 98% of the women and 96% of the men held the doctorate, while only 59% of the women were tenured, compared to 71% of the men. The study reveals that there are major differences between men and women regarding tenure in higher education, and mentions that females are often forced to litigate in order to obtain tenure. Premeaux and Mondy (2002) also declare that it is unlikely that a heavily male-dominated tenure system will suddenly begin granting tenure to a larger number of women. Similarly, in a study of tenure-track women faculty, Helvie-Mason (2007) reports that women felt incongruence in terms of those values rewarded professionally and their personal values. Their socialization was shaped by uncertainty in where to put their time and energy, as well as

uncertainty in the promotion and tenure process. The historically male-dominated system of higher education offered little socialization for women in tenure-track positions, and women often felt rejection in the culture of the academy (Helvie-Mason, 2007). In a similar view, Branch-Brioso (2009) suggests that although women are earning doctoral degrees at a pace equal to or greater than men, they still are not catching up when it comes to tenure positions and top jobs in academe. Women have been made to feel uncomfortable in male-dominated departments and often applicant pools are not diverse enough to include women. Recruiting and tenure policies should be clear and consistent (Branch-Brioso, 2009).

As Patterson (2008) asserts, university administrators have the power to close the numerical gap between tenure-track male and female faculty members, but larger schools are having more success at accommodating women's needs. Women in higher education may choose to have children which can cause a personal dilemma if in a tenure-track position. Although some institutions allow a semester off and stopping the tenure clock to care for children, every higher education institution does not have generous family-centered policies, and this may have a profound effect on women's choices regarding tenure or having children (Patterson, 2008). In a study on extending the tenure clock (Pribbenow, Sheridan, Winchell, Benting, Handelsman, & Carnes, 2010), results show that extension policies are increasingly available for faculty members who need more time due to special circumstances such as health issues and family responsibilities. However, the results also suggest that men are more likely to understand tenure criteria, be satisfied with the tenure process, and to feel supported by their department. Administrators in positions of institutionalized power, who are often men, could develop

policies that support both women in tenure-track positions and motherhood, and this would help close the tenure gap between men and women.

According to Lerner (2008), women are not in positions of power in the academy and the impact on governance is serious. Tenured faculty members, who are usually male, have more institutionalized power and have most responsibility for committee work and participation in the governance of the institutions. The more of them there are, the more institutionalized power and influence they can exert. Riley (1999) suggests that differences among people of different genders arise through social institutions that are themselves created by and in turn reinforce differences in institutionalized power. This leads me to believe that institutionalized power is constructed, interpreted, and continues to be a barrier for women seeking tenure in the academy.

<div align="center">Issues of Gender in the Academy</div>

For the purpose of this study, gender is defined as a modern social structure used for the purpose of constructing women as a group to be subordinate to men as a group (adapted from Lober, 1994 and Risman, 2004). Defining gender as a social structure brings gender to the same analytic plain as politics and economics (Risman, 2004). Documentation of the effect of tenure practices on women is becoming more prevalent in scholarly literature. Women may be at a particular disadvantage due to the language used in tenure criteria. They appear to be disenfranchised in general when it comes to distribution of assignments that are labor intensive and prohibitive to participating in the rigors of tenure track positions. Such positions may be reserved for senior faculty members and those in positions of institutionalized power, and they are typically male. The politics of tenure practices and perceptions of female faculty members could lead to

effective revisions in institutional policies that lend more support to faculty seeking to advance their academic careers. The persistence of gender inequality in higher education has prompted an increase in the examination of the causes and effects of such inequality. As some scholars point out, the organizational structure of the academy appears to be geared toward the success of males rather than females (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Moore & Sagaria, 1991). Perhaps illumination of the marginalization of women may prompt organizational change in the policies and processes that continue to support structures that constrain women in academia.

Dzuback (2003) points out that we must think of gender as a fundamental category that shaped institutionalized power and hierarchy within and among educational institutions, and recognize that gendered assumptions influenced the development and implementation of organizational missions and practices. Gender was repeatedly invoked to justify relations of institutionalized power within missions and practices, as well as the introduction of new institutional forms, establishment of professions, requirements of professional expertise, and the relationships among professions and educating institutions (Dzuback, 2003). Lorber (1994) argues that gender is an institution that is embedded in all of the social processes of everyday life and social organizations, and that gender difference is primarily a means to justify sexual stratification. The concept of gender is so endemic because unless we see difference in the way individuals are treated based on gender, we cannot justify the inequality that is associated with difference (Lorber, 1994). Risman (2004) defines gender as a social structure because this view brings gender to the same analytic plain as economics and politics. She asserts that gender is deeply embedded as a basis for stratification not just in personalities, cultural rules, or

institutions, but in all of these in complicated ways. The gender structure differentiates constraints and opportunities based on sex category, and thus has consequences in three dimensions: 1) At the individual level in the development of gendered selves; 2) during interaction as women and men encounter different cultural expectations, even when they fill identical structural positions; and 3) in institutional domains where explicit regulations regarding material goods and resource distribution are gender specific (Risman, 2004). Women in the academy may be faced with consequences in all three dimensions as they navigate the process to tenure.

Some feminist theories assume that gender inequity is the result of purposeful choices to benefit a particular group's ideology and purpose (Cooper, Fuserelli, & Randall, 2004), and is concerned with identifying how the political agenda benefiting males is embedded in organizational structure and practices (Marshall & Anderson, 1995). Feminist positions are based on the belief that society favors males, disadvantages females, and promotes policies from a sexist institutional setting. Such policies are implemented and enacted to the disadvantage of women, resulting in further reinforcement of the sexist nature of organizations (Cooper, et al., 2004). Education policies that are anti-feminist include fewer job opportunities, lower pay, and fewer chances for promotion (tenure) for women, all of which perpetuate continued male dominance. Feminist scholars (Ferguson, 1984; Marshall, 1993) have examined differential socialization and barriers to opportunities in education that limit females' choice and access (Marshall & Anderson, 1995; Menges & Exum, 1983), ethics (Noddings, 1984), and women's ways of knowing (Gilligan, 1982).

Clark and Corcoran (1986) contended that the issue of differential progress for women in higher education is especially acute in the ranks of tenured faculty in elite, research-oriented institutions. They addressed professional socialization with a focus on both theory and policy and asserted that sponsorship of women faculty members was critical to their socialization. Their study suggested that women may be limited to a middle-range of career success and that sponsorship should be a more deliberate process. Freeman (1977) compared the status of academic women and men in the United States and found inequities in prestige, rewards, rank, social expectations, and work environment. Regardless of the type of degree a woman held, she was much more likely than her male counterpart to be in one of the lower academic ranks. According to Gibbons (1992), the criteria for tenure are subjective which enhances discrimination against women, sometimes for subtle reasons. Women often faced entrenched attitudes that considered them not as good or less committed to research due to family responsibilities. Although the number of women receiving doctorate degrees has increased, the number achieving promotion and tenure has not kept up with that of their male counterparts. When women are not allowed to advance but remain in lower status positions, their chances to collaborate and win grants are decreased which reinforces the perception that they are less productive (Gibbons, 1992).

To continue the discussion of gendered issues in higher education, Hornig (1980) declared that women faculty members were over-concentrated in the lower ranks, underpaid, and carry a disproportionate share of teaching loads at introductory levels. She argued that problems of equity were obvious and caused imbalances for women, the institutions they serve, and the profession as a whole. Discrimination against women

raised profound ethical issues which faculty members and administrators must address in order for women to achieve equity in higher education (Hornig, 1980). Menges and Exum (1983) found that the numbers of women faculty members remained small at senior ranks in predominantly white institutions. They argued that barriers for women may relate to the distinctive review problems that women face in higher education when it comes to promotion and tenure. Those problems are categorized in the areas of seniority, teaching and service, serving multiple masters, scholarship, and support networks.

Focusing on support networks, Perna (2005) examined how marital status, employment status of the spouse, and parental status are related to promotion and tenure. Results show that the contribution of family ties to tenure status and academic rank is different for women than for men, and that family ties are not associated with improved employment outcomes for women as they are for men. In a study of the language of tenure criteria, Marchant, Bhattacharya, and Carnes (2007) note that tenure criteria containing the word leader appear to suggest a differential advantage for male faculty members in achieving tenure and becoming a department chair. The study is an example of automatic activation of gender stereotypes by language relative to use of the word leader when women are increasingly acknowledged to have leadership abilities as well as men. The word leader is not used fairly with women, and the authors recommend that the language in tenure criteria be examined and replaced with specific attributes and behaviors desired of a leader. In this same view, St. Pierre (2000) argues that feminists and others representing disadvantaged groups should use critiques of language, especially

deconstruction, to illuminate how language operates to produce very real, material, and damaging structures in the world.

Many of the previously mentioned assertions are supported by more recent studies relative to women seeking tenure in academe. For example, a phenomenological study by Helvie-Mason (2007) found four emergent themes based on tenure track women's perceptions and socialization into the culture of higher education. The identified themes are balance, place, support, and trust. Workload, environment, mentoring, and understanding are also identified as the respective underlying sub-themes. Women's socialization was shaped by uncertainty in the promotion and tenure process and in where to focus their time and energy. Another study by O'Brien (2008) explored tenure-track women's perceptions of success in navigating the promotion and tenure process and found that tenure-track women experienced a lack of clarity in the process of how they could be successful. The changing organizational environment had an impact on the process of promotion and tenure for the women involved. A study by Umbach (2007) offers evidence that a wide gap in salaries exists, and comparable worth continues to influence faculty salaries in fields dominated by women. Clearly women face political, social, and economic challenges related to institutionalized power and gender in the academy as they seek tenure. The issues of institutionalized power and gender in the academy are ongoing as reflected in the following statement by Morley and David (2009):

> Inclusions and exclusion both appear to produce dangers and opportunities. Women are simultaneously constructed as winners and losers. They are winners because they are gaining access, as students, in significant numbers, but losers because of their lack of entitlement to leadership and prestigious disciplines. Today, women are participating in increasing numbers in higher education, in a range of national locations.

Yet, women's academic identities are often forged in otherness, as strangers in opposition to (privileged) men's belonging and entitlement. This means that gender in higher education is often encoded in a range of formal and informal signs, practices and networks. The gender debates are full of contradictions. (p. 2)

Intersection of Gender and Race

Race is an integral part of gender issues in higher education. As a black female who grew up in Mississippi during the Civil Rights Movement, it is difficult for me to discuss race due to my feelings and experiences with both race and gender. Leaving an extensive examination of race issues out of this study is not an attempt to mask the intersection of race and gender in the academy and the challenges it poses. Most women, irrespective of race, express concern about the challenges and gender issues that women encounter when seeking tenure. According to Glazer-Raymo (1999), gender issues relate to the scarcity of affordable child care, work-family roles, and women's particular concern that they will be viewed as insufficiently motivated or committed to their careers.

Following the passage of Title VII (prohibits discrimination based on race, sex, religion, color, and national origin), and Title IX (prohibits sex discrimination in educational programs and activities) of the Civil Rights Act, the states, universities, and stakeholders (women and people of color) sought to control the higher education policy agenda (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Proponents of these legislative policies focused on increasing the proportional representation of women and minorities to correct current inequities, compensating disadvantaged groups for prior discrimination, and using cultural and gender diversity to enrich institutions (Francis, 1993; Tierney, 1996). Nevertheless, the idea of female-friendly policies and programs is not considered by those who lead our institutions, or in the laws or policies such laws produce

(Glazer-Raymo, 1999). While tenure systems are professional, peer-dominated, and built on good will, trust, and commonly held notions of collegiality (Bess, 1997), I argue that women, regardless of race, are often not accepted into these elite systems. This is especially true for black women.

Collins (1991/2000) and Lorde (1997) point out the interconnections of gender, race, and social class in black women's lives, and their effect on black feminist thought. Although some experiences are unique for black women, they endure far more challenges in society and the academy than white women (Collins, 1991/2000; Lorde, 1997; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; hooks, 1989). For example, Collins (2000) asserts that black women are susceptible to more surveillance, silencing, and false universal perspectives than white women. White women do not encounter the same challenges as women of color. Even though they are women, white women have racial privilege and, therefore, hold more institutionalized power than black women in both society and the academy. Lorde (1997) suggests that anger is the result of years of racism experienced by black women both in and out of the academy. As hooks (1984), Collins (1991/2000), and Harding (1991) point out, white women have not only left the experiences of women of color out of feminist scholarship, but their own class and status privileges often prevent them from seeing how even their research often flows from classist and racist assumptions. In addition, when white women problematize inequalities in any professional setting, they risk commodifying, distorting, and marginalizing the experiences of women of color in order to further their own careers (Collins, 1998; hooks, 1984).

Both race and gender are under the influence of institutionalized power and intersect in the academy. While women are marginalized and face many challenges, white women enjoy more privilege and institutionalized power than women of color. I argue that as long as there are women in the academy, there will be an intersection of race and gender; however, for the purpose of this study, the focus is on institutionalized power and gender because, in the academy, institutionalized power is held by the majority and they are men.

The Academy

We are experiencing ongoing changes in the nature and structure of the academy as globalization creates new structures, incentives, and rewards for some aspects of academia while instituting disincentives and constraints for other aspects (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). As state and federal funds have been diminishing, the resource mix of higher education has created a new reality for higher education (Breneman, 1993). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that this new reality has caused a shift in the efforts of marketing, commercial culture, and competition for revenues that may be tied to national policy initiatives for higher education. This is related to the privatization trend metastasizing into academia and the efforts of big business to nurture a new form of corporate welfare in one of the core institutions of democracy, higher education (White & Hauck, 2000). The corporatizing of higher education over the last several decades has greatly influenced the structure of the academy.

According to Keeling, Underhile, and Wall (2008), the two major characteristics of higher education are its horizontal and vertical structures. These structures are ambiguous as they attempt to allow for creative thinking and respect the autonomy of

different disciplines. Horizontal forces include central administration, which may or may not have significant institutionalized power, and the centralization of power is directly related to how resources are managed and allocated. Institutional accreditation, different policy levels, and overall financial management are also included in the horizontal structure. Vertical structures in higher education are the various colleges, schools, business operations, divisions, foundations, student support services, real estate and economic development areas, and athletic programs. In this same view, scholars suggest that institutions of higher education operate in silos based on a primarily vertical organization with various schools, colleges, and departments operating in parallel with one another, and focusing on promoting their own internal goals and objectives rather broader institutional purposes (Keeling, Underhile, & Wall, 2007; Kuh, 1996). Schools and colleges within larger institutions compete with each other for scarce resources and often promote their own interests rather than those of the university at large. The vertical organization structure is reinforced by centrifugal forces that create decentralization and locate responsibility, governance, and resources peripherally, rather than centrally. These vertically organized institutions have horizontal forces that pull some governance, control, and decision-making to the center of the institution (Kuh, 1996). Central administration is a notable horizontal force which may or may not have significant institutionalized power. The strength of the vertical, horizontal, and centrifugal forces varies by institutional type, culture, history, and perceptions of the need for public accountability, and the inherent tensions between these forces generate and sustain complexity in institutions of higher education (Keeling, et al., 2007). Furthermore, the

academic professional and faculty governance also complicate institutions of higher education.

Lerner (2008) contends that when it comes to faculty governance, tenured professors have most of the responsibility for participation in the governance of the institutions and committee work. While women are awarded more than half of all research doctorates granted to graduates who are United States (U.S.) citizens (Hoffer, Hess, Welch, & Williams, 2007), women comprise only 34% of full-time faculty positions in doctoral granting institutions (West & Curtis, 2006). In these same institutions, only 25.8% of tenured faculty members are women and only 19.3% of full professors are women (West & Curtis, 2006). The fewer tenured faculty members there are, the less institutionalized power and influence they can exert. Since most tenured faculty members are male, they have more institutionalized power and influence than female faculty members who are tenured. For example, in a study comparing the status of tenure female and male faculty members, Appling-Biel (2000) found that women were in lower ranks, were paid less, and constituted a very small number of tenured faculty members. Whoever holds institutionalized power also controls resources. Female faculty members cannot make their impact felt on the governance of the institution to the same degree as men. I contend that women in the academy are often not in positions of institutionalized power and control within the organizational structure of the academy, and may have access to fewer resources when it comes to meeting the criteria for tenure.

Davies (2006) suggests that a male-female binary is lodged in the structures and practices of the academy. He argues that today's halls of academe have become institutions that employ systematic removal of the old implicit bases on which decision

making was made, accompanied by the generation of rules and policies that are intended to be transparent, and to make the processes of recognition (appointment, promotion, funding, publishing) available to anyone. In cultural and gender terms, the claim has been made that this transparency will lead to greater equity; however, the increased surveillance and the increased detailing of what is required, which is also involved in this type of management, may work in another direction (Davies, 2006). For women who may turn on themselves to admonish and correct themselves, the increased incitement to self-judgment and self-monitoring may become self-harming (Davies & Petersen, 2005). While the structure of the academy is problematic for women seeking tenure, other variables such as tenure requirements and expectations also influence the process for women.

<center>Tenure Requirements and Expectations</center>

In addition to discussing issues of institutionalized power, gender, and women's experiences in the academy, it is important to understand the meaning of tenure and what is involved in earning tenure. For the purpose of my study, tenure is defined as an appointment in an institution of higher education that offers freedom of teaching, research, and extramural activities, including an assumption of a sufficient degree of economic security for individuals of ability (adapted from the American Association of University Professors, 2006). The criteria, requirements, and expectations of tenure vary among institutions, but have some similarities. Tenure may be conceptualized as a game with rules to be understood, observed, and applied (Leverenz, 2000). While a good tenure-track job is traditionally defined as one with substantial support for research, minimal service requirements, a light teaching load, and the opportunity to teach graduate

students, such jobs are rare (Leverenz, 2000). The American Association of University

Professors (2006) asserts that in its original form, tenure was closely tied to academic

freedom which applied to both teaching and research. From the inception of tenure in

1940, the case was made that "the common good depends on the free search for truth and

its free expression" (Fuchs, 1963/1997, p. 138). Byse and Joughin (1958) assert that

tenure enables a faculty member to study, teach, and act free from pressures and restraints

which otherwise would inhibit thought and action. Tenure was established to protect the

academic freedom of faculty members and to provide enough financial security to attract

able women and men to the profession (Baez & Centra, 1995).

Current tenure policies and practices have produced outcomes that have caused

much discourse and warrant attention. While many tenured faculty members are

productive, esteemed members of the academy, tenure policies have not always been

applied consistently or equitably. This inconsistency and inequity has caused challenges

for many faculty members seeking tenure status. The assertion that tenure reflects a

narrative of institutional institutionalized power is supported by the intolerance for

diversity and difference hidden in private rules and institutionalized power relations that

operate behind the public rhetoric of tolerance and diversity (Agathangelou & Ling,

2002). Faculty members who are different from the majority and have no seniority, such

as women and junior faculty members, may be left out of certain elite groups and placed

in positions that require heavy workloads resulting in inequity (Chavez, 2008).

Criteria and requirements for attaining tenure vary widely from institution to

institution and are often based on the mission, goals, and objectives of such institutions

(Levy, 2007; Antony & Raveling, 1998). Disagreement about the process of tenure

between institutions and individual departments has further clouded the ability of pre-tenured faculty to determine essential practice requirements for attaining tenure. Pre-tenured faculty members report anxiety and frustration associated with conflicting and unclear information about the tenure process (Austin & Rice, 1998). The basic criteria for tenure generally required at most institutions are related to the traditional domains of the professorate which are teaching, service, and scholarship (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). While these domains are essential for teaching in higher education, what constitutes scholarship is a matter of discourse in academe; however, the most widely used criteria for tenure was developed by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989).

According to The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989 National Survey (1989), traditional tenure criteria include the following fourteen (14) areas: number of publications; recommendations from outside scholars; research grants received by the scholar; reputations of presses or journals publishing books or articles; recommendations from other faculty within the institution; student evaluations of courses taught; lectures or papers delivered at professional meetings or at other colleges and universities; published reviews of the scholar's books; service within the scholar's discipline; observations of teaching by colleagues and/or administrators; service within the university community; recommendations from current or former students; academic advisement; and syllabi for courses taught. Little has changed regarding what comprises the area of academic scholarship since the survey was conducted. Research publications continue to carry the most weight, especially in research and doctorate-granting institutions.

Because of the incongruence and discourse evidenced by the advantages, disadvantages, and outcomes of the tenure process, Fairweather (2002) created a decision model that suggests how productivity measures might be combined to identify highly productive teachers and highly productive researchers, which he calls the complete faculty member, for promotion and tenure review in the academy. Although scholarship, teaching, and service are the primary focus of tenure (Davis et al., 2006), the strongest evidence for tenure has traditionally been scholarship that refers to publications and presentations (Davis et al., 2006; Leverenz, 2000; Shapiro, 2006). While service is also important, unlike teaching and service, the publication process is outside of the faculty member's control (Davis et al., 2006) and that is where the focus lies for tenure in academia. A faculty member may write well but all manuscripts submitted to highly regarded scholarly journals may not be published.

In Fairweather's (2002) model, quartiles and medians are calculated separately by program area within types of institution to develop norms. A modest standard is employed to define highly productive as it also reflects commonly held beliefs about the importance and nature of faculty work. Since the gold standard for productivity concerns the two years before tenure review, a faculty member is deemed a highly productive researcher if his or her refereed publications during the previous two years exceed the median for the relevant program area and institutional type (first quartile). Faculty members who fall into the second quartile (immediately below the median) of refereed publications are also designated as highly productive researchers if they are a principle investigator on a funded research project, and achieved top quartile in research funding,

conference presentations, or above the median in both conference presentations and research funding.

When teaching is considered, Fairweather (2002) posits that the highly productive teacher is any faculty member above the relevant median in the production of student classroom contact hours. Those in the second quartile of contact hours are also included if they are in the top quartile of independent study contact hours and in the top quartile of serving on thesis and dissertation committees. In addition, evidence of collaborative or active instruction is used for effective instructional quality or teaching. Results showed that men were more likely than women to be highly productive researchers or teachers; however, women were much more likely to use collaborative or active teaching. Fairweather (1999) also contends that, across all types of four year institutions, the most common factor in simultaneously achieving high research and teaching productivity is for faculty members to spend more time in the classroom. Spending more time in the classroom could have a negative effect on women because, as Fairweather's (2002) research points out, women tend to use more collaborative teaching techniques, therefore, more time in the classroom could put them at a disadvantage in achieving recognition as highly productive teachers. Those faculty members who do spend more time in the classroom are able to publish at greater rates when they are supported by research grants, which allow them the opportunity to use their ongoing research work as a resource for publishing. Similar to Fairweather (2002), Pace (2004) declares that key features of the scholarship of teaching and learning also involve using peer review, informing future teaching, and submitting scholarship of teaching and learning work in a public forum. Examples may include faculty members that practice a variety of teaching methods with

both students and peers such as discussion, interactive activities, reading, testing, essays, papers, musical presentations, and a multitude of creative productions.

Fairweather (2002) declares that the complete faculty member is relatively rare for several reasons. First, few faculty members have research projects that are externally funded, thus increasing their ability to publish while teaching above average numbers of students. Second, few are able to publish while carrying such above average teaching loads. Third, few faculty members attain productivity levels in the above average range in teaching and research while using collaborative or active instructional techniques. Traditionally, increasing productivity in teaching and research has been an individual accomplishment; however, as Fairweather (2002) suggests, "The key to increasing teaching and research productivity may lie in looking for group solutions rather than on relying on each faculty member to increase productivity levels in teaching and research" (p. 44). I argue that this approach could be beneficial for women in academia as they seem to already practice active and collaborative instructional techniques. To change faculty members' attitudes and behaviors from independence to include more interdependence relative to teaching and research may be beneficial to departments and institutions, as well as women as they strive to increase their productivity while seeking tenure.

Schoening (2009) points out that in order for women to be successful at promotion and tenure, requirements for teaching, service, and research must be clearly specified. I contend that tenure criteria, requirements, and expectations are not consistent in higher education, and women and men may be held to different standards as they navigate the tenure process. Although women may engage in various methods to become

highly productive researchers and teachers, the individuals evaluating their work are usually men, and they have the institutionalized power to control women's progress or lack of progress in the academy, including tenure. In my view, women who aspire to become tenured in continue to encounter challenges that need exploration and illumination.

<div align="center">Challenges for Women Seeking Tenure</div>

Documentation of the affect of tenure practices on women is becoming more prevalent in the literature. Women appear to be disenfranchised in general when it comes to distribution of assignments that are labor intensive and prohibitive to participating in the rigors of tenure track positions. Such positions may be reserved for senior faculty members and those in positions of institutionalized power, and they are typically male. It is important to examine women's experiences with the tenure process in order to achieve a better understanding of the process and how women may overcome the barriers they may encounter.

In higher education, there have been many covert paradigms that marginalize or devalue women (Moore & Sagaria, 1991). According to Eliou (1991), women are accompanied throughout life by the handicaps placed on them because of their gender. There are, however, certain key points in time when fundamental choices are made. These choices concerning women's personal and occupational futures seem to be free, but are often determined by others. The key points in time are socialization at school, preparation and guidance during acquisition of higher education, entry into the labor market, and personal life including marriage, children, and family. Eliou (1991) declares that determination of women's choices by others constitutes retroactive inequality, and all

of these choices have a cumulative effect on women's careers in academia. Data from Eliou's (1991) study also show that there is a considerable difference in the way teaching faculty members are treated, with women being required to devote greater amounts of time to administrative duties (paper work) than men, regardless of their rank.

In this same view, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) assert that women in academia use culturally imposed strategies called smile work and mom work to fit in with departments that have a tradition of male dominance. These departments may have added women without changing socialization practices to be more welcoming. Male-dominated cultures encourage stereotypical feminine behaviors that make women appear congenial, cheerful, and unobjectionable, rather than unpredictable and strident. Smile work entails the symbolic management of behavior to present oneself as being agreeable and pleasing, while accommodating behavior from males that may be unpleasant and costly (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). These scholars report that another form of accommodation that women in academia may engage in is mom work, which entails the imposition of caretaking and nurturing roles on women. For example, in their study they found that students tend to cling to women professors, and when they are not allowed to cling and the female professor tries to control her own time, she is considered selfish, whereas the male professor is not expected to give more time to students because he has more important things to do. For women in predominantly male departments, the challenges are intensified by the combined politics of promotion and tenure, and gender relations. One woman on a tenure track in the study was advised to play the academic strategy game by taking time away from teaching and being unavailable for committee work. The structure

of the department influences the choices, behaviors, and self-presentation of women

faculty members (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Wilson (2001) offers an example of how women are treated as they try to achieve

tenure in the academy. The case presented is that of a female faculty member who was

denied tenure although her department supported her tenure. The college committee,

dean, and provost did not support granting tenure and felt that the department's tenure

criteria were not strict enough. If the tenure had been attempted five years earlier, the

female faculty member would have been successful, but since the bar for tenure is rising

at teaching institutions and major research universities, tenure was denied. According to

the author, there are several areas of concern and discourse involving tenure. The

overwhelming pressure is coming from administrators, not just from other faculty

members, who are trying to raise the status of the entire institution on the backs of a new

generation of young faculty who are often women. Since the job market in some

disciplines is depressed, it is easier for institutions to demand more from faculty seeking

tenure. In some cases, individuals seeking tenure had to go to church, begin publishing

from day one, or just plain abandoned the quest for tenure because they felt it was not

worth the pressure (Wilson, 2001).

Another perspective regarding women's experiences with the tenure process was

put forth by Clark and Corcoran (1986). They contend that the issue of differential

progress for women in higher education is well-documented and that the problem is

especially acute in the ranks of tenured faculty members in elite, research-oriented

institutions. Professional socialization is addressed with a focus on both theory and

policy, while identifying the stages of professional socialization. Sponsorship of women

faculty members is cited as being critical to their socialization and an exploratory

institutional case study with specific examples and narratives is used to illustrate the

importance of sponsorship. The scholars offer qualitative data to illustrate the utility of

theoretical conceptions of professional socialization for women. The study suggests that

women may be limited to a middle-range of career success and that sponsorship should

be a more deliberate process (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Perhaps more emphasis on

professional socialization of women faculty could increase their chances of successful

outcomes with the tenure process.

In their work on socialization, promotion, and tenure in the academy, Tierney and

Bensimon (1996) contend that nonsexist academic workplaces and gender equity cannot

be attained unless conscious attention is given to relations between women and men.

