2010

Re-starting the conversation about race in academia : transcultural narratives in the lifeworld

Francisco Gamez

The University of San Francisco

RE-STARTING THE CONVERSATION ABOUT RACE IN ACADEMIA:
TRANSCULTURAL NARRATIVES IN THE LIFEWORLD

A Dissertation Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Education
Organization and Leadership Studies Department

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Francisco N. Gamez
San Francisco
December 2010

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Dissertation Abstract

Re-Starting the Conversation about Race in Academia:
Transcultural Narratives in the Lifeworld

For this dissertation, I carried out a participatory hermeneutic research inquiry on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color who work at various organizational levels within selected post-secondary institutions. This research explored the current narrative identities of staff and administrators of color within higher education using Ricoeur's theories on narrative identity through research conversations. Recent literature would suggest that new and developing interpretations of race and race relations encourage us to explore and challenge conventional notions of what social justice is and how it plays within organizational life. This research looked at new ways to interpret the issue of race and racial discrimination by using Jürgen Habermas's (1984, 1985) theory of communicative action and theoretical concept of lifeworld to come to new understandings about these issues. This study will provide background on the research topic from the anthropological beginnings of race to race relations in the United States, a literature review related to this research topic, describe the framework of the research process I used in this study, present both primary and secondary analysis of my research, and offer a summary of the overall research study, findings, implications, and recommendations.

The findings from my research study suggest that conversations about race/ethnicity and its role in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color need to re-start. A discourse on race may lead to new interpretations of the issue and

potentially expand the lifeworld of others who hear and share the narratives brought to life in this study. While a dialogue on race and ethnicity may start on any level, implications exist for leaders within higher education and those who are developing and implementing policy. This may help shift organizational cultures within institutions of higher education and build socially just communities within academia at institutions across the United States.

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Francisco N. Gamez_____   _10/22/2010_____
Candidate   Date

Dissertation Committee

Ellen Herda, Ph.D._____   _10/22/2010_____
Chairperson

Christopher Thomas, Ph.D._____   _10/22/2010_____

Betty Taylor, Ph.D._____   _10/22/2010_____

Acknowledgements

My quest to further my knowledge was not an individual journey, but involved many others who I have met and helped me throughout the years. I would first like to thank my advisor and dissertation committee chair, Dr. Ellen Herda. She not only inspired me to reinterpret my world view, but also helped introduce me to the world of critical hermeneutics for which I am forever thankful. She has acted as mentor, friend, colleague, and supporter, which helped me in various aspects of my student and personal life. Words cannot express the thanks and gratitude I feel for all she has helped me with.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Christopher Thomas and Dr. Betty Taylor who have been generous enough to be part of my committee and share their valuable insights and knowledge that helped develop my research and writing.

To my parents who have supported me throughout my whole educational career and who have always instilled in me the value of education, lifelong learning, and social justice. It is the values you have taught me that helped me become the scholar and man I am today.

To my sister for her support in my education and life, being the cheerleader to help me throughout my program.

To my friends, who have always been there to support me in life and helped me balance the stresses of life, work, and school. Much love and gratitude to you all.

I want to also specifically acknowledge the new friends I made in this doctoral program that have not only gone through this journey with me, but provided much needed balance and perspective to my life; Hamaseh Kianfar, Kimberly Mendoca, and

Mary Grace Almandrez. We have not only seen each other grow as scholars, but also as people who will make a difference in this world.

Finally, I would like to thank all the participants for this research study. The narratives you shared and the truth of your voice is captured in this text for all to interpret into their lifeworld. Your bravery for sharing your stories will hopefully inspire others and may lead to further academic research in areas involving people of color working in higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE - RESEARCH RELEVANCE AND BACKGROUND

Statement of Research Topic

The legacy of race has played a large part in the history of the United States from the belief of its biological origin to the realization that it is socially constructed and culturally embedded within our society (Sarich and Miele 2004). As a result, there are everyday struggles with racial discrimination within various domains in our society that are socially constructed and interpreted differently by various people in the United States. Looking at education, and in particular post-secondary educational institutions, the hegemonic structures of race are entrenched within the everyday policies and discriminatory practices that people of color often face. Both on an overt and covert level, people of color must navigate a labyrinth of formal and informal discriminatory practices, while maintaining their identity and living in what some people would argue is a society with a pretense of outward politeness and acceptance for diversity, but an undercurrent of bankrupt morality.

For this dissertation, I carried out a participatory hermeneutic research inquiry on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color who work at various organizational levels within selected post-secondary institutions. While faculty may sometimes come up the ranks as administrators within various universities, this study focuses on non-faculty staff and administrators. The use of the term "faculty" comes up in the literature review and research conversations, but the use of the term is to provide context to the study at hand. This research explored the current narrative identities of staff and administrators of color within higher education using Ricoeur's

theories on narrative identity through research conversations. Recent literature would suggest that new and developing interpretations of race and race relations encourage us to explore and challenge conventional notions of what social justice is and how it plays within organizational life. This research looked at new ways to interpret the issue of race and racial discrimination by using Jürgen Habermas's (1984, 1985) theory of communicative action and theoretical concept of lifeworld to come to new understandings about these issues. This study will provide background on the research topic from the anthropological beginnings of race to race relations in the United States, a literature review related to this research topic, describe the framework of the research process I used in this study, present both primary and secondary analysis of my research, and offer a summary of the overall research study, findings, implications, and recommendations.

Background of Research Topic

While there are current laws that protect groups against discrimination based on race and ethnicity, the everyday social reality that many staff and administrators of color on all organizational levels of university life face, is that of informal and covert discrimination in the workplace. Much of this informal and covert discrimination is hidden under the guise of political correctness and the informal structures that create barriers to access and promotion within institutions of higher education. Therefore, it is important to look into the anthropological background of race and look at race relations in the United States to get a broader idea of the role race plays in our everyday lives. It is through the narratives of the staff and administrators on various levels who face this type

of discrimination that groups may hopefully come together and communicate with each other with an orientation toward understanding the other.

Anthropological Beginnings of Race

Race in the United States was originally thought to be a biological attribute among people in society. The early foundation of anthropology was based on the assumption that race was a biological phenomena that needed to be studied scientifically. Based on the belief that biology was the basis of race, racial discrimination and justifications for slavery and other atrocities were common place and entrenched in the cultural foundations of our society (Smedley 1999). It wasn't until further research pioneered by Franz Boas (1912) that the scientific paradigm began to shift toward the belief that race did not find its origins in biology, but is socially constructed. Boas studied the plasticity of human skulls and found that race was not based on biological characteristics, but that these biological characteristics were shaped by the environment. This began the paradigm shift in anthropology from the study of race to the study of culture (Sarich and Miele 2004).

Ashley Montagu, a student of Boas, furthered the research on race with when he published his book *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (1942), in which he opposed the belief that race was biological in origin and actually a myth created in our culture and his famous lecture "On the Meaninglessness of the Anthropological Conception of Race" (1941) where he argued that race was a culturally created phenomenon in societies and not a biological reality (Smedley 1999). Montagu even adopted the term "ethnic group" in place of the term "race," since he believed "Race refers to a difference of origin, which in this case does not exist… Complexions run into

each other: forms follow the genetic character: and upon the whole, all are at last but shades of the same great picture, extending through all ages, and over all parts of the Earth" (Montagu 1941: 244). While this paradigm shift occurred within the field of anthropology and other disciplines, the socially created category of race has been so culturally entrenched in the everyday life of our pluralistic society that its legacy of discriminatory practices based on race continues to this day. By not looking into our historical past as a society and imagining a new and better future, American society and its organizations cannot move forward and reach new understandings on how to live with the everyday struggles of race and its influence on our society.

While the belief that race is a socio-cultural construct may still be debatable within various academic disciplines, the everyday reality of its engrained existence resonates in our daily lives (Sarich and Miele 2004). Race has been the subject of numerous debates and historical movements within the United States. It has become "the major mode of social differentiation in American society; it cuts across and takes priority over social class, education, occupation, gender, age, religion, culture (ethnicity), and other differences" (Smedley 1999: 20). To say race is a myth or does not exist, denies its socio-cultural importance and hegemonic presence in our society today. A prime example is the Southern region of the United States, "the entire culture and social system of the South had evolved with race and slavery at its core" (Smedley 1999: 214). To deny the effects of race and racial discrimination is to deny the historical foundations and narrative of the development and evolution of the United States. Even with current events taking place in 2008, the newly elected President of the United States is Barack Obama, a man who became the first African-American elected to the highest ranking

office in the U.S. He has endured death threats and foiled plots for his assassination just based on the color of his skin and the racial category that many in society have placed him in (CBS/AP 2008). It is this racial prejudice and presence that has been engrained within our society from the founding events of the United States to current situations that we live in today, that requires the need to create a racial discourse so we can come to new understandings and identities about race, discrimination, and the relationship it plays across all societal domains.

Researchers have tried to define race using various definitions and there has been no single agreeable concept of race (Blank, Dabady, and Citro 2004). Defining race is complex and can be subjective depending on through which academic discipline one is viewing the concept of race, as well as the social and political climate of the time. To try to define the concept of race is "…to understand race as an unstable and 'decentered' complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle" (Omni and Winant 1994:55). Currently, the U.S. federal government standards for data on race and ethnicity include five major racial groups that include black or African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and white; as well as one ethnic group defined as Hispanic, which may be of any race (Blank et al. 2004). Therefore, for purposes of this study, the Federal interpretation of racial and ethnic people groups will be used with the addition of the category of "multi-ethnic" for those research participants who identify with more than one racial category or ethnic group. However, my research participants sometimes use other everyday language to define or describe their own racial/ethnic categories and those of other people they are describing. This may be more apparent to the reader in Chapters Four and Five.

While the concept of race is always in flux and debatable depending on the socio-political climate of the time, the definition of racial discrimination is also debatable depending on how one defines race. For this research study, the definition of racial discrimination includes "differential treatment on the basis of race that disadvantages a racial group and the treatment on the basis of inadequately justified factors other than race that disadvantages a racial group" (Blank et al. 2004: 4). This definition encompasses the past atrocities of discrimination and hatred that has been historically recorded throughout the historical narrative of the United States and encompasses the overt and covert racial discrimination that exists in the current socio-political climate of American society today.

Focusing on post-secondary institutions, the discussion of race and discrimination has been "colormuted" (Pollock 2004), due to the ever changing socio-political climate of American society. The lack of conversation about race in American and in the everyday language we use in policies and procedures has according to Mica Pollock (2004), not made us colorblind to the issues of race, but "colormute," since the conversation and dialogue has been restricted when talking about race. By avoiding the topic or word race in conversation or keeping silent about the covert racism that goes on, it has rendered people in our society "colormute." According to Takagi (2006: 230), "race is an inescapable element of the national politic." Conversations and "issues of race are hidden in political discourse, but easily recognizable through key phrases that connote racial meaning without explicit mention of race" (Takagi 2006: 230). This requires us to engage in dialogue if we are to practice true democratic society or what Habermas (1998) calls deliberative politics. Even in 2009, the current U.S. Attorney General, Eric Holder

says that most Americans avoid candid discussions on racial issues and need to have a dialogue on racial issues to advance racial understandings (Barrett 2009).

Many in our society believe that race is not a discriminating factor in hiring, promotion, and access to various societal domains, since there are laws in place to protect those that fall under various societal categories such as race (Rosaldo 1996). The question then remains, if there are governmental laws that protect the civil liberties and rights of all people, why is it that many staff and administrators of color working in institutions of higher education feel discrimination on both an overt and covert level? Has higher education become one of the last bastions to perpetuate everyday hurdles and barriers toward access and upward mobility for minority students, faculty, staff, and administrators? Researchers such as Leon and Nevarez (2006), Ortiz (1998), and Jones (1993) ask similar questions which will be discussed in the review of literature, but to ask these types of questions are the very reasons we need to understand the role race plays within academia and re-start the conversation to reach new understandings about race and discrimination.

Race Relations in the United States

Before we can move forward and re-start a conversation on race and race relations within academia, we need to first understand the historical beginnings of race relations within the United States. As John Hope Franklin (2005: 133) states,

> [t]he reading of American history over the past two centuries impresses one with the fact that ambivalence on the crucial question of equality has persisted almost from the beginning. If the term 'equal rights for all' has not always meant what it appeared to mean, the inconsistencies and paradoxes have become increasingly apparent.

As previously stated, the Federal interpretation of racial and ethnic people groups will be used, this section will focus on African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and Native American people groups. I will briefly discuss some of the major historical points of race relations within the United States to provide the reader with a historical and socio-political context for the research I have performed. For purposes of this study, I provide a brief synopsis of that history to focus on my main research topic looking into the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color on all levels within post-secondary institutions.

African Americans in the United States

African Americans have a long history in the United States, starting in 1676 when the first slaves from Africa were brought to American enslaved and stripped of any rights to become a primary labor supply force (Takaki 2008). Since then, African Americans are what Takaki (2008: 7) describes as "the central minority throughout our country's history." The African population in the United States increased due to the slave trade industry and it quickly spread across the United States and in particular the South (Takaki 2008). Throughout "this country's history, slavery was not only tolerated but legally protected by the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court" (Schaefer 2004: 205). As a result, African Americans suffered decades of abuse and inhumane atrocities for centuries, until they were freed from the inhumane clutches of slavery after the American Civil War in 1865 (Hu-Dehart 1996). However, "contemporary institutional and individual racism which are central to today's conflicts have their origins in the institution of slavery (Schaefer 2004:205).

After their freedom, "African Americans endured another century of legal apartheid that barred them from full participation as equal citizens" (Hu-Dehart 1996: 245). African Americans still had to deal with "Jim Crow segregation, lynchings, {and} race riots" (Takaki 2008: 7). Segregation became the hegemonic norm and the "[l]egalization of segregation under Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) was not a watershed decision by the Supreme Court, it was the culmination of trends already set in place by this long period of demonization of 'the Negro,' especially after the Civil War" (Smedley 1999: 249). While there were numerous attempts by the African American community to work towards change, it wasn't until "the 1954 United States Supreme Court decision (Brown v. Board of Education) that called for the desegregation of schools nationally and the events in Montgomery, Alabama, in the summer of 1955 that gave rise to the civil rights movement" (Smedley 1999: 294). Socio-political activism "reached a new mass direct-action phase in the late 1950s and early 1960s with the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955-1956 and especially the sit-in movement that spread throughout the South in the early 1960s" (Gugliemo and Lewis 2003: 188).

It wasn't until after the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s that African Americans, as well as other minority groups were able to gain some equitable rights as individuals and as a community (Takaki 2008). As a result, "[t]he Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1965 broke forever state-enforced Jim Crow in the South, and made deliberate, transparent state racism forever impossible (Meagher 2003:195). Further activist movements culminated in the Black power cultural movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s, which "may not have worked as a political revolution, but it had worked as a cultural one" (Meagher 2003:199). This helped pave the way for African American

culture and studies to take a more prominent role in U.S. society and change the cultural

landscape of America (Meagher 2003; Schaefer 2004). Unfortunately, even after the

Civil Rights Movement, the present conditions faced by many African Americans are the

"persistent barriers to economic and educational mobility [that has] continued to

segregate them, relegating a disproportionate number to the 'underclass' of

multigenerational poverty and hopelessness" (Hu-Denart 1996:245).