Their premise is that the relations between women and men at the institutional and

departmental levels create different socialization experiences. The authors note that

faculty members were spoken about as if they were an undifferentiated class of people,

sexless, and disembodied. This generalized image of faculty members caused some

women professors with children to feel aberrant. Another example of how women's

experiences may be different is evident in a male department chair's comment as he

stated "Smart people tend to marry smart people," (p. 92), and went on to say:

> I have one woman whose husband is a foreign service officer stationed in
> another country, so they commute. I have another whose husband is
> involved in a job that takes him all over the world without much notice.
> These are strains that did not exist to the same degree 10 or 15 years ago,
> and we have not figured out how to accommodate them in the process of
> promotion and tenure. (pp. 92-93)

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) document how women expressed frustration,

discomfort, and annoyance with male dominance that permeated their institutions and

departments; however, none described her situation as so horribly oppressive as to be intolerable. None of the women expressed regrets about choosing the professoriate as their vocation, and none said they planned to give up their plans for an academic career, including seeking tenure. Nevertheless, few of the women described their institutions or departments as being completely affirming for women, and a relatively small number described institutional or departmental characteristics that made them good for women. An equity-oriented ethos, department chairs who were sensitive to women's personal lives, and a critical mass of women were among the factors that women identified as contributing to a positive climate and positive experiences (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). One woman in the study who was on a tenure track stated:

> In this department being a woman is great. We have a lot of them. Of the five junior faculty, three are women. My colleagues treat me as though they think I am smart and that I am worthy of consideration when we are debating. (p. 94)

In a different vein, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) report that a dean and feminist scholar who discarded traditional recruitment, hiring, and evaluation practices and changed position announcements to appeal more directly to women and minority applicants said:

> When I walked in the door there were three lawsuits in process: two by minority women and one by an Anglo woman in different departments charging the institution with discrimination not only in the promotion and tenure process, but in the ways that they had been treated during their time here. I also found that we had a very poor record of hiring and retaining women in most of the departments and that the most serious problems were at the senior levels where there were simply no women in most departments. (p. 97)

More current reports have identified a number of issues facing women as they seek tenure. Schoening (2009) reports women have significantly fewer mentors and role models, especially in research institutions. Family care, childcare, disability leave, and

lack of clear tenure criteria are also ongoing challenges. Awarding of promotion and tenure and funding for research continues to be controlled by men which is often a barrier for women (Bonawitz & Andel, 2009). Accusations of poor collegiality and personality shortcomings also haunt women as they try to fit in with their male colleagues (Haag, 2005). Lerner (2008) contends that highly trained intellectuals who are women with graduate and terminal degrees are inadequately rewarded for their knowledge and skills which constitutes a hidden form of discrimination. Lerner (2008) also states that the consequences are quantifiable and indicate that women who have children within five years of receiving a terminal degree are 27% less likely than their male counterparts to achieve tenure. Women face many challenges as they try to negotiate their multiple identities in society and especially in the academy.

<div align="center">Political Effects</div>

From a political view, the intersection of institutionalized power and gender in the academy are quite apparent. According to Freeman (1977), academic women were invisible until the 1970s. Higher education was assumed to be a legitimate male preserve and female faculty members were on the edges of mainstream academia. The concept of institutionalized power, defined by males in the academy, served to protect their interests and marginalize females. For example, in Cruikshank's (1998) work, William Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago, used his institutionalized powers of persuasion to win the trust of Julia Bulkley, a female professor, in efforts to advance the institution at her expense. Bulkley's letters to Harper also provide evidence of the contradictory forces acting upon women determined to enter the professoriate and the resultant feelings of betrayal, ambivalence, and intense need to prove oneself. Another

example of how institutionalized power was used to manipulate women relates to how women's place in American society was continuously challenged by popular standards that encouraged women to focus on family and home in traditional domestic roles (Clark, 1998). This discouraged some women from seeking access to college and led others to continue to adhere to stereotypically female activities despite being enrolled in college. Articles in *Life* magazine and *Newsweek* also promoted the ideal woman as being more social than academic, with emphasis on usefulness and support for the efforts of men, especially during wartime (Clark, 1998). Campbell (1996) also asserts that the concept of institutionalized power was also apparent in the text and rhetoric of academia. Scholarly writing, as defined by the academy, has historically been associated with masculinity, and terms such as chairman and freshman are labels used that carry baggage regarding generalizations about gender. These terms signal masculine bias about privilege in the academy, and that the position for entering academe is gendered male. If academic also implies male, institutionalized power is an issue and the tension for a woman in the academy is acute (Campbell, 1996).

While institutionalized power has been exerted in various ways in the academy, the effects on women and the disciplines they chose was quite apparent. As Walton (2000) contends, some female scholars, such as Marjorie Hope Nicolson of Columbia University, who ignored male institutionalized power, were aware that institutions of higher education were more willing to train and hire women in literary studies than in other disciplines. This tendency is a reflection of how disciplines were viewed as soft or hard in a gendered way relative to paradigm consensus. Colbeck (1998) suggests that disciplines vary based on the degree of consensus about paradigms. Paradigms represent

the theories, methodologies, techniques, and problems emphasized within a discipline (Braxton & Hargens, 1996; Lodahl & Gordon, 1972), and the degree of paradigm consensus influences expectations and relationships among faculty within a particular discipline (Becher, 1989).

According to Becher (1989) and Biglan (1973), in low paradigm consensus or soft disciplines, scholars use new lenses to investigate intellectual territory previously mapped by others, and knowledge is considered recursive and concerned with qualities, particulars, and understanding. They also assert that soft disciplines are characterized by weak boundaries, independent research efforts, tolerance for unusual ideas or methods, and idiosyncratic curricula. In contrast, in high paradigm consensus or hard disciplines, knowledge is perceived as cumulative and concerned with universals, discovery, and quantification (Becher, 1989; Biglan, 1973). Hard disciplines are characterized by general agreement about research collaboration, competition for recognition and funding, curriculum content, and the disciplines are clearly defined with gate-keeping of intellectual boundaries by institutionalized powerful elites (Becher, 1989; Lodahl & Gordon, 1972). Women and men have been guided toward specific disciplines based on their gender.

The study by Umbach (2007) reveals that the top five disciplines in which women are the majority are: 1) nursing (100%); 2) adult and continuing education (83.3%); 3) curriculum and instruction (72.7%); 4) education evaluation and research (66.7%); and 5) higher education, special education and student counseling and personnel services (57.1% each). These disciplines represent soft disciplines. The top five disciplines in which men are the majority are: 1) electrical engineering (96.6%); 2) agribusiness and agricultural

production (94.1%); 3) physics (92.7%); 4) philosophy (92.3%); and 5) mechanical

engineering and earth, atmosphere, and oceanographic sciences (92.0% each). These

results illustrate the claim that, historically and now, women have been guided toward the

"soft" disciplines in the academy (Umbach, 2007).

The unequal distribution of males and females in disciplines is clearly illustrated

in the *Digest of Educational Statistics* (2008, Table 254), as data show that more full-time

and part-time female faculty members are in the disciplines of education, health, and the

humanities (soft disciplines), while more males are in business, engineering, and natural

sciences (hard disciplines). In 2006-2007, 30,365 women and 30,251 men earned

doctorate degrees, and although women outnumbered men in earning doctoral degrees,

they have continued to lag behind men in the number of faculty members. As of 2003,

there were 420,000 male and 261,000 female faculty members at degree-granting

institutions (*Digest of Educational Statistics* 2008, Table 254), which points out the

continuing trend. In 2005-2006, there were 714,453 male faculty members and 575,973

female faculty members respectively *(Digest of Educational Statistics,* 2008, Table 187).

Rossiter (1993) gives many examples of how women, although expert in their

fields, have been marginalized in academia. While women have been instrumental in

many discoveries, they have seldom received equal recognition for their contributions.

For example, women who were assistants and associates of men who received high

recognition and awards were often invisible contributors who were excluded from the

claim to fame. She also found that while many studies of the 1950s and 1960s included

women in the data collection, they were omitted from the text. Rossiter (1993) argues that

in order to offset marginalization, women should be applauded and recognized for their

accomplishments in a more assertive manner so that society is made aware of their contributions (The Matilda Effect). Rossiter (1993) also claims that the Matilda Effect could motivate future scholars to be more inclined to include women for the recognition they deserve, and thus put forth a more accurate account of history and social science. Clearly the intersection of institutionalized power and gender in the academy continues to be an issue of concern for women as they pursue various disciplines and professional careers. Since institutionalized power and gender issues were and are so prevalent, proper socialization, mentoring, and support were and are critical to the success of women in academe.

<div align="center">Social Effects</div>

Socially, the intersection of institutionalized power and gender in higher education has been complicated and sometimes even seems contradictory. Solomon (1985) reports from 1790 to 1850, there was remarkable growth in schooling females, which resulted in experimentation with collegiate education and access to higher education. The institutionalizing of education at many levels produced unexpected opportunities for women and they were finally able to access and increase their numbers in liberal education in seminaries, academies, and colleges. These initial successes laid the foundation for women's higher education. Educating women to become teachers became acceptable and respected by religious groups and men, as females attended school in increasing numbers and more teachers were needed. For example, Herbst (1989) reports that in Massachusetts the percentage of women teachers rose from 56.3% in 1834 to 60.2% in 1837, while the percentage of men teachers fell from 43.7% in 1834 to 39.8% in 1837. Expanding economic opportunities and steep population growth forced

the abandonment of past employment patterns and practices in order to tap into new

sources (women) to supply more teachers. From 1834 to 1840 there was a 40.2% increase

in the number of female teachers. This trend is further noted in Kansas where, by 1899,

61.45% of the normal school graduates were women (Herbst, 1989). This shift in genders

relative to teachers paved the way for women to become more active and thus leaders in

the pursuit of education.

Women such as Sarah Pierce, Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher, Zilpah Grant,

Mary Lyon, and Almira Phelps were pioneers of women's education. This is illustrated

by the way they acquired advanced education and founded schools that focused on

academics for female students. These women were optimists, wise teachers, and

understood that women's decisions had consequences; however, they were determined to

help women overcome their inherent subservient roles through access to higher education

(Solomon, 1985). The actions of these early leaders provided the socialization,

mentoring, and support needed to advance the educational progress of women.

Scott (1979) suggests that in the nineteenth century, Emma Willard provided a

powerful example of a "new woman" whose achievements were possible because of her

ability to integrate new values with the traditional ones. In her, a complicated and

seemingly uncertain view of the feminist and "true woman" seemed to co-exist and

provide the source of her influence on education for women in the U.S. Willard's

students admired her and claimed she inspired them with a new self-respect and dignity.

She spoke publicly about women's rights, intellectual development, and advocated for

the professionalization of school teaching which opened new opportunities for women.

Willard's methods of training and mentoring other women as professional educators

served to spread her approach across the country as her mentees taught and influenced other women as well. Socialization, mentoring, and support of women as they became professional educators were germane to Willard's cause (Scott, 1979).

As Dzuback (2003) declares, "To understand how women scholars contributed to transforming the gendered culture of higher education, it is important to grasp how the institutions treated women as professional teachers and scholars" (p. 182). Gender and institutionalized power together functioned to shape the penetration of the male-dominated academic profession. Women entered academe as professionals by attending women's colleges that were established in the middle to late nineteenth century. Gordon's (1990) work gives a compelling example of the experiences of women in higher education during the Progressive Era. She points out how educated women (students and faculty members) were viewed as threats to the social order that men had established. Even though women endured resistance to their attempts to social advancement, intelligent, ambitious women encountered unique opportunities in protected environments called communities of women, which promoted their development in scholarship, research, and social reform. The cultural and political shift evolved into the politics of equality for many of the women as they became active feminist and engaged in separatist politics while pursuing equality with men (Gordon, 1990).

Clifford (1989) offers another scholarly overview of seven academic women who were pioneers at coeducational universities during the Progressive Era. Maria Louise Sanford, Marion Talbot, Grace Raymond Hebard, Clelia Duel Mosher, Maude E. Abbott, Theresa McMahon, and Lucy Diggs Slow are the women profiled in the work. These

women were highly motivated and intelligent in an environment that catered to men. In

coeducational institutions, women could not be natural as they were socialized to be. It

was fine to be female in the natural world, but since academe is a social world instead of

the natural world, many women found it was not fine to be female. In spite of the

negative responses of male faculty members, the non-stereotypical dedication,

individuality, and perseverance of the seven women lead to models of achievement in

higher education and other areas that affected women. Dzuback (2003) further states that

during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, educators began arguing that it was

appropriate to allow women to teach at the college level. Women faculty members in

academies for women began producing as well as transmitting knowledge, and this

initiated the process of reforming gendered institutionalized power relations in academe.

Patriarchal institutionalized power eroded somewhat and women's efforts concerning

suffrage and social reform threatened male institutionalized power and control. Men

sought to protect their manliness, institutionalized power, and control as a matter of white

masculine honor, and thus marginalized women who accessed institutions of higher

education for graduate study. Women met this challenge by attending graduate school

abroad, and when they were finally allowed access to universities in the U.S., they were

not recommended for teaching positions in academe (Dzuback, 2003). This practice

continued the domination by males in higher education in administration and in faculty

ranks.

Since women were not welcome as faculty members at coed colleges, women

scholars created their own institutions of higher education for women. Wellesley, Bryn

Mawr, and the Troy Female Seminary are examples of women's colleges that were

established in order to provide teaching positions for women, as well as higher education

for female students (Solomon, 1985; Dzuback, 1993; Scott, 1979; Palmieri, 1995). Some

of the women faculty members at Wellesley were scholars in the "hard" sciences such as

chemistry, physics, and biology (Solomon, 1985); women faculty members at Bryn Mawr

focused on academic research in the social sciences (Dzuback, 1993); and women faculty

members at Troy emphasized the professionalization of teaching (Scott, 1979). As

Dzuback (2003) declares, "The women's colleges opened their doors with the self-

conscious understanding that they were reaching out to a constituency that was different

from those at the majority of existing institutions" (p. 180). Women's colleges provided

unique opportunities for women faculty members to excel in scholarly productivity and

become department heads, deans, and presidents of institutions of higher education.

While these accomplishments were notable, many female faculty members still faced

barriers related to rank and salary, and thus economics, in academe.

Solomon (1985) offers evidence of how women's life choices and education

affected women socially. In exploring the theme that involves the effects of education

upon women's life choices, the utility of women's education becomes the focus. The

author points out how the popularizing trend in public education, Reconstruction, and

expansion in university education propelled women's education forward, even though

there were setbacks due to the skepticism about the worth of educating women. As

Solomon (1985) points out, attacks on women's female brains and bodies, such as those

made by Dr. Edward Clarke (1873) in *Sex in Education* that declared women inferior,

only served to reinforce the determination of educators to expose educated women in a

positive light. An explosion in female enrollment occurred between 1902 and 1912 and

brought with it more criticism and strong reactions. For example, Solomon (1985) asserts that males became resentful at some institutions, like Stanford, because women earned more honors and awards. Jane Stanford even limited the number of women who could be enrolled at one time. Solomon points out that this type of discrimination by ratios was overturned in 1933, and women stayed on the academic scene by their tenacity and faith. They gained access to diverse institutions that served their various needs and the push into higher education continued (Solomon, 1985).

Another area relative to the effects of education upon women's life choices is based on who went to college (Solomon, 1985). Ascent to college depended on recognition of the value of a college education for a particular daughter and available financial resources. Solomon declares that the female collegians came from a range of families within the expanding and broad middle class. Many parents and their daughters sought intellectual and economic independence and farm women who did not acquire a college education often understood the value of education. While many female students were self-supporting, some women's organizations established scholarships and loans to provide financial assistance for students. This is illustrated by organizations such as the Massachusetts Society for the University Education of Women, the Women's Scholarship Association of Boston, and the *Ladies Home Journal* contest. In addition, Solomon (1985) also notes that immigrants found that accessing higher education was difficult, very few blacks were allowed access to higher education, and the black college woman was the exception of exceptions. She argues that black women had to have significant family or teacher support to overcome strong social prejudice in order to gain access and succeed in college. Nevertheless, in the early twentieth century, collegiate

education appealed to women of many backgrounds, and by World War I it was an important option for women to achieve or aspire to.

According to Solomon (1985), the theme concerning the effects of education on women and their life choices also includes how liberal education for women was defined. She presents a liberal education as being based on the formal course curriculum, as well as exposure to intellectual issues confronting the larger society. Although women and men had similar interests in courses, students at women's colleges leaned toward the sciences as 41% of female scientists graduated from women's colleges. Professionalism versus a woman's usefulness were compared and debated in the context of women's roles in society. Whatever their principles on women's advancement, both male and female professors became mentors to brilliant female students. For example, professors provided exposure to intellectual issues confronting the larger society with the goal of instilling moral or ethical purpose and good character (Solomon, 1985).

Another effect that education had on educated women was that they made life choices based on their desire to pursue personal ambitions through work and professional careers, or get married and have children. Solomon (1985) clearly describes how the life choices of educated women were scrutinized by society, especially those who accused white women of race suicide because they had fewer children. The author also notes that although a substantial number remained single, the majority of college women did marry, but they married later than most uneducated women. The changing curriculum and its impact on college women also lead women to embrace well-roundedness and discover both feminine and feminist implications in their educations (Solomon, 1985).

Involvement in extracurricular activities with faculty members and administrators kept students constantly aware of their responsibilities as liberally educated women. Solomon (1985) reports that female collegians identified and defined themselves by the issues that challenged them, and by what they shared as students. Women in the early 1900s were more sophisticated than their predecessors, responsive to Progressive causes of social reform, and also flouting conventional mores. Students discovered what their talents were, experienced the cultural opportunities and social realities of city life, and they learned to live and work together in a community. Women at different types of institutions identified more with each other than with their male counterparts, and many separate activities and organizations were established. For example, women had their own literary clubs, sororities, and athletic activities. Outsiders such as Catholics, Jews, blacks, and immigrants were discriminated against and not allowed to join these organizations or participate in these activities. Some privileged students felt a responsibility to address social prejudices on and off campuses and began advancing the cause for women's suffrage and other social reforms.

As Solomon (1985) explains, educated women's association with women's suffrage and feminism was awkward, since not all women who supported education advancement for women joined in the causes. Some educated women strengthened their liberal attitudes toward women's employment and professionalism, while others believed that being a lady required staying out of the work force after marriage. Even though there was discourse regarding how educated women should participate in society after college and marriage, the traditional forms of social service were reshaped by the professionalizing of attitudes and methods in field work and social investigations. Many

engaged in teaching, nursing, social work, magazine writing, editing, and the performing arts. Although women made advances in many areas during the early 1900s, during the middle 1900s they had greater gains.

Strengthened by feminist incentives, professions such as law, medicine, and the professorate were actively pursued in greater numbers by women during the last half of the twentieth century. The civil rights movement and female activists of the women's movement became connected with the general student politicization of the late 1960s and resulted in enormous increases in the number of women students. The importance of education for women finally caught on, and that the main effect of higher education on women is that it provided women more options, including the opportunity to create multiple identities for themselves rather than those dictated by society (Solomon, 1985).

During the last decades of the twentieth century, women immersed themselves in higher education and experienced higher graduation rates then men (Jacobs, 1996; American Association of University Professors, 2005; Schoening, 2009). Women persisted in education despite the limited rewards and financial returns they gained (Jacobs, 1996). Graham (1978) notes that between 1930 and 1970, women's representation on the faculty of colleges in the U.S. declined before beginning a sustained advance during the 1970s and 1980s. Women were initially a small proportion of doctorate degree recipients and later entered academia in large numbers pursing fields that were facing sharp declines in enrollment (Slaughter, 1993). Even though women were advancing socially by attaining higher education and entering academic professions, they were still confined to the lower ranks and often in non-tenure track positions (American Association of University Professors, 2005).

In a phenomenological study of socialization of tenure-track female faculty members, Helvie-Mason (2007) reports that balance, place, support, and trust are themes that emerged as key elements to women's perceptions of their personal experiences. The women perceived socialization as filled with uncertainty, rejection, political astuteness, and they felt incongruence relative to those values rewarded professionally and their personal values. Their socialization was shaped by where to put their time and energy, and uncertainty in the promotion and tenure process. As Schoening (2009) points out, when women faculty members choose the tenure track, they often face intense pressure to make choices between family and careers. In order to avoid conflicts between family and work, women who stay in academia often choose non-tenure track or part-time faculty appointments. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2005), these appointments are generally the lowest paid and least secure. For as long as the AAUP survey has collected data on tenure status, since the 1970s, approximately 47 percent of women in full-time faculty positions have held tenure, while 70 percent of men have (AAUP, 2005). Salary inequities continue to be an issue with economic concerns for women in higher education.

<center>Economic Effects</center>

Economic issues have been particularly challenging for women in higher education. When women began to achieve higher ranks, which is accompanied by an increase in salary, acceptance and collegiality did not always follow. This is illustrated in the case of Martha Deane at the University of California Los Angeles (Weiler, 2007). Women professors, especially single women professors, were viewed with growing suspicion. Deane, a tenured professor and one of only two tenured women full professors

in the fall of 1952, was suspended and forced into early retirement because of questions about her sexuality. Even though the issue at hand was claimed to be about political subversives and Communists in academia, it was actually about sexuality. The only acceptable sexual relationship was heterosexual, and women in positions of institutionalized power were suspect. Any woman in a relationship with another woman was a threat to the American way of life. A disgruntled neighbor accused Deane of being lesbian, and it ended the professional career that she had worked hard to achieve. Some male faculty members continued to be hostile to other women professors and would not support them in any way. This case reveals antagonism and personal animosities toward institutionalized powerful women in university professorships, including a fear of lesbian sexuality. As Weiler (2007) concludes, "Those who lived outside the patriarchal ideal were vulnerable to exposure and punishment" (p. 495). While the case of Martha Deane appears to be a good example, it is only one of many types of inequity that women faculty members have been confronted with in academe.

Karen L. Graves' (2009) work on the expulsion of gay and lesbian teachers in Florida during the Cold War in the mid-twentieth century provides an excellent example of how women were discriminated against based on sexuality, causing them to lose their jobs and economic stability. Female faculty members were screened and evaluated based "not only with regard to their professional and academic competency but also with regard to their ideology and their moral conduct" (p. 61). While resisting invasion into their personal lives, the teachers were targeted, interrogated, and their professional credentials were revoked. This had an enormous effect on the economic status of the women involved. They no longer had the capacity to earn a salary and maintain the lifestyle that

they were accustomed to. The set of consequences that spring from a predominately female workforce in a sexist culture, and the expectation that school teachers serve as role models for children, circumscribed female teachers' autonomy while also limiting their earning capacity and economic status (Graves, 2009).

Another example of how institutionalized power and feminism influenced the economic status of women during the Cold War and McCarthyism period is the study by Charles H. McCormick (1989). Female faculty member Luella Raab Mundel was head of the art department at Fairmont State College in West Virginia. She was an outsider who represented privatist religion, modern art, academic freedom, due process, a psychological worldview, and free thinking in a typical small town filled with conservative business-professional elite, provincialism, ignorance, and suspicion of big-city liberalism and modernism. Although there were some decent, fair-minded citizens in Fairmont, Mundel was accused of being an immoral communist, lost her job after two trials, and was cast out of campus and the community because of false statements and accusations. Clearly personal views had a negative effect on the professional life and economic status of Mundel as she was forced out of a respectable faculty position (McCormick, 1989).

In fact, rank and salary issues are also common for women faculty in institutions of higher education. First, the case of part-time faculty members was highlighted by Sheeks and Hutcheson (1998) in their study. The scholars report a higher percentage of female part-time faculty members than male, and that part-time faculty members, in general, did not receive the same support in the form of orientation, computers, inclusion, socialization, and evaluation as full-time faculty members. This is interesting in light of

the fact that the part-time female faculty members also appear to have heavier teaching

loads. Perhaps the inequity is a reflection of gender bias, and as Sheeks and Hutcheson

(1998) assert, if the trend of using part-time faculty members continues, colleges and

universities should work toward uniting full-time and part-time faculty members to

improve departmental and university functioning. Clifford (1989) reported that women

faculty members were disproportionately located at the bottom of faculty ranks, and in

irregular positions off the tenure-track. Institutional resistance to salary equity has been

strong for pragmatic reasons as well as the sheer prejudice of the view that women should

not be men's equal.

> Salary is an issue that has been in the forefront for faculty women for a
> long time. Hornig (1980) reports salary differences between men and
> women are widespread in all occupations and at all educational levels; the
> professoriate is no exception. The salaries of male faculty exceed
> women's by about 20 percent overall- a difference which follows in part,
> but only in part, from their different pattern of distribution among
> institutional types, fields, and ranks. (pp. 120-121)

Dzuback (2003) declares that women faculty encountered patterns of gender

discrimination in promotion, community expectations, and salary that were easier to

maintain when departments were controlled by males or administrators not committed to

academic women's professional advancement. The issue of salary discrepancies is

illustrated by Petrzelka (2004) in her study of gender stratification on campus. She found

that the wages are unevenly distributed between different colleges, and jobs are unevenly

distributed among males and females, with males occupying jobs with higher salaries.

Jacobs (1996) also found evidence that gender differences in salaries persist despite the

parity in education attained by women, and that women earn less than men even when

they have the same level of education. Regardless of the type of degree women hold, they

are much more likely to be in one of the lower ranks (Freeman, 1977; Haag, 2005; Umbach, 2007), and thus earn a lower salary than their male counterparts.

Umbach (2007) reports that on average, women faculty members earn approximate $18,000 or 21 percent less than their male counterparts. Even after controlling for disciplinary and human capital effects, women faculty members earn approximately 10 percent less than their male counterparts. For example, male faculty members in English literature earn approximately $55,000 while women earn approximately $50,000, and males in psychology earn approximately $69,000 while women earn approximately $63,000 (Umbach, 2007). Upon reviewing the report "AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006," Banerji (2006) agrees with the report's conclusion that salary inequities will continue unless institutions of higher learning establish a centralized review of all salaries at the time of appointment or hiring. As long as women hold only 36 percent of the assistant through full professor positions and 57 percent of the lecturer and instructor positions, these significant differences between women and men's average salaries will remain (Banerji, 2006). The *Digest of Education Statistics* (2009) reports that during the 2007-2008 academic year at public institutions, 42.6 percent of females and 56.2 percent of males held tenure (Table 264). During the 2009-2010 academic year at public institutions, 42.9 percent of females and 56.3 percent of males held tenure (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 2010, Table 274). Unfortunately, the historical discourse relative to scholarship, rank, and salary persist today.

Women faculty members have experienced marginalization within disciplines and fields from the time they first entered the teaching profession. Since women were considered nurturers, they were guided toward the soft disciplines such as literary studies

(Biglan, 1973; Becher, 1989; Palmieri, 1995; Colbeck, 1998; Walton, 2000). Hard

disciplines such as math and the sciences were reserved for men (Solomon, 1985;

Palmieri, 1995). The marginalization of women into the soft disciplines has caused

barriers to promotion and tenure, as research and publication is considered more

prestigious in the hard disciplines (Umbach, 2007; Bonawitz & Andel, 2009; Schoening,

2009). For example, Bonawitz and Andel (2009) report that most women still earn their

degrees in the soft disciplines of education, social science, the humanities, and health

related fields, creating a "pink collar barrio" (p. 3) in the academy. More evidence of how

women continue to dominate in the soft disciplines is provided by the *Digest of*

Education Statistics (2009). Data show that 37,357 females and 17,681 males earned

bachelor's degrees in English language and literature, while 6,134 females and 3,027

males earned master's degrees in the same areas. In contrast, at the doctoral level, 809

females and 453 males earned doctorate degrees in English (*Digest of Education*

Statistics, 2009, Table 307). Furthermore, the number of tenure track positions declines

as the number of women in these fields increases (West & Curtis, 2006), and these fields

do not receive the corporate grant funding as the science, technology, engineering, and

mathematics (STEM) fields (Bonawitz & Andel, 2009). Pink collar fields also do not

afford as many opportunities for promotion and tenure, and when female faculty

members do make it onto the tenure track, they encounter hurdles that their male

colleagues rarely encounter. Some of the hurdles that women may encounter include

limited opportunities for promotion, research funding, rank held, conference support,

salary cap, and private office space (Bonawitz & Andel, 2009). Clearly, this promotes

the marginalization of women in the soft disciplines.

In a similar view, Acker (1983) contended that faculty women are paradoxically, both extravisible and invisible. According to Clifford (1989), manifestations of extravisibility include constant pressure where one is the exception and is thus, on trial as the representative of all other women who aspire to become faculty members in academe. Invisibility includes lack of recognition and support through promotions, salaries, holding association offices, offers of outside consulting, publication offers, university-conferred honors, the quality of interaction with colleagues, and being taken seriously in general. Some women faculty members even report feeling a sense of vulnerability and betrayal while serving in administrative positions (Clifford, 1989). In his historical account of the plight of women in education, Herbst (1989) documented the challenges that women have faced since the nineteenth century, making this a centuries-old problem. Although more women than men chose teaching, they followed that profession as a short-term pursuit, and those few who remained in the teaching profession longer lagged behind their male colleagues in achieving advanced positions in either teaching or administration. The scholar also declares that women faculty members did not fare well as evidenced by the low esteem in which they were held by fellow citizens, and the minimal financial awards they were allowed along with the expectations they were asked to meet. Financial rewards followed rank which could be limited for women in many fields (Herbst, 1989). As Clifford (1989) stated, if women faculty members were in fields like nursing where they are dominant, women's progress would be more equitable, they would be promoted in rank more rapidly and, as a result, earn higher incomes.

In many ways, rank is based on the scholarship, productivity and research of individual faculty members. The criteria for rank, or promotion and tenure, can be quite

rigorous and involves high levels of research and writing for publication. Criteria generally required at most institutions are related to the traditional domains of the professorate which are teaching, service, and scholarship (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). While these domains are essential for teaching in higher education, what constitutes scholarship is a matter of discourse in academe. Tenure criteria, requirements, and expectations are not consistent in higher education, and women and men may be held to different standards as they navigate the tenure process. Although women may engage in the various methods of scholarship to achieve rank, the individuals evaluating their work are usually men, and they have the institutionalized power to control women's progress or lack of progress in the academy.

Kelly and Slaughter (1991) point out gender inequities in the academy, and Haag (2005) and Schoening (2009) give evidence that inequalities in higher education have continued to persist. While women have increased their presence in higher education, they have not made the same gains in terms of job opportunities and advancement, and men continue to outnumber women in privileged and professional positions, including rank and tenure. Institutions of higher education also remain dominated by men who serve as administrators and professors and they hold much of the authority and institutionalized power in the institutions. Even when women hold the same degrees as men, they usually reap differential rewards and lower positions, including tenure. Having the same qualifications as men does not mean that women have similar life chances (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Umbach, 2007).

As described by Merton (1988), the "Matthew Effect," (p. 608) may be an additional way that women encounter barriers to achieving higher rank in the academy.

Even though women faculty members may research and publish alone or in collaboration, they may not acquire the same recognition of other, already prominent scholars. As Merton (1988) points out that "The already better known investigator in a field gets the credit for joint work, irrespective of the order of authors on the paper, and so gets even better known by an autocatalytic process" (p. 608). I argue that since males dominate higher education and have done research that led to tenure, they are the ones who may have more exposure in their field of expertise. Even though collaborative work may have a relatively unknown woman as first author on a publication, the male who is already published and more familiar to readers and colleagues will attain more and more recognition. This may put women at a disadvantage regarding research and scholarly productivity that could lead to tenure. The "Matthew Effect" (p. 608) may slow the progress of women as they work to achieve tenure even though they may be researching and publishing at rates equal to or greater than their male counterparts.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

In this chapter, I reviewed the literature surrounding the main research question for this study: *how do women in higher education experience the tenure process*? The qualitative studies and data provided by Tierney and Bensimon (1996), Clark and Corcoran (1986), along with the studies and reports by Bonawitz and Andel (2009), Schoening (2009), and Umbach (2007) informed my research as I examined the experiences of female faculty members and generated insights about the intersection of institutionalized power and gender relative to women's experiences in the academy. Using power influenced by gender as the theoretical framework for this study, the intersection of race and gender were also addressed. The academy, tenure requirements

and expectations, and challenges that women face were explored. Challenges that women encounter are many and include inequity in assignments, smile/mom work, ineffective peer relations, and lack of research funding. I also examined some of the challenges reflected in the political, social, and economic aspects of women's professional lives as they negotiate their multiple identities. These particular challenges can have marked effects on the outcomes of women's professional careers. Other studies provide evidence that because institutionalized power is owned by males in the academy, the challenges for women continue to be barriers to tenure. As men control institutionalized power in the academy, challenges may continue to exist until more women are in administrative, and thus, more institutionalized powerful positions in academia.

My research enhances the existing literature in several ways. First, I investigated the experiences of women in academia who have achieved tenure beyond the challenges illuminated in quantitative data. The quantitative data present evidence of a systemic problem of marginalization of women, including underrepresentation in tenure positions, but do not highlight the experiences of individual women in that system. Research conducted with individual cases is essential to understanding and explaining issues at the more broad, societal and institutional level (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009; Yin, 2009). Second, I researched the experiences of women in the specific context of a small public university, a context that is largely missing from the literature. The existing literature reports research that was conducted at mostly larger research universities, but offers little to inform our understanding of women's experiences with the tenure process in a small public university. Finally, by conducting in-depth interviews with each participant, I expand the data about the experiences of women during the tenure process. In chapter

three, I present research methods, which includes a discussion of qualitative case study

research, phenomenology, in-depth qualitative interviews, and the research process.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This study of the experiences of women who achieved tenure was a qualitative

research study using a phenomenological case study approach and in-depth interviews as

the primary data collection technique. Before describing the research process, I will

discuss qualitative case study research, phenomenology, theories of power and gender

relative to phenomenology, and in-depth interviews. I also explore why phenomenology

is an appropriate methodology for this type of study. While my study is not a traditional

phenomenological study, it is phenomenological in its approach to case study research.

Qualitative Case Study Research

Qualitative, case study research utilizing phenomenological interviews is an

approach to scholarly inquiry that can be utilized in a broad range of studies focused on

human beings, their experiences, and how they make meaning of their experiences.

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2003), qualitative research has a long, distinguished,

and sometimes distressed history in the human disciplines. The word *qualitative* implies

an emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and meanings that are not

experimentally measure (if measured at all) or examined in terms of quantity, intensity,

amount, or frequency. Qualitative researchers stress the intimate relationship between the

researcher, what is studied, the situational constraints that shape inquiry, and the socially

constructed nature of reality. They seek to answer questions that focus on *how* social

experience is created and given meaning (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Regarding

constructed realities, Lincoln and Guba (1995) assert: "Events, persons, objects are

indeed tangible entities. The meanings wholeness derived from or ascribed to these

tangible phenomena in order to make sense of them, organize them, or reorganize a belief system, however, are *constructed realities*" (p. 84). In this same view, St. Pierre (1997) asserts that qualitative inquiry encourages efforts to produce knowledge differently and produce different knowledge. It stretches across cultural boundaries and national divides as well as across disciplinary discourses and practices (St. Pierre & Roulston, 2006).

Glesne (2006) contends, "Qualitative research methods are used to understand some social phenomena from the perspectives of those involved, to contextualize issues in the particular socio-cultural-political milieu, and sometimes to transform or change social conditions" (p. 4). Qualitative researchers seek to interpret and understand how participants in a social setting construct the world around them. According to Glesne (2006), predispositions of qualitative approaches to research include four tenets. First are the assumptions that reality is socially constructed and variables are interwoven, complex, and difficulty to measure. Second are research purposes that involve contextualization, interpretation, and understanding. The third tenet focuses on research approaches which are naturalistic, inductive, and descriptive, use the researcher as instrument, seek pluralism, and may result in hypotheses and theory. The fourth tenet emphasizes the researcher role as including personal involvement and empathic understanding. Qualitative research looks for patterns but does not try to reduce the multiple interpretations to a norm (Glesne, 2006). The paradigm from which qualitative research emanates is constructivist or interpretivist and maintains that humans construct their perceptions of the work, that no one perception is more real or right, and that realities must be seen as wholes rather than divided into discrete variable that are analyzed separately. Values that apply to qualitative research are trustworthiness, rapport,

and reflexivity (Glesne, 2006). In support of qualitative research, Preissle (2006) contends that it represents a theory-practice nexus in which theory and practice are interactive and interdependent with a focus on self-consciousness and self-awareness by both the researcher and participants.

A qualitative research approach capitalizes on the five principle strengths of qualitative research as put forth by Maxwell (1996). The strengths are the capacity to examine 1) the *meaning* for participants of the situations, events, and actions in which they are involved; 2) the particular *context* within which participants act including how the context influences such actions; 3) phenomena and influences that are *unanticipated* which emerge spontaneously in interviews that are open-ended in ways that cannot in structured interviews; 4) the *process* by which actions and events take place; and 5) relationships that are *casual* and complex. Qualitative research allows the researcher and participants to interact in an environment that is natural and conducive to data gathering while drawing on the feelings, desires, memories, social activities, and perceptions of the participants (Maxwell, 1996). In my study, I utilized qualitative case study research to interact with women in their professional environment and gather data regarding their feelings, desires, memories, social activities, and perceptions as they navigated the tenure process to achieve tenure.

Merriam (1998) states that qualitative case studies are prevalent throughout the field of education and offers two definitions of a case study. First, a qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single phenomenon, instance, or social unit (Merriam, 1988). Second, the case is seen as a single entity, a thing, a unit around which there are boundaries and the object of the study can be fenced in, and it

could be a person, a program, a group, a community, or a specific policy (Merriam, 1998). It is a phenomenon that occurs in a bounded context (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The bounded case may be selected because it is an instance of some issue or concern and focuses on holistic description and explanation. Qualitative case studies can also be defined by special features and be characterized as descriptive, particularistic, or heuristic (Merriam, 1998).

According to Merriam (1998), descriptive case studies produce end products comprised of rich, thick description of the phenomenon under study. These case studies include many variables and portray their interactions over a period of time. There is a complete, literal description of the entity or phenomenon being investigated. Particularistic case studies focus on a particular event, program, situation, or phenomenon and the case is important for what it reveals about the phenomenon and what it may represent. These case studies are a good design for situations, questions, or puzzling occurrences that arise from everyday practice. Heuristic case studies illuminate understanding of the case or phenomenon under study and can extend the reader's experience, confirm what is known, or produce discovery of new meaning. The uniqueness of a case study lies in the questions asked and their relationship to the end product, rather than in the methods employed (Merriam, 1998). My study is a particularistic case study as it focuses on tenured women in the academy and their experiences with the tenure process. Shaw (1978) contends that this type of case study takes a holistic view of the situation and concentrates attention on the way particular groups of people confront specific problems. The case itself (tenured women) at a small public university is important for what it may reveal and what it may represent.

Hays (2004) declares that case study research involves the close examination of topics, issues, people, or programs. Such studies might explore experiences of identified groups and are known as particular cases unique in the character and content. These studies seek to answer focused questions and produce in-depth descriptions and interpretations over a relatively short period of time. Case studies investigate contemporary cases for the purposes of understanding and illumination. Discovering the uniqueness of the case is the main purpose in uncovering new and unusual interactions, events, interpretations, explanations, and cause-and-effect connections (Hays, 2004). Yin (2009) states, "A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 18). My study investigated women's experiences with the tenure process at a single institution, which is a contemporary phenomenon that has shaded boundaries relative to context in higher education. I wish to understand the real-life phenomenon of the tenure process for women in dept, but such understanding also encompasses important contextual conditions that are highly pertinent to the process for women (Yin, 2009).

<div align="center">Phenomenology</div>

In higher education, institutionalized power and tenure are constructed by those in positions of power and they are usually men. Because institutionalized power and tenure are important constructs in higher education, the epistemological stance for my study is constructivism which is a variant of constructionism as presented by Crotty (2003). Constructionism is the view that knowledge and meaningful reality is contingent upon human practices that are constructed in and out of interaction between humans and their

world, and developed and transmitted within a social context. "According to constructionism, we do not create meaning. We construct meaning. We have something to work with. What we have to work with is the world and objects in the world" (Crotty, 2003, pp. 43-44).

Constructivism is the epistemological consideration that focuses on the meaning-making activity of the individual mind and emphasizes the unique experience of each individual. It suggests that one's way of making sense of the world is as worthy and valid as any other (Crotty, 2003). Schwandt (1994) asserts that constructivism focuses on the practical and instrumental function of theory construction and knowing. Constructivism describes how individuals engage with objects in the world and how they make sense of them, and phenomenology requires individuals to engage with phenomena in the world and make sense of them directly and immediately (Crotty, 2003). Women in higher education engage in a world that is constructed by men in institutionalized power, yet the presence of women has some influence on such construction. Since the academy, institutionalized power, and the process of achieving tenure are constructed by individuals involved and influenced by feminism, constructivism is an appropriate epistemology for inquiry into the experiences of tenured women in the academy. My research describes how women engaged with the process, the environment, and how they made sense of them directly and immediately as they worked to achieve tenure.

While constructivism is the epistemological stance for my study, the theoretical perspective is the paradigm of interpretivism with phenomenology as its focus. Interpretivism is also the theoretical perspective that underpins phenomenology as

methodology. It provides the context for the process, its logic, and criteria (Crotty, 2003).

Grbich (2009) declares that constructivism and interpretivism fit well together as

These positions assume that there is no objective knowledge independent of

thinking. Reality is viewed as socially and societally embedded and existing within the

mind. This reality is fluid and changing and knowledge is constructed jointly in

interaction

> by the researcher and the researched through consensus. Knowledge is
> subjective, constructed and based on the shared signs and symbols which
> are recognized by members of a culture. Multiple realities are presumed,
> with different people experiencing these differently. (p. 8)

According to Grbich (2009), there are three major characteristics of the

constructivist/interpretivist paradigm. First, the research focus is on exploration of how

individuals interpret and make sense of their experiences in the worlds in which they live.

The influence of the contexts of situations, events, and how they are placed within wider

social environments and their impact on constructed understandings is also explored.

Second, the understandings that researchers construct and impose through interpretation

are viewed as limited by the frames derived from their personal life experiences. Third,

the researcher's own views and how they have been constructed (subjectivity) and

reconstruction of views through interaction with others (intersubjectivity) are also

significant (Grbich, 2009). A case study using a phenomenological approach to

investigating women's experiences with the tenure process fits well within these

perspectives. As researcher, I explored participants' interpretations and views of their

experiences within the context of the tenure process, with the understanding that my

interpretations are limited as they are constructed and imposed based on the frames

acquired from my own life experiences. My own subjectivities and intersubjectivities resulting from interaction with participants were also significant to the research process.

Phenomenology, the focus of the interpretivist paradigm in my study, is a theoretical perspective that has a broad approach to philosophical inquiry with multiple paths representing various philosophical and methodological interpretations. Although phenomenology provides the context for this study, this is not a traditional phenomenological study. It is a phenomenological case study of women who have achieved tenure in a small public university. Crotty (2003) points out that phenomenology places emphasis on " Back to the things themselves!" (p. 78), which are phenomena that present themselves immediately to us, as human beings. According to Crotty (1996) phenomenology also suggests that, if we put aside, as best we can, the prevailing understandings of phenomena and revisit our immediate experience of them, then it is possible for new meanings to emerge or we experience at least an authentication and enhancement of former meaning. The work of Edmund Husserl (1913/1997; 1931/1967) is the foundation for the three interpretations of phenomenology which are transcendental (classical), existential, and hermeneutic.

Husserl's (1913/1997; 1931/1967) view of phenomenology is transcendental or classical and contends that individuals are set in a world that has constant changes, yet remains one and ever the same with objects constituted as pure consciousness. The world is also continually present, since each individual is a member of the world and engages in a consciousness that includes all experiences. The essence of conscious experiences is the accompanying inquiry, background intuition (awareness), sensory perception, and reflection. Polkinghorne (1983) posits that Husserl's interpretation of phenomenology

proposes two basic approaches to the study of human experience and they are the method of free variation and intentional analysis. Free variation leads to the description of essential or invariant structures and disengages the idea of a structure from all accidental aspects manifested in a particular structure. For example, a particular apple may be red, but redness is not part of the essence of appleness because there are also green and yellow apples. The structure of appleness includes a particular skin texture, stem, and seeds. Intentional analysis describes how a particular experience has been constructed by focusing on a concrete experience itself. Attention is given to a particular experience in which the various modes and structures of consciousness that have been synthesized to constitute it are descriptively explained and analyzed to create a unique experiential moment (Polkinghorne, 1983).

According to Kockelmans (1967), Husserl's view of phenomenology asserts that perception is the most original among all our acts that refer to things, and we express it in judgments and proceed through induction and deduction to new knowledge. That which manifests itself through our consciousness and bodily presence is true and certain and does not need any further foundation (Kockelmans, 1967). Husserl (1931/1967) states that reflexion is an expression for acts in which the stream of experience, with all of its manifold events, intentionalities, and phases of experience, can be grasped and analyzed in systematic order based on its own evidence. The phenomena of reflexion are comprised of a sphere of pure, and perhaps some of the clearest, data. It is an essential insight always attainable because it is immediate, and it is the basic peculiarity of the sphere of experience (Husserl, 1913/1997; 1931/1967). The inquiry associated with phenomenology also includes phenomenological reductions.

Phenomenological reductions are essential to consciousness and include the process of bracketing as we allow the experience of phenomena to speak to us at first hand (Crotty, 2003). To bracket means to put to one side or set aside the taken-for granted world in order to intentionally reflect and concentrate on the perception of that world (Husserl, 1931/1967). Bracketing uses reductions and a different way of thinking and reasoning to move the researcher away from their own assumptions and preconceptions. Personal assumptions and preconceptions may misdirect and distract from the phenomenon at hand and bracketing moves the researcher back towards the essence of the given phenomenon (Smith et al., 2009). In addition, reduction of the cultural world to the world of immediate experience, and transcendental reduction that leads us from the phenomenal worldly "I" to transcendental subjectivity also occurs (Husserl, 1931/1967). The reduction that leads us from the cultural world to the world of our immediate experience appears to be the most idealistic type (Husserl, 1913/1997; 1931/1967), and may offer freedom from presuppositions in philosophical procedure, which is the ideal that should be imposed upon epistemological investigation (Farber, 1943). Husserl's contention that phenomenological reduction could provide adequate technique for reflective descriptive analysis seems suitable for phenomenological inquiry as it prohibits prejudgments (Farber, 1943). This reduction also moves from the real to the abstract relative to structures of the world and how people act and react within the realms of consciousness, intentionality, and essences (Grbich, 2009).

Martin Heidegger's concept of phenomenology questions Husserl's essences and their associated layer of consciousness (Crotty, 2003; Grbich, 2009). Heidegger (1962) suggests that consciousness is not separate from the world and, instead, is a formation of

historically lived human existence. Grbich (2009) declares that this concept of phenomenology is existential and sees consciousness as being linked to human existence, particularly in relation to the active role of the body and to freedom of action and choices, and not as a separate entity. The focus is on the issues of in-the-world existence with intentionality linking humans with their physical contexts. These contexts are *place* which represents temporal and spatial location, *home* which represents a location and a state of mind in a particular situation, and *lifeworld* which represents mundane daily occurrences. Humans have the capacity to respond and react to situations and relationships with others that they meet, confront, or are attached to in their worlds. According to Grbich (2009), in these worlds, the notion of "free choice" (p. 90) is viewed as an individual responsibility not to be left to society or the group. The physical and intellectual experiences (actions, emotions), the choices and responsibilities that are possible, and the interconnectedness of individuals from "being-in-the-world" (p. 90) all provide a focus for "being" (p. 90).

Scholars such as Moustakas (1994) and van Mannen (1990) present the hermeneutic concept of phenomenology that investigates the interpretive structures of experience of texts, whether private, public, in the form of art or other material forms. This concept emphasizes the everyday lived experience. Grbich (2009) contends that this interpretive view can occur either from the inside with a focus on interaction between the interpreter and the text, or from the outside from the perspective of the "objective" (p. 91) researcher. The essence of "being" (p. 91), or existence, is the overarching hidden aspect, which becomes evident through the activities of "beings" (p. 91), or individuals, as everyday transactions predominate. In addition to bracketing, which is suspended during

interviews, reflective journals of the researcher's personal assumptions, experiences, and views, are essential as the researcher and study participants co-construct data (Grbich, 2009). According to Moustakas (1990) and his view of heuristic research, which is a branch of hermeneutic phenomenology, the research process is one of internal search that leads to discovery of the nature and meaning of experience and develops methods and procedures for further investigation and analysis. Moustakas (1990) also declares,

> The heuristic process is a way of being informed, a way of knowing. Whatever presents itself in the consciousness of the investigator as perception, sense, intuition, or knowledge represents an invitation for further elucidation. What appears, what shows itself, casts a light that enables one to come to know more fully what something is and means. In such a process not only is knowledge extended but the self of the researcher is illuminated. (pp. 10-11)

The researcher experiences growing self-awareness and self-knowledge while understanding the phenomenon with increasing depth. The process of discovery also leads the researcher to new images and meanings about human phenomena, as well as realizations relevant to their own experiences and lives (Moustakas, 1990). Transcendental, existential, and hermeneutic phenomenology may be applied to various types of qualitative research. Some scholars (Crotty, 2003; Grbich, 2009) declare that it is common for the three types of phenomenology to overlap, which enhances applicability in various kinds of disciplines and research studies.

Grbich (2009) contends that phenomenology is an approach which attempts to understand the hidden meanings and the essence of an experience, including how participants make sense of the meanings and experience. This view contends that phenomenology involves exploring experiences in depth to clarify their essences, and that the foundations of knowledge could be placed upon reality as it is consciously

interpreted. Objectivity and subjectivity are combined as the actual spatial and temporal event, together with the feelings, memories, and multi-visual images associated with the event, to comprise the whole. "The major outcome pursued in phenomenology is the description of the structures of consciousness of everyday experiences as experienced at first hand" (Grbich, 2009, p. 86).

Another view of phenomenology is presented by Crotty (2003) which suggests that "if we lay aside the prevailing understandings of phenomena, and revisit our immediate experience of them, possibilities for new meaning emerge for us, or we may witness an authentication and enhancement of former meaning" (p. 78). This view of phenomenology contends "that there *are* 'things themselves' to visit in our experience" (p. 79) and "objects to which our understandings relate" (p. 79), and thus there is intentionality. The notion of intentionality proclaims there are such objects and that they lie at the heart of phenomenology (Crotty, 1996; 2003). Husserl's (1931/1967) claim that intentionality is a concept which is quite indispensable as a starting-point and basis at the threshold of phenomenology appears to be the foundation for Crotty's (2003) claims.

Intentionality also refers to the way the researcher uses established objects and ways of seeing to judge and analyze experiences, while combining objectivity and subjectivity to enhance knowledge outcomes (Crotty, 2003). Phenomenology involves engaging with phenomena in our world and making sense of phenomena directly and immediately, and this refers to what we directly experience as the things themselves (Crotty, 2003). "Phenomenology is both a school of philosophy and a research method used in the human sciences. The philosophy is the conceptual framework and the method is the application of these concepts in a real world situation" (Melby, Dodgson, &

Tarrant, 2008, p. 178). Polkinghorne (1983) states that both the phenomenological and hermeneutic systems provide contexts of knowledge important in qualitative inquiry. The phenomenological approach is descriptive and focuses on the structures of experience which provide the organizing principles that give form and meaning to the *lifeworld*. The hermeneutic approach is interpretive and emphasizes the historical meaning of experience and its cumulative and developmental effects, and both the individual and social levels (Polkinghorne, 1983). A phenomenological approach in methodology and case study method can be used to distill the experiences of the participants in a study. Drawing from Crotty's (2003) view of qualitative inquiry and phenomenology, methodology involves the strategy, plan of action, design of process behind the choice and use of particular methods, and links the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes. Method refers to the tools, procedures, or techniques used to collect and analyze data related to a research hypothesis or question. Using phenomenology and a case study approach to conduct phenomenological interviews in my study did yield a deeper understanding of the phenomena in question, which is how women in higher education experience the tenure process.

Women in academia who have achieved tenure have direct experience of the tenure process and what it means to them. In my study, I utilized phenomenological interviews to collect data from women who have become tenured within the last five years. In the process of collecting data, I listened attentively, reflected, and probed for rich, thick description of their experiences as they reflected on how they progressed through the tenure process. The tenured women recalled a range of feelings, thoughts, and actions associated with the tenure process. The data provided allowed me to judge

and analyze their experiences while employing objectivity and subjectivity in a systematic manner that enhanced knowledge outcomes. The phenomenological method has a wide range of application to the various fields of scholarship and may be utilized as the methodology as well as the method in research.

<div align="center">Theories of Power and Gender Versus Phenomenology</div>

Since theories of power and gender are major frameworks for this study, a discussion of these theories relative to phenomenology is warranted. Institutionalized power within the context of this study is exercised by those in dominant positions in higher education, and they are usually male (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Helvie-Mason, 2007; Kelly & Slaughter, 1991). Lukes' (1974) theory of power suggests that power operates within a particular political and moral perspective. The focus on control over decision-making, political agendas, issues, and conflicts is dominated and carefully monitored by males (Lukes, 1974). According to Bensimon and Marshall (2000),

> Power and politics feminisms identify the range of structural, overt and subtle mechanisms through which men retain the power to define and control institutions, policy and women's activities, options and even their identity. The institutionalized power of men to manage the social construction of identity, with man at the center, makes women *Other*; what and who women are can be molded to work in support, for example, of patriarchy in family life and capitalism in the gendered hierarchies of work and professions. (p. 135)

In Arendt's (1970) view, males also derive legitimacy from unity and this makes power consensual. Since women are fewer in numbers in the academy, they lack institutionalized power, and this lack of power has been experienced by women in the academy for many years (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Branch-Brioso, 2009; Eliou, 1991; Lerner, 2008; Premeaux & Mondy, 2002). This makes institutionalized power important in relation to phenomenology in this study.

Phenomenology places emphasis on revisiting experiences to enhance meaning making (Crotty, 1996), and reflection and perception are a part of all experiences, including the phenomenological process (Husserl, 1913/1997; 1931/1967). In this study, power and phenomenology are associated because women in the academy lack institutionalized power, yet they can still reflect on their experiences and the conscious perceptions that they developed as a result of the lack of institutionalized power during the tenure process. Their experiences offer a thick, rich description of situations they encountered while progressing through the tenure process. Phenomenology can assist women in grasping and analyzing (Husserl, 1931/1967) the influence that institutionalized power played in their tenure process, and it may also shed light on how each woman creates a unique experiential moment as she descriptively explains and analyses her own tenureness (Polkinghorne, 1983). Romero and Stewart (1990) declare that women's stories cannot be fully comprehended and understood without first considering the specific institutionalized power structure (political, social, economic) in which they are constructed and told. In this study, institutionalized power is defined as a concept endorsed by the master narrative (men) to maintain consensus and unity in order to control political agendas and decision-making (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Lukes, 1974).

Similar to institutionalized power, gender is also an essential concept of this study, and it is closely aligned with feminism and feminist theories. These theories examine oppressive representations of women while valuing the experiences perspectives of women (Collins, 1991/2000; hooks, 1984). According to feminist positions, society disadvantages females, favors males, and promotes policies from a male dominated view

(Ferguson, 1984; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Marshall, 1993). These policies represent master narratives (Romero & Stewart, 1999) that serve to reinforce the legitimacy of the dominant position, gender, class, and race arrangements (Delgado, Stefancic, & Harris, 2001). In her work on women in the academy, Glazer-Raymo (1999) utilizes a critical feminist perspective and offers evidence of the relationship between feminism and professionalism, the gendered construction of the academy, and the ways in which the policy environment impedes women's ability to eradicate barriers to their advancement in higher education. She asserts that women have been hampered by limited access to the male power structure and a lack of resources. Feminists have long argued that women's societal status has been impeded by a series of dichotomies which are political/domestic, dominant/subordinate, public/private, and they perpetuate separate spheres of existence for women and men. The dichotomies continue to exist not only in society, but in the academy as well. "The corporate university dominated by patterns of managerialism also perpetuates gender hierarchies and reward systems rooted in credentialism and expertise (Glazer-Raymo, 1999, p. xi). As Riley (1999) suggests, "Gender organizes and resides not only in the lives of all individuals but in all social institutions as well" (p. 375). Gender issues illuminate the challenges and barriers that women face when trying to achieve tenure (Freeman, 1977; Gibbons, 1992; Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Marshall & Anderson, 1995; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Since it is well documented that gender issues are of serious concern in higher education, utilizing phenomenology to study such issues is appropriate. Phenomenology offers an approach that emphasizes understanding the hidden meanings and essence of an experience (Grbich, 2009). As women reflect on their experiences with the tenure

process, objectivity and subjectivity, along with the memories, feelings, and images (Grbich, 2009) associated with the tenure process will comprise the whole experience. In Crotty's (2003) view of phenomenology, revisiting their tenure experience increases the possibility for new meaning or enhancement of former meaning. A phenomenological approach is an appropriate way of addressing gender issues in this study. In this study, gender is defined as a modern social structure used for the purpose of constructing women as a group to be subordinate to men as a group (adapted from Lober, 1994 and Risman, 2004).