Asian Americans in the United States

According to Takaki (2008: 8), "Asian Americans represent one of the fastest

growing ethnic groups in America, projected to represent 10 percent of the total U.S.

population by 2050." However, their history "in the United States has been one of

repeated exclusion and special treatment" (Hu-Dehart 2006: 245). From the Federal

Naturalization Laws (1790) enacted to deny citizenship to nonwhite immigrants to the

Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which denied Chinese immigrants access to the United

States, the early years of Asian immigration to the United States was full of exclusionary

policy measures (Hu-Dehart 1996 and Takaki 2008). When Asian workers "were

brought to the American West during the nineteenth century to build the railroads and

work the mines, they found themselves barred from full political participation and social

integration into society" (Hu-Dehart 1996). Even California's Alien Land Act of 1913

"prohibited land ownership to aliens ineligible to naturalized citizenship," which

prevented Asian American farmers and families from owning land. For the periods

"[f]rom 1882 to World War II, the Chinese and later other Asian groups were barred from

entering the country at all" (Hu-Dehart 1996: 246). Thus, "the racial formation of Asian

Americans was a key moment in defining the color line among immigrants, extending

whiteness to European immigrants, and targeting non-white immigrants for racial oppression" (Wing 2005: 1).

One of the worst political exclusionary measures in Asian American history was "[d]uring World War II, [when] thousands of Japanese residents on the West Coast and their U.S.-born children were interned in camps behind barbed-wire fences, when not one of them had committed an act of disloyalty or sedition" (Hu-Dehart 1996: 246). Executive order 9066 had not only taken Constitutional rights of U.S. citizens of Japanese Ancestry and placed them in internment camps starting in February of 1942, but in a contradictory political move the United States later classified American-born Japanese to be authorized for military enlistment under Selective Service to fight in World War II, while still being incarcerated in internment camps when not serving in the U.S. military (Takaki 2008).

Not until legal action was taken and public discourse in the public sphere (Habermas 1989) took place, that Asian Americans gained some equity as citizens in the United States. According to Wing (2005: 14), "[t]he development of Asian-American consciousness took place in the 1960s when, for the first time, the majority of Asians in this country were U.S. born. It was an explicitly political consciousness influenced by the Civil Rights and Black Power movements of that era." This helped the Asian American community in the 1960s and during the Vietnam War "to reject the passive racist stereotype embodied in the white-imposed term 'Oriental' and to embrace an active stance against war and racism" (Wing 2005: 14). This movement "of the late 1960s and 1970s was of mass proportions and dramatically transformed the political (and personal) consciousness and institutional infrastructure of the different Asian-American

communities" (Wing 2005: 14). Today, it is through their struggles and the struggles of other minority groups that "[r]ecognition is growing that race is a fundamental and constituent element of U.S. political discourse" (Takagi 1996: 230) and the conversation on race needs to continue.

Hispanic Americans in the United States

One of the founding events in Hispanic relations with the United States was the Mexican-American war which lasted from 1846 to 1848 (Takaki 2008). The war ended with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in which "Mexico accepted the Rio Grande River as the Texas border and ceded the Southwest territories to the United States for fifteen million dollars" (Takaki 2008: 163). The land that was acquired by force and bought at an undervalued price, amounted to one-half of Mexico that was lost and debatably stolen from Mexico at the end of the war (Hu-Denart 1996 and Takaki 2008). The terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo were not honored as the treaty stated that "the largely Spanish-speaking residents of the greater Southwest were promised citizenship and the right to retain their languages and cultures" (Hu-Denart 1996). This set up a trend of broken political promises between the United States and its Hispanic/Latino communities.

One of the most exploitative policies that the United States subjected Hispanic Americans to, was the Bracero Program which was a temporary worker program enacted between 1942 and 1964 (Sandos and Cross 1983). The Bracero program was a series of "informal" policies between the United States and the Mexican governments that allowed for contracted laborers to work in the United States. Under the Bracero Program, more than four million farm workers came to work in the United States from Mexico and other

South American countries, mainly as migrant workers in agriculture (Espinoza 1999).

What was supposed to be a mutually beneficial program between the countries for

contracted labor, ended up with the exploitation of workers who were promised fair

wages and proper working conditions, but received substandard wages, sudden

deportation, and poor working conditions (Sandos and Cross 1983).

At the end of World War II, many Mexican and South American workers were

ousted from their jobs by returning servicemen from the war and workers returning from

wartime industries, as well as the invention of many agricultural machines, such as the

cotton harvester (Espinoza 1999). By the end of the Korean War, even more workers

were displaced and were threatened with deportation, even though many had established

homes in the United States and had no other employment if they returned to their home

countries. By this time, the U.S. government implemented a military campaign called

"Operation Wetback," which gathered and deported Mexican migrant workers and

reorganized the Border Patrol along military lines (Vogel 2004). Once the United States

were done with the need for migrant workers, they tried to haul them back to their home

country of Mexico without thought of the possible social, economic, or political

consequences. By 1964, the United States officially repealed the Bracero Program,

which sparked political uproar on both sides of the border, due to the inhumane treatment

of the "braceros" workers (Vogel 2004).

While many Hispanic Americans live in the United States today, many often live

in two worlds. Their American citizenship and their cultural connection to their

homeland south of the Mexican-American border makes for a dichotomous relationship

with their identity and their place in society. A "literal border exists as an absolute

13

policed divide between two nations. The separation is defended through state violence, inflicted literally by the border patrol," (Rosaldo 1996: 217) as well as the political struggles many Hispanics face in the United states today (Takagi 1996). With the growing population identified as Hispanic American today, it is imperative to come to new understandings between various cultures and racial/ethic people groups.

Native Americans in the United States

Native Americans were "the original Americans, here for thousands of years before the voyage of Columbus" (Takaki 2008: 10). They "represent a significant contrast to all of the other [minority racial] groups, for theirs was not an immigrant experience" (Takaki 2008: 10). Their land was taken from them and seized by warfare, while being labeled as savages in their own land (Takaki 2008). Even the racial/ethnic term Native American simplifies and denies "the diversity of cultures, languages, religions, kinship systems, and political organizations that existed-and in many instances remain among the peoples referred to collectively as Native Americans" (Schaefer 2004: 171). The history of this people group has been glossed over and "[t]he narrative of American history that dominates public education in the United States still generally portrays Indians as the helpless victims of a militarily and culturally superior civilization" (Kidwell and Velie 2005: 42).

Native Americans were the indigenous people of what is currently known as the United States (Smedley 1999). When early settlers began to colonize the lands, they exterminated numerous Native Americans in 1800's which reduced the Native American population by catastrophic numbers (Schaefer 2004). By 1830, the United States government passed the Indian Removal Act, which relocated all Eastern Native American

14

tribes from their ancestral lands across the Mississippi River and was later known as the "Trail of Tears" (Schaefer 2004). Forced to relocated to reservations and segregated from American society, from 1830 to the present day, Native Americans lost much of their ancestral way of living and have been thrust into lower socio-economic levels and living standards caused by United States policy and poor policy planning and implementation practices (Schaefer 2004).

According to Hu-Dehart (1996: 245), Native Americans were not granted citizenship by the United States government until 1924, "shamed into doing so only after many had served and died in defense of this country during World War I." By that time, "most Native American nations had lost their land and water; many had been destroyed by war and disease; still others had been relocated far from their original homelands;" and onto reservations in desolate lands (Hu-Dehart 1996:245). In 1953, the Termination Act was passed by the United States government in an effort to give Native Americans fiscal independence, but also lessen the financial burden of supporting Native American services by the U.S. government (Schaefer 2004; Kidwell and Velie 2005). This eliminated or reduced services such as subsidized healthcare, college scholarships, road repair, and fire and safety services and ended up in economic upheaval for most tribes that were unable to establish or sustain these basic services (Schaefer 2004). By 1975, the U.S. government resumed these services, but to disastrous results that affected Native Americans economically, due to a poorly formulated and implemented policy (Schaefer 2004; Kidwell and Velie 2005).

The United States was built on the lands of Native Americans that were stolen during warfare and through bloodshed, while destroying Native American culture and

society in the process (Takaki 2008).   Today, Native Americans are "[c]onfined to reservations on desolate land in remote places, unemployed, and unable to scratch out even a decent living, they have been conveniently placed out of our sight, and therefore out of our minds and out of our consciences and consciousness" (Hu-Dehart 1996: 245).

Summary

The role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions is an important topic in need of further study. It is part of the discourse on race relations and provides new understandings into the lives of others. The need to restart the conversation on race within the United States is imperative, since we all must deal with the social construct of race within our everyday lives and interactions with others. Focusing on the anthropological beginnings of race, one can see how the social construct of race has been used to dominate certain groups of people in our society and control the discourse on race.   It is through the narrative histories of these marginalized racial groups that we can come to new understandings and hopefully re-start the conversation on race within our society today.   Exploring race relations within the United States also provides a context for the participatory research inquiry into the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions. In the following chapter (Chapter Two), I discuss the research literature relating to racial discrimination of staff and administrators in higher education, which will provide the reader with further context to my dissertation research study.

CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

<u>Introduction</u>

While the research literature on race and discriminatory acts on faculty and students of color is extensive, the research literature looking specifically at racial discrimination toward staff and administrators in higher education is limited. However, as limited as it is, several themes were found amongst the research literature pertaining to staff and administrators of color on all organizational levels within post-secondary institutions including, access barriers, support, recognition, and tokenism. These themes were prevalent in the literature and the narratives of staff and administrators of color add to the insight and everyday experiences they face in terms of their race or ethnicity. Through this review of literature as text, we can come to a new understanding and communicate about race in academia, while realizing that the need for future research into this area is sorely needed.

Access Barriers

How staff and administrators of color advance or are prevented from advancing within a post-secondary institution can influence their career outlook and administrative level status. Karen Fraser Wyche and Sherryl Browne Graves (1992) studied access and barriers to professional participation for minority women in academia. Their research found that "[e]ducational access affects how one enters and advances within the job market" (Fraser Wyche and Browne Graves 1992: 430). How far one advances his or her educational path, affects their upward mobility within an organization. Minority students in undergraduate programs do not represent a high percentage of the student population and are even less represented in the graduation rates compared to their

Caucasian counterparts. Looking at the graduate and doctoral levels, the percentage is even less with minority candidates being in the smaller percentages of overall graduate school enrollment (Fraser Wyche and Browne Graves 1992). For minority women who enter academia with a doctoral degree, most find it difficult to enter at the faculty level and usually find themselves "more likely to enter administrative positions" (Fraser Whych and Browne Graves 1992: 432). Mirza (2006: 102) posits "that black and female staff are likely to be concentrated in lower-status universities, be on lower pay, and are more likely to be in short-term contracts." These access barriers to senior levels positions for staff and administrators often deter many people of color working in higher education from ever moving up beyond support staff or middle management positions. With the added dimension of gender in place, the barriers increase with dual minority status at play that prevent many from gaining access into the top level positions within post-secondary institutions. According to Mirza (2006: 105), "…in some institutions the 'sheer weight of whiteness' is overt and almost impenetrable. Research looking at the University of Cambridge shows how elite culture is self-reinforcing. It was seen as a white, male, tough and 'macho' culture that was secretive, intimidating, and insular." Also, many administrators "…of color are in the implementation rather than policy-making roles. In other words, persons of color in administrative positions may not hold the degree of power and authority that is associated with the position. This restriction excludes them from attaining the top position of the institution" (Ortiz 1998:131). With these access barriers, many staff and administrators of color do not have the support to move up within post-secondary institutions and find little opportunity to be part of support networks such as mentoring programs.

Support

From the lack of support from leaders in senior level administration to the feeling of isolation and the need for mentoring, the issues presented in much of the research literature can be summarized under the theme of support. Many staff and administrators of color feel isolated, marginalized, and underrepresented within their college of university communities (Jones 1993; Leon and Nevarez 2006; Mirza 2006; and Valverde 1998). The need and desire for mentoring opportunities and access to senior administrative positions of leadership in their higher education communities has grown, as the number of staff and administrators of color have increased (León and Nevarez 2006 and Valverde 1998).

The top level administration in universities and colleges do not support staff and administrators of color and often continue with the traditional organizational structural protocols that keep many staff of color in support and middle management levels. The traditional professional leadership training many administrators receive are conventional and tend "…to promote 'sameness' and neglect to integrate transformation models necessary to make institutions more equitable" (León and Nevarez 2006: 1). Post-secondary key roles and power positions such as chancellors, university presidents, and college deans are critical roles that more people of color need to occupy "… in order to be 'validated' in the minds of the campus community" (Valverde 1998: 27). According to Valverde (1998), the need for more visibility within senior level administrator roles is a start, but there also needs to be a transformational style of leadership to help bring about change and equity within a campus community. The support from higher levels of

administration would help bring about this shift and create more equitable practices with the promotion and upward mobility for staff and administrators of color (Valverde 1998).

Many staff and administrators of color also feel isolated due to the lack of support from senior levels of administration (Jones 1993). There are little if any opportunities for mentoring of support and middle management staff of color due to the limited opportunities staff and administrators of color have to network with senior level administrators within a campus community (Fraser Wyche and Browne Graves 1992). Many believe that "...the key to success in academia is simply a matter of hard work and that politics, personal preferences, and subjectivity have little to do with merit (Reyes and Halcón 1997: 433). The reality is that "research on interpersonal power indicates that participation in social networks is critical for professional advancement…" which is necessary for staff and administrators to gain upward mobility within post-secondary institutions. Feeling isolated and not being allowed access to certain social networks or mentoring opportunities, the support that many staff and administrators of color need is not there. The lack of support networks to assist staff and administrators of color to survive and succeed in academia, is demoralizing to some and makes it almost impossible to tolerate acts of racial discrimination aimed at them (Reyes and Halcón 1997). Without support, staff and administrators of color become isolated and the lack of mentoring opportunities create issues with recognition for their valuable contributions to many colleges or universities.

Recognition

The struggle to be recognized for one's contribution and qualifications is something many staff and administrators of color face. Valverde (1998: 21) found that "there is still a stereotype that faculty and administrators of color are not competitive or qualified, [t]hat is, incentives have to be provided by the administration or regents to faculty units in order to stimulate the hiring of minorit[ies]." This has led to discriminatory practices towards staff and administrators of color since many of their contributions to the organization are marginalized and not recognized as much as their Caucasian counterparts. There is also the feeling of being "under constant scrutiny and informal evaluation by his/her peers," since there is sometimes the belief that staff and administrators of color are not qualified (Jones 1993: 6). When the issue of racial discrimination is brought up, "[t]he assumption is that discourse on race and ethnicity is a disruptive factor in academia and compromises the quality of higher education institutions" (Trueba 1998: 79). This belief is detrimental to staff and administrators of color since "people of color are urgently needed in higher education institutions because they help prepare all students to face the real world, which is culturally diverse…" (Trueba 1998: 88).

Tokenism

The hiring of minority staff and administrators of color started due to "[t]he civil rights movement of the 1960s [which] ushered the way for Executive Order 11246, the federal blueprint for affirmative action" (Reyes and Halcón 1997: 426). This labor regulation "required that all federal contractors and subcontractors take affirmative action in all employment activity, assuring equal opportunity to job applicants and barring

discrimination on the basis of 'race, color, religion, sex, or national origin" (Reyes and

Halcón 1997:427). Due to this socio-political movement and its latter hiring policies

within the United States many post-secondary institutions, hired many staff and

administrators of color as the token employee for the department or college (Reyes and

Halcón 1997). This created a way for many departments and colleges within universities

to covertly discriminate against staff and administrators of color, by having a token

employee that would meet any affirmative action hiring requirements set by the

government or the post-secondary institution itself. This practice "left all minority

professionals and academics with a legacy of tokenism-a stigma that has been difficult to

dispel" (Reyes and Halcón 1997: 427).