Theories of power and gender are closely associated in the context of this study. Women in the academy are automatically subject to both institutionalized power and gender issues because they *are* women. Phenomenology provides a medium for examining the experiences of women as they achieved tenure because it focuses on meaning making, reflection, perception, feelings, and memories that occurred during the tenure process. Differences among people of different genders are not somehow natural, but arise through social institutions that are created by, and in turn, reinforce differences in institutionalized power (Riley, 1999).

<center>In-Depth Qualitative Interviews</center>

Hays (2004) asserts that interviews usually result in the most important type of data to be collected, and are one of the richest sources of data in a case study. Interviews provide information from a variety of perspectives that is very useful to the researcher. Crotty (2003) suggests that interviewing may be a useful tool with case study research. Data are usually gathered by using only open-ended questions to ensure that the subjective character of the experiences is not prejudiced, therefore unstructured

interviews with open-ended questions are utilized to collect data. Phenomenological

researchers create contexts that enhance participants' retrospective reflection on an

experience they have already lived through (van Mannen, 1990) allowing them to

describe the experience in as much detail as possible. Hays (2004) contends that as

participants describe the particular aspects of an experience as they lived it, the essence

of an experience emerges from interview data. Researchers seek to discover the structure

or essence of the experience through an interpretation of the rich, textual data provided as

participants describe the particular experience being studied. Thus, the purpose of

phenomenological interviews is to achieve a first-person description of the specified

domain of experience (van Mannen, 1990). The researcher assumes the role of learner,

while the participant is the one who has had the experience and is considered the expert

on the experience and can share it with the researcher (deMarrais, 2004).

Phenomenology is often used as the methodology and the method to study the

experiences and perceptions of participants across a variety of topics. For example, in one

study a qualitative phenomenological approach is used for the interview and analysis

framework to identify themes and describe the lived experience of nurses surrounding the

death of patients (Gerow, Conejo, Alonzo, Davis, Rodgers, & Domain, 2010). The study

by Melby, Dodgson, and Tarrant (2008) also applies a qualitative phenomenological

approach to identify themes and describe the lived experience of nurse educators. While

interviewing may be appropriate for my study, there are certain expectations that should

be applied in order to enhance the quality of the participant responses about their

experiences with the tenure process.

H. Rubin and I. Rubin (2005) put forth the concept of the responsive, depth interview, rather than ordinary conversation, as important in the data collection process. There are some similarities between the responsive interview and ordinary conversation and they include maintaining a continuous flow by carefully linking questions to each other and using transitions when topics are changed, clarification of meaning and rephrasing or summarizing to indicate understanding, asking for narratives and stories to obtain details, and signaling the end of the interaction. There are five characteristics of the responsive interviewing model and these are: 1) interpretations of participants' experiences and their understanding of the world in which they live and work; 2) beliefs, personality, and style of the researcher matter; 3) the researcher is subject to ethical obligations to protect the participants; 4) researchers should not impose their views on participants; and 5) responsive interviewing design is adaptive and flexible. The researcher is the tool of discovery (Rubin, H. & Rubin, I., 2005).

In addition, H. Rubin and I. Rubin (2005) contend that responsive interviews utilize electronic recording for accuracy and later analysis, note taking and immediate review to improve subsequent questioning, and timely transcribing of electronic recording while memory recall is still clear. The responsive interview keeps the interview primarily focused on the research question and guides the conversation by asking follow-up, open-ended questions related to the research topic in order to obtain depth and detail while clarifying answers that are superficial or vague. Responsive interviews are structured around stages that focus on introducing oneself (researcher) and the topic, asking easy questions while showing empathy, asking tough, provocative questions, toning down the emotional level by returning to less stressful questions, and closing

while maintaining respect and contact. By evaluating the interviews, researchers can examine participants' responses and use reflexivity and identification of personal subjectivities to reveal ways in which the interview process could be improved (Rubin, H. & Rubin, I., 2005). Grbich (2009) asserts that reflexive subjectivity is the constantly reflective and self-critical processes the researcher experiences during all stages of the research process. These processes involve a heightened awareness of the self in the process of knowledge creation, clarification of how one's beliefs have been socially constructed, and how these values are impacting on interaction (interviews), data collection, and data analysis in the research setting.

The purpose of phenomenological, depth interviews conducted as part of inquiry using case studies is to find out what happened, why, and what it means more broadly (Rubin, H. , & Rubin, I., 2005). In using a case study approach with women who became tenured in the academy, the goal was not just to figure out who is becoming tenured, but to figure out who is using the tenure process, and also to understand when and why women feel entitled to seek tenure, if they feel the process is fair, and what they believe about the academy in relation to their tenureness. In addition, the study addresses women's perceptions of the influence of institutionalized power and gender on their experiences, and what factors increased or decreased the perception that they would be successful. In this study I used the participants' reports of their experiences as their perceptions. As H. Rubin and I. Rubin (2005) assert, I hoped to be able to explain or understand the tenure process for women and to discover reasons for success. Phenomenology is reflected in the qualitative, case study approach as it examined the experiences of women and sought to glean what the experiences mean. Research based

on phenomenological, depth interviews helped me understand tenured women's professional lives and how they managed stress during the process, as well as challenges they encountered during the tenure process (Rubin, H. & Rubin, I., 2005).

Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009) report that interpretative phenomenological analysis, or IPA, is a qualitative research approach dedicated to examining how people make sense of their major life experiences. The scholars point out that this research approach can also be utilized as theory, method, and analysis. Interpretative phenomenological analysis is phenomenological and effective when doing case study research, single case studies in particular, as analytic induction is applied to explore detailed personal perspectives before moving to more general claims. In my study, participants recalled an experience of importance, the tenure process, reflected on the significance of what happened, and engaged in considerable hot cognition in trying to make sense of the experience (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). Although IPA can be used as theory, method, and analysis, I used IPA for data analysis. Smith (2009) and colleagues suggest that between three and six participants can be a reasonable sample size for IPA analysis. They argue that this should provide sufficient cases for development of meaningful points of difference and similarity between participants, but not so many that the researcher will be in danger of being overwhelmed by the amount of data generated. I referred to scholars such as Millward (2006), who uses IPA to identify themes and analyze the experiences of women as they transition to motherhood in an organizational context. According to Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009), IPA has two major theoretical axes. First, it is phenomenological because it is concerned with exploring experience on its own terms, and second it is an interpretative endeavor that is

influenced by hermeneutics. Access to experience is dependent on what participants tell researchers about the experience, and the researcher then interprets that account from the participant in order to understand their experience (Smith, et al., 2009). As interpretation occurs, themes are identified that may link the experiences of participants around the phenomenon under study (van Mannen, 1990).

According to van Mannen (1990), themes are insightful, interpretive discoveries and written attempts to uncover the notions of data in order to give them shape and make sense of them. Themes are fasteners or threads around which the phenomenological description is facilitated (van Mannen, 1990). An IPA approach encompasses a distinct configuration of methodological principles as well as suggestions for their application, which is idiographic, interrogative, and inductive. The idiographic principle focuses on the insider perspective on reality and involves a detailed analysis of one or only a few individual accounts, rather than aiming to describe objective reality outside of the lived experience. The interrogative principle refers to the need for interpretative engagement of in-depth analytic inquiry by the researcher who is interpreting the meanings derived. The inductive principle pertains to the way in which theory is evolved from the meaning derived from individual accounts (Smith, 1999). As Millward (2006) declares, the intention with IPA is not to build up an account of these meanings that can be generalized, but to produce a legitimate theoretical analysis for the sample in question. This analysis should be accountable to the participants themselves as it resonates with them as a way of understanding their own personal experiences, as well as to external readers of the account because there is sufficient evidence provided from individual accounts to assure readers of its credibility. Millward (2006) also suggests that IPA, with

emphasis on the idiographic principle, may be an effective way to analyze data gleaned from in-depth semi-structured interviews. Interpretative phenomenological analysis is committed to detailed examination of a particular case and examines in detail what the experience for each person is like, and what sense each particular person makes of what happened to them (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). Thus, individual statements are just as important as thematic statements during the data collection and analysis processes.

Phenomenology is reflected in IPA as both concepts are inductive and suggest that data are collected in order to make sense of the experiences of individuals, while themes were identified as data were analyzed. Husserl's (1913/1997) urging to go back to the things themselves underpins IPA as it is concerned with exploring experience in its own terms and how individuals make sense of their major life experiences (Smith et al., 2009). Only a few individual accounts are detailed to grasp the insider perspective on reality, and in-depth analytic inquiry assisted in co-constructing the meanings with participants (Smith, 1999). The aim of IPA is to reveal something of the experience of each of the participants in the study. The common thread is that the experience is of major significance to each participant, and each participant engaged in a considerable amount of thinking, reflecting, and feeling as they worked through what the experience means (Smith et al., 2009).

Since H. Rubin and I. Rubin (2005) claim the purpose of interviews conducted as part of case studies is to find out what happened, why it happened, and what it means, the case studies of three tenured women in academia were appropriate for this study. In research that utilizes IPA for analysis, case study approaches can also be used to generate rich and particular accounts by focusing on a specific type of phenomenon or unit (Smith,

Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). A case study method assisted me in understanding the experiences of women during the tenure process, as well as discovering causes and explaining the phenomenon.

<div align="center">Generation of Data</div>

In my study, the focus of the interviews was the participants' experiences, perceptions, feelings, and actions related to the process of becoming tenured. I sought to identify patterns of meaning, understandings, and definitions of the situation from women who have achieved tenure at a small public regional university south of Atlanta. Interaction between the participants and I served to produce a constructed reality and the participants' voices were given priority (Crotty, 2003). As Johnson-Bailey (2004) declares, "No research methodology can provide a perfect balance for telling and representing" (p. 138); however, I remained vigilantly aware of institutionalized power issues which could affect competing political agendas, the societal hierarchies surrounding the process, and the balance of voices (Johnson-Bailey, 2004). Kvale (1996) contends that the researcher does not uncover some preexisting meanings, but supports the participants in developing their meanings throughout the course of the interview.

As researcher, I conducted two semi-structured interviews with each participant. The first interview lasted for 45-60 minutes while the second interview was a follow-up interview that lasted 15 minutes. Audio tapes were used to conduct the interviews, they were transcribed verbatim, and participants verified the transcriptions for accuracy relative to the taped interviews. I looked for common patterns of meaning through preliminary data analysis and thematic analysis. (I describe this process in detail later in this chapter.) Semi-structured interviews are open-ended, flexibly worded, and assume

that individual respondents define the world in unique ways (Merriam, 1998). Themes were identified from the data, while the major focus was on in-depth understanding of the participants' experiences and identification of related issues. Phenomenological inquiry is an effort to understand, identify, describe, and maintain the subjective experiences of the participants in an uncritical manner (Crotty, 2003). In order to achieve this outcome, I used bracketing during the interviews. Using bracketing means I made every effort to put to one side, or set aside, the taken-for granted world of the tenure process, including my personal assumptions, in order to intentionally reflect and concentrate on the perceptions of that world (Husserl, 1931/1967). This does not mean that I made the taken-for-granted world disappear. By bracketing, I was able to move away from the distraction and misdirection of my own assumptions and preconceptions back towards the essence of the participants' experiences with the tenure process (Smith, et al., 2009). Since I may, at some point in my professional career, seek tenure, I made every effort to put myself in the place of the participants which is, according to Crotty (2003), sometimes referred to as "the great phenomenological principle" (p. 83). My own subjectivities, as Johnson-Bailey (2004) suggests, will allow readers to know the lens through which the research is presented and to make their own evaluations about the worth and legitimacy of the study.

The concept of lens also brings to mind Johnson-Bailey's (2004) contention of positionality. Most research is in some way connected to the researcher through individual connections, special interests, emotional and psychological ties, or both. In relation to the participants, I may have been considered both an insider and an outsider at some point. The fact that I am female and teach in the same institution of higher learning as the participants made me an insider. In contrast, the fact that I am not tenured, nor am I

seeking tenure at this point, also made me an outsider. My experience as the researcher, and as an insider or outsider, was not fixed given the setting. In addition, my perspectives were multifaceted and susceptible to shifts influenced by the changing research context, time, interaction with others, and other unpredictable factors (Johnson-Bailey, 2004). Fine (1994) seems to also support this view as she asserts that as researchers we probe how we are in relation with our participants, and with the contexts we study, understanding that we are all multiple in those relations. Since we are all multiple in those relations, and although bracketing was used during the research process, it was suspended when interviewing the participants in order to establish effective rapport and communication (Dreyfus, 1994). Researchers and participants are not exclusive of each other and co-create the data (Benner, 1994).

I obtained approval from the Institution Review Board (IRB) at Georgia State University and the small public university in which I conducted my study. Tenured faculty members often have teaching and research assignments, therefore it was important for me to schedule the interviews as soon as possible in order to accommodate their schedules, and be available when it was convenient for participants to meet for the interviews. In order to begin establishing rapport, I communicated with each participant via electronic email and by phone before the actual interview sessions began. This served to enhance the participants' willingness to speak freely during the interview session.

<div align="center">Sample</div>

In order to examine different perspectives on the experiences of women during the tenure process, for this study, I selected females who were tenured within the last five years at a small public university in the southern metropolitan Atlanta area. Between

three and six participants is a reasonable sample size for IPA analysis and provides sufficient cases for generation of meaningful points of similarity and difference (Smith et al., 2009). My study is a particularistic case study (Merriam, 1998) because it focuses on tenured women in the academy and their experiences with the tenure process. This type of case study views the situation in a holistic manner and concentrates attention on how particular groups of individuals confront specific problems (Shaw, 1978). The case, which is tenured women at a small public university, is important for what it may represent and also for what it may reveal. Although I selected the participants from a list of tenured female faculty members, each participant volunteered to participate in the study. I utilized purposeful sampling which is based on the assumption that the researcher wants to understand, discover, and gain insight, and must therefore select the participants from which the most can be learned and that meet the selection criteria (Merriam, 1998). The selection criteria for this study were women, and specifically women who have been tenured within the last five years.

I purposefully studied women who have been tenured within the last five years of their academic careers because they might have a different perspective than women who are in the latter part of their tenured careers in higher education. For example, an individual who has been tenured for more than five years may not focus on her experiences during the tenure process, but on what has happened since she became tenured, and this would yield a different perspective. I was interested in learning about the lived experiences of women as they negotiated the challenges to earn tenure. It is possible that a senior academician might have more difficulty reflecting and recalling her initial experiences during the tenure process. Additionally, I think it is important that all

of the women selected to participate in the study have approximately the same number of years tenured in order to improve the validity of the study. As a result of the underrepresentation of tenured women in higher education, it was necessary for the years since achieving tenure to be one to five years in order to have enough women to constitute a sample.

At the time of the interviews, the participants were faculty members in a small public university located near a large metropolitan region in the southeastern part of the United States. The institution began as a junior college and has been adding baccalaureate and masters degree programs for several years. The participants represented three disciplines from each of the following areas: the School of Business, College of Arts and Sciences, and School of Nursing. Each of the participants holds the rank of tenured associate professor in their respective departments and all names are pseudonyms. Ashlee Curtis is a management professor who has approximately 25 years of experience in higher education at various institutions. She set tenure as a personal goal after earning her doctoral degree. She communicates in an open, expressive manner and approaches life and her career with enthusiasm and creativity. Josie Hemphill is a nursing professor who is somewhat reserved, but animated and excited about teaching and being tenured. She has worked hard for her accomplishments, values fairness, and is very future oriented about her career and possible opportunities. Marley Jarrett is an applied science professor who is somewhat quiet and reserved. She likes her career and places emphasis on family and helping others achieve their goals in the academy.

After explaining the research design and obtaining consent, I began each interview with the suggestion that the participant reflect back on her decision to seek

tenure, including her experiences while she was going through the tenure process, to be able to provide rich, thick description. In order to examine experience, Husserl (1913/1997) suggests that we adopt a phenomenological attitude which involves a reflexive move as we turn our gaze from objects and experiences in the world and direct the gaze inward, towards our perception of those objects and experiences. For example, the participants reflected on what the tenure experience meant to them personally rather than the experience in general. Rich, thick description provides enough description to enhance readers' ability to determine how closely their situations match the research situation, and therefore, whether findings can be transferred (Merriam, 1998). Readers may be able to identify the participants' experiences as similar to their own. I utilized the responsive, depth interview technique (Rubin, H. & Rubin, I., 2005) to create an atmosphere of acceptance and openness so the participants would feel comfortable speaking with me. For instance, I listened carefully, linked questions to each other, and used transitions when topics changed. Since I may at some point seek tenure, I was genuinely interested in the experiences of the participants and was able to keep the focus positioned on their experiences with the tenure process.

As researchers, we need to initiate investigations that ask new questions about women who become tenured in higher education. I used open-ended questions to explore three women's experiences with the tenure process. As the interviews progressed, other questions arose from the participants' responses and my observations of their demeanor and body language. Due to the open-ended structure of the research, each participant was able to answer from her own perspective and frame of reference, and to freely express her thoughts, rather than from prearranged structure (Smith et al., 2009). However, as the

research progress, I discovered questions and concerns and adjusted my questions throughout the interview process. The interviews investigated how and why the women made the decision to seek tenure, challenges they encountered during the process, if they felt the process was fair, and what they thought about the institution relative to institutionalized power and gender issues. I identified themes and commonalities (discussed later) as the participants freely expressed their experiences with the tenure process and what the process meant for them.

<div align="center">Assumptions and Researcher Bias</div>

The research study and conclusions drawn from the data can always be shaped by the researcher's personal experiences. As Malterud (2001) points out, "A researcher's background and position will affect what they choose to investigate, the angle of investigation, the methods judged most adequate for this purpose, the findings considered most appropriate, and the framing and communication of conclusions" (pp. 483-484). I have been teaching in higher education for many years and have observed both women and men as they navigated the tenure process. As a female who may aspire to become tenured, I inherently brought some personal assumptions about challenges that women face during the tenure process to my research.

While personal assumptions and preconceptions may distract and misdirect the focus of inquiry (Smith et al., 2009), I utilized bracketing during the research process to assist me in staying focused on the essence of women's experiences with the tenure process. I made every effort to set aside my personal views about women's experiences with the tenure process; however, I brought five assumptions about challenges that women may experience during the tenure process. First, my perception is that, like men,

women find the tenure process challenging and stressful. It consumes most of the focus in the years immediately prior to the review. While teaching and research responsibilities continue, research and publication are the priorities. Second, as teaching and research responsibilities are ongoing, there seem to be limited resources relative to funding and classroom assistance to assist in these areas as women negotiate the tenure process. Third, women's qualifications and preparation are devalued in academia. A female with the same qualifications and preparation as a male may not get equal recognition for equivalent work or productivity. Fourth, expectations of women seeking tenure appear to be different from expectations of men seeking tenure. Women often have heavier teaching loads with little time for scholarly activities. They also have major childrearing and family responsibilities. Finally, mentors seem to have a positive effect on women as they navigate the tenure process. Having a mentor, whether male or female, provides the support and encourage needed over long periods of time as tenure challenges are addressed. Personal assumptions may not be universal; they are unique to me and my observations about women as they navigate the tenure process, and these assumptions are a part of my background and why I chose to investigate women's experiences with the tenure process.

As I began this research, I reflected on my personal assumptions but maintained an open mind regarding what I expected to find in the data generated from interviewing the participants. I entered the researcher-participant relationship with the expectation that the participants would be open to sharing their tenure process experiences with me. My background in academia informed my expectation. Since I am a nurse, over the years I developed and enhanced my communication, observation, and listening skills. I also

developed the skill of prioritizing both subjective and objective information and data.

Careers in nursing and academia have provided me continuous opportunities to establish

rapport with faculty members, students, clients, and other members of the health care

team, and utilize the nursing-related skills that enhance open, effective communication.

<center>Researcher's Role, Confidentiality, and Ethics</center>

Merriam (1998) contends that apart from being a sensitive observer and analyst,

and being able to tolerate ambiguity, the qualitative researcher must also be a good

communicator. A good communicator establishes rapport, empathizes with participants,

asks good questions, and listens intently. The researcher is the primary instrument of data

collection and analysis, and must be highly intuitive during the research process

(sensitivity). This means the researcher must be sensitive to the context and all of the

variables within it, including the participants, the overt and covert agendas, the physical

setting, and the nonverbal behavior without being judgmental (Merriam, 1998).

Furthermore, deMarrais (2004) points out that the researcher also assumes the role of

learner, because it is the participant who has the experience under investigation. It was

important for me to be conscientious about establishing an effective relationship that was

based on trust and respect.

Ethical research practice is a dynamic process which needs to be monitored

throughout the data collection and analysis processes (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). I

followed ethical procedures throughout the course of the study and ensured that

confidentiality was maintained. Confidentiality and ethical considerations were

maintained in several ways. I conducted each interview in person in a location that

allowed the participants to speak freely about their experiences with the tenure process.

Prior to the interview, I provided each participant with a consent form and information letter that outlined the purpose of the study and explained how the data would be used. I also explained, to each participant, that the study would be confidential, their participation would be anonymous, and that the interviews would be recorded. In order to ensure confidentiality, I assigned pseudonyms to each participant and the small university where the study was conducted. I informed each participant that she had the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

In order to continue to maintain confidentiality and ensure ethical considerations, I stored all of the data in my home office and secured the interview transcriptions on a firewall-protected computer in my home office. I also kept the interview recordings in a locked file cabinet in my home office until the study was been completed. Once the study was completed, I erased the audio recordings of all interviews and shredded all interview transcriptions.

<div align="center">Context</div>

The participants in this study were employed at Monroe State University (pseudonym), a small four-year public institution located near a metropolitan city in the Southeastern area of the United States. This is a non-research institution which concentrates on teaching and career-focused programs of study. According to Finnegan (1993), Monroe State University (MSU) is a comprehensive university and this type of institution tends to focus on the mission and objectives of the institution, needs of the labor market, and teaching. Faculty research studies are usually not conducted at non-research institutions of higher education, and interviewing women at MSU expands research to non-research institutions.

Monroe State University began as a junior college and is a relatively young institution of higher education. The college continued to focus its image and identity on serving the community as a teaching and career focused institution after converting to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Teaching continued to be the primary responsibility of faculty members as MSU increased marketing efforts to attract both local and transferring students. A decade after beginning its first baccalaureate program, MSU offered baccalaureate degrees in nursing, teacher education, music, health care management, business administration, and applied science. The university continued its community-focused mission to offer educational and cultural programs to meet the diverse needs of the population it served. Degrees in more traditional academic fields such as biology, psychology and human services, and integrative studies were gradually added throughout the 1990s through the School of Arts and Sciences. These programs of study provided opportunities for more faculty members to teach junior and senior students in upper division curricula, and the number of majors and faculty members increased rapidly. New programs of study provided degrees in history, English, mathematics, communication and media studies, political science, and criminal justice. As programs grew, so did the push toward graduate education and the first graduate students were admitted in 2006. Graduate programs and faculty members also increased rapidly and graduate degrees in nursing, health administration, teaching, liberal studies, and business administration, psychology, and archival studies became available. With the rapid growth and transition came changes in expectations and requirements for faculty members.

Finnegan's (1993) asserts that comprehensive universities have undergone changes related to fluctuations in the academic labor market, student enrollments, and opportunities available to faculty. In reviewing the history of MSU, my observation is that the changes led to a culture of uncertainty, apprehension, and resentment as faculty members without a terminal degree were reassigned or dismissed if they did not enroll in a doctoral program, and all newly hired faculty members were required to have an earned terminal degree. The MSU Faculty Handbook specifies that, in almost all cases, the appropriate terminal degree is a doctorate, and that a terminal degree is required for promotion to ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor. The minimum state system guideline of requiring a doctoral degree for the rank of full professor had been the requirement that the previous MSU promotion and tenure policies followed. New MSU promotion and tenure policies reflected a shift in the weight of evaluation categories, with a higher weight factor being placed on scholarly activities. At the time my research was conducted, there were 90 tenured faculty members (including administrators) at MSU, and of that number 46.7% (42) were women and 53.3% (48) were men. The total number of tenured administrators was 21 and 33.3% (7) were women while 66.7% (14) were men.

While responses to the changes were exhibited as frustration and discouragement by some faculty members, other faculty members were pleased with the changes which offered them the opportunity to teach upper level and graduate courses. The faculty members who accepted the changes as positive also embraced the new focus on scholarly activities, including the revised promotion and tenure policies. The participants in this study were among the group who accepted the changes in promotion and tenure policies

as positive. They represent a variety of disciplines and met the challenges of transition and increased rigor by continuing in tenure-track positions, seeking, and achieving tenure.

<center>Data Analysis Techniques</center>

In analyzing the data (interview responses of the participants), emphasis was on both individual and common understandings, including the meanings of common practices relative to the tenure process. The existing literature on analysis relative to IPA does not prescribe any single method for working with data; however, Smith (2009) and colleagues recommend using several strategies. The analytic focus of IPA directs attention toward participants' attempts to make sense of their experiences. This sense making is characterized by a set of common processes and principles. The processes move from particular to shared experiences and from descriptive to interpretative, while the principles involve commitment to understanding the participants' point of view with a psychological focus on personal meaning-making in particular contexts (Smith et al., 2009). These processes and principles are applied flexibly and result in analysis that is an iterative and inductive cycle (Smith, 1999).

I utilized the six steps of IPA analysis as outlined by Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009) to analyze my data. They are 1) reading and re-reading; 2) initial noting; 3) developing identified themes; 4) searching for connections across identified themes; 5) moving to the next case (participant); and 6) looking for patterns across cases. In the first step, reading and re-reading, I immersed myself in the original data by have the interviews transcribed, then reading and rereading the data. After I read the transcript, I also listened to the audio-recordings of each interview at least once to ensure that the

participants became the focus of analysis. Part of this step also involved recording some of my own recollections, including my initial and most striking observations about the interview and transcript in a notebook to allow my focus to remain with the data. Repeated reading allowed a model of the overall interview structure to develop and assisted me in gaining an understanding of how narratives can bind certain sections of an interview together. This also facilitated an appreciation of how trust and rapport may be built across an interview, and thus highlights the location of contradictions and paradoxes, or richer and more detailed sections (Smith et al., 2009).

Step two is initial noting which is the most time consuming and detailed of the steps. In this step, I examined language use and semantic content on a very exploratory level. I maintained an open mind and noted anything of interest within the transcript. This process enhanced familiarity with the transcript and identification of specific ways in which participants talked about, understood, and thought about their experiences with the tenure process. This initial noting revealed a descriptive core of comments, which have a clear phenomenological focus that is close to the participants' explicit meaning. These descriptive comments described the things which matter to them (processes, places, events, relationships, values, and principles) and the meaning of those things for the participants (what those things are like for each participant). Along with this, the outcome was more interpretative noting that helped me understand how and why my participants have certain concerns. As I thought about the context of their concerns (their lived world), I looked at the language they used and identified more abstract concepts, which helped me to make sense of the patterns of meaning in their account. Step two produced

descriptive comments, linguistic comments, and conceptual comments (Smith et al., 2009).

In step three, I looked for themes in the data as I reduced the volume of detail by mapping the connections, patterns, and interrelationships between exploratory notes, as I shifted from working with the transcripts to working primarily with the initial notes which were closely tied to the original transcripts. The original whole interviews became a set of parts as I conducted my analysis, but these parts came together again in new wholes at the end of the analysis in the write-up. At each stage, the analysis moved me away from the participants and included more of me and my interpretation; however, my interpretation was closely involved with the lived experiences of the participants, making the resulting analysis a product of the collaborative efforts of both the participants and me. The identified themes are precise statements of what was important in the comments attached to a piece of transcript. I expressed these themes as phrases that contain enough particularity to be grounded and enough abstraction to be conceptual while speaking to the psychological essence of the piece of transcript. The themes reflect the participants' original words and thoughts and also my interpretation, which in turn reflect a synergistic process of description and interpretation, while feeling like they have captured and reflect an understanding of women's experiences with the tenure process (Smith et al., 2009).

According to Smith (2009) and associates, step four of IPA data analysis focuses on searching for connections across themes. In this step, I ordered the themes chronologically in the order in which they came up and then developed a chart or map of how I thought the themes fit together. This produced a structure which allowed me to point to all of the most interesting and important aspects of the participants' accounts. I

looked for connections by typing the themes in chronological order into a list. Then I

printed out the typed list of themes, cut up the list, and placed each theme on a separate

piece of paper. I moved the themes around to explore spatial representations of how they

related to each other. In the final figure, themes which represented parallel or similar

understandings were placed together. Themes which were in opposition were positioned

at opposite ends of the piece of paper (Smith et al., 2009). Although themes varied among

participants, they also have some commonalities. Thematic analysis can be applied to

reflect on participant meanings, outcomes, and allow categories to be abstracted from the

data (Saldaña, 2009).

Step five involved moving to the next case or participant's transcript and

repeating the process of steps one through four. I treated each case on its own terms, in

order to do justice to its own individuality. I was inevitably influenced by what I had

already found; however, I focused on allowing new themes to arise with each participant.

After completing the process of steps one through four for all participants' transcripts, in

step six, I looked for patterns across cases. I placed the figure from each transcript on a

large surface and looked across them. The questions that I asked were: "What

connections are there across cases? How does a theme in one case help illuminate a

different case? Which themes are the most potent?" (Smith et al., 2009, p. 101). This

process was a particularly creative task and lead to a relabeling and reconfiguring of

themes. Themes or super-ordinate themes which were particular to an individual case or

participant were also representative of higher order concepts which the cases share. The

research came forth as an exploration of personal experiences that revealed prevailing

cultural understandings of women in academia who achieve tenure (Crotty, 2003). As

Gribch (2009) declares, individuals who have certain experiences have particular ways of making sense of them within their own lives, which they can articulate; however, it is acceptable that these meanings will differ.

Qualitative researchers are held to similar standards regarding the validity and reliability of research. Validity is the extent to which a study is viewed as investigating what it aims to investigate, or the degree to which the research findings actually reflect the phenomenon being studied (Akerlind, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Credibility is the issue with validity. Since an interpretive process cannot be objective and represents the data as experienced by the researcher, the focus shifts to ensuring that the research aims are appropriately reflected in the methods used (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Kvale (1996) puts forth two types of validity checks, communicative and pragmatic, that can be useful in qualitative, phenomenological research. Communicative validity checks are provided when research methods and final interpretation are regarded as appropriate by the relevant research community through the prevalence of research seminars, peer-reviewed journals and conference presentations. Other sources of feedback for communicative validity checks include the participants who are interviewed, other members of the population represented by the participant sample, and the intended audience for the findings. Pragmatic validity checks refer to the extent to which the research outcomes are viewed as useful and meaningful to the intended audiences, while offering more effective ways of operating in the world (Kvale, 1996).

For my study, I employed communicative validity checks. The sources I utilized included the participants, other women who have become tenured, and women who aspire to become tenured in academia. I employed these individuals to read my

interpretations of the text to ensure the accuracy of my translation and interpretation. The results of the data analysis revealed themes that allow women who seek tenure to be more effective throughout the process and acquisition of tenure status. Women who are already tenured may have a better understanding of their experiences as a result of this study.

Reliability may be viewed as reflecting the use of appropriate methodological procedures for ensuring consistency and quality in data interpretations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The focus of reliability is trustworthiness. According to Kvale (1996), coder reliability checks and dialogic reliability checks are most common and both use several researchers for offsetting or evaluating the potential impact of having the perspective of only one researcher on the data. Two researchers independently code interview transcripts and compare categorizations in coder reliability check, while in dialogic reliability check researchers reach agreement through mutual critique and discussion of the data and of each other's interpretive hypotheses (Kvale, 1996). An alternative to these forms of reliability checks is for the researcher to make interpretive steps transparent to readers by fully detailing the steps and presenting examples that illustrate the steps (Kvale, 1996). I utilized the alternative method for reliability checks in my study. This means that I made analysis and interpretative steps transparent to readers by detailing the steps and presenting examples from the transcripts and data that illustrate the steps. Akerlind (2005) asserts that these validity and reliability checks also involve documenting how researchers have assumed a critical attitude towards their own interpretations, how they have analyzed their own presuppositions, and the checks and balances that they employed to help counteract the impact of their perspectives on the research outcomes; I have shown how I accomplished these three processes.

Roulston (2007) offers various methods to ensure quality, and I found that using multiple methods to collect data, member checking, and documentation were applicable to my study. National data bases with statistics regarding the gendered aspects of tenure in higher education, interviews with different individuals to gain multiple viewpoints, and scholarly literature concerning tenure of women in academia were used as multiple data collection methods. According to Roulston (2007), member checking is a method that can be utilized to ensure quality. Member checking allows participants to review transcriptions and interpretations to verify that the researcher has developed an adequate understanding of the phenomenon being investigated. The interviews were carefully transcribed, including my interpretations of the data. After each transcription was completed, I performed member checking by providing participants with a copy to review for accuracy in order for them to corroborate or question information or assumptions that had been drawn (deMarrais & Lapan, 2004). As the participants granted approval of data accuracy, I began to analyze the data.

Another method that can be utilized to assist in making the research process transparent and accessible is documentation. It can be achieved with memo writing and journaling throughout the research process (Roulston, 2007; Saldaña, 2009). Large chunks of interview texts can be displayed to support interpretation of the identified themes (Crotty, 2003), and IPA can be used to produce a legitimate theoretical analysis for the participants in question. Documentation to support quality assurance can also be provided with the researcher's use of analytic memo writing, archival research, and journaling to provide transparency of the research process (Roulston, 2007). In my study,

I employed analytic memo writing and journaling after each interview and member checking session to enhance transparency of the research process.

Analytic memos are comparable to researcher blogs or journal entries and provide a place to dump one's brain about the phenomenon, participants, and process under investigation by thinking, writing, and thinking about them even more (Saldaña, 2009). The purpose is reflexivity on the data. As Saldaña (2009) suggests, I reflected on and wrote about how I personally related to the phenomenon, participants, my research questions, data analysis, patterns, concepts, themes, possible connections, problems, ethical dilemmas, previous memos, future directions, and the final report for the study. Ensuring high quality of the study is essential to its validity and reliability. Every effort was made to maintain quality and integrity throughout the research process while protecting the rights of the participants involved.

In order to explain what I learned about the phenomenon of women's experiences with the tenure process in higher education, I organized the findings from this study around the themes that I identified from the data. I utilized the method for IPA analysis suggested by Smith, Flowers, and Larkin (2009). The six-step process was applied to identify themes, connections, and patterns across cases. I interpreted data based on analysis of the text, individual participants' use of metaphors, and connections across cases, to connect the parts back to the whole, women's experiences during the tenure process. Particular descriptions were presented as quotes from participants interviewed (Merriam, 1998) and quotes from my analytic memos (Saldaña, 2009). I have provided the reader with a vicarious experience of the participants and the inquiry setting by

including particular description, general description, and interpretative commentary (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Summary

I was interested in investigating how women in higher education experienced the tenure process. In this chapter, I discussed the methods, generation of data, negotiating entry and selection of participants. My research questions, assumptions, and role are also outlined. Considerations regarding confidentiality, ethics, analysis of data, and ensuring high quality are presented, followed by comments relative to findings and timeline. My research will enhance the existing literature in several ways. First, I investigated the experiences of women in the academy beyond the problems suggested in quantitative data. Although quantitative data expose a systematic problem of discrimination against women, they do not emphasize the experiences of individual women. While existing literature reports research that was conducted at the institutional level or focused on tenure requirements (Gibbons, 1992) and expectations (Antony & Raveling, 1998; Levy, 2007), little is offered to inform our understanding of women's experiences with the actual tenure process relative to institutionalized power and gender, and how they influence political, social, and economic issues. Second, I utilized a case study approach to research the experiences of three women in the specific context of the tenure process, a context that is largely missing from the literature. Finally, by conducting in-depth phenomenological interviews with each participant, I expanded the data and literature about women's experiences with the tenure process. Specifically, I asked women to describe their experiences with the tenure process using institutionalized power influenced by gender as the theoretical framework. Utilizing a case study approach,

phenomenological interviews, and IPA to examine women's experiences with the tenure

process lead to a deeper understanding of the process, and may also be helpful for women

faculty members who aspire to achieve tenure in academia. The next chapter presents the

women's descriptions of their experiences with the tenure process.

CHAPTER 4

THREE TENURED WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES

Knowing the reasons these women decided to seek tenure provides the

background for understanding the meaning the tenure process created in their personal

and professional lives. Each woman described her interest in seeking tenure and the

challenges she encountered. At the time of the interviews, each woman was employed as

a tenured faculty member at Monroe State University. Their experiences with the tenure

process from tenure-track position to full tenure status are unique, yet hold some

similarities.

Ashlee Curtis, the management professor, is enthusiastic and spoke quickly while

making sure she addressed areas of interest and concern. She was eager to share her

perspective on her experiences with the tenure process. Josie Hemphill, the nursing

professor, was calm and relaxed while speaking of her experiences. Her answers were

brief but thorough, as she professed relief that the process was over and emphasized the

amount of work involved in seeking tenure. Marley Jarrett, a professor in the College of

Arts and Sciences, was soft spoken and very reflective in her responses. She often

mentioned the importance of family and spirituality as she spoke of her experiences with

the tenure process. Each of the women seemed comfortable speaking with me in the

interview setting, and explored her experiences with humor, enthusiasm, and honesty for

the research project. Interview transcriptions are literal and are not edited for grammar.

Ashlee

Ashlee Curtis, the management professor, has been in higher education for

approximately 25 years. She was on the faculty at five different institutions of higher

education before Monroe State University and loves teaching. Her love for teaching and

desire to remain in higher education prompted her to go back to school to earn a doctoral

degree. Once this was completed, her goal was to become tenured. She described her

decision as she stated:

> So, I knew that in order to have a good position in a university as a faculty
> member I really needed my Ph.D. so I worked on my Ph.D. and finished that and I
> was really only interested in a tenure track position because otherwise what's the
> point? That was the only reason to get the Ph.D. in the first place.

Since she made a decision to seek tenure immediately after earning her doctoral degree,

Ashlee accepted a tenure-track position at Monroe State University and immediately

researched the expectations and preparation required to become tenured. She described

her findings by indicating,

> The expectations were actually quite clear. We have a very quantified
> performance evaluation process here in the School of Business and it was
> somewhat parallel to the tenure process although I had to go out and find that
> information and compare it and do my own analysis of what it was like to go
> through the tenure process. I did feel like I had people resources available.

Since the performance evaluation process in the school in which Ashlee taught was quite

rigorous, she felt it was similar to the university tenure criteria and expectations. This

seemed to give Ashlee a feeling of confidence and she began her path toward tenure. In

addition she shared that several professors in her school had already been through the

tenure process and were willing to be resources for her. They were assets as they

provided support, information, and direction for Ashlee as she worked to meet the criteria

and expectations to become tenured.

Monroe State University has a policy that includes pre-tenure review during the

third year of the five-year process. Ashlee described it by stating:

> One thing that happened was at year- believe it was three- went through a pre-
> tenure review process which was very helpful because it basically simulated what
> it was like to go through the process and it really forced me to get my

documentation organized in the way I needed to be organized going forward earlier than I would have otherwise done it. So it was very helpful to go through the pre-tenure process because what that did was - it allowed you to see what you had together and it gave you two years in terms of the requirements to be successful- it gave me two years to kind of fill in any gaps I had. So that was good.

The documentation process was a challenge for Ashlee as she completed scholarly activities to build her tenure portfolio. The portfolios of tenured professors were confusing to her causing her to establish her own method when was more meaningful and sensible for her. Although it meant more work for her, she was pleased with the outcome. Regarding the documentation process, she related,

That was interesting because I was able to look at other peoples' portfolios which at the time, I guess they still are - they're in a notebook form. I was able to look at other people's portfolios and I put my portfolio together using someone else's as an example whom I consider to be very linear and organized as I can be when I have to be. But, it didn't make sense to me. There were things that I had in my professional past and my experience that I felt were important that if I followed their pattern I wouldn't have included them. So I basically redid the notebook and the way it was organized. It actually created a fair amount of work for me but it made more sense to me and I felt like it had to make sense to me in order to make sense to someone else. I wanted it to be as easy for the reviewers as possible because I knew that would make me more likely to be successful. So I did go through the effort in doing that and what was interesting about that was that notebook I created is now used by everyone else.

The results of making meaning of the portfolio for Ashlee also resulted in an unexpected reward and recognition as she reported:

Well, I don't know about in general but the Tenure and Promotion committee is a university wide committee. I do know that whenever anyone goes up for tenure in my department, in our college, now it is recommended that they ask me to look at mine.

While she spent extra time on her own portfolio, Ashlee seems proud that her work has been recognized. She has made a point to keep it updated and current for future reference and others who aspire to achieve tenure at Monroe State University.

The tenure experience in general was strenuous and required much more time than Ashlee anticipated or was told it would require by other tenured professors. She described this by saying,

> I knew that it was going to be a lot of work, so I decided that I would not teach that summer. I was thinking that because I went through the pre-tenure process I knew the amount of work that was going to be involved, or at least I thought I did. I knew where all this was headed and so I continued to collect information - and this was that time - that was in the spring, early spring or winter when I thought- you know this doesn't make sense to me - it's not the organizational format - what am I going to do? So I declined to teach in the summer so that I could completely focus on this. So I asked around and I said to some colleagues that I respected - I asked a couple who were like me and a couple who were not like me so I could get a better view of what the tenure process was like - it ranged from various levels of hours. My question was how many hours *does* this take? Do you think that forty hours are enough? I figured that was a complete week of time and that kind of focus for that amount of time - in a week, I could not possibly be able to do that. Oh, everyone said that will be plenty of time! At about 128 hours in the process, I stopped counting the hours. So I was very curious about how long it really took - so when I really began in earnest putting that book together and I got to 128 hours I stopped counting.

The time required to prepare for tenure review seemed to be a point of frustration for Ashlee as she spoke about it. Not teaching in the summer enabled her to focus on it more, but at the same time may have impacted her economically, as this meant she would have less income. At this point, I began to wonder if the tenured professors who served as resources for her were men or women. That may also have impacted the amount of time she was required to spend on preparing, as men and women could have different views of the process and its requirements. This inquiry led to the impact that institutionalized power and gender had in Ashlee's experiences with the tenure process. It was quite interesting when she revealed information about the professors who served as her resource persons during the process by saying,

> The people who I asked for help were people - were people in the "in" group - people who were tenured, people who knew what the process was like - but also

who had served on Promotion and Tenure committees. So they were going to be most likely to give me an inside scoop - it's like, I don't want to know what the "book" says - meaning the rules. But I also wanted to know, what is the game? What are the politics involved that I need to be aware of so I would be able to present this information in a way that doesn't ruffle any feathers - and make sure that everything is easy, and that is the message that I got from everyone who had served on these committees - make it as easy as you can. I am always interested to know the sex of the people that you go to for help and they are all men.

In this response, institutionalized power and social effects were implied and Ashlee also mentioned politics and gender. Since Ashlee was already part of the "in" group, gender may have been a more subtle or nuanced issue for her during the tenure process experience. She seemed pleased that she was able to have access to people who were in the "in" group (institutionalized power) to guide her during the tenure process. This is further reflected as she stated:

I asked for mentorship from men and that is not because I wouldn't have asked it from women but only men had been on the Tenure and Promotion committees - and who were in the "in" group, the "power" group in the university and the college. When I first arrived at Monroe State University and taught as a full-time, temporary professor - I did that for two years, then went to Kensington (pseudonym), and then came back in 2004. Actually, I was here for one year, left and came back - when I was here, there were no other women in this department, so it is not surprising that there were no other women to ask for help.

As for others going through the tenure process at the same time as she was, Ashlee reported that:

I honestly was so focused on myself that I didn't pay much attention except in - at the fifth year, you can go up for tenure and if you don't make it, in the sixth year you can reapply. That's the standard process. There was one person that did not make tenure that first go-round - well actually, you know what happened? He was advised to pull out of the process and told specifically why. I knew about that but I didn't pay much attention to it. I was so focused on myself. I was pretty selfish.

Politics are an issue in all organizations and institutions of higher education are no exception. While Monroe State University is a small public university, its size does not

matter since it still has its political factions. Ashlee described the effects of politics on her tenure experience by saying,

> Well, I think that the people who I asked for advice were definitely people in the know because they had gone through the process or served on the committees. So in that sense they had political power - because of the knowledge and expertise that they had and also because of the position they had held. I know that I, partially because of my personality, had no hesitation about asking for that help. It is also because at the time, I was in the "in" group so maybe that was one reason I felt more comfortable.

Based on this statement, it appears that Ashlee felt she held some political institutionalized power, as she identified with the "in" group in her school and in the university, even before she achieved tenure. Ashlee was honest in her responses and is proud of her honesty which I noted given that she stated her values in a strong voice. Being part of the "in" group, which she referred to as a club, brought to my attention how political and social aspects seemed to overlap somewhat for Ashlee, as she related her perceptions of the social effects of the tenure process on her experience.

> Well you know tenure is a very - it's a club and I really wanted to be in this club, but I wasn't willing to do anything to get into the club because that wouldn't be morally or ethically in keeping with who I am. But I was certainly very - probably more agreeable to volunteer for things than I might otherwise have been or have been since I got tenure. Because when I finished that process…it took me a year to get over it. It was just exhausting - so that's partially why - I think that would be social.

When economic effects were considered, Ashlee voiced her concern by stating, "Okay, well the economic benefits are miniscule - except that there may be more job - what's the word I am looking for?" In response, I stated "Stability?" and she continued.

> Yes, stability. Basically I feel like I have a job and that's a really, really rare club to be in, in this economic situation. I don't really know what the promotion in terms of monetary amount is; I think it may be $2,000.00. But to know that you have a job, unless something reorganizational happens or your unit is closed or you do something really bad or I do something really bad, I will have a job for as long as I want it - and that's really relieving in a lot of ways. It doesn't make me

less loyal but it makes me more willing to be honest and focus on what I think I am best at - what I want to do as opposed to what I have to do - which I would say is a reward. Autonomy is the most important thing to me, so to know that I have stability in a job doing something I do well for as long as I want it and I have autonomy; it is really good.

Although the economic and financial rewards of being tenured appear to be few, for Ashlee, career stability and autonomy seem to be major advantages. She seemed confident and relaxed when speaking of these aspects relative to being tenured. However, there were some areas that still cause concern when she spoke about how the process affected her in general:

I probably said "no" more times the year after I finished this process than - well actually there is a lag time between the time you finish the process and the time you find out - but honestly you hear things through the grapevine during that lag time - you know if things are going well or not - because nice people tell you. I guess the administrators want you to know what to expect if you're not going to get what you want - and kind of prepare you for that. I was exhausted and I probably said "no" for a year and a half more than I had ever said "no" before. Really it took me a while to refocus and think about, okay I have done this, now what do I want to do? It was very tiring.

When talking about how she felt being tenured has affected her professionally, Ashlee said:

I think that there is more credibility when someone has tenure - no matter what area. There's this "aura" around tenured professors which is somewhat unfounded. I certainly don't think that I'm the expert or be all, know all of everything. When you are in the community and someone finds out you're a tenured professor - I would never tell anyone - that's like wow - that's really cool. There's a credibility that goes along with that. I also think that there's some curiosity because people don't really understand it. The academy, being in the academy is something that people in the private sector have no understanding about…don't understand - we were advised - I can remember one administrator - when the budget cuts were coming - told us not to mow our lawns in the middle of the day, because that would mean that you weren't working, and so there is some of that misperception in the community about what professors do. What they don't understand is that we really are on 24/7 - all the time, and because we are willing to do that we do require a lot of autonomy and a lot of flexibility. I am willing to do that.

She went on to add:

> I do think there's a lot of relief and freedom that is the result of attaining this goal and - I think that - within the - we are in restricted budgetary times - so I think that if that - if that were not true, there would be more of that - more freedom and more opportunity, but since we are in tough times and we all have to be fiscally responsible, I think I realize that I might have to do some things that I don't want to do - and that's okay. Within that though, I feel like I have earned a certain amount of freedom and will take the responsibility that comes along with that to determine - what course of leadership I want to take and I do feel a certain responsibility to take leadership in terms of my students, career, and their development more than anything.

This seems to imply that Ashlee feels she has more institutionalized power and opportunity to pursue her personal career interests now that she is tenured. Since she has gone through the tenure process, Ashlee's experience has led her to believe that having a mentor and making family aware of the significance of achieving tenure are important. She expressed this when she described what worked for her:

> Find a mentor. Be sure that you can focus entirely on the process when it's time - whether that means putting aside - it's like dissertation day, D-day and T-day. Tenure day - every week I spent time on my tenure process just being aware that even with your family, you have to say no, today is T-day; I can't do that. I've got to work on my tenure, because I've got to be able to have a job so I can take care of you. My daughter, I remember, said to me during this process, it was during that summer - she said something to me and I said Natalie (pseudonym), I am so sorry I am just stressed out. She's very much a caretaker and she came up to me and put her arm on my shoulder and said "Mommy, what is the matter?" And I told her that I was working - she knew that I was working on this notebook that I had to give to my boss - that's the way I told it to her - she was about 6 or 7 at the time, and she understood the notebook and the boss thing - and if I didn't do a good job that it wouldn't be a good thing…and she said, "You know, you can only try your hardest and do your best work." So, that's it exactly - and that was coming from my 6 or 7 year old. I think that would be good advice to give to anyone else - try your hardest and do your best work and know that if for some reason if it doesn't happen, that there will be other opportunities for you.

I argue that for women, working hard and doing one's best work may not counter the effects of institutionalized power and gender in the academy. After her experience with

the tenure process, Ashlee feels there are several things other women can do to enhance a

positive outcome. She elaborated on what women can do by declaring:

> Tell women to ask for help. Make sure that women are represented at all levels of the university. If you look at the AUP's statistics then you'll see - or AAUP's statistics - then you'll see that we are not represented - so that would be certainly one thing we can do - as an academy, in general, making sure that the guidelines for tenure and promotion are parallel to the guidelines for the performance evaluation process every year. So that when you get to the fifth year you don't have to reorganize everything because that is what I ended up having to do.

While Ashlee stated reorganizing everything was frustrating for her, she went on to add:

> But, I was resigned to the fact that it had to be done - so I did it, but it probably took me twice as long because I had to - because it was a different organizational pattern. It's partially personality. I like to understand things analytically and logically. And so if I didn't understand it, I knew no one else was going to understand it. So I had to put it in a format that was easily understood.

In summary, Ashlee pointed out:

> I don't think that my tenure experience is that much different from anyone else's. I think that - I just wish there had been more guidance - from anybody - earlier on, or that somehow - or maybe the guidance was there, but I was not as aware of it as I should have been - maybe just making new professors more aware that this is - even though you know it's imminent - to start preparing earlier or maybe having incentives or awards in place to help.

Throughout her tenure experience, Ashlee reported that she managed stress by

running. She reported that she has been a runner for 20 years and that helped her

tremendously. Ashlee is very committed to teaching and helping students. She also

participates in leadership organizations for women in academia and business. The

excitement she demonstrated during the interview was genuine and she was open and

honest with her responses. As the interview concluded, Ashlee spoke about enjoying her

life more and spending more time with family. Now that she is tenured, she plans to

continue to enhance her teaching skills to reach students, and also develop a consulting

business for retirement. Ashlee is happy to be a tenured faculty member at Monroe State University and plans to continue her career at that institution.

<center>Josie</center>

Josie Hemphill arrived at Monroe State University in the fall of 2004 as a nursing professor. She had previously been a part-time faculty member and this was her first full-time academic position; however, she had been in higher education eight years before seeking tenure. Josie had taught at two other institutions of higher education before coming to Monroe State University. Her initial appointment at Monroe State was as assistant professor and she achieved tenure in 2009. Josie believes in helping others, especially the underprivileged, to achieve their goals and often volunteers to assist with research projects and other mentoring activities. For Josie, seeking tenure was an expectation since she was hired into a tenure-track position. She explains this as she stated:

> Well, I was hired into a tenure track, so there was an expectation that you would apply for tenure. And also it is my understanding that if you are in a tenure track and you don't obtain tenure, then you can be dismissed. And also, I wanted to do tenure because I was going - I had gone through a divorce and I wanted job security.

In response to her statement about job security, when asked whether she thought having tenure would give more job security than being in a non-tenure track position, Josie replied by saying "Yes, yes. That's what I had always heard." In the academy, it is general knowledge that achieving tenure involves a rigorous process. Josie described her preparation by saying:

> Okay, first I had to look in the faculty handbook and see what the criteria were to become tenured. Also I borrowed a portfolio notebook from a colleague, and also an administrator let me borrow her portfolio notebook and that helped me see what the expectations were and what the examples were.

Concerning the clarity of the expectations and examples, she said she was unsure of herself and when asked to clarify what she was unsure about she added:

> Of what was expected, and I think it's the lack of control - you've always heard even if you think you have met the criteria there could be someone - someone on the committee that says you didn't meet the criteria. So I think it's that fear factor - that you lack control and someone could do you in.

I noticed that the fear factor and lack of control seemed to cause Josie to have a lot of anxiety when she was going through the tenure process. She was very animated when speaking about this and put emphasis on certain words. When discussing the actual tenure process, Josie described it by sharing the following:

> Well, it was scary and I had a colleague in another department who was hired at the same time that I was, and we kind of became support for each other. She would call and tell me, "We need to be doing this, at this time, at this juncture in our career." And I think that's the thing that was disturbing. No one really prepared me for what I was supposed to be doing. I had to depend on my friend, who knew more than I did about the process. So –

Having no control and lack of information about the process were significant stressors for Josie. Suggesting that the process could be improved during orientation, she added:

> I think during orientation - of course, during that time you are overwhelmed with information, but I think orientation about the process. But then you need someone who - not only may be a colleague, but may be an administrator that keeps tabs on you to make sure you are on track because I do know people that, for whatever reason, did not stay on track and they were due for pre-tenure review and they don't even have a notebook. So I think without someone working with you, like a mentor during that process - the results can sometimes be bad.

Although Josie was assigned a mentor, she stated it was an informal relationship that was ineffective as she explained:

> When I started work, a colleague was assigned to be my mentor but I felt like she was very busy, and she really wasn't engaged with me, didn't care about me at all. That was very frustrating. So then I realized that anything that I did, I was going to have to find it out on my own. Yeah.

Having an effective mentor-mentee relationship that is helpful seemed to be important to

Josie. She feels it would have made a difference in the preparation and the support would

have been appreciated as she experienced the tenure process. Josie found the pre-tenure

process to be helpful as she acknowledged:

> Well the pre-tenure wasn't too bad. I had my notebook and I had tabs - you know. The layout of the notebook is very important - the presentation - and that went through pre-tenure and at that point I just needed - I just had one article that was in the - I needed to have two articles. I had one article that - I hadn't heard if it was going to be accepted or not, so the recommendation was that I needed the additional article. So I liked the pre-tenure process because at least you knew if you were on track. That was good.

However, the actual tenure process was quite different as she went on to add:

> Now as far as the whole process, the problem - when I came up for actual tenure - was that I had too much stuff in my notebook. I had to reduce it from two notebooks to one notebook and I found that extremely frustrating. I was scared that I would remove something and it would be the one thing that someone is going to want to see. So, that was frustrating.

Concerning reducing the portfolio notebook, Josie explained:

> Um, I just kind of used my own judgment and one of the administrators helped me some - she just rode my case that I was going to have to reduce the notebook. So eventually, I did. And then one thing that was very frustrating was that people from different departments had different guidelines. Because we had no nursing faculty who was tenured at the time that weren't administrators, other departments looked at our notebook. I had put all my stuff in plastic sleeves and the committee wanted to send it back and reject it, I think, because I had it in plastic sleeves even though everything else was fine. One of the top administrators said that, no, there is nothing in the guidelines that says that you can't have it in plastic sleeves. It's those little idiosyncrasies, I think, that scare people.