Even today, when many staff and administrators of color are hired in various

departments and colleges within a university, they are sometimes the token or only

person of color working in that department or school. This creates an atmosphere of

isolation and these staff and administrators of color are often called to participate in

diversity programs or initiatives where they are the "face" of diversity for that particular

department or college (Jones 1993). Being the token sometimes requires the token staff

or administrator of color to "serve on multiple committees to represent a minority

perspective in programs, serve as consultant to faculty and administrative staff on

minority problems and concerns, and serve as general 'window dressing' when needed to

draw attention to the college 'commitment to diversity" (Jones 1993: 8). They also face

being placed in "a subordinate status, providing an easy excuse to ignore or minimize

[their] presence and [their] efforts" (Reyes and Halcón 1997: 427). Unfortunately, in

many post-secondary institutions the "notion of diversity [is] skin-deep. We find that

people of different ethnicities are celebrated in colourful brochures with smiling 'brown'

faces- like a box of chocolates. There is often one from every continent and one of every

colour: Chinese, African, Indian…their bodies objectified and commodified for the

'desiring machine' of capital" (Mirza 2006: 103).

Summary

These themes within the literature review show the need for further inquiry and

research in regards to the role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and

administrators of color within academia. While all the research literature reviewed was

based on traditional qualitative and quantitative research methodology, the issues and

themes raised within the literature would suggest that a participatory interpretive inquiry

into this subject would yield data that would help us reach new understandings within the

critical hermeneutic tradition. In Chapter Three of my dissertation, I outline the research

process to carry out an interpretive inquiry based in the critical hermeneutic tradition that

may bring new understandings into the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and

administrators of color within higher education.

CHAPTER THREE - RESEARCH PROTOCOLS

Introduction

To carryout my research, I used an interpretive inquiry research protocol using a critical hermeneutic framework. This participatory research framework enabled both the researcher and conversation partners to come to new understandings about the role race plays in academia, as well as imagine new possibilities for re-interpreting the research issue. According to Herda (1999: 87), "[t]he researcher's orientation toward the research event as a whole gives opportunity for one to become a different person than before the research took place." This research may help re-start the conversation on race, which may potentially lead to action and help create socially just policies and institutions.

In the subsequent section, I detail the theoretical foundation for my research analysis beginning with my three theoretical research categories. This is followed by the conceptual framework of my research process which includes my guiding research questions, data collection, and data analysis. I then describe my initial pilot study, along with my background and desire to study the research topic at hand.

Theoretical Foundations of Research

The use of critical hermeneutic theory is the foundation for the interpretive inquiry and research in my study on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within academia. To understand one's relationship with the other is necessary to reach new understandings and interpretations in the world in which we live. Using Paul Ricoeur's theories on narrative identity and Jürgen Habermas' theory of communicative action and lifeworld, a new interpretation into the study of race and discrimination in academia can emerge. Before one can interpret the research, one must

understand the basic theoretical foundations of Ricoeur and Habermas, in order to reach a new understanding of the subject at hand and bring one's interpretation of the material into the world in which we live.

Narrative Identity

Ricoeur uses the concept of mimesis to describe how narrative can interpret the world. He explains that "Augustine sees time as being born in the unceasing differentiation of the three aspects the present: expectation, which he calls the presence of the future; memory, which he calls the presence of the past; awareness, which is the presence of the present" (Ricoeur 1991: 435-436). Ricoeur (1991) expands this definition to include mimesis, which he divides into three stages of interpretation. Mimesis $_1$ (pre-figuration) looks at the past-present which is our memories and recollections of the past. Mimesis $_2$ (configuration) is the present and what is now. Mimesis $_3$ (refiguration) can be described as the present-future, where we imagine our future and expectations. When using mimesis to create our narrative identity and share our narrative with others, Ricoeur discusses the use of emplotment to help give narrative temporal order and a place in time. It helps plot out the points of the story or narrative so both the narrator and other can come to an interpretive understanding. It helps one understand their narrative identity as well as helps others understand the life narrative being shared. These life narratives are what Ricoeur (1991: 435) believes to be intertwined with our living lives in relation to others because

> …we learn that fiction, particularly narrative fiction, is an irreducible dimension of the understanding of the self. If it is true that fiction cannot be completed other than in life, and that life can not be understood other than through stories we tell about it, then we are led to say that a life examined, in the sense borrowed from Socrates, is a life narrated.

This in turn helps one understand his or her self in relation to the other and helps the other reach a mutual understanding of the narrative, which is their interpretation of their life story. We can take this interpretation of narrative and understand the other's world in relation to our own since "When we look at the already figured world, the take-for-granted world in mimesis $_1$ we connect this to the new world we want to live in, mimesis $_3$, we see ourselves in different capacities; we see a self enlarged by the appropriation of a proposed world which interpretation unfolds" (Herda 1999: 77).

It is through narrative identity and the understanding of the other, that we can learn from the past and imagine a new future. This can lead to new understandings about the role race plays in the lives of staff and administrators in post-secondary institutions. To understand the history behind one's own identity and that of the other, as well as how each person imagines the future can lead to a new interpretation or narrative on race within academia. This new narrative can then be communicated to others and open up a dialogue or discourse on race and its effects on the everyday lives of staff and administrators in higher education.

Communicative Action

Jürgen Habermas' (1984,1985) theory of communicative action incorporates actors/participants in society who seek to reach common understanding and coordinate actions through rational argumentation or the force of the better argument, consensus, and cooperation, rather than taking action towards one's personal agenda or goals. This can lead participants towards mutual understanding and shared realities since "acting and speaking subjects can relate to more than only one world, and that when they come to an

understanding with one another about something in one world, they base their communication on a commonly supposed system of worlds" (Habermas 1984: 278).

Before the dialogue or discourse on any issue can start, Habermas stipulates that communicative competence or rationality must be achieved. He believes that in order for any communication that can lead to mutual understanding can start, there needs to be an orientation towards understanding from all parties involved in the dialogue. Herda (1999:71) illustrates communicative competence when she writes that "… this principle, characterized by the validity claims of comprehensibility, shared knowledge, trust, and shared value, is 'always already' implicitly raised in action orientation to reaching understanding." It is by reaching theses universal validity claims that our dialogue and discourse can help us reach mutual understandings.

This dialogue and discourse should lead us toward a point where we can share realities that can lead us to imagine the next actions to take when looking at the roles race and discrimination play in academia. In this exchange of dialogue, Ricoeur (1981: 78) explains Habermas' idea when he writes that "Habermas invokes the regulative ideal of an unrestricted and unconstrained communication which does not precede us but guides us from a future point." Habermas (1984, 1985) believed that the force of the better argument could open up dialogue and discourse towards a shared mutual understanding, so when applied to how colleges and universities address the issue of race in their institutions, it becomes inclusive and democratic so that policies are created with all parties involved, which he called "deliberative democracy."

Habermas (1984, 1985) believed that argumentative politics in deliberative democracy is a form of governance in which multiple participants are engaged within the

27

public sphere. So by engaging in dialogue and discourse about race, we can hear

multiple voices from multiple participants and potentially engage in mutual learning and

understanding on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of

color and the various interpretations that can occur in their relationships with others and

the institution. Denhardt and Denhardt (2003: 99) illustrate Habermas' ideal of

deliberative democracy in the public sphere concisely by stating

> …while our society operates under a narrow definition of rationality, one
> consistent with a society dominated by technology and bureaucracy, we maintain
> an innate capacity to reason in a much larger sense. Moreover, it is this capacity
> to reason that enables us to communicate across various social and ideological
> boundaries.   But for reason to prevail in any given situation, we must (1) engage
> in dialogue, not a monologue, and (2) the dialogue must be free of domination and
> distortion.

This exchange of dialogue that must be free of domination and distortion should be the

norm in any discussions about race or any other issues relevant to post-secondary

institutions. Unfortunately, the reality is that most dialogues are dominated and distorted

by those with influence and power within any college or university's organizational

political system. Regardless of race or ethnicity, as staff and administrators, and as

participants in college and university communities, we must be vigilant to change this

through incremental steps that include dialogue with multiple parties/actors and being

open to learn from each other to create policies and working environments that are

mutually beneficial for all. Sharing narratives and creating forums for dialogue and

discourse would help shift the power towards the public sphere and become more

inclusive, which can lead to new interpretations and understandings that can affect the

lifeworld of all involved.

Lifeworld

According to Habermas (1989: 170), the lifeworld is "represented by a culturally transmitted and linguistically organized stock of interpretive patterns." It is reality created through social and cultural interactions with participants engaging in linguistic communication and communicative actions toward mutual understandings. The lifeworld is ever present and has fluid boundaries that expand or contract within the horizon of the actors and situations involved. It is believed that "language and culture are constitutive for the lifeworld itself" (Habermas 1989: 170). Therefore, the lifeworld is constantly in the background and forefront of our everyday interactions with others and as participants of the lifeworld; interpretation is a constant process for all involved in the lifeworld and social structures that maintain it.

As active participants in the lifeworld, Habermas (1989: 171) believes that "[c]ommunicative actors are always moving within the horizon of their lifeworld; they cannot step outside of it. As interpreters, they themselves belong to the lifeworld, along with their speech acts, but they cannot refer to 'something in the lifeworld' in the same way as they can to facts, norms, or experiences." Since the lifeworld is continuously a part of the communicative actor or participant, then the boundaries are constantly in flux when interacting with others and reaching mutual understandings. It is part of the participant's reality since

> [t]he lifeworld is, so to speak, the transcendental site where speaker and hearer meet, where they can reciprocally raise claims that their utterances fit the world (objective, social, or subjective), and where they can criticize and confirm those validity claims, settle their disagreements, and arrive at agreements. In a sentence: participants cannot assume *in actu* the same distance in relation to language and culture as in relation to the totality of facts, norms, or experiences concerning which mutual understanding is possible (Habermas 1989: 171).

By reaching mutual understandings and expanding the borders of the lifeworld, "[e]very new situation appears in a lifeworld composed of a cultural stock of knowledge that is 'always already" familiar" (Habermas 1989: 171). In essence the structural components of the lifeworld involve culture, society, and personality, in which each plays a vital role in maintaining the lifeworld and also in its reproduction within the everyday world of individuals.

These structural components that maintain the lifeworld; culture, society, and personality, help with the maintenance of the everyday lifeworld. Habermas uses the term culture to describe "the stock of knowledge from which participants in communication supply themselves with interpretations as they come to an understanding about something in the world" (Habermas 1989: 174). It is through this interpretation that culture is created and an understanding comes into play within the lifeworld. He uses the term society to describe "the legitimate orders through which participants regulate their memberships in social groups and thereby secure solidarity" (Habermas 1989:174). This social solidarity creates legitimate order in the everyday interpersonal relationships with others. Without it, there would be social disintegration which would create chaos with no thought or regard for the other. The final component to the structural maintenance of the socio-cultural lifeworld is what Habermas calls the personality.   It is the process of the individual to reach "understanding and thereby to assert his own identity" (Habermas 1989: 174). By reaching one's own identity through understanding and interpretation, it helps maintain the lifeworld and creates a basis for mutual understanding with the other.

Even though there are structures that maintain the lifeworld, it must be constantly reproduced as the participants interpret and come to new understandings in relation to others. Habermas lists three reproduction processes that help maintain and create the lifeworld: cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization. Habermas (1989: 176) believes that "the cultural reproduction of the lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations are connected up with existing conditions in the world in the semantic dimension: it secures a continuity of tradition and coherence of knowledge sufficient for daily practice." Cultural reproduction simply put is the transmission and interpretation of cultural knowledge. According to Habermas (1989: 176),

> [t]he social integration of the lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations are connected up with existing conditions in the world in the dimension of social space: it takes care of coordinating actions by way of legitimately regulated interpersonal relations and stabilizes the identity of groups to an extent sufficient for everyday practice.

Through our everyday interaction with others, the social aspect of the interpersonal relations reinforces and stabilizes the identity of groups and their inclusiveness. Without this reinforcement and reproduction of social integration, society would fall apart and disintegrate into what sociologist Emile Durkheim (1893) calls anomie or social unrest. Looking at the third component of the lifeworld reproduction process,

> the socialization of members of a lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations are connected up with existing situations in the world in the dimension of historical time; it secures for succeeding generations the acquisition of generalized competences for action and sees to it that individual life histories are in harmony with collective forms of life. Interactive capacities and styles of life are measured by the responsibility of persons (Habermas 1989: 176).

So when coming to new interpretations about race and discrimination faced by staff and administrators of color, the shared knowledge becomes part of the lifeworld and part of

the socialization process. By socializing members within the lifeworld, there is a reproduction of cultural traditions and social norms that help create the individual's identity and their responsibility toward the maintenance of existing or newly emerging social structures for future generations.

Without these structural components and reproductive processes in place, the lifeworld would cease to exist. Habermas (1989) believes that there would be a loss of cultural meanings if the reproduction processes are disturbed within the culture/cultural reproduction stage, social unrest or anomie would be the result in the disruption of the social integration process within society, and psychopathologies would be developed in individual persons when the socialization process is disturbed. To illustrate an understanding of the lifeworld and its reproduction, Habermas uses systems integration, which is reaching through action orientations. By action orientations, he believes that "what binds sociated individuals to one another and secures the integration of society is a web of communicative actions that thrives only in the light of cultural traditions, and not systemic mechanisms that are out of the reach of a member's intuitive knowledge" (Habermas 1989: 184). This lifeworld "that members construct from common cultural traditions is coextensive with society. It draws all societal processes into the searchlight of cooperative processes of interpretation" (Habermas 1989: 184). The lifeworld is created with its borders in flux depending on what communicative actions and cultural traditions are brought into the realm through mutual understandings. As the communication with others expands to different mutual understandings, so does the lifeworld expand. If the situation is limited and the lifeworld is already shared with other members, the lifeworld contracts. So if one were to be at a social party for a friend, the

lifeworld would be the shared lifeworld of cultural traditions and social interactions with others at the same party. If the topic of discussion at the party shifts to race relations, the borders of the lifeworld would shift and any relevant realities of members participating in this discourse would create the possibility for mutual understanding through the sharing of narratives, cultural traditions, and dialogue. The lifeworld is ever present, but the context of the situation and dialogue changes the lifeworld borders and mutual understandings expand the lifeworld created through communicative action. In the case of racial issues faced by staff and administrators of color, the emergence of new understandings, could lead to communicative action that creates newly inclusive social structures that can be passed down to future generations that work in post-secondary institutions.

Research Process

Introduction

I carried out an interpretive inquiry into the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within academia using critical hermeneutic theory. I based the research process on the idea that interpretive theory within the critical hermeneutic tradition will help the researcher and others come to new understandings about the research topic. According to Herda (1999: 86), "in field-based hermeneutic research, the object is to create collaboratively a text that allows us to carry out the integrative act of reading, interpreting, and critiquing our understandings." These conversations that act as the text, may help both the researcher and those who participate in the conversation come to new understandings about the role race within academia and allow for new interpretations to develop for potential further research.

33

Research Sites

The research sites that I selected to study were University of San Francisco and Stanford University. I selected these sites because I am familiar with both campuses and have professional contacts to conduct my research on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions. Both sites provided me with opportunities to converse with research participants and provided me with networking opportunities for additional participants as the research progressed. Both universities were chosen for their similarities of being private post-secondary institutions with a long historical tradition of educational excellence and both are located in the San Francisco Bay Area, which is a diverse metropolitan area with a large population of diverse racial and ethnic people groups.

University of San Francisco is a private Jesuit University that was "established as the City of San Francisco's first institution of higher education by Jesuit Fathers in October 1855" (USF 2009). According to the school's website, the university is comprised of six schools, which include the School of Arts and Science, the School of Law, the School of Business and Management, the School of Nursing, the School of Education, and the College of Professional Studies. It is one of the largest independent university campuses in San Francisco and has an estimated student population of nine thousand students and an estimated workforce population of five thousand employees (USF 2009). According to University of San Francisco's (2009) human resources website,

> [t]he mission of Human Resources is to lead the campus in creating an environment that support the quality of life for faculty and staff and enables them to accomplish the mission of the University. Consistent with the Jesuit ideals of

education excellence, we believe in the following values in our service to the community:

- Faculty and staff are primary assets of the University;
- Each individual has significant contributions to make to the organization;
- Each individual is unique and worth, freedoms, rights, needs, values, and beliefs;
- Based on mutual trust, each person is treated with equity and respect for individual differences in an open, supportive manner;
- Communication between administration, faculty and staff is open and interactive.