It was very eye opening for me to learn that although the required information and

documentation might be present in the tenure portfolio, something as simple as having

plastic sleeve covers and needing to re-do the notebook could cause a delay in the tenure

process. This is indicative of the institutionalized power that the promotion and tenure

committed holds in the academy. Institutionalized power is an issue that Josie seemed to

perceive as causing fear for her as she stated:

> Well, it was - my result was positive - but I really had a great fear. I thought these - this group has my career in their hands - so it was kind of a perceived fear of power with them that I was concerned about and I had personal life issues going on. I had gone through a divorce. I had sold my house and I was - I had to move and I moved closer to school but I couldn't buy a house yet because I thought if I don't get tenure, I will have to - I'm going to, you know - I'm not going to stay - so I had that additional stress - for me.

Josie stated that she handled stress during her tenure experience by exercising at the gym.

Similar to Ashlee, Josie felt that gender was not an issue for her as she worked toward

achieving tenure. She stated the following about the impact of gender in the process for

her: "I didn't feel in my case it had any impact." She had no idea how many women

were up for tenure at the same time that she was and also went on to add:

> Well, when I was going through I heard there were some other people that had not gotten tenure from other departments. The only ones I heard of was there were a couple of men - but, um - now in my own department - okay. Over the past few years, we've had faculty members that are in the tenure track. They haven't been developing their notebooks and they probably haven't received some of the guidance - I think not publishing - not getting articles published is a major horrible stress and I think of the entire process - I would say that the article thing wakes you up in the middle of the night. Because you know if you don't have the number of articles they want; that's what's really "done in" other faculty that were going through that process.

The issues of gender and politics appear to overlap as Josie shares some possible

influences when discussing the political effects of her tenure experience:

> No. No, I haven't really noticed anything - the only thing in regard to tenure is…I have heard some negative things related to a coworker who worked at another university and when she started working here, she wasn't given credit for tenure and she wasn't given a promotion that she said a male colleague had received in another department.

Since this situation was not personal for Josie, she did not care to dwell on it or discuss it

in more detail and I respected her preference. Regarding social issues that may have

occurred during her tenure process, Josie offered the following:

> The only thing I felt that may be social is - from faculty that – well - it takes a lot of work to get tenure. Sometimes faculty will say - oh, you're working too hard or you're doing too much. I guess that's the only social thing - but I have noticed that after I got tenure that I felt more free to disagree at faculty meetings when issues would come up. Because sometimes I felt like privately faculty would complain about student/instructor ratios in clinical. But yet, when you get in faculty meetings, everybody's mum - they won't say a word and I had felt free to voice my opinion. Talking about social - I think if people are on a tenure track and things don't go well and then they have to move out of the tenure track I think it can affect faculty attitude of people that didn't accomplish the tenure - which can create discontent among faculty. I guess because I got tenure, I feel good - it's a lot of work.

Feeling free to voice her opinion seemed to be important to Josie. She may have been

reluctant to do so before she became tenured, but now she takes pride in expressing her

concerns and offering advice as issues arise in the school and its programs. For Josie,

having tenure has caused certain changes for her as she expressed:

> Oh, I think it's definitely increased my confidence and my job security and my ability to - I think it's empowered me. So I feel like I can say things - I have a right to say things, I have worked very hard and I have had accomplishments.

She also went on to add her frustration with how the criteria are applied as she stated:

> One of the things that comes jumping back is there are - I know there's a faculty member who - some administrators they really liked that person and they are trying very hard to get her name on publications - and I guess that's the frustrating thing - I worked very hard on my articles, I didn't tag along on anybody. But there are people that tag along and they might be the sixth author and they are getting the same credit as I am getting. There's something I find unpleasant about it and sometimes - for some people they will accept articles as being worthy of certain journals and then for other people, you know, they might not – so - Those are the kind of things - lack of equity, not equity but - continuity, or being consistent with treatment - depending on what you are like - if you're special.

When I inquired about how one gets to be special, Josie responded:

> I think sometimes the administrators have to - I am trying to think of the word here - have to identify with you as being one of them - you know what I am saying? And maybe that person does some perks for them in some way - informal way and I think - I don't think that's the whole story but it certainly gives people a little "leg up."

This statement by Josie gave me insight into how schools and colleges across campus apply and accept scholarly activities based on who is making the submission and who may or may not be helped in the process. It was obvious to me that inequity is an issue of concern for Josie as the amount of work may be quite different for individuals seeking tenure.

Economically, Josie quickly pointed out, "Well, I got $2,000.00 more a year which is not as much as I had hoped." This seemed to be disappointing for Josie, as she anticipated achieving tenure would be more rewarding financially than it actually was. While the immediate financial rewards were minimal, Josie believes that being tenured is an asset that she will carry throughout her professional career in academia. She described her support of this view by saying:

> But I think it has put me in a position where I think I could, you know, at least on an interim basis I could get a promotion which is helping me with my career advancement and more money. I think it will open up some opportunity. It's also opened up opportunities on committees because on some committees you have to be - on major committees they want tenured people. You've got an opportunity to really get involved with other faculty on campus and get to know them - Oh, I know one thing - because of the budget crunch that if people were in a tenure track - they have more rights to getting travel money than people who are not tenured. That would be true.

Now that she has achieved tenure, for other women who seek tenure in higher education Josie offered the following advice:

> I think they need to find a mentor - maybe someone they admire and they want to be like them. Or maybe somebody you know that knows the system and can

guide them. I think that's really, really important. And have a plan. Because if you do not have a plan for your career, time goes by and you're not ready - you haven't done what you need to do - I just think when you are in a job – when you start a job someone needs to be assigned to you to help you map out your career, what your goals are and what you need to do to get there and the tenure process.

She feels the tenure process in general is stressful and explained her rationale:

I just think it's stressful and the only thing I worried about again was the articles - publications. That was very, very stressful. I think it takes a lot of time - when you talk about social - it affects family life. You have to spend a lot of your free time because there is no time at work - to do things. I know one other faculty member she was saying if you're on a tenure track, there is so much work to prepare for tenure and promotion but they really don't - you have the same teaching load and you're expected to do research - but you have the same load as everybody.

Josie was reflective when she talked about how she felt she was treated during the tenure process and stated:

Yeah, I don't feel like I was treated unfairly. I felt like I met the criteria, I received tenure and I received a promotion. The only thing I feel is unfair - at least my perception is - there may be other people - who may not be doing as much as I did but they may accomplish the same thing. And it doesn't seem fair. I keep going back to the articles - that's the thing - that it's getting harder and harder to publish in the nursing journals - it takes - I mean it could take a year or more and you have the rewrites - I wish there was more support on campus - maybe if we had someone to help – editing - and that kind of thing - a lack of resources - we don't even have copies of SPSS - you know - things that make it difficult to accomplish what we are supposed to do for tenure. All I can say is I am glad it's over!

Josie is very relieved and excited to be tenured. She feels it will provide her with more options in her professional career while also providing her some job security. She works hard and continues to expand her expertise in areas such as grant writing and program development. Her first full-time position in higher education has been rewarding and she is looking forward to a positive future. Now that she is tenured, her goal for the future is to be promoted to full professor.

Marley

The College of Arts and Sciences is where Marley Jarrett has taught applied

science for the past seven years. She had been in higher education for six years before

seeking tenure. Marley was on the faculty at three other institutions of higher education

before coming to Monroe State University. She is an associate professor who decided to

seek tenure in order to keep her job. Completing the promotion and tenure requirements

became the focus and goal as she decided to remain in higher education. Marley was soft

spoken and often paused to reflect as she responded to the unstructured questions during

the interview. Preparing for the tenure process seemed to be challenging for Marley as

she relates her feelings regarding expectations:

> Well, I found that the - if I am understanding the question right - my expectation
> or really the expectation of the institution was not really communicated to me
> when I was hired - and so, after about a year or so it seemed to become more
> important at this university, not just my school, but it seemed to become more
> important at this university, and I found myself playing catch up. Now fortunately
> I wasn't too far down the road so that I couldn't correct it but I did not begin my
> career at this institution understanding specifically what was required of me at
> those important milestones - at those gates.

Adding to the challenge was the lack of clarity relative to the criteria and requirements

for promotion and tenure. She pointed out:

> The criteria wasn't clear and what would have made it better would have been
> when I was hired, or even I guess it makes sense when I was hired to be given the
> P&T requirements at that time along with the time frame when I was to be
> evaluated. If you know ahead of time what you are supposed to do, most people
> have no trouble meeting those expectations. It's just when you don't know - and
> you are told it's a requirement - that's where it becomes a challenge.

While Marley felt the criteria and requirements were unclear, there were other aspects of

the tenure process that caused other emotions for her as she began the process. She

described them by saying:

Well, it was a combination of excitement and fear - frankly. The excitement came because - probably everybody that goes through and gets their doctoral degree - you think about what it's going to be like and how much time you are going to spend on your research and you have all these ideas you come in with - I was just excited to just jump on that road and try and just get beyond your dissertation - publish in areas and do research in areas that were exciting - that piece I really liked. The rub became - or I should say the rub was when I had to publish for expediency. So, there were things that I would have loved to have worked on - and I guess at this point I'm just now able to start on some of those things. But really because of the timing of everything I needed to - and I will just say there's the research, the service and the scholarly work. The first two are no problem, teaching was great - had no problem with that - the service was great - so now I am just really focusing on the scholarship piece of it.

The excitement and fear that she experienced seemed to motivate her to work harder at

accomplishing her goal of tenure, even though she had no control over the outcomes of

scholarly production. Although she worked hard to get published in scholarly journals,

she felt that others had control over her success or failure to succeed. This is pointed out

as she stated:

So it takes a long time - the cycle to generate and then have somebody review it, that's out of my control so - the teaching and service that's under your control - the publishing and presenting you have to rely on other people - you have to start, you know, far ahead of time - so getting back to the original question - it was exciting, it was also a challenge because now I was "under the gun" with timing and so I found myself working really hard - and I probably took some resources away from some other areas in order just to catch up - but I would explain it as some excitement and some fear.

In general, Marley described her experience with the tenure process by referring to the

pre-tenure review and what it meant for her:

The notes that you got back from the committee that evaluated the pre-tenure binder, those were helpful. But I will say that during the time that I was first evaluated for pre-tenure, the university was in a bit of flux and there were conversations about changing - I should say - increasing the rigor so even while I thought I was checking the box I thought was required - there were still those conversations that you would hear off-line and informally - these may not really be the requirements - and there was some angst about that. But I decided I wasn't going to worry about that. I could do what I had to so - the process, the pre-tenure process was very helpful. What would have been better would have been if I had a

mentor to say before I got to the three year point – let's sit down and let's talk about – let me tell you where I see you are and you tell me where you think you are. The tenure evaluation at year five was actually a lot less stressful than the pre-tenure was.

The College of Arts and Sciences is the largest unit in the university and there is institutionalized power in numbers. Marley addressed her perception of institutionalized power and its effects during her tenure experience as she stated:

> Well, you know as a candidate that those who are evaluating you, of course, have - I mean it's evaluative power. They - there's an expectation, they say yes or no, so that's kind of a given. As I am thinking back on it now, I remember a couple of times asking my supervisor what she thought or asking her for some more guidance - and I generally got the feeling that she wasn't that sure herself. I'm not sure she felt empowered to communicate to me exactly what the standards were so - I guess that's probably about all I can say about that - I'm not sure she - either she - I'm not sure it was even a matter of influence I just think it was - meaning I don't think she lacked influence on campus, I don't think it was that - I think it was more that - the process was not as transparent and the goals were changing or at least fuzzy - and because of that, she did not - she wasn't able to give me clear guidance.

It appears that Marley felt that others had power over her situation in which she had little control over the outcome. In contrast, she declared that gender had little influence on her experience:

> I have never thought about that - and as I consider it now - I am not sure it had any effect. The one - the colleagues that had been tenured before - who had already been promoted, who already had tenure - I think they were more male than female as I think about it now. I'm not that sure that made that much of a difference for me. Yeah, I don't think it was that much.

However, when asked about how she perceived others advanced through the tenure process in comparison to her experience, Marley expressed some concern that may have been influenced by gender:

> I think that some of the schools may have been - may have had more systems in place or maybe it's just the appearance - sometimes when you're - when you feel like you're just treading water - it seems like other people are doing okay, but to me it was more of a school - differences between schools. I can think of other

colleagues who seemed to have - those already…that had gone through the process - had taken them under their wing and frankly, I wish that were me. I can't begrudge them, that's great for them. But that was one reason why I had decided if I got through this - I was going to be helpful to other colleagues'- particularly women.

Again, Marley implied that a mentor would be helpful during the tenure process. Since Marley is a black female in a white male dominated environment, I inquired about her feelings regarding the effect race may have played in her tenure experience. She responded:

Well, I know there weren't that many black women that were - that had been tenured - that had been promoted and tenured - I don't know that for a fact except when I go to those "all-hands-on-deck" meetings - you can't help but look around and you see who's like you and whose not - and we're all alike, I'm just saying I didn't know who they were and so - I'm not really sure, I'm not really sure.

Politics are present in all environments and activities and political influence can be significant in the academy, especially when seeking tenure. Marley related her experience with politics during the tenure process with scholarly productivity in meeting criteria and requirements. She explained the influence of politics:

Well, the only thing that really comes to mind is the differences in the schools. I think one of the schools on campus is known to be - they have more stringent requirements for publications. It was more of an informal grapevine thing I heard that on the committees that a certain publication in a certain journal may not hold as much weight as some others. In every organization you have factions that are competing for resources and the more that you can show that your people are - the more you give the impression that - I lost my train of thought - but I think that the basic issue was - there was some worry on my part that some of the publications may not hold as much weight as - and so - I am just concerned. That goes back to having requirements.

For Marley, social effects seem to have been more influential as she worked toward achieving tenure. Although some colleagues were supportive, she felt that others expressed their thoughts about whether she was meeting tenure requirements in an unusual manner. She verbalized her feelings concerning this type of behavior, saying,

> I did have one colleague, as I think back on it now, who was tenured a year or two before me and he would make jokes that were really - I'm not sure he meant them to be hurtful but - I can't even think of a good example and I'll try to make one up that illustrates what I am saying - something like "Oh yeah, if I am on the committee I'll have to keep an eye on that for you or I'll have to look more closely at that." It was almost like a passive/aggressive kind of thing. I think - we all knew that he was tenured but just that he would bring it up in conversation and say that he would pay a little bit more attention and see if that was something that would pass - I just thought that was in poor taste and that was probably his way of separating us over here and him over there. But I think if I was the type of person that would have brought it up, he would say "Oh, I'm just kidding, don't take things so seriously." So that's the kind of thing you can't even confront, you just recognize it for what it is and you - I just stopped paying attention to this person.

Behavior such as this, especially from male colleagues seemed to cause Marley some frustration; however, she was able to overcome it by relying on her own capabilities and ignoring the unusual comments. Perhaps some colleagues are not aware of the effect their behavior and comments have on those who are in the process of seeking tenure, especially women in a male-dominated environment.

As we began to discuss the economic effects of the tenure experience, Marley's response was similar to those of the other participants. As she declared,

> To be honest with you, I looked at my paycheck and I tried to keep up with how much money it was and I think it was there - but it was so small that I really didn't notice that much of a difference.

She quickly went on to add:

> You know - but part of it - you're not really doing it so much - you are not trying to get promoted and tenured just for the money but you would think if it were that important - that would be in place as well. I have heard that there is a plan in place, at least at our school, to try to make that jump from associate to full, something more substantial - and I think the administration probably recognizes that, actually they do because they said they recognize that. If you compare the associates from our school to others and even nationally, we're below - but saying it and doing something about it are two different things. But I am not complaining but the money part has never really been - I haven't really said - I haven't looked at my paycheck and said wow this just shows that I am really valuable.

While compensation for tenure would be welcomed, Marley seems to have the view that it is not the most important aspect of her professional career in academia. She accepts the budgetary challenges of the institution and acknowledges that the level of awareness concerning this issue is high with administration. In addition to the economic effects of the tenure process, Marley expressed the effects of the tenure process in general:

> Well, with any challenge, my faith plays a big part so once I started getting those - and even for things that I am thankful for, once I started getting those feelings of, "I don't know how I am going to do this, I don't know how I'm going to pull this off," I just really decided I am going to worry less, work harder and pray more. So one thing, I think it did help my faith because I had a few things happen - I had an article published - but from the time that I started to the time it was published was literally six months - which is a very short period of time. And it was in a fantastic journal and so- one, I think it helped to develop my faith more and two I think, once I finally was promoted, I just got such a sense of - I can do this - hard things you know.

Marley's face lit up when she mentioned how faith and prayer play essential roles in her life, especially when she was seeking tenure. She went on to add:

> There are other hard things in my life but this was one of those professional markers where I reminded myself that - hard things come - you can dig in and it will - and I guess if it had not gone my way, I don't know if I would be sitting here saying the same thing but - hard things come and you do the best that you can. So I was really excited, I felt real proud of myself - I also thought, that's an awful lot of emotional angst to give to one thing - and I decided that I was not going to buy into that anymore. I am going to try to be as professional as I can, do the best I can, help somebody else, but after that I am not going to waste personal energy that much anymore.

After achieving tenure, Marley's view of power in the academy has shifted to focus on her accomplishment. She feels tenure gives professors more institutionalized power and opportunity to determine the course of their intellectual work than they had earlier in their careers. She explained:

> I have always been concerned about my students having a valuable learning experience but now I don't worry so much about the evaluations and the teaching

> \- I do still - I won't say it doesn't hurt my feelings but when I see a student say 'Oh, she never responds to emails or something like that' - I rack my brain, I think, what do you mean I never respond to emails? But I also remember that they have a different perspective than I do so - I'm not so concerned about the ones and twos on the evaluation any more. I think I have more of a long-range view of what the purposes of those are - and as I mentioned when we first started, I've started on a research agenda now that I'm really excited about - and I think I'm finally going to have a chance to pursue it. And that's exciting since after this next level I won't be under the gun so much just to produce. I can take my time more.

Upon my inquiry about her research agenda, Marley stated "The topic involves veterans and their access to resources at universities- transitioning from military to civilian and the whole experience of learning." Marley and her husband are proud veterans and her interest in helping veterans is genuine. Upon offering advice to women who may seek tenure, Marley made an analogy of the military and being tenured:

> Well, I think it's kind of the same thing as being enlisted or being an officer. They both are valuable, but you get a little more respect when you are tenured. I don't even - people don't sit around and say who's tenured and who's not - but I just have - it just seems like there are probably doors opened to you when you're tenured that may not be. I was in a meeting not too long ago and I heard one faculty member talking about how another who was a lecturer should kind of be dumped on - since this person is not on the tenure track they should have more. There were some administrative duties that had to be parceled out and this person just did not want to - who wants more work? I understand that - nobody wants more work, but it protects you a little bit - so I guess - I don't even think about it as oh, I can never be fired that's not how I think but I do think that to others if you have made it through that process…they do tend to give you more respect.

The caring, thoughtful attitude focused on being fair and helping others was evident as Marley spoke about the similarities in how people are treated in some situations. She is proud to be in a position that demands more recognition and respect now that she is a tenured faculty member. However, Marley offered this advice for women:

> I think women probably need to educate themselves more. Here's what I mean. You know often times when you look at women who are going through this they are of the childbearing age so either you're just starting out trying to start your family or you're in the middle of having your family which is kind of where I was

or you've kind of launched them - so, not that fathers don't have the same kind of demands but - I think women just need to know it's going to be hard and you're not going to be able to be great at everything at the same time. So, when you're going through this - the tenure process - you may have to let your house be dirty - your kids are healthy, your house is dirty and you're doing your work - that's okay.

In closing, Marley stated:

I would just like to say - I haven't run into this myself but you hear horror stories about - it's kind of like the interns becoming doctors. They make the interns stay up for 24 hours and so when the student becomes a doctor they do the same thing. I would say you just never want to be a person or a woman that makes it hard for somebody else. If you can be a helpful colleague then do. That's about all I have to say.

Marley was soft spoken and reflective throughout the interview. She was sincere about her faith, prayer, family, and helping others, which she mentioned often. She managed stress during her tenure experience with prayer, exercise, and being as organized as possible while playing to her strengths. Marley also expressed excitement about being able to pursue her research interests. Her future goals are to scale back on service and spend more time on her research agenda.

The tenure experiences of these three women, Ashlee, Josie, and Marley, at a small public university are unique yet similar in certain ways. Ashlee's outgoing, creative communication style is similar to Josie's enthusiastic, direct way of communicating. Marley is quiet and shy, but reflective in expressing her thoughts. Each woman brought her own perspective to higher education including her reason for seeding tenure. Their disciplines provide unique avenues for accomplishing their goals and being successful in their careers. In spite of their individual experiences with the tenure process, they share commonalities. Next, I will discuss the four themes that I identified from my in-depth interviews with the women.

CHAPTER 5

THE THEMES

I began this research seeking to understand the experiences of women seeking

tenure in a small public university. Consistent with the characteristics of qualitative, case

study research with a phenomenological view, the interviews enhanced the focus of the

research. The themes that were identified from my analysis of the data offer insights into

the experiences of women who achieved tenure at a small public university. Each woman

had her own reasons for seeking tenure, and during the tenure process each one

experienced challenges related to institutionalized power influenced by gender to varying

degrees. As they navigated the tenure process, each woman encountered challenges that

were similar and yet unique to her experience and discipline. As Merriam (1988) points

out, qualitative case study research views the case as a unit that has boundaries in which

the object of the study, tenured women at a small public university, can be fenced in due

to the commonalities that may exist. The focus is on holistic description, analysis, and

explanation of their experiences with the tenure process as the single phenomenon. While

the women's tenure experiences represent the phenomenon in bounded context (Miles &

Huberman, 1994), there are particular aspects for each participant. The women's stories

are not intended to be generalizations and the research reveals the multiplicity and

uniqueness of women's experiences (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). As I report the themes

that were identified from the research, my goal is to preserve the coherence of the

identities and lives of the women who shared their tenure experiences (Smith et al.,

2009). I identify themes that come forth as commonalities on the path to achieving tenure

at a small public university. Although the interviews concluded at a specific time, their

lives continue as they progress toward achieving personal and professional goals beyond the tenure experience.

<center>"Just Stressed Out" (Ashlee)</center>

Ashlee, Josie, and Marley each revealed situations that caused them to feel stressed out during their tenure experience. Although the stressed out feeling was a commonality found among the women, the cause was specific to each woman's perception and memory. In Ashlee's case, she cited preparation of the portfolio and the number of hours it took to prepare it as a major cause of frustration. She explained how she used other tenure professors' portfolios as examples but found that they did not make sense to her, so she basically redid her portfolio notebook and how it was organized. This created a fair amount of work for Ashlee, but the reorganization made more sense to her. She commented, "It actually created a fair amount of work for me but it made more sense to me and I felt like it had to make sense to me in order to make sense to someone else." Reviewing the portfolios of other tenured professors was helpful for Ashlee, but at the same time it created more work for her. She went on to add:

> At about 128 hours in the process, I stopped counting the hours. So I was very curious about how long it really took - so when I really began in earnest putting that book together and I got to 128 hours I stopped counting.

It appears that the overwhelming amount of work and time that it took to prepare the portfolio was quite frustrating for Ashlee. For Josie, reviewing the portfolios of tenured professors was helpful; however, she reported her frustration in a different way. Josie explained how reviewing the portfolios helped her understand what the expectations were. When I asked if the expectations and examples were clear to her, she responded:

> Not totally - it was a new process for me. I really hadn't worked in the academic setting before. I had always been - if I was, it was part-time and so I was very unsure of myself.

Feeling unsure of herself was frustrating for Josie and she went on to clarify what she felt unsure about, including expectations, as she commented on the lack of control she felt she had. She was also frustrated by the possibility of someone on the committee saying she did not meet the criteria. She stated, "So I think it's that fear factor – that you lack control and someone could do you in."

Another factor that added to Josie's frustration was actually having a mentor. She found that having a mentor was great, but if the mentor was not engaged, it was frustrating as she recounted how she was assigned a mentor but felt like the mentor was very busy, was not really engaged with her, and did not care about her at all. Josie noted, "I realized that anything that I did, I was going to have to find it out on my own." Overall, Josie reported that her experience with the tenure process was very stressful. She was very animated as she declared that she had too much documentation in her portfolio notebook and had to reduce it from two notebooks to one notebook. She was afraid of leaving something important out and that was very frustrating for her. Josie noted, " I just think it's stressful and the only thing I worried about again was the articles – publications. That was very, very stressful." Josie also spoke about how it is getting more difficult to publish in the nursing journals, including the long time line from submission, to rewrites, to publication. When she exclaimed, "All I can say is I am glad it's over!" she seemed excited and relieved. As Josie spoke, I could sense the feeling of frustration and stress that she experienced as she tried to meet publication requirements during her tenure process. This seemed to be the major cause of stress for her during her experience with

the process. Marley's stress was related to not being aware of the need to begin

preparations early, and unclear and inconsistent expectations across disciplines. She

verbalized her frustration as she commented on how the expectation of the institution was

not really communicated to her when she was hired and she found herself playing catch

up. Her frustration with the criteria was noted as she expressed:

> The criteria wasn't clear and what would have made it better would have been
> when I was hired, or even I guess it makes sense when I was hired to be given the
> P&T requirements at that time along with the time frame when I was to be
> evaluated.

Not knowing the requirements was a challenge for Marley. She was very pensive as she

talked about her feelings of always being behind during the process. Marley stated the

importance of beginning to prepare early and the need to have a mentor who can provide

guidance:

> What would have been better would have been if I had a mentor to say before I
> got to the three year point - let's sit down and let's talk about - let me tell you
> where I see where you are and you tell me where you think you are - and then
> we'll - not expecting someone to hold my hand but - I kind of felt like I was
> shooting in the dark so it's like any performance evaluation - you should never
> walk in not knowing what you're going to get - there should be an agreement on
> what the expectation is - and if you are a valuable member of the organization
> then someone at some level should say we want to keep this person so let's put a
> couple things in place - how about we get you a mentor?

Having little mentoring and guidance made the pre-tenure experience more stressful for

Marley than the actual tenure experience due to the rigor of the pre-tenure process. If she

had been fortunate enough to have a mentor, she imagined what it would have been like

as she reported someone might have said:

> You guys need to periodically get together - and if you are having any struggles
> or problems - then that way they will not have wasted the organization's - the
> organization will not have wasted the time in recruiting, the couple years in
> teaching before you go to pre-tenure - and so that would have been helpful. So
> then let's press forward after the pre-tenure, the process after that of course I was

a little more - I was clearer about what the expectations were and then it was just a matter of getting it done. So, the tenure process was actually - I should say the tenure evaluation at year five was actually a lot less stressful than the pre-tenure was.

Marley's perception was that colleagues in other schools on campus may have been privileged with more support than some and this seemed to cause some frustration and stress for her. She described her concern:

> I think that some of the schools may have been - may have had more systems in place or maybe it's just the appearance - sometimes when you're - when you feel like you're just treading water - it seems like other people are doing okay, but to me it was more of a school - differences between schools. I can think of other colleagues who seemed to have - those already - that had gone through the process - I had taken them under their wing and frankly, I wish that were me. I can't begrudge them - that's great for them. But that was one reason why I had decided if I got through this - I was going to be helpful to other colleagues - particularly women. I guess until we started talking about it now I didn't know anything about it. I had decided I was going to be as helpful as I could because to me if someone is worth - if someone is my colleague and I say yeah, I am going to hire this person, we all are invited to those candidates' presentations when they come on campus. If I am going to sit in the audience and say - yeah I think this person can be an independent colleague, can be of value to the institution, and he or she is struggling and I can help them, then I am happy to do that.

Here Marley mentioned being helpful to women, which leads me to consider institutionalized power and gender issues in relation to her experience with lack of support during the tenure process. There are more tenured men than women at Monroe State University and this point is made by Ashlee as she expressed how she asked for mentorship from men because only men, not women, had been on the Promotion and Tenure committees and they were in the "in" group which held the institutionalized power. There were no other women that she could ask for help. Concerning gender issues, Josie stated "I don't feel in my case that it had any impact." I also found it very interesting that Josie did not mention men as part of her experience with the tenure process in any way. This could be because she teaches nursing and that is a

predominantly female profession with no men on the faculty. She aligned herself with a female colleague for support during the process as she reported:

> Well, it was scary and I had a colleague in another department who was hired at the same time that I was, and we kind of became support for each other. She would call and tell me, "We need to be doing this, at this time, at this juncture in our career." And I think that's the thing that was disturbing. No one really prepared me for what I was supposed to be doing. I had to depend on my friend, who knew more than I did about the process.