This mission is the heart of human resources at University of San Francisco and I hope that one of the questions my research inquiry will ask is, whether the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color coincides with the inclusive mission of University of San Francisco or excludes them in their everyday interactions with others.

Stanford University was founded in 1891 in Palo Alto, California by Leland and Jane Stanford (Stanford 2009). According the Stanford University's website, the university is comprised of seven schools, which include the Graduate School of Business, the school of Earth Science, the School of Engineering, the School of Education, the School of Humanities and Science, the School of Law, and School of Medicine. It has an estimated matriculated student total of about fifteen thousand undergraduate and graduate students and is one of the San Francisco Bay Area's largest employers, employing an estimated nine thousand staff and administrators. According Stanford University's Human Resources website, the mission of the Human Resources department and University is to

> …support the University's mission of excellence in teaching and research through strategic, innovative and flexible policies, practices, programs and services that are:
> - Fair, ethical and legally compliant

- Foster a productive work environment where people feel valued
- Attract, develop, reward and retain a diverse and talented workforce; and
- Are efficient, cost-effective and add value.

The research I performed will hopefully bring about new understandings for Stanford University's Human Resources mission statement and bring about a conversation on the role race plays in the lives of staff and administrators of color who work there. It is through an interpretive inquiry that we can understand the other and share our narratives, which can lead to action and imagination for socially just institutions.

Entrée to Conversation Partners

I chose University of San Francisco and Stanford University as my research sites because I had met professional contacts to conduct my research on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions and both campuses were familiar to me. Both sites provided me with opportunities to have conversations with research participants and provided me with networking opportunities for additional participants as the research progressed. In this participatory field based research, it was not possible to know of all of my participants ahead of time and entrée to conversation partners took various forms such as networking and referrals from initial research participants. I engaged in conversation with staff and administrators of color that come from various racial and ethnic backgrounds, as well as various staff and administrative positions from the various organizational levels from their respective campuses. I received approval to carryout my research from the University of San Francisco Human Subjects Committee (Please refer to Appendix A).

I sent a letter of invitation to each participant to introduce myself as the researcher and the research topic for my study. Included within the letter of invitation were my

guiding questions to serve as an outline for the research conversation (please refer to

Appendix B). Once I receive agreement that the person would participate in my research,

I sent a letter of confirmation that included a brief description of my study and the type of

research I was performing, another copy of the guiding questions, and my contact

information if they had any questions or concerns (please refer to Appendix C). The

letter also confirmed the dates of the scheduled conversation and emphasized that the

nature of my interpretive research was a participatory inquiry into the role race plays in

the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color in post-secondary institutions.

<div align="center">

Research Participants

</div>

The participants for this study were from both research sites discussed above

(University of San Francisco and Stanford University). They are all working

professionals within the field of higher education with extensive knowledge and

experience that they are eager to share. The research participants listed in the table below

and in Appendix D were mailed a letter of invitation (Appendix B) to be a research

participant prior to the start of my formal participatory research inquiry.

Table 3.1

Research Participant	Job Title	Post Secondary Institution
Dr. Cora Dupar	Assistant Director of Advisng	University of San Francisco
Dr. Mary Grace Almandarez	Assistant Dean, Multicultural Student Services	University of San Francisco
Lauren Johnson	Program Assistant	University of San Francisco
Monica Bernal, J.D.	Manager, Graduate Student Affairs	University of San Francisco
Keiko Price	Assistant Director of Advising (Student Athletics)	Stanford University
Anonymous (this person participated anonymously due to the sensitivity of the subject matter)	Manager, Communications	Stanford University

Lourdes Andrade	Student Services Officer	Stanford University
Annie Craft-Kitcheon	Admissions Assistant	Stanford University

The first person I had a research conversation with was my pilot study participant, Dr. Cora Dupar. We conducted our research conversation in spring and as work colleagues, I was able to have a more in depth conversation with Dr. Dupar and learn both about her history with the institution and her experiences as a person of color. Dr. Dupar has worked at University of San Francisco for over 30 years and has worked in multiple offices with various titles. She is currently the Assistant Director of Advising for the College of Professional Studies and self identifies as African American.

In the early fall months of 2009, I met with my other research conversation partners. Mary Grace Almandarez is the Assistant Dean of Multicultural Student Services. She identifies herself as Asian Pacific American. She has worked for University of San Francisco for about five years and works as an administrator with senior management and students on a daily basis. Lauren Johnson is a program assistant at the College of Professional Studies and has worked for University of San Francisco for two years. She currently assists with the management of the Organizational Behavior and Leadership programs and the Public Administration programs. She self-identifies as African American and is currently working on her masters degree. My final research participant at University of San Francisco was Monica Bernal. She has worked at USF for about one year and previously worked at Stanford University. She works as the Manager for Graduate Student Affairs for the School of Business and Management and self identifies as Mexican American.

At Stanford University, I had an in depth research conversation with Keiko Price, who is the Assistant Director of Advising in the student athletics department within the Athletic Academic Resource Center (AARC). She had been in her position for about two years and describes her ethnicity as both African American and Japanese American. She works with student athletes on a daily basis from academic advising to pre-admission and recruitment advising. At Stanford University's School of Education, I met with an Asian American Stanford employee (AASE) who preferred to remain anonymous for purposes of this study. She works within the School of Education and interacts with students, alumni, and donors in an administrative capacity. She has worked for Stanford for about two years.

It was important for me to get a mix of staff and administrators of color who had various years of experience with the institution, to provide various view points and interpretations to their experience working at Stanford. So a few weeks earlier, I met with Lourdes Andrade, who identifies herself as Mexican or Latino. She works at Stanford University's Undergraduate Advising and Research (UAR) division as a Student Services Officer. She has worked for Stanford University for over nine years and has primarily worked in student service positions. Through Lourdes, I met with Annie Craft-Kitcheon, who also works at Stanford University. She has worked at Stanford University for over 30 years and is currently the admissions assistant for the School of Education, also commonly known as SUSE (Stanford University School of Education). She self identifies as African American and her work experience over her years at Stanford has led her to positions from general secretary and faculty support to her current position in admissions.

Data Collection and Text Creation

Data for my research topic were based on conversations with participants that are digitally recorded and transcribed. According to Herda (1999: 97), "[t]he transcription is a text – the fixation of our conversation in writing. This is an act of distanciation, a distancing ourselves from our conversations." Once the conversation has been transcribed, the researcher will give the transcript to the research participant for review and reflection (Herda 1999). If the participant wants to make any changes to the text, remove certain sections, or requests that their conversation remains anonymous, the researcher must honor the request (Herda 1999). It is through the text that both the researcher and participant can learn from one another and this may lead to new understandings about the research topic. A second or informal conversation may occur with participants, which can expand on what was said in the original text or bring the conversation to a new level of understanding (Herda 1999). During this data collection process and text creation, the researcher will keep a journal to document his experiences with participants, questions that may arise during the research process, and key notes and comments made through observation throughout the research process. The results of the journal "will show remarkable changes overtime in the researcher's understanding of both the process and the theory" (Herda 1999: 98).

Research Categories and Guiding Questions

Each of my guiding questions below falls under a research category that has been explained in depth in the theoretical foundations section above. The guiding questions listed are used only to guide the conversation, therefore every question may not be asked. The purpose of these questions is to guide the conversation and come to a new

interpretive understanding of the research topic. If the conversation takes the researcher

into a new direction, the questions may shift and the researcher may come to a new

understanding of the research issue for further or future conversations with research

participants.

Narrative Identity

- How do you identify your cultural/ethnic background?

- If someone asked you to share your narrative/story as a person of color in higher
  education, how would you explain it to them?

Communicative Action

- Looking over your career in higher education, has there been any moments where
  you had a dialogue with someone about race in academia with both you and the
  other coming to a new/mutual understating in regards to the reality of race? If so,
  please share your story. If not, what do you think it would take for such a
  conversation/dialogue to occur?

- Imagine you are in the public sphere and given the opportunity to freely discuss
  your experiences as a person of color in higher education, what would you say
  and bring to the table if both you and the other were geared toward reaching
  mutual understanding? Any thoughts or ideas on changing the relationship?

Lifeworld

- If you could imagine an ideal environment or new reality within the world of
  higher education, please describe what it would be

- What do you think people of color experience working in the field of higher
  education on a staff/administrative level? If you have any stories, please feel
  free to share them. (This question can also fall under Narrative Identity)

Participants are asked the above questions, but the research conversation is not

limited or restricted to these questions. Throughout the conversation, participants may

feel free to ask the researcher to share his stories or ask questions about the researcher's

experiences as well. At any time, the participant may ask for clarification if something

does not make sense or stop the conversation if they do not feel comfortable answering the researcher's question.

Data Analysis

According to Herda (1999: 98), data analysis "is a creative and imaginative act. In data analysis the researcher appropriates a proposed world from the text." It is through this analysis and interpretation of the text that "the researcher sees the world differently than before the research, and implications are manifest for looking at the everyday problems differently" (Herda 1999: 98). It is through this process of appropriation of the text, that anyone who reads this study may view the research through their own experiences and lifeworld knowledge, which may result in similarities and comparisons to any particular individual's lifeworld. Herda (1999) provides the following guidelines for analysis for the data collected:

- The researcher transcribes the data himself since hearing the conversation and transcribing it, allows for review and reflections of the conversation and research topic.
- Once the conversation is transcribed, pull out significant statements and develop themes that fall within your research categories. If your themes do not fit the research category, the researcher may need to change one or more research categories to something more appropriate.
- Substantiate themes and ideas with quotes from the research conversation.
- Examine the themes and tie it to the theoretical framework that the research is grounded in. The researcher should bring in data collected through his or her personal journal, observations, and outside document study.
- The researcher should provide "continued discussion and conversations with participants using the developed text when appropriate" (p.99). If there are any changes requested by the participant, the researcher must honor the request.
- The researcher should set a context for the written discussion
- When "developing the text, discuss groupings of themes and sub-themes within each category in light of the theory and problem at hand" (p.99).
- When discussing the research problem, the researcher must discuss the problem at a theoretical level and implement the practical use for critical hermeneutics.

42

- From the developed text, pull out implications that may provide insight and new directions for the research issue or problem to merit further study.
- Provide examples in the analysis of learning experiences on both the part of the participant and researcher.

It is through this data analysis that the world can open up in front of the text and new interpretations to the research issue or problem can emerge. This new interpretation can lead to action, which can lead to new imagined possibilities for social change.

Research Timeline

I collected my data from research conversations from eight participants between May and November of 2009. My research participants were gathered from a pool of professional contacts and referrals from University of San Francisco and Stanford University. The data analysis took place from January 2010 to April 2010.

Pilot Study

This section includes a synopsis of the pilot study, a description of my conversation partner, and the data analysis of the study.

Pilot Study Synopsis

My research conversation with Dr. Cora Dupar was held on November 13, 2008 during an extremely busy time in the student advising and support services office. We scheduled an appointment to meet that afternoon in one of the private conference rooms and have a conversation about her experiences with race at University of San Francisco. I presented her with my preliminary guiding conversation question one week prior to our scheduled meeting and assured her that the questions were just a point of reference and she was free to ask me questions about anything we discuss before, during, or after the conversation. The guiding questions were used to open up the dialogue and not limit or restrict the conversation. The room we reserved was sterile and neutral like most

43

conference rooms at a university and we each sat at opposite ends of the table to begin the conversation. This lent itself to a more formal meeting atmosphere that may have contributed to the question and answer format that dominated the start of our conversation (The full transcription of our research conversation can be found in Appendix E).

We started the conversation with how Dr. Dupar defined her ethnic/cultural background and I found her answer interesting as to how she defined herself as a Black American versus an African American which is what is currently considered by many in American society as the politically correct term. Part of her ethnicity was defined as a Black American since that was the terminology used when she was growing up and she feels comfortable with. In her own words she "…still like[d] to refer to [herself] as a Black American and still [doesn't] feel comfortable saying African American because [she] really [doesn't] see where the African part comes from." Through mimesis$_1$ (pre-figuration), her present identity (mimesis$_2$) has been affected by the history of growing up as a Black American versus an African American. Historically many of those who are now referred to as African American were brought over as slaves and lost their cultural ties and traditions through the pillaging of African culture and society to maintain the slave trade in the 1800's. For many, the African American culture that now exists is not closely connected with or identified with that of Africa, but more of an amalgam of African and American culture, history, and tradition based on slavery and oppression from the atrocities that built the foundations of American society. According to Ricoeur (1985: 247), "[i]ndividual and community are constituted in their identity by taking up narratives that become for them their actual history" so through a combination of Dr.

44

Dupar's personal narratives and experiences and that of the African American community, her historical past of $mimesis_1$ is the historical combined past of individual and community narratives that have affected her identity in the present ($mimesis_2$).

Throughout our conversation on race, she touched upon many critical hermeneutic concepts such as narrative identity, mimesis, lifeworld, and aspects of communicative action. The vernacular used in our conversation was very relaxed since we are colleagues and friends, so many of the hermeneutic concepts were in the form of everyday language the two of us use on a daily basis. Her experiences as a Black American at USF expanded the horizons of her lifeworld and affected her own narrative identity through her past working experience and what she hopes for and imagines for the future. In response to her ideal or fantasy (imagined) future for higher education, Dr. Dupar would "love to see a rainbow of colors. Everyone working together, different colors and different levels of staff and administration... straight, gay, black, white, pink, blue, or whatever, we all make this world and we are all a part of this world. We all need to be a part of the decision process since it affects everyone. And that is what I would like to see." The inclusiveness of this statement, covered many themes found in critical hermeneutics and could lead many to new understandings. Dr. Dupar's imagined world covered $mimesis_3$ (refiguration), which affected her present identity ($mimesis_2$), and this also expanded her lifeworld horizon on what higher education could be 10 to 20 years from now. The inclusiveness of wanting everyone to be part of the decision process included aspects of communicative action and reaching mutual understandings that would benefit all. Transcribing this part of the conversation also brought back a point that she made towards the beginning and end of our conversation. Dr. Dupar reiterated part of

45

Shelby Steele's book *Content of Character* by saying "don't judge me by the color of my skin, but the content of my character," which helped her gain a new interpretation of her narrative identity, since her present-past (mimesis$_1$) and present-future (mimesis$_3$) were tied into that statement and was part of how she identified herself in the present (mimesis$_2$). This relationship is described by Ricoeur (1985: 248) as the "circular relation between what we may call a 'character'- which may be that of an individual as well as that of a people-and the narrative both express and shape this character, illustrates in a marvelous way the circle referred to at the beginning of our description of threefold mimesis."

Throughout my conversation with Dr. Dupar, there were many stories about the racial discrimination she experienced in her career within academia, which has helped her gain new interpretations of who she is as a person of color in higher education. She also understands that it will take dialogue and discourse about race and its role in academia to help come to new understandings and interpretations about the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color in higher education. Through the narrative of others like Dr. Dupar, the dialogue and conversation can start, which will help all who engage in this conversation and interpretation of text come to new understandings about our relationship with and responsibility to the other.

Conversation Partner

In searching for a research conversation partner to engage in a dialogue on the topic of race in higher education for staff and administrators of color, I was fortunate enough speak with Dr. Cora Dupar (Ed.D.) who is a colleague of mine at the University of San Francisco's College of Professional Studies (CPS). She currently works as the

academic and administrative advisor under the student advising and support services (SASS) division at CPS, where I also work as an undergraduate academic advisor. Dr. Dupar has recently celebrated her thirtieth anniversary working at USF and she seemed like the perfect candidate to have a research conversation with and discuss the issues of race within higher education. Her thirty years of experience at USF would bring about much insight on what it is like to work at USF as an African American administrator and would hopefully reveal the personal experiences and narratives of her career and life. While at USF, she has also moved up in her educational path by first earning an undergraduate degree in Information Systems and then a master's degree in Organizational Development through the College of Professional Studies, and finally a doctorate in International and Multicultural Education through the School of Education.

A dedicated employee of the University of San Francisco, Dr. Dupar started in support positions at USF and eventually moved up to become the Director of the Oakland Regional Campus during its operation and eventual closure in 2005. She then moved on to work at her current position of Administrative and Academic Advisor at the College of Professional Studies and has played an active role in helping students reach their educational and life goals. While balancing work, school, and family commitments, Dr. Dupar has made a difference in many lives and has many ties to the USF community. Her reputation and commitment are long standing and held in high regard with all those who work with her.

Pilot Study Analysis

From my research conversation with Dr. Dupar, I was able to interpret the text and come to new understandings about the problem of race and discrimination that staff

and administrators of color face within academia. The three theoretical categories that I

selected for my pilot study were narrative identity, lifeworld, and communicative action

and their presence in the everyday non-hermeneutic language used by Dr. Dupar during

our conversation, reflected upon these themes and brought new interpretations to the

research issue at hand. From the narrative identity that Dr. Dupar has developed from the

mimetic process of looking at her past and imagining her future, to her new

interpretations and expansion of her lifeworld, she understands the need for rational

dialogue and discourse on race within higher education to make changes and develop

new interpretations on the role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and

administrators of color within post-secondary institutions.

Narrative Identity

Dr. Dupar's narrative identity as a person of color working in higher education

has been shaped by her past work and personal experiences, as well as her hopes for in

the future. Through the threefold mimetic process, which "refers to three domains: a

past, a present mediating act, and a future" (Herda 1999: 76), Dr. Dupar is able to use the

emplotment of her life's narrative and her imagined future to create a new interpretation

of who is as a person of color and how she struggles with racial issues within academia.

She feels from her personal experience that "when you apply for positions, you have to

be 100 percent better than the next person in line." Her experience of applying for a job

in the past that required relevant experience and "preferred" a college degree, provided

her with a new understanding of who she was as a person of color within higher

education and what she would have to do to move forward. The job she applied for was

in the same department that she worked for and she had working knowledge of the

functions of the position, but was not promoted to the new position because the administration said that she "scored really high on the interview and everything else, but [she] didn't have a degree," even though she was at the time, in the process of obtaining an undergraduate degree. Instead it went to a new hire white woman who had no experience or knowledge about the position, but had an undergraduate degree. To add insult to injury, Dr. Dupar informed me during an informal conversation, that she was required by the administration to train this new hire (who was her supervisor) on all aspects of the job.

This developed a new understanding for Dr. Dupar because "just that whole thing of not trusting you because you are a person of color…people thinking you can't do the job…you know…even though you don't have the degree, but that is one way of keeping me out and not getting that position." The result was Dr. Dupar imagining her future to include upward mobility and how she would have to work 100 percent better than most of her colleagues to make it as an administrator of color within higher education. It was through this mimetic process that "the mediation brought about by thinking about history between the horizon of expectation, the transmission of tradition, and the force of the present" (Ricoeur 1985: 260), created a new narrative identity for her as a person of color working in higher education at that moment and presently. Her narrative identity is always in flux because "narrative identity is not a stable and seamless identity. Just as it is possible to compose several plots on the subject of the same incidents (which, thus, should not really be called the same events), so it is always possible to weave different, even opposed, plots about our lives" (Ricoeur 1985: 248). Through her narrative identity, Dr. Dupar has come to reach new understandings about her self and the role race plays in

her relationship with others. These new understandings also help her expand the horizons of her lifeworld and its interpretive role in her everyday interactions with others.

Lifeworld

Habermas (1985: 119) believed that the concepts of the lifeworld are "linked with everyday concepts that are, to begin with, serviceable only for the narrative presentation for historical events and social circumstances." It is "represented by a culturally transmitted and linguistically organized stock of interpretive patterns" (Habermas 1989: 170) that are created by our everyday social and cultural interactions with others in society.

For Dr. Dupar, being a person of color in higher education has shaped and expanded the lifeworld that she interacts with on a daily basis. Her past experience of losing a job to a white woman, who was not as qualified for the position as she was, due to her lacking a degree at the time, expanded the horizons of her lifeworld. Dr. Dupar realized that for her to gain upward mobility in the field of higher education she needed to complete her formal education and as a person of color, she needed as much education as possible to stay competitive within her career. In our research conversation, Dr. Dupar recounted her story of losing the job due to her lack of formal education and she said that based on that experience,

> I vowed from then on… I said that, that was one thing that would never be used against me. They would never be able to tell me that I can't get a position because I don't have a degree. So that really pushed me to strive and move on…and work through to get my undergraduate degree, get my graduate degree, and then on to my doctorate.

This experience helped her understand that a college degree was essential to her upward mobility and that without a degree she would not be competitive against others, since as a

50

black American, she felt she needed to be 100 percent better than those she was competing with and to her that is the reality that she lives in everyday of her life. Her lifeworld can then expand or contract based on how she communicates and reaches understandings with others and perhaps through the act of communicative action, she can come to mutual understandings with others about the role race plays in the everyday lives as staff and administrators of color.

Communicative Action

Jürgen Habermas' (1984, 1985) theory of communicative action incorporates actors/participants in society who are oriented towards reaching common or mutual understanding and coordinate actions through rational argumentation, consensus, and cooperation rather than taking action towards one's personal agenda or goals. Using Habermas' theory of communicative action, narrative can be used to create dialogue and discourse within the public sphere. Habermas believed that "[o]nly in the light of the public sphere did that which existed become revealed, did everything become visible to all" (Habermas 1989:4). Therefore, by brining the dialogue into the public sphere, the problems and realities of the role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color can be exposed. This can lead participants towards mutual understanding and shared realities since "acting and speaking subjects can relate to more than only one world, and that when they come to an understanding with one another about something in one world, they base their communication on a commonly supposed system of worlds" (Habermas 1984: 278).

For Dr. Dupar, she never had the opportunity to participate in such a dialogue, so I asked her to imagine herself in the public sphere where both she and others were there

to engage in a dialogue and was geared toward reaching a mutual understanding. She believed racism would never disappear from our society, but felt that with "any relationship [with others], communication was key." She believed that to really have a dialogue about race issues, one "really [needed] to have a comfortable environment to discuss those issues because it is such a touchy subject for everyone involved." When asked how she would start the conversation on race within the parameters I outlined in my question, she stated that

> Probably the first thing I would want to say or ask to open the dialogue is to ask…Why do you feel the way you do? What has brought you to this point in your life that you may not trust or be comfortable with someone of color? What exactly are your feelings? Why are you feeling this way? And trying to get that person to voice what they want, what they feel and then maybe I would feel more comfortable in explaining [my beliefs on race].

Dr. Dupar was very eager to ask the "why" questions to try and reach an understanding about the other and their views on race and discrimination against staff and administrators of color within higher education. She felt that if they could answer her honestly, it would open her up to share her experiences so the other party could relate and perhaps reach a shared or mutual understanding about the issues faced by staff and administrators of color in post-secondary institutions.

Pilot Study Implications

The use of communicative action in the conversation about race can help those who participate, come to new interpretations and mutual understandings about the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color. The act of communicative action itself helps people reach mutual understandings and expands the horizons of their lifeworld, while taking action towards interpretations about the issue at hand. This discourse should lead us towards a point where we can share realities that can

lead us to imagine the next actions to take when developing policies and practices that are inclusive and not discriminatory towards people of color within higher education. Ricoeur (1981: 78) explains Habermas' idea when he writes "Habermas invokes the regulative ideal of an unrestricted and unconstrained communication which does not precede us but guides us from a future point." So by engaging in dialogue and discourse throughout the policy making process, we can hear multiple voices from multiple participants and potentially engage in mutual learning and understanding when creating policy that affects others, as well as ourselves.

The discourse would include the sharing of narratives, which can also bring new understandings and interpretations about the role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within higher education. Through the narratives of staff and administrators of color, we can come to understand part of their reality and reach a point where we can imagine a better future of inclusiveness and forgiveness in our relationship with others within higher education. The act of narrative helps preserve our history and traditions, but can also help us develop new and inclusive practices for all people who work in higher education. The interpretation of the text from critical hermeneutic inquiry can "…[point] to future possibilities and alternatives for our social problems and requires creativity on the part of the interpreter(s) to imagine new possibilities and configurations of social life and policy" (Herda 1999: 75). It is because of the possibilities to imagine new ways of looking at social problems such as race, that there is the need to continue with critical hermeneutic participatory research, where the text can lead us to new interpretations and shared realities can emerge.

Background of the researcher

I was born a bi-racial child of Mexican and Korean descent in Oakland, California. I grew up in the San Francisco Bay Area, which is considered one of the most liberal metropolitan areas on the West coast of the United States. Although liberal by most respects, children from multi-ethnic backgrounds were not common when I was young and sometimes xenophobia reared its head in the form of racism from both the dominant white society in which we live and from people of my own ethnic/racial backgrounds. Growing up was my own social experiment about tolerance and race relations within the United States. It served as a founding event for my curiosity and eventual academic interest in race relations and society.

In 1997, I completed my Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology at California State University, Hayward. During my time at California State University, Hayward, I worked as an admissions intern, helping recruit students for admission and perform pre-admission advising at various Bay Area high schools and community colleges. It was then, that I realized that I enjoyed working in the field of higher education and continued working in higher education after earning my Bachelor of Arts degree and moving to Los Angeles, CA. I moved back to San Francisco after working at various universities in Southern California and began working at Stanford University in 2001 and subsequently enrolling in a Master of Public Administration program at California State University, Hayward. I completed my MPA degree in 2006 and ended up working at University of San Francisco at that time. After one year, I applied to and was accepted into the doctoral program here at University of San Francisco School of Education in the Organization and Leadership program, where I developed a research interest to pursue a

participatory hermeneutic research inquiry into the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color in post-secondary institutions. I am currently working as an academic advisor for University of San Francisco's College of Professional Studies and have varied research interests in ethnic studies, race relations, policy development and implementation, and democratic political systems.

Summary

The role of race in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within all levels of post-secondary institutions is a conversation that needs to be re-started. An interpretive approach to dialogue needs to occur so we can understand the overt and covert ways staff and administrators of color on all levels of organizational life are discriminated against and the ways we can move forward and interpret a more inclusive future. We must share the narratives of those who have experienced discrimination based on race and understand the historical and anthropological roots of the concept of race. To understand these roots and the effect it has had in the development of American culture and society can bring us to new understandings about the role of race. We must not be what Mica Pollock (2004) calls "colormute," but instead move towards an open discourse on the role race plays within post-secondary institutions.

 Based on my efforts to find literature specifically relevant to staff and administrators of color within higher education, which I could scarcely find, I suggest there is a gap in the research literature, which reflects the need to study the issue of race and understand the effect it has on not only people of color working in the field of higher education, but its affect on post-secondary organizations as well. By researching the issue using critical hermeneutic participatory inquiry data and analysis, we can reach new

understandings and interpretations on how to deal with this issue and imagine the

possibility of a better future in higher education that includes policies and practices that

are inclusive of all people regardless of the color of their skin or their racial or ethnic

background. According to Herda (1999: 79), "If the programs promote living our lives

guided by wisdom rather than expedience, and if they promote everyday activities shaped

by a care and concern for others rather than by a spirit of independence and autonomy,

then a better interpretation of a text may ultimately and in retrospect be determined."

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF DATA

<u>Introduction</u>

The staff and administrators that I introduced in Chapter Three shared their narratives and insights with me regarding the role race and ethnicity plays in their everyday work lives. In this type of participatory inquiry research, both the researcher and the research participant incorporate their own understanding and interpretation about the research topic throughout the conversation. In this chapter, I will present the data yielded from my research conversations and a preliminary analysis, while in Chapter Five, I will provide a more in depth secondary analysis.

Working at Stanford University over nine years ago, introduced me to a world of elite academic privilege and service that few administrators and staff members outside of the Ivy League school tradition discover. Re-entering that world through the research conversations I had, led to new insights and interpretations of what it was like for me as an administrator of color to work at Stanford University and what current administrators and staff members experience at this elite research institution. While Stanford University's surrounding community of Palo Alto has traditionally been one of affluence, higher socio-economic standing, and a predominantly white community, just a few miles away is the city of East Palo Alto, which in contrast has traditionally been an area of lower socio-economic standing with a high population of non-white minorities. This contrast was instantly noticeable when I drove through East Palo Alto to arrive at the Stanford campus and conduct my research conversations with four participants I met at Stanford University.

My other four research conversation partners work for the University of San Francisco. University of San Francisco is a private Jesuit institution with an urban campus located in the San Francisco Bay Area. The city of San Francisco is multicultural and its population consists of residents from all socio-economic standings and residents that are recent immigrants to long standing generational residents from all Federal racial and ethnic categories. Like the research participants from Stanford University, I wanted to conduct conversations with participants that have various years of seniority at the institution to provide my study with a variety of viewpoints.

All of my research conversation partners were in a position to want to share their stories with both me and others to hopefully add to the research on race relations in higher education and start a conversation to bring about new interpretations on the role race plays in their everyday lives.

Stories Shared, Experiences Remembered, & Identities Created

The stories shared by my research conversation partners were based on their reinterpreted past experiences, present interpretations, and imagined futures, which helped develop their own personal identities. Ricoeur (1988: 246) explains that "[t]he fragile offshoot issuing from the union of history and fiction is the assignment to an individual or a community of a specific identity that we can call their narrative identity." Many of my conversation partners' past experiences helped shape their present identity. What they imagine for themselves in the future, affected how they saw themselves today; but as experiences are reinterpreted and new imagined futures are explored, their narrative identities may also evolve and change. Therefore, "narrative identity is not a stable and seamless identity. Just as it is possible to compose several plots on the subject

of the same incidents…, so it is always possible to weave different, even opposed, plots about our lives" (Ricoeur 1988: 248).

To start my research conversations and to help calm any nervousness, I asked my conversation partners how they identify their cultural or ethnic identity. All of my conversation partners elaborated on their identities as people of color and rarely did they self-identify as one of the Federal racial and ethnic categories that are published for the U.S. census. With their self identified ethnic categories, my research conversation partners often elaborated with historical knowledge about their cultural people grouping and how that history and their own past experiences have shaped how they identify themselves as people of color in their everyday work lives. Keiko Price from Stanford University described her experiences with racial and ethnic identity in relation to forms she must fill out when applying for jobs or self identification questionnaires,

> I am Japanese-American and African-American…so like when I have to pick a category, when we have racial categories and there's like five bubbles to fill in and they only let you pick one, I always put Black because I feel like based on the color of my skin and my hair, and my features, most people just automatically see Black. They don't really see the Japanese side…you know 5 foot 10; dark skin. Not usually the standard for Japanese women.

One of Keiko's colleagues at Stanford University, Lourdes Andrade, described her issues with being labeled Hispanic versus her self-identity as either Mexican or Chicano; she described the term Hispanic as "a terminology that has been given by White society to lump all people who speak Spanish or are of Spanish decent into one group. So I wanted to own the term myself, that's why I think Chicano…which means that I'm both Mexican and from the United States." Similarly, Monica Bernal from University of San Francisco identified herself as Chicana and described her interpretation of its meaning as "…I'm Mexican, Latina, and I'm third generation…I think I'm probably most comfortable with

Chicana because I can identify strictly with people who aren't first generation, and also…there is a politicized aspect to it." From these conversations, it seemed that all my research conversation partners had more to say about their ethnic and cultural backgrounds than just a one or two word description of a cultural category developed within U.S. society and forced upon others.