In their discussion of tenured women, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) report that women felt frustrated and exhausted by the amount of energy required to seek and achieve tenure. While Ashlee, Josie, and Marley made comments regarding feeling stressed out and their frustrations with the tenure process, their views point out the subtle nature of institutionalized power and gender in the academy. Institutionalized power issues related to the theme of being stressed out could be related to policies and procedures. In higher education, institutionalized power is held by administrators and the majority of them are men. Many issues related to the women feeling stressed out could be addressed by administration with policies and procedures in order to decrease the stress and frustration factors when individuals are going through the tenure process. As Bensimon and Marshall (2003) point out, elimination of institutionalized power asymmetries and domination that structure relationships between women and men in the academy requires gender-based appraisals of academic structures, policies, and practices.

"Someone Could Do You In" (Josie)

When discussing the role that institutionalized power played in the tenure process, the three participants gave similar responses. They were all cognizant of how others could affect the outcome of their tenure aspirations. Ashlee seemed adept in seeking out individuals to assist her in the process. She was keenly aware of the institutionalized

power and authority held by professors who were not in administrative positions, but

could influence her outcome. She recalled her efforts to acquire guidance by stating how

the people who she asked for help were in the "in" group (all men), had served on the

Promotion and Tenure committee, and knew what the process was like. They could help

her learn the game, how to be politically correct, and not ruffle any feathers. As Ashlee

pointed out, being informed is important and she made sure she had access to information

that was important to her aspirations. She was attuned to both the requirements and the

politics involved in achieving tenure, and she also recognized the institutionalized power

that men held in the process. Her comment regarding not wanting to ruffle any feathers

indicates that she accepted and used male norms and aspired to be neutral in presenting

her information in a way that was non-threatening to those (men) who may be reviewing

her portfolio.

Interestingly, the individuals available to help Ashlee navigate the tenure process

were men, and thus gender is significant in this case. She went on and explained the

significance by stating there were no other tenured women in her department to ask for

help. Concerning the men, Ashlee also noted that they had political institutionalized

power because of their knowledge, expertise, and the positions they held and that she felt

comfortable with them. As I listened to Ashlee recount her experience, I wondered why,

in 2004, there were no other women in the department in which she worked. In addition

to there being no men in her department, there were no women on the Promotion and

Tenure committees. Clearly, men held the institutionalized power in this situation. This is

evidence of gender inequities and the lack of women in higher education (Kelly &

Slaughter, 1991; Hagg, 2005; Schoening, 2009). It appears that Ashlee felt comfortable

because she was already a part of the "in" group, which made her have more support in her quest for tenure.

Josie's experience seemed to cause her more anxiety and fear than Ashlee's. While Ashlee was focused on the "in" group, Josie was more focused on fear of losing her job and that one person could prevent her from achieving tenure. She explained this by commenting on her personal life (going through a divorce) and wanting job security. Josie also expressed concern about not achieving tenure and being dismissed, as well as lack of control if one person on the committee said she did not meet the criteria for tenure. These comments by Josie indicate that she felt she had little control over the outcome of her tenure experience. In other words, others held the institutionalized power and control over the outcome of her future, and they were men. This seemed to mobilize her to work hard at scholarly productivity to ensure that she met the criteria. The fact that men held the institutionalized power did not seem to be a significant part of Josie's experience, when addressing gender issues she stated "I didn't feel in my case it had any impact." There was no mention of the political effects of the tenure process, and the only other comment regarding gender that she made during the interview was associated with political effects when she spoke about a female coworker who was not given credit for tenure when she arrived at MSU. In addition, Josie's female colleague was not given a promotion that a male colleague in another department had received. Perhaps Josie was genuine in her feelings regarding gender and political effects, or she was reluctant to address these issues. Her demeanor during the interview suggested the former, as she was relaxed and thoughtful with her responses and gave no indication that she was reluctant to discuss these issues.

Marley's description of her experiences with others having control over a candidate's tenure process outcome focused on institutionalized power in different way. Her comments regarding working hard to publish and not having control over time lines and acceptance of articles made it clear that the lack of control was a serious concern for her. She also talked about the evaluative power held by the committee, unclear standards, and lack of guidance by her supervisor. As Tierney & Bensimon (1996) point out, there is a need for tenure candidates to be active in the tenure process so that they feel a sense of control and thus less frustration. Socially, Marley experienced frustration at the hands of a particular tenured male colleague who made what Marley thought were inappropriate, passive-aggressive jokes about her tenure process experience and what he would do if he was on the committee and reviewing her documents. She indicated that she felt she could not confront him, and so she just ignored him and his comments. Perhaps, because of Marley's faith, she felt less anxious about other individuals having institutionalized power and control over her tenure outcome. This is evidenced as she spoke about how her faith played a big part in how she handled the tenure process just as she would any challenge. She reported that she decided to worry less, work harder, and pray more, and declared that by doing so her faith was strengthened.

My assertion is that the feelings of lack of control felt by the women are based on Lukes' (1974) contention that women's lack of institutionalized power in the academy is associated with the third dimensional view of power. This view asserts that the focus of control is over political agendas, decision-making, issues and potential issues, covert or overt latent conflicts, and also subjective and real interests (Lukes, 1974). Clearly the fear, anxiety, lack of control, and lack of institutionalized power the women voiced were

evident in the patterns of the rigor associated with the tenure process, as political agendas and decision-making are intertwined with various units and administration as tenure is either granted or denied. Social effects are inherent in the tenure process as it is navigated as well as the outcome. Faculty members may remain ordinary faculty members or become part of the elite group of tenured professors on campus. Each of the women in my study was concerned about being appropriate in associating with colleagues in order to avoid negative political and social effects as they worked toward achieving tenure. Although the women in my study expressed concern regarding the lack of significant economic rewards of achieving tenure, the economic advantages for the department in which they are a member of may benefit in other ways. The more tenured faculty members, the more influence the department may have on major decisions at all levels in the university, including those decisions that involve budgetary allowances.

<div style="text-align:center">"The Criteria Weren't Clear" (Marley)</div>

An issue that was mentioned early in the interviews by each of the women, but not elaborated on, was lack of clarity and standardization of criteria for tenure. This seemed to be consistent across all disciplines at the university. At the time of their tenure applications, MSU was undergoing change and transition in several ways, one of which was revisions in promotion and tenure criteria. Marley voiced her feelings about the situation as she noted that the expectation of the institution was not really communicated to her when she was hired and she found herself playing catch up. She also commented on lack of clarity concerning the promotion and tenure requirements, including time frame expectations regarding evaluation. These were all challenges for Marley as she navigated the tenure process. Marley's concern about meeting tenure requirements was

focused on keeping her job. As the university began to focus more on research and

scholarly productivity, she expressed her concerns by sharing:

> Well, it's up or out….so, if I want to keep my job, which I do very much because
> I like what I do, then I needed to make sure I checked all the blocks that were
> necessary to keep my job and one of those was to complete all the promotion and
> tenure requirements.

When addressing whether the expectations and criteria were clear to her, Josie stated:

> Not totally….it was a new process for me. I really hadn't worked in the academic
> setting before. I had always been….If I was, it was part-time and so I was very
> unsure of myself.

> You've always heard even if you think you have met the criteria there could be
> someone- someone on the committee that says you didn't meet the criteria.

Josie did not voice much concern about the criteria now that she has been successful.

However, she did emphasize the need to be fair and consistent by commenting on what

she called a negative situation that caused her concern. The situation involved a coworker

who did not receive credit for tenure or the same promotion as a male colleague in

another department.

Ashlee's concern about criteria focused on preparation of the portfolio for review,

as she spoke about the criteria in relation to her school's and department's expectations.

She noted that the expectations for tenure were quite clear and parallel to the evaluation

process in her school; however, improvements could be made. Ashlee talked about the

need for university wide consistency when she stated:

> So that would be certainly one thing we can do - as an academy, in general,
> making sure that the guidelines for tenure and promotion are parallel to the
> guidelines for the performance evaluation process every year. So that when you
> get to the fifth year you don't have to reorganize everything because that is what I
> ended up having to do.

Ashlee also stated that the consistency would prevent tenure candidates from having to reorganize their materials for tenure review. Nevertheless, she noted that her experience with reorganizing her portfolio was time consuming but rewarding, since other candidates now use her portfolio as an example. Ashley seemed very proud of her accomplishment and the way she is now able to assist others with their portfolios. During the interviews, I felt that the women discussed the issue of unclear criteria even though they came from different academic disciplines. They seemed to assume that the criteria required for tenure was appropriate for their respective disciplines.

<p style="text-align:center">"Find a Mentor and Start Early" (Ashlee, Josie, Marley)</p>

When presented with the question "What advice would you give to women who are seeking tenure?", each of the participants made comments that focused on getting an early start and finding help in a mentor. As each women pointed out, and consistent with the work of Umbach (2007), Helvie-Mason, (2007), and Bonawitz and Andel (2009), there were few tenured women in the university and thus, few women that could provide the support that they needed as they navigated the tenure process. Ashlee spoke about the lack of tenured women by stating that "I am always interested to know the sex of the people that you go to for help and they are all men." She went on and described this further by talking about how she asked for mentorship from men because only men had been on the Promotion and Tenure committee, and they were in the "in" group and the "power" group in the university. She declared that there were no women to ask for help and that she had no problem asking her male colleagues for help.

Ashlee did voice the need to begin preparing early for tenure, have more guidance early in the tenure process, and for tenure candidates to be made aware of available

guidance. She also indicated that having incentives and awards might assist candidates in motivating candidates to begin preparing early. Gender was an issue as Ashlee seemed particularly concerned about the need for women to ask for help when she declared that others should tell women to ask for help. She noted that women should be represented at all levels of the university and compared women's lack of representation to lack of women in higher education as documented by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

The need for mentorship was a strong theme throughout all of the interviews. In addition to commenting on starting early with the tenure process, Ashlee expressed this several times as she spoke about how she asked for mentorship from men because of the unavailability of tenured women who had served on the Promotion and Tenure committee. Her strongest statement was "Find a mentor. Be sure that you can focus entirely on the process when it's time."

In a similar view, Josie also voiced the need for starting early and having a mentor. She noted "No one really prepared me for what I was supposed to be doing. I had to depend on my friend, who knew more than I did about the process." Josie voiced her concern that information about the tenure process should be given to faculty members early during orientation to the university as she commented "I think during orientation - of course, during that time you are overwhelmed with information, but I think orientation about the process." She went on to describe the need further when she recounted:

> But then you need someone who - not only may be a colleague, but may be an administrator that keeps tabs on you to make sure you are on track because I do know people that, for whatever reason, did not stay on track and they were due for pre-tenure review and they don't even have a notebook. So I think without someone working with you, like a mentor during that process - the results can sometimes be bad.

Josie stated that when she started work, a female colleague was assigned to be her

mentor, but she felt like the colleague was very busy, was not really engaged with her,

and did not care about her at all. Josie summarized her advice to women who seek tenure

when she commented:

> I think they need to find a mentor…maybe someone they admire and they want to
> be like them. Or maybe somebody you know that knows the system and can
> guide them. I think that's really, really important.

Marley was quite descriptive as she described what having a mentor meant to her.

The guidance she had during the tenure process was provided by her immediate

supervisor and she felt there was a lack of clarity regarding expectations. She described

how it would have been better if she had a mentor to assess her progress early in the

tenure process, encourage self-assessment, and provide guidance regarding mutual

expectations. Marley noted that periodic meetings with a mentor might also be helpful for

tenure candidates. This description represents what Marley thought a mentor's role

might have been and how it could have been implemented. As we discussed her

experience and differences or similarities in how others progressed through the tenure

process, Marley commented on how she thought some of the schools in the university

may have more systems in place to help candidates with the tenure process. She noted

how some colleagues seemed to have supportive mentors and that she plans to be helpful

to future tenure candidates, especially women, now that she has achieved tenure status.

Clearly Marley's perception about lack of guidance has caused her to be more willing to

help others, especially women, as they navigate the tenure process in the future.

For Marley, starting early seemed more related to expectations not being

communicated to her when she was hired. She spoke about how the expectations of the

university were not communicated to her when she was hired, and because of that she had to play catch up regarding preparing for the tenure process. Fortunately, she had not progressed so far that she could not catch up in a timely manner. These comments imply that while she was able to make up for lost time, Marley felt she would have been able to complete her tasks in a more timely manner if she had known the expectations and time line regarding the tenure process upon beginning employment at MSU. A plan that included check points and goals may have assisted her with her preparation.

Each woman in this study voiced concern about needing clarity and consistency involving the portfolio, standard tenure criteria, and having an effective mentor. While the themes have been identified as having major roles in the participants' experiences with the tenure process, lack of consistency, standard criteria, and mentors were issues that represent commonalities among the women. Their experiences reflect familiar dimensions found in the literature and some that were surprising to me. The frustration and fear that political and social factors could cause a negative outcome was alarming to me. Unclear and inconsistent expectations, which I did not anticipate, seem to also be a factor in these women's experiences. While the themes provide insight into the tenure experiences of three women in a small public institution, now I will discuss the significance of the themes relative to institutionalized power and gender in the academy.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

In this research, my interests focused on institutionalized power and gender issues related to women in higher education, and specifically their experiences with the tenure process. I continue to encounter and observe institutionalized power and gender inequities in the academy as women are underrepresented, especially in the rank of tenure, even though they have made great strides attaining doctoral degrees in the last several decades (*Digest of Educational Statistics*, 2009). Institutionalized power in academic institutions is basically held by men; the structure of the institutions is based on gender, reinforcement of such structure, and the devaluing of women's interests (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Helvie-Mason, 2007; Reimer, 2009). Challenges that create barriers for women who seek tenure are related to political, social, and economic issues which often serve to increase the time required for women to achieve tenure (Risman, 2004; Umbach, 2007; Lerner, 2008; Branch-Brioso, 2009; Bonawitz & Andel, 2009). I hoped that my study would provide increased understanding of women's experiences with the tenure process in higher education relative to institutionalized power and gender.

My review of the literature indicated that most research is either conducted at research universities or is quantitative. While some qualitative studies have been conducted, they focus on general experiences with tenure, faculty perceptions, pre-tenure experiences, and were not designed as case studies with a specific focus on women's experiences with the tenure process in a small public institution. My goal was to enhance the literature by investigating the experiences of women in a small public university within the specific context of institutionalized power and gender in the academy beyond

the problems implied in statistical data. By using a phenomenological case study

approach and in-depth interviews, I hoped to elicit, illuminate, and present a more

comprehensive representation of the women's experiences as they navigated the tenure

process. I expected to participate completely in the interview process, committing myself

to learning (deMarrais, 2004) while remaining sensitive and non-judgmental in

communicating (Merriam, 1998).

Upon interviewing each participant, I felt a personal connection with each

woman, and I also felt a sense of anticipation about the possibility of achieving tenure.

While the women had different personalities and varied in the way they approached the

topic at hand during the interviews, the themes that I identified during data analysis

reflect what the tenure experience meant to each women (Rubin, H. & Rubin, I., 2005),

and thus also reflect the phenomenological character of qualitative research (Crotty,

1996, 2003). I established rapport with each participant, and was reflexive and

trustworthy in my approach (Glesne, 2006). I also focused on understanding the women's

experiences as they perceived them, and the interviews revealed the women's personal

perspectives and reflections (Glesne, 2006). Being actively situated in the research was

satisfying as I empathized with the participants, asked appropriate questions, and listened

intently (Merriam, 1998). The themes that I identified as a result of utilizing IPA for data

analysis (Smith et al., 2009) represent the women's perceptions of their experiences.

Commonalities are reflected in the experiences of Ashlee, Josie, and Marley, even

though their personal experiences were unique. The first commonality was their concern

about lack of adequate information regarding the process. Even though the criteria and

requirements were available, each woman's perception of them was different, and each

woman expressed concern regarding the applicability of the criteria. It was noted that some disciplines appeared to have more rigorous requirements than others in the university. This is consistent with Leverenz's (2000) assertion that tenure may be conceptualized as a game with rules to be understood, observed, and applied. Each participant's understanding of the rules was unique and that understanding influenced how she prepared. Austin and Rice (1998) also report that faculty members have anxiety and frustration associated with conflicting and unclear information about the tenure process. Researchers have suggested a number of contributing factors regarding inconsistencies in criteria, especially concerning what constitutes scholarship and productivity (Fairweather, 2002; Davis et al., 2006). This was reflected in the women's statements as they spoke about their frustration with the process. As Schoening (2009) points out, requirements for teaching, service, and research should be clearly outlined in order for women to be successful at promotion and tenure. However, Ashlee felt that she was a member of the power group on campus and thus had more access to the support and information needed in order to be successful. Ashlee's perception is consistent with Chavez's (2008) view of the importance of elite groups that may provide protection for some faculty members. Research has tended to focus on the perceptions and expectations of faculty members, and these women's experiences represent a finding that indicates inconsistencies among disciplines in the same institution. This was surprising to me since I thought there was standard application of the process across disciplines. While each of the women found the pre-tenure review helpful, the institutionalized power of the dominant group, which consists of men, may hold the key to policy changes that could increase the consistency of the application of tenure criteria and requirements. Like the

participants in this study, other women who seek tenure may encounter the same inconsistencies during the tenure process. Baez and Centra (1995) declare that tenure policies should be unambiguous, explicit, consistent, and clearly articulate how tenure is to be acquired. The scholars also assert that the criteria for tenure should be specific enough to provide guidance to faculty members (Baez & Centra, 1995). Future research which questions the consistent application of tenure criteria and requirements in different disciplines in the same institution needs to be conducted.

A second commonality that I identified from interviews with these women was that the process required a lot of hard work beyond what they anticipated. This is consistent with the work of Tierney and Bensimon (1996) as they report the long work hours of women faculty members. Ashlee reported that preparation involved not just a lot of work, but also a lot of time. In order to have adequate time to prepare, she did not teach one summer semester and, although she did not mention it, this had an economic effect, as it caused a decrease in salary that she was accustomed to having. Ashlee also talked about the impact that the time required to prepare had in her family and gave specific examples of informing the family that she was having a "T Day" (tenure day) when she was not available for them. Josie voiced her concern about the hard work by emphasizing the need she had to be over prepared, which took a lot of time. She indicated that she had so much information in her portfolio that she had to reduce it and this was extremely frustrating for her since she was unsure of what could be omitted. Marley expressed her feelings about the work by focusing on the short time span within which she had to produce scholarly work. She felt under pressure and took time from other areas in her life in order to be productive. One point that Marley emphasized is that women

should educate themselves regarding the requirements of the tenure process before they actually begin the process. Her concern is that since women have so many things to juggle, they should understand that they are not going to be great at all things at all times, especially when seeking tenure. This concern also relates to how women are constantly negotiating their multiple identities in society and in the academy.

These women's experiences with the hard work required during the tenure process may be gender related as Risman (2004) implies. Gender is deeply imbedded as women fill identical structural positions as men such as tenure (Risman, 2004), and there is inequality that is associated with difference (Lorber, 1994). This inequality is based on the differences in the amount of responsibility women have for the day-to-day maintenance of the family and often women are at a disadvantage in the professional and political arenas (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991; Marshall & Anderson, 1995; Dzuback, 2003). In addition, gender issues are also consistent with Helvie-Mason's (2007) findings in her phenomenological study which shows that workload and uncertainty in where to focus time and energy are social challenges for women. As Eliou (1991) points out, women are accompanied throughout life by the handicaps placed on them because of their gender. Women in academia often have heavier workloads than men (Eliou, 1991; Chavez, 2008) and are expected to perform other duties such as smile work and mom work (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Therefore, seeking tenure puts additional work on women who may already be challenged by responsibilities in the home and work environment. The study by Perna (2005) also shows evidence that lack of support networks, along with the contribution of family ties to academic rank and tenure status, are different for women than for men, and do not support improved outcomes for women. Since the

organizational structure of the academy appears to be geared toward the success of males rather than females (Kelly & Slaughter, 1991), administrators hold the institutionalized power to create change in this area by making changes and implementing policies that are fair and consistent. Political agendas are set by administrators, deans, and department heads, who also have the primary responsibility of making decisions at many levels (Lukes, 1974). This raises the question of why women have heavier workloads than men in the academy. Future research which investigates the workloads of women and men, especially women seeking tenure, needs to be conducted.

Another commonality that I observed relative to gender was associated with the subtle, nuanced ways in which gender shapes the academy which is consistent with Risman's (2004) assertion of deeply imbedded gender practices. Each of the participants spoke about the "in" group which was dominated by men, and they acknowledged that men also held institutionalized power and determined expectations and criteria related to tenure at MSU. This description by the participants is reflective of Lukes' (1974) claim regarding political power and control. While the women recognized the "in" group as the institutionalized power group, they did not seem to see gender as having a major influence on their tenure experience. For instance, one participant felt she was already part of the "in" group before she achieved tenure status, and for her gender did not appear to be an issue. She had already accepted and used male norms in her professional life, including the tenure process. Dzuback (2003) declares that gender and power are evident in the mission and practices of the academy which are usually established by the dominant male group. The mission and practices may have shaped the participant's behavior to male expectations as she became part of the "in" group. Without specifically

mentioning gender, another participant voiced her concern about the heavy demands of motherhood that were already present in her life as she began the tenure experience. She accepted the fact that because she had children she had more demands than a man, which made her experience more difficult. Each participant stated that she believed her tenure experience was not that much different from anyone else's. The absence of substantive responses regarding gender reflects the covert embedded nature of institutionalized power and gender in the academy. The participants seem to have accepted the norms established by their male-dominated power structure.

The next commonality that I identified from interviews with these participants was the need for effective guidance and mentoring. I was surprised by this finding since I thought that candidates for tenure were assigned mentors who supported them throughout the process. Because there were few tenured women in their disciplines, each woman expressed that she would have sought women for help if more women had been available. This is evident as Ashlee expressed:

> I asked for mentorship from men and that is not because I wouldn't have asked it from women but only men had been on the Tenure and Promotion committees - and who were in the "in" group, the "institutionalized power" group in the university and the college.

> There were no other women in this department, so it is not surprising that there were no other women to ask for help.

Although Josie was assigned a female mentor, she felt that the assistance that she received was minimal and ineffective, and this caused her to seek guidance elsewhere:

> Well, it was scary and I had a colleague in another department who was hired at the same time that I was, and we kind of became support for each other.

> And I think that's the thing that was disturbing. No one really prepared me for what I was supposed to be doing. I had to depend on my friend, who knew more than I did about the process.

> So I think without someone working with you, like a mentor during that process, the results can sometimes be bad.

Marley was also concerned about the lack of guidance and she described it by saying:

> I can think of other colleagues who seemed to have- those already- that had gone through the process- had taken them under their wing and frankly, I wish that were me. I can't begrudge them, that's great for them. But that was one reason why I had decided if I got through this- I was going to be helpful to other colleagues- particularly women.

This research adds to existing literature by pointing out both consistencies and variations based on the participants' personal experiences. These women's descriptions of the need for guidance and effective mentoring during the tenure process are consistent with the view of Clark and Corcoran (1986). They contended that professional socialization of women should be focused on theory, policy, and sponsorship (mentoring) of women faculty members. This sponsorship should be a more deliberate process (Clark & Corcoran, 1986) which could be implemented by those holding institutionalized power, many of which are men. Schoening (2009) also reports that there are few women mentors in higher education. Since women are not mentored properly, they also experience lack of entitlement to prestigious disciplines and leadership (Morley & David, 2009). Thus, women in higher education continue to be marginalized and devalued (Moore & Sagaria, 1991). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) contend that for women in predominantly male departments, the challenges are also intensified by the combined politics of promotion and tenure, and gender relations. The lack of guidance and mentoring for women raises the question of why women do not have mentors in the academy, and when seeking such an important and prestigious status as tenure. Future studies should investigate the effectiveness of mentoring for women in the academy, especially when seeking tenure.

Beyond the themes and commonalities identified in this study, utilizing a phenomenological case study perspective within the framework of power informed by gender to investigate the tenure experiences of Ashlee, Josie, and Marley has brought forth a number of other implications. Findings of this study suggest the underrepresentation of women faculty members in higher education needs to be addressed in faculty hiring and retention policies. The majority of faculty members and tenured faculty members in the academy are men, which leaves few tenured women faculty members to serve as mentors for other women faculty members. While men appear to have similar experiences with the tenure process, future research focused on a comparison of the tenure experiences of women and men as they seek and achieve tenure might yield more information and significant themes related to institutionalized power, gender, and tenure challenges. In addition, future research may explore the patterns within disciplines instead of across disciplines, and could include women who have gone beyond tenure to serve in administrative or leadership positions in the academy. Further research is also needed to examine the influence of mentors and challenges on a more diversified, multicultural cohort of women.

As the general move away from tenured professors and a drive toward prestige occurs in the academy, the views of Merton (1988) and Rossiter (1993) may become more significant. The Matthew Effect (Merton, 1988) suggests that women produce scholarly work in collaboration with men but get little or no recognition, while men gain more recognition and status. The Matilda Effect (Rossiter, 1993) suggests that women's scholarly work should be announced more and recognized more, in order for women to receive recognition and gain equal prestige and status as men. Professors who have

achieved recognition and status in their fields or areas of expertise may become more desirable than tenured professors. This has implications for women as they continue to produce scholarly work and seek individual recognition and status for their achievements. Institutionalized power and gender issues need to be studied in relation to the recognition that women and men receive for the same or similar scholarly activities.

Several questions were raised by this study and they are whether or not existing policies related to tenure practices are applied equitably across and within disciplines, and if there are differences in tenure experiences between genders. Because of these questions, I found the policy implications to be consistent with the recommendations of The Modern Language Association of America (2007) which include: a) practicing and promoting transparency throughout the tenuring process; b) devising a letter of understanding with explicit expectations for new faculty members; c) providing support commensurate with expectations for achieving tenure, including start-up funds and research leaves; and d) establishing mentoring structures that provide guidance to new faculty members on scholarship and the balance of teaching publication, and service. Adoption and implementation of these recommendations by departments and institutions may assist women who seek tenure in having a more equitable chance at achieving tenure without many of the challenges that they now encounter. This study suggests the need for more phenomenological case studies that give serious consideration of women's meaning-making of their tenure experiences in higher education. Such studies would aid in further understanding the experiences of women seeking tenure.

References

Acker, S. (1983). Women, the other academics. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *6*(2), 194.

Agathangelou, A., & Ling, L. (2002). An unten(ur)able position: the politics of teaching for women of color in the US. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *4*(3), 368-398.

Akerlind, G. (2005). Variation and commonality in phenomenographic research methods. *Higher Education Research & Development, 24*(4), 321-334.

American Association of University Professors. (2005). Inequities persist for women and non-tenure track faculty: The annual report on the economic status of the profession 2004-05. *Academe*, *91*(2), 20-30.

American Association of University Professors (2006). 1940 Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments. In *American Association of University Professors Policy Documents and Reports (10th ed.)*, (pp. 3-11). Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.

Antony, J., & Raveling, J. (1998, November). *A comparative analysis of tenure and faculty productivity: Moving beyond traditional approaches*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Miami, FL.

Appling-Biel, T. (2000). *The status of tenured female faculty compared to tenured male faculty*. Dissertation. North Carolina: North Carolina State University.

Arendt, H. (1970). *On violence*. London: The Penguin Press.

Austin, A., & Rice, R. (1998). Making tenure viable: Listening to early career faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *41*, 736-755.

Baez, B., & Centra, J. (1995). Tenure, promotion, and reappointment: Legal and administrative implications. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Banerji, S. (2006). AAUP: Women professors lag in tenure, salary. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education, 23*(20), 27.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories*. Milton Keynes, U.K.: Open University Press.

Benner, P. (Ed.). (1994). *Interpretive phenomenology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bensimon, E., & Marshall, C. (2000). Policy analysis for postsecondary education: Feminist and critical perspectives. In J. Glazer-Raymo, B. Townsend and B. Ropers-Huilman (Eds.). *Women in American higher education: A feminist perspective (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Bensimon, E., & Marshall, C. (2003). Like it or not: Feminist critical policy analysis. matters. *The Journal of Higher Education, 74*(3), 337-349.

Bess, J. (1997, March). *Contract systems, bureaucracies and faculty motivation: The probable effects of a no-tenure policy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*, 195-203.

Bonawitz, M., & Andel, N. (2009 Summer). The glass ceiling is made of concrete: The

    barriers to promotion and tenure of women in American academia. *Forum on*

    Public Policy, pp. 1-16.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton,

    NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Branch-Brioso, K. (2009). Keeping pace, but not catching up. *Diverse: Issues in Higher*

    Education, 26(2), 14-16.