As the conversations moved forward, many of my conversation partners relayed stories about how they entered into the field of higher education and how past experiences helped bring them to where they are now. These past experiences included negative student services experiences when they were enrolled in school to wanting to make a difference and help other students like them relate to someone of color. Monica Bernal who earned a law degree related her story of being frustrated with the lack of student services support for people of color at her law school and how she turned that negative experience into something positive by entering a career in student services to help others like her. She shared that "…my dissatisfaction with…my student services [experience], kind of culminated in me thinking…Well, I like working with students, I wish I would have had a better advisor who had a graduate degree and understood my experience and the stress I'm under. This kind of led me back into higher ed." By imagining a career in higher education to help others, Monica was able to work towards that future and eventually entered the field of higher education and student services. This imagined future, helped form her narrative identity as a person of color working in higher education. She related that being a person of color and culturally competent, has helped her engage with her graduate student population at USF. She provided the example that for many cultural communities, including her own, networking and exchanging business

cards is seen as fake or not a real connection, so she shared that "…even as an advisor to grad students, who would really work on kind of breaking those things down and be like, you guys need to network, we need to e-mail people and say, oh, it was nice to meet you, it might seem fake, but people want to help people, this is the way it's done." It is her own past experiences and imagined future, that helped her share who she is today in relation to others.

Lourdes Andrade's foray into higher education was something she imagined to help other people of color, like herself. She shared that "…when I entered education, I always thought it'd be a great place for a person [of color] to come up to be because there are so many students of color that I would turn into a role model for…" She spoke about her current position at Stanford and how she is working with underrepresented populations who are struggling academically and socially, with many of these students being students of color. As she explained "[s]o, I think when I do have an opportunity to speak with them, they feel a little bit more at ease because I can share with them my struggles and growing up and being either first generation or just not being a high achieving student who's done really, really well. So I think that's been really nice." Her past experiences and eagerness to help new generations of students achieve success has shaped her narrative as a person of color working in higher education.

After sharing their reasons for entering into the field of higher education, my research conversation partners described past experiences working in higher education and how it made them strive to better their working environment and futures. There were many stories shared of past discrimination that helped shape who they are as people of color and how it shaped their career choices and future selves. Both at Stanford

61

University and University of San Francisco, my research conversation partners described experiences where they felt discriminated against or culturally offended by co-workers, supervisors, and the administration.

Annie Craft-Kitcheon, who works in admissions at Stanford University, described her past experience with an administrator when she wanted to apply for a position as a doctoral coordinator for the School of Education. The first time she applied, she was discouraged to apply and told that the position would require a bachelors degree. This interaction with a high level administrator helped Annie imagine the future employment opportunities once she earned a degree, so she enrolled in school and earned her bachelors. Unfortunately, when the doctoral coordinator position opened up again, she experienced both rejection and discrimination. As she explained "…I went back on, got my degree, and went back to Vicky again, and Vicky says, well, I like you in the position you're in now, you do very well at what you're in now. She said if you really want to go up higher, you're going to have to leave here and come back." This negative experience not only affected her drive to further her education, but in addition to being told not to apply for the position, the position eventually went to a white colleague. Annie shared that "[i]n the meantime, they hired a white person, Kristina, who didn't even have her GED. She didn't …I don't even know how they hired her to be a receptionist and then they turn around and hired her for the Ph.D. coordinator position." This experience not only discouraged her from applying for other positions at Stanford, but also drove her to educate herself further about race relations and the experiences of others through her own readings and research.

Similarly, my pilot study participant, Dr. Cora Dupar shared her experience of applying for a job in the past at University of San Francisco that required relevant experience and "preferred" a college degree, which provided her with a new understanding of who she was as a person of color within higher education and what she would have to do to move forward. The job she applied for during her early years at University of San Francisco, was in the same department that she worked for and she had working knowledge of the functions of the position, but was not promoted to the new position because the administration said that she "scored really high on the interview and everything else, but [she] didn't have a degree," even though she was at the time, in the process of obtaining an undergraduate degree. Instead it went to a new hire white woman who had no experience or knowledge about the position, but had an undergraduate degree. To add insult to injury, Dr. Dupar informed me during an informal conversation, that she was required by the administration to train this new hire (who was her supervisor) on all aspects of the job.

This developed a new understanding for Dr. Dupar because "just that whole thing of not trusting you because you are a person of color…people thinking you can't do the job…you know…even though you don't have the degree, but that is one way of keeping me out and not getting that position." The result was Dr. Dupar imagining her future to include upward mobility and how she would have to work 100 percent better than most of her colleagues to make it as an administrator of color within higher education. It was through this mimetic process that "the mediation brought about by thinking about history between the horizon of expectation, the transmission of tradition, and the force of the present" (Ricoeur 1988: 260), created a new narrative identity for her as a person of color

63

working in higher education at that moment and presently. Through her narrative

identity, Dr. Dupar has come to reach new understandings about herself and the role race

plays in her relationship with others.

While Annie and Dr. Dupar provided stories of what appeared to be deliberate

discrimination, the lines of discrimination or cultural insensitivity may become blurred.

Keiko Price recounted a past experience with the athletic department at Stanford

University. Since she works advising student athletes, she was asked to help recruit for

the football and basketball leagues. As Keiko explained, "[a]nd I'm not stupid. I know

what it's for…They want me to recruit because they want those recruits that they were

trying to get, to come to campus to feel like there's another person of color on this

campus." While not a deliberate and obvious form of discrimination, many research

conversation partners recall being asked to perform additional duties when related to

diversity initiatives and recruitment or participate as one of the few people of color at a

university or departmental diversity event.

Lauren Johnson who works at University of San Francisco, recounted numerous

occasions where supervisors and colleagues would stereotype her because of the color of

her skin. She explained, "[c]o-workers, supervisors, they usually assume that you're the

only one in your family with a college degree. And if you inform them no, I come from a

family of people who've been educated, who are educators, the go oh, they're sort of

surprised that you have a legacy behind you." Relating to her job function, she has been

asked to speak with first generation students of color, just based on her skin color.

Lauren shared her experiences,

> I've had numerous things where oh, Lauren would you go talk to this group of
> students, their first time, they don't have any family, and you can probably relate

to them. I'm like how am I supposed to relate to them? I wasn't raised –well, what they typically call a black…the ghetto or whatever. I wasn't raised like that. So it's hard for me to relate, because I see it from a different perspective. And so a lot of times, being whatever ethnicity you are and whatever cause is coming up…they want to get like, minority students more involved, they'll put their minority workers out there as if to say, see, we have people of color working here to…

This type of discrimination and past experience helped create Lauren's narrative identity by making her determined to prove her worth and skill set regardless of her skin color and prove to others that everyone is an individual with different backgrounds and experiences that they may share with others.

Surprisingly, there were a few conversation partners who brought up special mentors of color, who helped them move forward and imagine future possibilities for themselves in higher education. Those who were lucky enough to have a mentor of color really appreciated the bond and rare relationship that they could experience. Those who did not have a mentor or any mentor opportunities, were hungry for a mentoring relationship and were open to being mentors for other staff and administrators of color coming up the employment ranks.

Mary Grace Almandarez who works for University of San Francisco recollects memories of her mentor and the feelings she experienced when meeting her, "…it is very rare to see Asian-American women in the leadership position…meeting an Asian-American woman in power, with my mentor, who was my former supervisor, and I was shocked…it was the first time I had ever seen any Asian American who was hired as a Dean." Her mentor was a Korean-American higher education administrator who used to work for University of San Francisco during Mary Grace's early years as Assistant Dean of Students. She helped guide her through her career path and imagine the possibilities of

Asian-American women being in positions of power within higher education. Mary Grace described her mentor relationship as "…both a gift and surprise. And it was sad that it was a surprise, because I hadn't seen anyone… up until that point. When Mary Grace's mentor left, she was devastated and described her feelings, "[t]hen she left to do bigger and better things, it was such a traumatic experience; because I knew I would never ever…I don't even anticipate having another supervisor who is an Asian-American woman."

Like Mary Grace, Monica Bernal was fortunate enough to find a mentor, and recalls her experiences, "and I was really blessed to have a boss who was the director of the visitor center and she was a woman of color. And we kind of bonded and I mentored with her a lot…I think for people of color, it's very hard to find a mentor in higher ed." She shared her observation that one of the difficulties in finding a mentor of color in higher education is

> because there's not that many people of color working in higher ed, because there's not that many people at the high levels or even like middle levels who are people of color…because there are so few in that position. It becomes really hard for you to find someone to kind of show you the ropes and guide you through this career.

Luckily for Monica, her mentor helped guide her towards her current career objectives and future goals. Her past experience with the mentor helped shape her narrative identity as she shares her experiences and stories with others.

While there were opportunities for mentorship for Mary Grace and Monica, other conversation partners relayed their desire to be allowed opportunities and be mentored by someone they could relate to. Lourdes Andrade described the limited opportunities presented for mentoring at her current position,

66

It's really frustrating and I think sometimes it makes me a little bit angry, in that I feel that there's so much to contribute. And it's hard for me to be the one trying to pursue these avenues. Not that I want somebody to give me an opportunity on my lap, because I've worked for everything that I've earned, but it's really frustrating that nobody is seeing the bigger picture. Let's see how we could have these people who are influential, who can be influential, who have these experiences, who are of color, and let's do something with them.

It is her past experience with a lack of mentoring opportunities and her desire to be mentored that Lourdes has tried to pursue avenues for a possible doctoral degree and is willing to be a mentor for others. In an informal conversation a few weeks after our initial research conversation, Lourdes mention that she is pursuing volunteer work as a mentor, to mentor high school students and hopefully mentor them into college and careers in education; where she feels people of color may make a difference. Lourdes' narrative identity is constantly in flux as she experiences new interactions with others and reinterprets past memories and imagined futures. As Ricoeur states (1991: 437), "[i]n the same manner we do not cease to re-interpret the narrative identity that constitutes us in the light of stories handed down to us by our culture."

Conversations Toward Understanding

When discussing using communicative action to reaching a mutual understanding regarding the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color, my conversation partners rarely experienced having a true in-depth conversation regarding race and ethnicity where both parties were oriented towards reaching an understanding. Habermas (1984: 286-287) defines mutual understanding as "a process of reaching agreement among speaking and acting subjects;" and further clarifies that "[a] communicatively achieved agreement has a rational basis; it cannot be imposed by either party, whether instrumentally through intervention in the situation directly or strategically

through influencing the decision of opponents." Simply to engage in conversation is not enough. Both parties must be oriented towards reaching an understanding and meet communicative competence to even start a conversation towards communicative action. Almost all of my research conversation partners discussed what it would take for such conversations to occur and what they would contribute to the discourse on race and ethnicity within academia.

Lauren Johnson described the type of environment she feels would be needed for such a conversation to take place, "I think it's got to be a really safe environment and it's got to be an environment…its almost got to be really brutal, like brutally honest. And I think you have to have people who are willing to say…I have prejudices about this…be willing to be open and be willing to listen." She goes on to provide examples of the type of conversations that may occur in such an environment and further explains that "…it's got to be in a space where [there are] no judgments, when you leave that space, you got to leave everything back there…you've got to be able to say something for it to bounce back and for you to hear it and to say, you know, I understand now." Through Lauren's interpretation, the environment of trust, shared knowledge, and shared values would help staff and administrators to have honest conversations about race, that may lead to mutual understanding and communicative action.

Similarly, Monica Bernal shared her thoughts on how to bring about honest conversations about race in academia amongst staff and administrators. She shared, "I think race, just in life is a difficult topic to broach; especially in like mixed company, so people who are White…and then people who are different ethnicities, …trust has to come into play." Monica also acknowledged that "…it's difficult to speak with someone who's

68

not a person of color about how you feel you're being treated at times." Upon that

reflection, she shared a story where she went out to a business lunch with several white

male colleague and the conversation turned to her regarding what she liked to do in her

spare time, so as Monica explained her interests in community activism, hip hop, and

other related topics, she noticed "…some visible discomfort across the table, just one of

those things where it's basically crickets. I had somehow killed the conversation…" By

talking about her cultural background and related cultural and ethnic interests, her

conversation partners at lunch were not comfortable and were not oriented toward

reaching any understanding, other than their own.

While other conversation partners experienced similar situations and described

ideal environments for communicative action to take place, Mary Grace Almandarez was

able to recount an experience where she had a conversation that led to mutual

understanding and communicative action. When discussing the meaning of service

learning with a white colleague and what it meant for her as a person of color, Mary

Grace said that she was able to have this type of conversation because "[n]umber one, we

definitely have a common language being in higher ed. So she definitely knew language

that had to do with social justice education, and I definitely knew her." Further, she

explained that "…at the end of the day, we really trusted each other, because we had built

a real relationship. We really built an authentic relationship." So meeting the conditions

of communicative competence, Mary Grace was able to have a conversation that included

both their views on service learning. As Mary Grace explained, her colleague "was

complaining that the communities of color were not signing up for service learning

opportunities. I said they're doing service, but not in the way that you're thinking."

According to Mary Grace, this conversation went into a deeper

> philosophical debate because we couldn't deny our racial backgrounds. At that point, I'm a woman of color talking about my experience with community of color. She's talking as a white woman who has worked with communities of color, but she's white. So she has the privilege of not having to see that, whereas I see service as it's a social responsibility. I can't not serve.

At the end of their conversation, Mary Grace explained that they were able to reach a

new understanding to the issues being discussed. She explained that

> …we finally came to the understanding that community isn't just geographical. That community encompasses people who share common interests, people who have a common culture, and for folks of color, it could be a very different experience, because you may be serving your own community. Whereas white folks working in communities of color are just doing a voluntary service.

Mary Grace mentioned that this was one of the few occasions that she was able to have a

conversation on race and come to mutual understanding, since these type of

conversations are difficult to have and even start.

While conversations about race relations are difficult to start, Keiko Price

explained that her conversations about race have only been in comfortable situations and

with other people of color. She provided an example of working at University of

California, Berkeley, where she was able to have a conversation about race in academia

and more in particular staffing issues in athletics. She shared, "…I had somebody that I

worked with that I was really close to, we would have really drawn out conversations

about athletics and there needing to be more minorities in the AD (athletic director)

roles…" She further explained that "[a] lot of revenue athletes are African-American and

people in the positions of power…the ones who make the real decisions are white and

they don't look like any of their students." Through these conversations, she and her

70

colleague were able to come to new understandings about how to get more people of color in positions of power, which included themselves taking action. Keiko explained their coming to a new understanding and what action it may lead to; "just for ourselves to really keep moving forward, which is why I'm thinking of getting a doctoral degree, so I can be one of those people in positions of power. So at some point, it gets to a point where somebody has to make it happen. So why not be the one." It was through her communicating and conversing with her colleagues of color, that Keiko and her colleagues were able to come to a new understanding about the role race plays in their everyday work lives and take action towards changing what is, to what ought to be, in their lifeworld. As Habermas (1984: 278) explains, "…acting and speaking subjects can relate to more than only one world, and that when they come to an understanding…they base their communication on a commonly supposed system of worlds."

The World I Share with Others

Through my conversations with my research conversation partners, our lifeworld was constantly at play throughout our interactions with each other. Our interpretations for the world we live in were continuously in the forefront and background of our conversations and by sharing their stories and narratives, we were able to come to new understandings and expand the horizons of our lifeworld. As Habermas (1984: 131) explains, "a lifeworld forms the horizon of processes of reaching understanding in which participants agree upon or discuss something in the one objective world, in their common social world, or in a given subjective world." When having conversations about race, my research conversation partners were willing to share their lifeworld experiences and what they would like to see in their future lifeworld if conversations about race were geared

71

towards mutual understanding and new interpretations on the role race and ethnicity plays in the lives of staff and administrators.

Describing her experience working at Stanford University, an Asian-American employee discussed her observations where "…people of color tend to be more support characters in higher education, for Stanford…a lot of the people at Stanford…seems a lot of them are Stanford alums, [and] the majority are white…either middle-class or upper-class or aspire to be upper-class." She further to described that "[t]here's really pressure to fit in, like kind of the people…who seem to have more sway or power…often those are alums—Stanford alums, so it's very kind of [a] ra-ra Stanford sort of culture, or work culture." She shared that there is pressure to "…assimilate into that type of culture if you want to move up, but even if you do assimilate or try to adopt their way of being, you're still hit with a glass ceiling." So when she brings up issues of race within academia and upward mobility for staff and administrators, she explained that "there's this elitism, so they're not going to necessarily want to be challenged with the unfairness of race issues…" This pressure to fit in and the culture she works in has reinterpreted her lifeworld in that she is "…tired of being the only person of color to speak up about stuff, so that I'm…being a cultural ambassador…that's kind of the extra responsibility or whatever, that onus that's on you, so you have to educate these people about race…it's really hard to have an honest conversation in that sort of situation…" As a result, she realizes that if she wants to move up within Stanford, she will need to conform to their culture and keep silent about her feelings about any racial injustices. While this does not move the conversation of race along, it does explain the silence that many people of color are faced with when discussing race and ethnicity issues in the workplace. My research

conversation partner hoped that by sharing her stories, she may hopefully help re-start the conversation on race in academia and help make institutions and administration culturally aware of the sensitivities of this topic and create a safe or open environment to address and talk about these issues.

Lourdes' experience at Stanford has been one of frustration due to the lack of opportunities that have been available to her as a person of color. Her lifeworld experience is that for the staff population in general, there are no opportunities to further their education at Stanford. As she explained, "…there are no opportunities whatsoever to do graduate work. So you're kind of stuck as a staff person, even if you want to move up and be considered for a Ph.D. or any other kind of higher education degree through Stanford's own program." She further explains that adding the dimension of race and ethnicity, "there has been no way to get a promotion or go higher within the institution…there has been very little recognition." Lourdes was surprised how little outreach there was to staff members at Stanford and in particular staff members of color. There is very little conversation involved and to her knowledge, "…no conversations going on about the composition of staff when it comes to race and ethnicity."

When asked about her ideal, Lourdes explained that she would love to have Stanford University identify people on campus with leadership potential, who have the ability to be influential, to mentor, and move up the ranks. She believes that the University should promote education by subsidizing staff education and perhaps allowing for part-time doctoral work or master's work within the University. Lourdes states that if Stanford is serious and wants to "maintain and keep the best and brightest…this is good incentive. So let's see you putting your money where your mouth is and let's put

something together that we can work towards." Since there is no formal process in place currently, she has been "doing it on [her] own, just talking to people and people of color who are in positions that [she] would want to be in and just asking about what path they took towards getting to where they are."

Annie has been working at Stanford for almost thirty years, so her lifeworld experiences span decades throughout various positions within the University. She shares that throughout the years, whenever she tries to bring up the topic of racism with white colleagues at Stanford, the majority of the time, she is met with a response similar to "Annie I don't know if you misunderstood, because there's no racism at Stanford University. I've never seen it." Annie explains that when she hears that stock answer, she thinks, "[w]ell of course you've never seen it, you're White. White privilege goes a long way." Annie shared stories regarding uncomfortable stares from colleagues and others on campus, she provided the example of whenever someone is directed to her office for admissions or faculty services help,

> …I have people come here White and Black, stand right there [points to her office doorway], take one look at me and go 'Oh no,' she's not the person that you're talking about. You know… she's Black, she couldn't possibly have that kind of knowledge. And so they'll go next door or to reception…before they come back in here to me.

She further explained that once someone comes back, "they would ask me real slow like I was too inept to understand what they were saying, do you know how to reach professor so-and-so?" It is experiences like these that are remembered and brought forth within Annie's narrative and helps expand the horizons of the lifeworld in relation to others. When asked what she would like to see at Stanford University, Annie explained,

> My dream would be more people of color as directors and deans of the schools. More at Stanford University period. I would like to be able to move up within the

74

department, on an equal basis as other people. By my qualifications and not by my color…because I'm sure it was my color that has prevented many opportunities. I have the qualifications to be here or they would have fired me or laid me off…years ago if I wasn't qualified.

I inquired more and asked Annie what she thought this would bring to the field of higher education and she shared that she thought it would open up "…different ways of teaching, of learning…" and thought it was essential since "…there's so many different cultures here, especially in California." It is Annie's narrative that expands the horizons of the lifeworld when she shares her experiences with others. This may enable her to help develop new interpretations into the role race plays in the lives of staff and administrators of color at Stanford University, since "[t]he structures of the lifeworld lay down the forms of intersubjectivity of possible understanding" (Habermas 1989: 171).

Mary Grace Almandarez at University of San Francisco shared her experiences attending a national conference on race and ethnicity, which expanded the horizons of her lifeworld. She was at a presentation that shared statistics on people of color who would be vice presidents or presidents of universities in the United States and the numbers were low and more specifically for her, the Asian-American numbers were extremely low, which Mary Grace shared,

> …given how many Asian-Americans go through higher education. They just don't consider our kind of profession in higher education. If they do, it's likely teaching…then even to translate teaching into a deanship or higher, they're not necessarily coached because they don't have a kind of coaching or social networking that maybe folks in the good old boy networks would have.

Given that there are so few Asian-Americans in higher level administrative positions, Mary Grace shared that when attending meetings and in everyday interactions with colleagues, "I understand when I show up, I show up on the behalf of other people as well." The horizons of her lifeworld were expanded to understand that with such few

numbers of Asian-Americans in administrative leadership positions within higher education, that to some, she would be representing Asian-Americans as a whole cultural group.

When asked to imagine her ideal environment within higher education, Mary Grace shared a different interpretation to what has been the common theme of acceptance and colorblindness. She shared that "…ideally for me [it] would not be a colorblind society, but it would be more of a society that acknowledges the differences that exist." She goes further to explain her answer with the following example,

> …here's the reality…if someone came in here, a Black man came in here, took that bag, walked out, you're not going to say a man who works in Arts and Science took my bag. You're going to say a Black man came in here and took my bag, right? So the reality of difference has to occur, first of all.

By acknowledging the differences, Mary Grace feels the next steps of her ideal world would be people being comfortable with their own identity, "…in order to engage with people who are different from them." She discussed not only ethnic identities, but identities related to class, gender, sexuality, and other cultural categories. Within this imagined world, she related the need for others to self identify with people they relate to culturally and interact with them, so not only interacting with those who are different, but also with those who are the same to help interpret and understand their identities as people. She believes that "…the more opportunities that people have to score the different types of identities, the more they may be open to listen to the narratives of others or even to interact with people who are different from them."

Similarly, Lauren Johnson imagined a world within higher education as having an international type of university system "[w]here everybody has their own culture…and they don't have to assimilate into anything or lose themselves…have all these different

things going on and you have all these wonderful flavors of just different folks." She acknowledged the need for difference and wanted this world to still hold onto some "edginess, where you're able to confront some crap, because…you're never going to have that where it's all humble pie and all that wonderfulness…I think…that's good, because…you need to be reminded that there are people out there who don't think like you."

Ideally, Lauren imagined this university system to be based on skill set and merit versus ethnicity, family background, or people you know; because of her past experiences with race and ethnicity within her current university setting. As she explained, "[a]nd they'll pigeon you into different things that…oh, this will be important to you because you are a Black person. Why can't it just be, this is important to me because I'm a person and not just because I happen to be Black." Lauren said that in her everyday work life, people assume many stereotypical things about her, but she is "more than what you presume for me to be." She shared that "…they are so used to pigeonholing whatever ethnicity you are into a little bubble and they don't want to let you out…they want to keep you in that little stereotype, And in order for you to really grow, I think you need to break out of it." These experiences led Lauren to reinterpret her lifeworld and imagine what ought to be versus what currently is. Through her own personal narratives and interactions with others, she imagines a future where her shared experiences may help others reinterpret the role race plays for staff and administrators of color within academia. As Habermas (1989: 172) states, "[i]n the communicative practice of everyday life, persons do not only encounter one another in the attitude of participants; they also give narrative presentations of events that take place in the context of their lifeworld."

Summary

In Chapter Four, I presented the data collected from my research conversations with the participants of my study from Stanford University and University of San Francisco. The data were identified and presented within primary analysis, as their narratives were the primary focus of the conversations that unfolded. The narratives shared provide others with the opportunity to expand the horizons of their lifeworld and share in the experiences of the text that my research participants have provided through our research conversations. My research participants' narratives helped them re-remember their past and re-imagine their futures within the present conversations we had, which helped create their identities in relation to others. They later discussed what it would take to re-start conversations on race and reach mutual understanding, with some of my participants sharing their experiences with communicative action. The narratives shared and experiences with conversations toward understanding helped expand not only the lifeworld of my participants, but this researcher and those who share in this living text. This data that was yielded, will be interpreted in Chapter Five through the critical hermeneutic theories of narrative identity, communicative action, and lifeworld within secondary analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The research conversations that I had with my research participants provided me with the opportunity to interpret the appropriated text and come to new understandings about the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color. The three theoretical categories I used for this study were narrative identity, communicative action, and lifeworld. The everyday non-hermeneutic language used by my research participants within our conversations, reflected upon the above stated theoretical categories and brought new interpretations to the research issue at hand. From the mimetic narratives shared by my research conversation partners that helped form their narrative identity in relation to others, *to* the need to further the conversation on race through rational discourse and dialogue, the new interpretations and expansion of their lifeworld and those of others, may help make changes and develop new interpretations on understanding the role race plays within the everyday work lives of staff and administrators of color within academia.

Narrative Identity

Life narratives are what Ricoeur (1991: 435) believes to be intertwined with our living lives in relation to others since "…we learn that fiction, particularly narrative fiction, is an irreducible dimension of the understanding of the self." Ricoeur (1991) uses the concept of mimesis to describe how narrative can interpret the world. He defines mimesis as a threefold stage of interpretation. Mimesis$_1$ (prefiguration) looks at the past-present which is our memories and recollections of the past. Mimesis$_2$ (configuration) is the present and what is now. Mimesis$_3$ (refiguration) can be described as the present-

future, where we imagine our future and expectations. When using mimesis to create our narrative identity and share our narrative with others, Ricoeur (1991) describes the use of emplotment to help give narrative temporal order and a place in time. It is emplotment that helps plot out the points of the narrative so both the narrator and other can come to an interpretive understanding. It is through this narrative function that "…the world of fiction leads us to the heart of the real world of action" (Ricoeur 1981: 296). This action "…appears to us as the field of a constructive activity, deriving from the narrative intelligence through which we attempt to recover (rather than impose from without) the narrative identity which constitutes us (Ricoeur 1991: 436)

As my conversation partners shared their ethnic and cultural identities with me, the stories they shared about their ethnic identities through narrative was a "…congruence between historical and fictional narrative on the level of configuration" (Ricoeur 1985: 156). These "narrative modes are preceded by the use of narrative in daily life" (Ricoeur 1985: 156), so when asked by others how they defined their ethnic or cultural identities, the history behind who they identified with as a people group and their own fictive narrative they share with others come into play. As with Keiko who recalls having limited racial and ethnic categories on self-identification questionnaires and choosing "…Black because I feel like based on the color of my skin and my hair, and my features, most people just automatically see Black." Even though she is bi-racial, her past experiences of people always assuming that she was just African-American influenced how she answers on questionnaires with limited choices. Similarly, when both Lourdes and Monica identify as Chicano/Chicana, they are recalling the history of their Mexican people group, reconciling it with who they are today and how they want

others to address them in the future, so their narrative identity of using Chicano/Chicana as a political statement and identifier versus the general ethnic term of Hispanic, empowers them and their narrative when they share it with others. As Ricouer (1988: 246) explains "…the union of history and fiction is the assignment to an individual or a community of a specific identity that we can call their narrative identity."

Narrative identity is always in flux since it "…is not a stable and seamless identity. Just as it is possible to compose several plots on the subject of the same incidents…, so it is always possible to weave different, even opposed plots about our lives" (Ricoeur 1988: 248). These emploted events that construct the narrative identity are in temporal flux and through the mimetic process, my research participants came to share their narratives with me, since "…there is mimesis only where there is 'doing' or 'activity;' and the poetic 'activity' consists precisely in the construction of plots" (Ricoeur 1981: 292). Many of my participants explained how past pre-figured (mimesis$_1$) experiences have helped them configure (mimesis $_2$) and reinterpret negative school experiences and provided them with the refigured (mimesis$_3$) goal to enter the field of higher education to help make positive changes for future students . As Monica shared her narrative, she explained that "…my dissatisfaction with…my student services [experience], kind of culminated in me thinking…I like working with students, I wish I would have had a better advisor…this kind of led me back into higher ed." Similarly, Lourdes entered the field of higher education to help other people of color who struggled in the higher education system, like herself. She explained that "[s]o, I think when I do have an opportunity to speak with them, they feel a little bit more at ease because I can share with them my struggles and growing up and being either first generation or just not

81

being a high achieving student…" As my conversation partners shared their narratives about entering the field of higher education, "…a self is born, taught by cultural symbols, first among which are the stories received in the literary tradition. These stories give unity-not unity of substance but narrative wholeness" (Ricoeur 1991: 437).

As my conversation partners shared their narratives about their everyday work lives, they shared stories about racial discrimination and both positive and negative experiences with mentors and support systems. Both Annie Craft-Kitcheon and Dr. Cora Dupar experienced racial discrimination early in their careers when they tried to apply for jobs that they were qualified for, but didn't have an undergraduate degree which wasn't a requirement in both job postings. They were both told they were qualified, but that they needed a degree to move up. For both positions, they hired Caucasian women with less experience and in one case; one of the Caucasian women didn't even have a degree. These past experiences resulted in both women imagining new futures that included upward mobility, as Dr. Dupar stated "…just that whole thing of not trusting you because you are a person of color… people thinking you can't do the job… even though you don't have the degree, but that is one way of keeping me out and not getting that position." It was through this mimetic process that "the mediation brought about by thinking about history between the horizon of expectation, the transmission of tradition, and the force of the present" (Ricoeur 1988: 260), that created new narrative identities for both women and the need to share with others that education and working 110% is needed to succeed as a person of color working in higher education. Both were able to reach new understandings about themselves and the role race plays in their relationship with others, since "…we look at the already figured world, the take-for-granted world in mimesis$_1$, we

connect this to the new world we want to live in, mimesis$_3$, we see ourselves in different capacities; we see a self enlarged by the appropriation of a proposed world which interpretation unfolds" (Herda 1999: 77).

While the narratives shared by Annie and Dr. Dupar recalled experiences with overt racial discrimination, the use of covert racial discrimination may sometimes blur and be hidden under the guise of cultural insensitivity. Both Keiko and Lauren experienced stereotyping based on the color of their skin and been used to be the "face" of their departments for issues related to diversity or the recruitment of racially categorized diversity applicants. As Lauren shared, "…I've had numerous things where oh, Lauren would you go talk to this group of students, their first time, they don't have any family, and you can probably relate to them." Her processing of these experiences with covert racism through the mimetic process has helped her reinterpret who she is as a person of color within higher education and the need to share these types of stories to ensure that people are aware that discrimination of this type still occurs. It is her life narrative, which Ricoeur (1991: 435) believes to be intertwined with our living lives in relation to others because

> …narrative fiction, is an irreducible dimension of the understanding of self. If it is true that fiction cannot be completed other than in life, and that life cannot be understood other than through stories we tell about it, then we are led to say that a life examined, in the sense borrowed from Socrates, is a life narrated.