Braxton, J., & Hargens, L. (1996). Variation among academic disciplines: Analytic

    framework and research. In. J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of*

    theory and research, (pp. 1-46). New York: Agathon Press.

Breneman, D. (1993). *Higher education: On a collision course with new realities.*

    Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and

    Colleges.

Byse, C., & Joughin, L. (1959). *Tenure in American higher education*. Ithaca, NY:

    Cornell University Press.

Campbell, J. (1996). Freshman (sic) English: A 1901 Wellesley College "girl" negotiates

    authority. *Rhetoric Review, 15*, (1), 110-127.

Chavez, R. (2008). Diversity takes a back seat to economy. *Diverse Issues in Higher*

    Education, *25*(12), 21.

Clark, D. (1998). "The two Joes meet- Joe college, Joe veteran": The GI Bill, college,

    education, and postwar American culture. *History of Education Quarterly, 38*(2),

    165-189.

Clarke, E. (1873). *Sex in education*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company.

Clark, S., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 57*(1), 20-43.

Clifford, G. (Ed.). (1989). *Lone voyagers: Academic women in coeducational institutions, 1870-1937*. New York: The Feminist Press at the University of New York.

Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(6), 647-671.

Collins, P. (1991/2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of eminstitutionalized powerment*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, P. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Collins, P. (2000). Coming to voice, coming to institutionalized power: Black feminist thought as critical social theory. In J. Glazer-Raymo and B. Townsend (Eds.). *Women in American higher education: A feminist perspective (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Cooper, B., Fuserlli, L., & Randall, E. (2004). *Better policies, better schools: Theories and applications*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Crocco, M., & Waite, C. (2007). Education and marginality: Race and gender in higher education, 1940-1955. *History of Education Quarterly, 47*(1), 69-91.

Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crotty, M. (1996). *Phenomenology and nursing research*. Melbourne: Churchill Livingstone.

Cruikshank, K. (1998). In Dewey's shadow: Julia Bulkley and the University of Chicago

    Department of Pedagogy, 1895-1900. *History of Education Quarterly, 38*(4),

    373-406.

Davies, B. (2006). Women and transgression in the halls of academe. *Studies in Higher*

    Education, 13(4), 497-509.

Davies, B., & Petersen, E. (2005). Intellectual workers (un)doing neoliberal discourse.

    International Journal of Critical Psychology, 13, 32-54.

Davis, T., Levitt, D., McGlothlin, J., & Hill, N. (2006). Perceived expectations related to

    promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP program liaisons.

    Counselor Education & Supervision, *46*(2), 146-156.

Delgado, R., Stefancic, J., & Harris, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Critical race theory: An*

    introduction. New York: New York University Press.

DeMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In K.

    deMarrias and S. Lapan, *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in*

    education and the social sciences (pp. 51-68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

    Associates, Publishers.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of

    Qualitative research. *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials (2nd ed.).*

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Digest of Education Statistics. (2008). Chapter 3-A, Postsecondary education: Degree-

    granting, tables 187 and 354. U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education

    Sciences, [available online at nces.ed.gov].

Digest of Education Statistics. (2009). Chapter 3, Postsecondary education: Degree-granting, tables 187, 254, 264, and 307. U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences, [available online at nces.ed.gov].

Digest of Education Statistics. (2010). Chapter 3, Postsecondary education: Degree-granting, table 274. U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences, [available online at nces.ed.gov.].

Dilley, P. (2004). Interviews and the philosophy of qualitative research. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(1), 127-132.

Dreyfus, H. (1994). Preface. In P. Benner (Ed.). *Interpretive phenomenology* (pp. vii-xii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dzuback, M. (1993). Women and social research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915-1940. *History of Education Quarterly, 33*(4), 579-608.

Dzuback, M. (2003). Gender and the politics of knowledge. *History of Education Quarterly, 43*(2), 171-195.

Eliou, M. (1991). Women in the academic profession: Evolution or stagnation. In G. Kelly and S. Slaughter (Eds.). *Women's higher education in comparative perspective*, (pp. 145-164). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Eatough, V., & Smith, J. (2006). 'I was like a wild wild person': Understanding feelings of anger using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *British Journal of Psychology, 97*, 483-498.

Fairweather, J. (1999). The highly productive faculty member: Confronting the mythologies of faculty work. In W.G. Tierney (Ed.). *Faculty productivity: Facts, fictions, and issues,* (pp. 55-98). New York: Falmer Press.

Fairweather, J. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26-48.

Farber, M. (1943). *The foundation of phenomenology: Edmund Husserl and the quest for a rigorous science of philosophy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ferguson, K. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Finnegan, D. (1993). Segmentation in the academic labor market: Hiring cohorts in comprehensive universities. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(6), 621-656.

Francis, L. (1993). In defense of affirmative action. In S.M. Cahn (Ed.). *Affirmative Action and the university: A philosophical inquiry*, (pp. 9-47). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Freeman, B. (1977). Faculty women in the American university: Up the down staircase. *Higher Education, 6*, 165-188.

Fuchs, R. (1963/1997). Academic freedom- its basic philosophy, function, and history. In R. DeGeorge (Ed.). *Academic freedom and tenure: Ethical issues* (pp. 136-155). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gerow, L., Conejo, P., Alonzo, A., Davis, N., Rodgers, S., & Domian, E. (2010). Creating a curtain of protection: Nurses' experiences of grief following patient death. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 42*(2), 122-129.

Gibbons, A. (1992). Tenure: Does the old-boy network keep women from leaping over the crucial career hurdle? *Science, 255*, 1386.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glazer-Raymo, J., Townsend, B., & Ropers-Huilman, B. (2000). *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective (2nd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Gleane, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gordon, L. (1990). *Gender and higher education in the Progressive Era*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Graham, P. (1978). Expansion and exclusion: A history of women in American higher education. *Signs, 3*(4), 759-773.

Graves, K. (2009). *And they were wonderful teachers: Florida's purge of gay and lesbian teachers*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Grbich, C. (2009). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Haag, P. (2005). Is collegiality code for hating ethnic, racial, and female faculty at tenure time? *Education Digest, 71*(1), 57-62.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hays, P. (2004). Case study research. In K. deMarris and S. Lapan (Eds.). *Foundations for research: Methods of Inquiry in education and social sciences* (pp. 217-234). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Helvie-Mason, L. (2007). *A phenomenological examination of tenure-track female faculty member's socialization into the culture of higher education*. Dissertation. Indiana: Ball State University.

Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hoffer, T., Hess, M., Welch, Jr., V., & Williams, K. (2007). *Doctorate recipients from United States Universities: Summary report 2006*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.

Hornig, L. (1980). Untenured and tenuous: The status of women faculty. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 448*, 115-125.

Husserl, E. (1913/1997). *Logical investigations: Experience and judgment*. New York: Collier Books.

Husserl, E. (1931/1967). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. New York: Collier Books.

Jacobs, J. (1996). Gender inequality and higher education. *Annual Reviews in Sociology, 22*, 153-185.

Johnson-Bailey, J. (2004). Enjoining positionality and institutionalized power in narrative

    work: Balancing contentious and modulating forces. In K. de Marrais and S.

    Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the*

    social sciences, (pp. 123-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

    Publishers.

Keeling, R., Underhile, R., & Wall, A. (2007, Fall). Horizontal and vertical structures:

    The dynamics of organization in higher education. *Liberal Education*, 22-31.

Kuh, G. (1996). Guiding principles of creating seamless learning environments

    undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 135-148.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kelly, G., & Slaughter, S. (Eds.). (1991). *Women's higher education in comparative*

    perspective. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kockelmans, J. (Ed.). (1967). *Phenomenology: The philosophy of Edmund Husserl and*

    its interpretation. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Lerner, G. (2008). Corporatizing higher education. *The History Teacher*, *41*(2), 219-227.

Leverenz, C. (2000). Tenure and promotion in rhetoric and composition. *College*

    Composition and Communication, *52*(1), 143-147.

Levy, A. (2007). Tenure denied over topic of research. *Academe*, *93*(4), 6-7.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Lober, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lodahl, J., & Gordon, G. (1972). The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments. *American Sociological Review, 37*, 57-72.

Lorde, A. (1997). The uses of anger. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 25*(1/2), 278-285.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Institutionalized power: A radical view*. New York: Macmillan Press.

Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: Standards, challenges and guidelines. *The Lancet, 358*(9280), 483-488.

Marchant, A., Bhattacharya, A., & Carnes, M. (2007). Can the language of tenure criteria influence women's academic advancement? *Journal of Women's Health*, *16*(7), 998-1003.

Marshall, C. (1993). The new politics of race and gender. In C. Marshall (Ed.). *The new politics of race and gender* (pp. 1-8). London: Falmer Press.

Marshall, C., & Anderson, G. (1995). Rethinking the public and private sphere: Feminist and cultural studies perspectives on the politics of education. In J.D. Scribner and D.H. Layton (Eds.). *The study of education politics* (pp. 169-182). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Applied Social Research Method Series, 41*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

McCormick, C. (1989). *This nest of vipers: McCarthyism and higher education in the Mundel Affair, 1951-52*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Melby, C., Dodgson, J., & Tarrant, M. (2008). The experiences of western expatriate nursing educators teaching in eastern Asia. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 40*(2), 176-183.

Menges, R., & Exum. W. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(2), 123-144.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merton, R. (1988). The Matthew Effect in science, II: Cumulative advantage and the symbolism of intellectual property. *Isis, 79*(4), 606-623.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Millward, L. (2006). The transition to motherhood in an organizational context: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*, 315-333.

Moore, K., & Sagaria, M. (1991). The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic institutionalized power. In G. Kelly and S. Slaughter (Eds.). *Women's higher education in comparative perspective* (pp. 185-200). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Morley, L., & David, M. (2009). Celebrations and challenges: Gender in higher education. *Higher Education Policy, 22*, 1-2.

Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

O'Brien, S. (2008). *Tenure track at the knowledge factory: A case study of faculty perceptions at a comprehensive university*. Dissertation. Kentucky: University of Kentucky.

Pace, D. (2004). The amateur in the operating room: History and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *American Historical Review*, *109*(2), 1171-1232.

Palmieri, P. (1995). *In Adamless Eden: The community of women faculty at Wellesley.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Parsons, T. (1963). 'On the concept of political institutionalized power'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 107*, 232-262.

Parsons, T. (1957). The distribution of institutionalized power in American society. *World Politics, 10*, 123-143.

Patterson, G. (2008). Managing motherhood and tenure. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 25*(20), 16-18.

Perna, L. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contribution of family ties. *Research in Higher Education 46*(3), 277-307.

Polkinghorne, D. (1983). *Methodology for the human sciences: Systems of inquiry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Preissle, J. (2006). Envisioning qualitative inquiry: A view across four decades. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(6), 685-695.

Premeaux, S., & Mondy, R. (2002). Tenure's impact: Male versus female viewpoints. *College Teaching, 20*(4), 154-157.

Pribbenow, C., Sheridan, J., Winchell, J., Benting, D., Handelsman, J., & Carnes, M. (2010). The tenure process and extending the tenure clock: The experience of faculty at one university. *Higher Education Policy, 23*(1), 17-38.

Reimer, M. (2009). *Gendered inequality in academia: Exploring women's experiences during the pre-tenure stages of their academic career*. Dissertation. Canada: Brock University. *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(6), 685-695.

Riley, N. (1999). Challenging demography: Contributions from feminist theory. *Sociological Forum, 14*(3), 369-397.

Risman, B. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society, 18*(4), 429-450.

Romero, M., & Stewart, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Women's untold stories*. New York: Routledge.

Rossiter, M. (1993). The Matthew Matilda effect in science. *Social Studies of Science, 23*(2), 325-341.

Roulstand, K. (2007). Credibility and quality in qualitative research. Paper presented at the 20th Annual QUIG Conference of Interdisciplinary Qualitative Research, Georgia Center for Continuing Education. University of Georgia: Athens, GA.

Rubin, H., & Rubin, I (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schoening, A. (2009). Women and tenure: Closing the gap. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, 7*(2), 77-92.

Schwandt, T. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N.

    Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 118-137).

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, A. (1979). The ever widening circle: The diffusion of feminist values from the

    Troy Female Seminary, 1822-1872. *History of Education Society, 19*(1), 3-25.

Shaw, K. (1978). Understanding the curriculum: The approach through case studies.

    Journal of Curriculum Studies, 10(1), 1-17.

Shapiro, H. (2006). Promotion & tenure & the scholarship of teaching & learning.

    Change, *38*(2), 38-43.

Sheeks, G., & Hutcheson, P. (1998). How departments support part-time faculty. *Thought*

    & Action, 14, 85-90.

Slaughter, S. (1993). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender.

    Journal of Higher Education, 64(3), 250-280.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the*

    entrepreneurial university. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, J. (1999). Identity development during the transition to motherhood: An

    interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant*

    Psychology, 17(3), 281-299.

Smith, J., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis:*

    Theory, method and research. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Solomon, B. (1985). *In the company of educated women*. New Haven: Yale University.

St. Pierre, E. (1997). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data.

    International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 10(2), 175-189.

St. Pierre, E. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 477-515.

St. Pierre, E., & Roulston, K. (2006). The state of qualitative inquiry: A contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(6), 673-684.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). *National survey of faculty.* Stanford, CA.

The Modern Language Association of America (2007). *Report of the MLA Task Force on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion*. New York, NY.

Tierney, W. (1996). *The parameters of affirmative action: Equity and excellence in the academy*. Los Angeles: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis.

Tierney, W., & Bensimon, E. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Toren, N. (1991). Women at the top: Female full professors in higher education in Israel. In G. Kelly and S. Slaughter (Eds.). *Women's higher education in comparative perspective* (pp. 165-184). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Umbach, P. (2007). Gender equity in the academic labor market: An analysis of academic disciplines. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(2), 169-192.

van Mannen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vanda, C. (1989). *Tenure as a gendered process: Faculty perceptions in a research university. Dissertation*. Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh.

Walton, A. (2000). "Scholar", 'lady", "best man in the English department"?- Recalling the career of Marjorie Hope Nicolson. *History of Education Quarterly, 40*(2), 169-200.

Weiler, K. (2007). The case of Martha Dean: Sexuality and institutionalized power at Cold War UCLA.

History of Education Quarterly, 47(4), 470-496.

West, M., & Curtis, J. (2006). *American Association of University Professors Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.

White, G., & Hauck, F. (Eds.). (2000). *Campus, Inc.: Corporate institutionalized power in the ivory tower.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Wilson, R. (2001). A higher bar for earning tenure. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *47*(17), A12-A14.

Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods (4th ed.).* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

First Interview with Ashlee (all proper names are pseudonyms)

D: The first question is, it is really not a question - I want to ask you to tell me how long you have been at this institution and the department you teach in and what's your position? Just demographic information.

A: Okay. I have been here as a tenure track professor since 2004 and I am an associate professor. Do you want the school?

D: Yes.

A: School of Business.

D: Okay. Talk about your decision to seek tenure and how you came to that decision?

A: I have been in education for about 25 years - as a student, as a graduate student, as an assistant, as a full-time professor, as an instructor at Clark Atlanta University - I was there for seven years. I taught at various institutions throughout that time- as an adjunct at Kennesaw State University, Shorter College, Georgia State University - I taught as an instructor at University of Georgia after I finished my Master's degree for two quarters. So, I knew that in order to have a good position in a university as a faculty member I really needed my Ph.D. so I worked on my Ph.D. and finished that and I was really only interested in a tenure track position because otherwise what's the point? That was the only reason to get the Ph.D. in the first place. Does that answer your question?

D: Yes, it does. What preparation related to expectations and criteria was needed for you to become tenured?

A: The expectations were actually quite clear. We have a very quantified performance evaluation process here in the school of business and it was somewhat parallel to the tenure process although I had to go out and find that information and compare it and do my own analysis of what it was like to go through the tenure process. I did feel like I had people resources available. One thing that happened was at year - I believe it was 3 - we went through a pre-tenure review process which was very helpful because it basically simulated what it was like to go through the process and it really forced me to get my documentation organized in the way I needed to be organized going forward earlier than I would have otherwise done it. So it was very helpful to go through the pre-tenure process because what that did was - it allowed you to see what you had together and it gave you two years in terms of the requirements to be successful - it gave me two years to kind of fill in any gaps I had. So that was good.

D: Very good. Sounds like you had good support, information and direction. Describe what was like for you to begin the tenure process?

A: Do you mean the documentation process? That was interesting because I was able to look at other peoples' portfolios which at the time, I guess they still are - they're in a notebook form. I was able to look at other people's portfolios and I put my portfolio together using someone else's as an example whom I consider to be very linear and organized as I can be when I have to be. But, it didn't make sense to me. There were things that I had in my professional past and my experience that I felt were important that if I followed their pattern I wouldn't have included them. So I basically redid the notebook and the way it was organized. It actually created a fair amount of work for me but it made more sense to me and I felt like it had to make sense to me in order to make

sense to someone else. I wanted it to be as easy for the reviewers as possible because I

knew that would make me more likely to be successful. So I did go through the effort in

doing that and what was interesting about that was that notebook I created is now used by

everyone else.

D: That was going to be my next question. How did you creating your own notebook

that fit your profession and what you had done, affect the university as a whole, and how

the P & T committee looked at notebooks from that point forward?

A: Well, I don't know about in general but the Promotion and Tenure committee is a

university wide committee. I do know that whenever anyone goes up for tenure in my

department, in our college, now it is recommended that they ask me to look at mine. So -

D: I am not surprised. Can you describe for me your experiences with the tenure process

in general? How you felt that process went overall?

A: I knew that it was going to be a lot of work, so I decided that I would not teach that

summer. I was thinking that because I went through the pre-tenure process I knew the

amount of work that was going to be involved, or at least I thought I did. I knew where

all this was headed and so I continued to collect information - and this was that time - that

was in the spring, early spring or winter when I thought- you know this doesn't make

sense to me - it's not the organizational format - what am I going to do? So I declined to

teach in the summer so that I could completely focus on this. So I asked around and I said

to some colleagues that I respected - I asked a couple who were like me and a couple who

were not like me so I could get a better view of what the tenure process was like - it

ranged from various levels of hours. My question was how many hours does this take?

Do you think that forty hours are enough? I figured that was a complete week of time and

that kind of focus for that amount of time - in a week, I could not possibly be able to do that. Oh, everyone said that will be plenty of time! At about 128 hours in the process, I stopped counting the hours. So I was very curious about how long it really took - so when I really began in earnest putting that book together and I got to 128 hours I stopped counting.

D: Do you remember what summer it was?

A: Well, it would have been the summer before the spring that I did get tenure, so I would have to look back - was it 2009 or 2010?

D: Thank you that was very interesting information and helpful for me because one of the things I am looking at is tenure track versus non-tenure track, and how many more years I have left before retirement. So, all that – so, this is very helpful information for more than one reason. Now, we are getting to the heart and soul of what my dissertation is all about. Can you tell me how you perceived the role that power played in your tenure experience?

A: The people who I asked for help were people - were people in the "in" group - people who were tenured, people who knew what the process was like - but also who had served on Promotion and Tenure committees. So they were going to be most likely to give me an inside scoop - it's like, I don't want to know what the "book" says - meaning the rules. But I also wanted to know, what is the game? What are the politics involved that I need to be aware of so I would be able to present this information in a way that doesn't ruffle any feathers - and make sure that everything is easy, and that is the message that I got from everyone who had served on these committees - make it as easy as you can. I am

always interested to know the sex of the people that you go to for help and they are all men.

D: You have touched on the next thing - a good segue - because the next thing is: how do you perceive the role that gender played in your tenure experience? And that leads right into it.

A: I asked for mentorship from men and that is not because I wouldn't have asked it from women but only men had been on the Promotion and Tenure committees - and who were in the "in" group, the "power" group in the university and the college. When I first arrived at Clayton State University and taught as a full-time, temporary professor - I did that for two years, then went to Kennesaw, and then came back in 2004. Actually, I was here for one year, left and came back - when I was here, there were no other women in this department, so it is not surprising that there were no other women to ask for help.

D: That's very interesting. Did you notice any differences or similarities in how others progressed through the tenure process when you were going through?

A: I honestly was so focused on myself that I didn't pay much attention except in - at the 5th year, you can go up for tenure and if you don't make it, in the 6th year you can reapply. That's the standard process. There was one person that did not make tenure that first go-round…well actually, you know what happened? He was advised to pull out of the process and told specifically why. I knew about that but I didn't pay much attention to it. I was so focused on myself; I was pretty selfish.

D: Okay. Describe any political effects or issues you noticed during the tenure process. I know you mentioned that word 'politics' earlier which is why I sort of lit up. Can you

tell me any political effects or issues you noticed while you were going through that process?

A: Well, I think that the people who I asked for advice were definitely people in the know because they had gone through the process or served on the committees. So in that sense they had political power - because of the knowledge and expertise that they had and also because of the position they had held. I know that I, partially because of my personality, had no hesitation about asking for that help. It is also because at the time, I was in the "in" group so maybe that was one reason I felt more comfortable.

D: Thank you for your honesty and your candid answer.

A: You will always get that from me.

D: I know. The next one is: describe any social effects or issues you noticed during the tenure process. We touched on gender, we touched on power and politics and the next is social. Any social issues or concerns or affects you noticed while going through that process? Does it intersect with gender or politics?

A: Well you know tenure is a very - it's a club and I really wanted to be in this club, but I wasn't willing to do anything to get into the club because that wouldn't be morally or ethically in keeping with who I am. But I was certainly very - probably more agreeable to volunteer for things than I might otherwise have been or have been since I got tenure. Because when I finished that process - it took me a year to get over it. It was just exhausting - so that's partially why - I think that would be a social.

D: Thank you for that. Now describe any economic effects that you noticed as a result of the tenure process.

A: So this is after the tenure process?

D: During and after.

A: Okay, well the economic benefits are miniscule - except that there may be more job - what's the word I am looking for?

D: Stability?

A: Yes, stability. Basically I feel like I have a job and that's a really, really rare club to be in, in this economic situation. I don't really know what the promotion in terms of monetary amount is; I think it may be $2,000.00. But to know that you have a job, unless something reorganizational happens or your unit is closed or you do something really bad or I do something really bad, I will have a job for as long as I want it - and that's really relieving in a lot of ways. It doesn't make me less loyal but it makes me more willing to be honest and focus on what I think I am best at - what I want to do as opposed to what I have to do - which I would say is a reward. Autonomy is the most important thing to me, so to know that I have stability in a job doing something I do well for as long as I want it and I have autonomy; it is really good.

D: Thank you. You've touched on this next question already when you talked about you were really exhausted and really tired at the end of the process. Can you talk a little more about how the tenure process affected you?

A: I probably said "no" more times the year after I finished this process than - well actually there is a lag time between the time you finish the process and the time you find out - but honestly you hear things through the grapevine during that lag time - you know if things are going well or not - because nice people tell you. I guess the administrators want you to know what to expect if you're not going to get what you want - and kind of prepare you for that. I was exhausted and I probably said "no" for a year and a half more

than I had ever said "no" before. Really it took me a while to refocus and think about, ok

I have done this, now what do I want to do? It was very tiring, if that tells you what you

need to know-

D: It does, it does. As far as your profession is concerned, how do you feel it affected

you, professionally?

A: I think that there is more credibility when someone has tenure-no matter what area.

There's this "aura" around tenured professors which is somewhat unfounded. I certainly

don't think that I'm the expert or be all, know all of everything. When you are in the

community and someone finds out you're a tenured professor - I would never tell anyone

- that's like wow - that's really cool. There's a credibility that goes along with that. I also

think that there's some curiosity because people don't really understand it. The academy,

being in the academy is something that people in the private sector have no understanding

about- don't understand - we were advised - I can remember one administrator - when the

budget cuts were coming - told us not to mow our lawns in the middle of the day, because

that would mean that you weren't working, and so there is some of that misperception in

the community about what professors do. What they don't understand is that we really

are on 24 – 7 - all the time, and because we are willing to do that we do require a lot of

autonomy and a lot of flexibility. I am willing to do that. Does that answer your question?

D: (Nods head yes.)

D: Now, this is a question that I found - I thought this is really neat, that I need to ask

this too. Sometimes it is said that granting professors tenure gives them more power or

more opportunity to determine the course of their intellectual work than they had at

earlier times in their careers. Do you think this is or will be true for you? What do you

think has changed most since you've been granted tenure? You have already touched on the autonomy piece a little bit.

A: I do think there's a lot of relief and freedom that is the result of attaining this goal and - ask the question again? Sorry, I don't want to go off track too much.

D: It's just that sometimes people, once they become tenured, feel they have more power and more opportunity to determine the course of their intellectual work. Have you found that to be true for you?

A: I think that - within the - we are in restricted budgetary times - so I think that if that - if that were not true, there would be more of that - more freedom and more opportunity, but since we are in tough times and we all have to be fiscally responsible, I think I realize that I might have to do some things that I don't want to do - and that's okay. Within that though, I feel like I have earned a certain amount of freedom and will take the responsibility that comes along with that to determine - what course of leadership I want to take and I do feel a certain responsibility to take leadership in terms of my students, career and their development more than anything.

C: Okay, thank you. Now we are getting toward the end - what advice would you give women who seek tenure in higher education?

A: Find a mentor. Be sure that you can focus entirely on the process when it's time - whether that means putting aside - it's like dissertation day, D-day and T-day. Tenure day - every week I spent time on my tenure process just being aware that even with your family, you have to say no, today is T-day; I can't do that. I've got to work on my tenure, because I've got to be able to have a job so I can take care of you. My daughter, I remember, said to me during this process, it was during that summer - she said something

to me and I said Natalie, I am so sorry I am just stressed out. She's very much a caretaker and she came up to me and put her arm on my shoulder and said "Mommy, what is the matter?" And I told her that I was working - she knew that I was working on this notebook that I had to give to my boss - that's the way I told it to her - she was about 6 or 7 at the time, and she understood the notebook and the boss thing - and if I didn't do a good job that it wouldn't be a good thing - and she said, "You know, you can only try your hardest and do your best work."

D: That was a very good thing.

A: So, that's it exactly - and that was coming from my 6 or 7 year old. I think that would be good advice to give to anyone else - try your hardest and do your best work and know that if for some reason if it doesn't happen, that there will be other opportunities for you.

D: Okay, thank you. Now, how do you think that the tenure process can be improved to better prepare women for the experience?

A: Tell women to ask for help. Make sure that women are represented at all levels of the university. If you look at the AUP's statistics then you'll see - or AAUP's statistics - then you'll see that we are not represented - so that would be certainly one thing we can do - as an academy, in general, making sure that the guidelines for tenure and promotion are parallel to the guidelines for the performance evaluation process every year. So that when you get to the fifth year you don't have to reorganize everything because that is what I ended up having to do.

D: How was that for you?

A: Frustrating.

D: I thought I picked that up in your tone.

A: But, I was resigned to the fact that it had to be done - so I did it, but it probably took me twice as long because I had to - because it was a different organizational pattern. It's partially personality. I like to understand things analytically and logically. And so if I didn't understand it, I knew no one else was going to understand it. So I had to put it in a format that was easily understood.

D: Okay, thank you. And now I think we've touched on everything that I needed to ask and I need to say to you, is there anything else you would like to say? Or, is there anything I haven't touched on or that you would like to share at this time about your tenure experience?

A: I don't think that my tenure experience is that much different from anyone else's. I think that - I just wish there had been more guidance - from anybody - earlier on, or that somehow - or maybe the guidance was there, but I was not as aware of it as I should have been - maybe just making new professors more aware that this is - even though you know it's imminent - to start preparing earlier or maybe having incentives or awards in place to help.

D: Help them focus on it more before the time.

A: Yeah, but that pre-tenure review was a great process. That certainly was a help.

D: Now, do you have any questions for me?

A: When are you going to have your results?

D: I'm working really hard to get all of my data collected between now and the end of July. Hopefully, the month of August will be spent analyzing the data. And I probably won't get my last two chapters written to be done by December, although I would love to - working full time that would really push me really hard - so I hope to be done, have the

results by early fall and then finish everything up in early spring and graduate in May.

That's my goal.

A: Okay, well you just let me know.

D: I will. Thank you so much. That's it.

A: That's it?

D: No more questions, okay. This concludes our interview. When I complete the

transcripts, I will send it to you so you can review it for accuracy. Thank you for your

time and participation.

A: Thank you for asking me. I'm happy to help.