The above quote is repeated to re-emphasize the importance of the intertwined relationship between one's narratives being shared with others when creating one's narrative identity. Similarly, Keiko's experience of being occasionally asked to recruit for the athletics department in traditionally high minority category sports like football and basketball has reinterpreted her experience working at Stanford. She explains "I know

what it's for…They want me to recruit because they want those recruits that they were

trying to get, to come to campus to feel like there's another person of color on this

campus." Her recollection of these past experiences and her imagined future to change

this type of behavior, has led her to share her narrative with others, for "the world of

fiction leads us to the heart of the real world of action" (Ricoeur 1981: 296).

With various forms of discrimination recounted through the narratives of my

research conversation partners, many of my conversation partners brought up the need for

support systems. While a few conversation partners were lucky enough to have mentors

of color, a few did not get the chance for mentoring or support from the post-secondary

institutions they worked for. Mary Grace and Monica both recounted positive mentoring

experiences which helped them refigure (mimesis$_3$) their life narrative and imagine the

possibilities for upward mobility in senior management roles within a university. As

Herda (1999: 77) states

> [m]imesis$_3$ represents an act of reading in the relationship between time and
> narrative. It is an intersection of the text and the reader and creates an imaginary
> world we might inhabit. If we cannot imagine how our organizations could
> improve, we can never live in a world different from the current conditions.

Other staff members, such as Lourdes, were not lucky enough to find mentorships from

others or support systems within their institutions. For Lourdes the realities of not having

a mentor or support, have helped her reinterpret her role within Stanford and has

refigured what she wants for her future. This has led her into action, where she is

thinking of pursuing a doctorate and has started volunteering at an educational non-profit

organization as a mentor for youth of color. For it is "…the facts recounted in the past

tense we find projects, expectations, and anticipations by means of which the protagonists

in the narrative are oriented toward their mortal future" (Ricoeur 1992: 163).

84

Communicative Action

Jürgen Habermas' (1984) theory of communicative action incorporates actors/participants in society who are oriented towards reaching common or mutual understanding and coordinate actions through rational argumentation, consensus, and cooperation rather than taking action towards one's personal agenda or goals. Using Habermas' theory of communicative action, narrative may be used to create dialogue and discourse within the public sphere. Habermas (1989: 4) believed that "[o]nly in the light of the public sphere did that which existed become revealed, did everything become visible to all." Therefore, by bringing the conversation into the public sphere, the problems and realities of the role race plays within the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color in higher education may be exposed. This may lead participants towards mutual understanding and shared realities since "acting and speaking subjects can relate to more than only one world, and that when they come to an understanding with one another about something in one world, they base their communication on a commonly supposed system of worlds" (Habermas 1984: 278).

While many of my research conversation partners could not recall having reached mutual understanding through communicative action, when discussing issues about race and ethnicity within higher education, they did discuss what it would take to get to the point where both parties are oriented towards reaching an understanding and meet the validity claims where communicative competence is met. As Habermas (1984: 287) posits,

> Processes of reaching understanding aim at an agreement that meets the conditions of rationally motivated assent to the content of an utterance. A communicatively achieved agreement has a rational basis; it cannot be imposed

by either party, whether instrumentally through intervention in the situation directly or strategically through influencing the decisions of opponents.

Lauren Johnson explained how a safe environment must be achieved to create an atmosphere where conversations may happen and communicative action may occur. When she describes her ideal environment as "…it's got to be a safe environment and it's got to be an environment…it's almost got to be really brutal, like brutal honest…be willing to be open and be willing to listen;" communicative competence is built into that statement.   Herda (1999: 71) illustrates communicative competence when she writes that "…this principle, characterized by the validity claims of comprehensibility, shared knowledge, trust, and shared values, is 'always already' implicitly raised in action orientation to reaching understanding." Communicative competence is essential to re-start the conversation about race in academia and hopefully reach new understandings and interpretations to this issue.

Similarly, when communicative competence is not met, the possibility of mutual understanding cannot be achieved. When Monica Bernal described her lunch with colleagues who consisted of older white males and they inquired about her life outside of work, they were not sincere or truthful about really wanting to understand her life outside of the conversation they were having. She shared her outside work life with her colleagues; as loving hip hop culture and working as a community activist in hopes of engaging their interest and developing new understanding as to who she was as a person of color. As Monica recalled her conversation with the group, she described that there was "…some visible discomfort across the table, just one of those things where it's basically crickets. I had somehow killed the conversation." The validity claims were not met and as Habermas (1984: 287) describes,

> …a group of persons can feel at one in a mood which is so diffuse that it is difficult to identify the propositional content or the intentional object to which it is directed. Such a collective like-mindedness does not satisfy the conditions for the type of agreement in which attempts at reaching understanding terminate…

Since the whole group at lunch was silent and they could not identify with Monica, all attempts at reaching an understanding were ceased and the conversation ended with silence. For this reason, it is important to try and re-start conversations about race within academia to provide new interpretations on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color, so new understandings may develop and experiences as described by Monica, become less frequent and conversations more inclusive.

A few of my research conversation partners did recall instances of reaching mutual understanding through communicative acts. They were able to meet communicative competence with their conversation partners and both parties were oriented towards reaching an understanding versus strategically trying to achieve personal agendas. Habermas (1996: 18) describes this process as

> ...actors in the roles of speaker and hearer attempt to negotiate interpretations of the situation at hand and to harmonize their respective plans with one another through the unrestrained pursuit of illocutionary goals. Naturally, the binding energies of language can be mobilized to coordinate action plans only if the participants suspend the objectivating attitude of an observer, along with the immediate orientation to personal success, in favor of the performative attitude of a speaker who wants to reach an understanding with a second person about something in the world.

Mary Grace described her conversation with a white colleague regarding service learning, where both parties reached an understanding about community. As Mary Grace described, "…we finally came to the understanding that community isn't just geographical. That community encompasses people who share common interests, people who have a common culture, and for folks of color, it could be a very different." By

reaching an understanding that service learning within communities means different things for people of color they came to reinterpret how service learning should be defined versus what has traditionally been defined as service learning within their student services offices.

Habermas (1984: 286) defines the process of mutual understanding as "[r]eaching understanding is considered to be a process of reaching agreement among speaking and acting subjects." By reaching this understanding, Mary Grace and her conversation partner were able to reinterpret what service learning means and perhaps at a later time, work towards reinterpreting service learning protocols for future terms within their university. The process of rational discourse within their conversation, lead to both parties reinterpreting what they thought they knew, since "[a]rgumentation plays an important role in learning processes as well" (Habermas 1984: 18). Through reaching mutual understanding, "…acting and speaking subjects can relate to more than only one world, and that when they come to an understanding with one another about something in one world, they base their communication on a commonly supposed system of worlds" (Habermas 1984: 278).

It is through mutual understanding that potential social change or action may occur. Reinterpretations about the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within higher education may occur if "…we are regarding the communicative acts with the help of which speakers and hearers come to an understanding about something as a mechanism for coordinating actions" (Habermas 1984: 288). Keiko Price described how she was able to have an honest conversation about race in academia and staffing issues within the athletics department with a

88

colleague. She and her colleague were able to come to a new understanding about how to get more people of color in positions of power within higher education, which resulted in her working towards that goal, as she stated, "… I'm thinking of getting a doctoral degree, so I can be one of those people in positions of power. So at some point it gets to a point where somebody has to make it happen. So why not be the one." As Habermas (1984: 330) posits, "[i]n addition to the level of acts of communication (that is, speech), we bring in the level of communicative action (that is, the coordination of the plans of individual participants)."

By reaching new understandings about the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color, new interpretations about this issue may help enact change. Habermas (1984: 342) posits, "[o]nly with the conceptual framework of communicative action do we gain a perspective from which the process of societal rationalization appears as contradictory from the start." It is through communicative action that we may reinterpret societal views about race within academia; enabling new understandings with others to work towards changes in the lifeworld.

Lifeworld

Habermas (1989: 170) posits that the lifeworld is "represented by a culturally transmitted and linguistically organized stock of interpretive patterns." The concepts of the lifeworld are "linked with everyday concepts that are, to begin with, serviceable only for the narrative presentation for historical events and social circumstances" (Habermas 1985: 119). Habermas (1989: 171) further explains that "[t]he lifeworld is, so to speak, the transcendental site where speaker and hearer meet, where they can reciprocally raise claims that their utterances fit the world (objective, social, or subjective), and where they

can criticize and confirm those validity claims, settle their disagreements, and arrive at agreements."

Recounting her experiences at Stanford, an Asian-American employee described the work culture at Stanford as elitist with the majority of the staff being Stanford alums and White, "…either middle-class or upper-class or aspire to be upper-class." The lifeworld experienced by this employee is what Habermas (1985: 130) explains as the"… province of reality which the wide-awake and normal adult simply takes for granted in the attitude of common sense." She knows that if she wants to move up within Stanford, she must assimilate into the culture, since "[t]he lifeworld forms the indirect context of what is said, discussed, addressed in a situation" (Habermas 1985: 131). While understanding the need to assimilate with the Stanford culture, this Asian-American staff member realizes that "…even if you do assimilate or try to adopt their way of being, you're still hit with a glass ceiling." This reality within her lifeworld "…always remains in the background. It is 'the unquestioned ground of everything given in [her] experience, and the unquestionable frame in which all the problems [she has] to deal with are located" (Habermas 1985: 131). As a result, she realizes that if she wants to move up, she will need to conform and keep silent about any racial injustices, since as she described "…they're not going to necessarily want to be challenged with unfairness of race issues…" While the realities of upward mobility within her lifeworld confine her everyday interactions, she hopes that her participation in this study and narrative can help reinterpret the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions. As Habermas (1989: 172) explains, her narrative is important

In the communicative practice of everyday life, persons do not only encounter one another in the attitude of participants; they also give narrative presentations of events that take place in the context of their lifeworld. Narration is a specialized form of constative speech that serves to describe sociocultural events and objects. Actors base their narrative presentations on a lay concept of the 'world,' in the sense of the everyday world or lifeworld, which defines the totality of states of affairs that can be reported in true stories.

It is her narrative that "not only serves trivial needs for mutual understanding among members trying to coordinate their common tasks; it also has a function in the self-understanding of persons" (Habermas 1989: 172).

Lourdes shared her frustrations at Stanford University due to the lack of opportunities for staff of color. In her lifeworld, there are "…no conversations going on about the composition of staff when it comes to race and ethnicity." She wishes to advance her educational level to the doctoral level, but does not see opportunities within Stanford to address her needs. She imagines a new world within Stanford, where the university promotes education for staff by subsidizing education and allowing part-time graduate level work within the University's programs. As she states, it would help "maintain and keep the best and brightest..." This future would not only include herself, but other people of color trying to move up the ranks at Stanford. Sharing her narrative and lifeworld experiences, "…ensures that newly arising situations are connected up with existing situations in the world in the dimension of historical time: it secures for succeeding generations the acquisition of generalized competencies for action and sees to it that individual life histories are in harmony with collective forms of life" (Habermas 1989: 176). Furthermore, since Lourdes has limited opportunities and recognition for promotion within Stanford, she has been speaking with other people of color in positions that she would want to be in and asking them what path they took, thus sharing lifeworld

experiences. As Habermas (1989: 172) explains "…communicative action serves to transmit and renew cultural knowledge; under the aspect of coordinating action, it serves social integration and the establishment of solidarity." So by having conversations about race and its role in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color, the horizons of the lifeworld expand and renew and reinterpret cultural knowledge within our society when dealing with issues about race and ethnicity.

For Annie, working at Stanford University has provided her with many lifeworld experiences to share with others and work towards mutual understanding. Her experiences with racism and subsequent denial by Caucasian colleagues who believe she has misunderstood situations because "…there's no racism at Stanford;" her past experience of being discouraged from applying for higher positions has made her reinterpret her lifeworld to one where she can imagine that she could "…be able to move up within the department, on an equal basis as other people. By my qualifications and not by my color…" This encouraged her to complete her undergraduate degree and share her narrative with others to reinterpret the lifeworld to include equity for people of color working in higher education, since "[c]ommunicative actors are always moving within the horizon of their lifeworld; they cannot step outside of it. As interpreters, they themselves belong to the lifeworld, along with their speech acts" (Habermas 1989: 171).

When Mary Grace discussed her experience attending a national conference on race and ethnicity and how the statistics presented showed a disproportionately low number of ethnic minorities that would populate senior level positions in post-secondary institutions, the horizons of her lifeworld expanded. This new information helped her gain new understanding and expanded the borders of the lifeworld, since "[e]very new

92

situation appears in a lifeworld composed of a cultural stock of knowledge that is 'always already' familiar" (Habermas 1989: 171). The structural components of the lifeworld involve culture, society, and personality, in which each plays a vital role in maintaining the lifeworld, so for Mary Grace, the new statistics about minorities reaching senior level positions in post-secondary institutions, expanded the horizons of her lifeworld, while reinterpreting what it means for her as an individual within her everyday life. As she describes her life after the conference, "I understand when I show up, I show up on the behalf of other people as well" since knowing the statistics on people of color in senior level positions within higher education and herself being an Assistant Dean, she knows she is representing other cultural groups being one of the few to make it to her administrative level.

Mary Grace shared her ideal for the world of higher education in terms of improvement for people of color and described a world where the reality of difference does exist, but where people were comfortable with their own identity, "…in order to engage with people who are different from them." She related the need for other s to self-identify with people they relate to culturally and interact with them, not only with those who are different, but also with those who are the same. Mary Grace further explained that "…the more opportunities that people have to score the different types of identities, the more they may be open to listen to the narratives of others or even to interact with people who are different from them." This imagined world of what ought to be versus what currently is, may help bring about new interpretations about race within higher education since

> [t]he socialization of members of a lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations
> are connected up with existing situations in the world in the dimension of

historical time; it secures for succeeding generations the acquisition of
generalized competences for action and sees to it that individual life histories are
in harmony with collective forms of life. Interactive capacities and styles of life
are measured by the responsibility of persons (Habermas 1989:176).

It is this imagined world and her own shared experiences that Mary Grace forms the

horizons of her lifeworld and hopes to assist in developing new understandings and

reinterpretations on the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of

color.

Similarly, Lauren shared her narrative and imagined world within higher

education, in which difference was the norm and where one's staff or administrative

place within a university system was based on skill set and merit versus ethnicity and

stereotypes. She described her past experiences working in higher education within her

lifeworld as, "…they are so used to pigeonholing whatever ethnicity you are into a little

bubble and they don't want to let you out…they want to keep you in that little

stereotype…" Her battles in trying to change how people perceive her as a person of

color working in higher education and her efforts to try and help people understand that

not all African American people come from lower socio-economic conditions has shaped

the horizons of her lifeworld. It is her experiences and narrative that she wishes to share

with others to help reinterpret what role race plays in the lives of staff and administrators

of color within higher education, since "[i]n the communicative practice of everyday life,

persons do not only encounter one another in the attitude of participants; they also give

narrative presentations of events that take place in the context of their lifeworld"

(Habermas 1989: 172). For every lifeworld narrative shared by staff and administrators

of color working within higher education , "…the horizons of a given situation opens up

access to a further complex of meaning, which, while it calls for explication, is already

intuitively familiar" (Habermas 1985: 133). This may in turn expand the horizons of the lifeworld to be more inclusive and understanding about the experiences that people of color have faced working within higher education, since "…participants in communication encounter one another in a horizon of unrestricted possibilities of mutual understanding" (Habermas 1989: 185).

Summary

Chapter Five provides a secondary analysis of the data within the framework of the research categories selected to guide my study. The data were analyzed using critical hermeneutic theory to interpret the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within post-secondary institutions. Through the shared narratives of my research participants and the theoretical categories used in my study, new possible interpretations to the role race and ethnicity may play within higher education institutions may restart the conversation on race and may help develop just and fair institutional policies. In Chapter Six, I will present my findings, thoughts on the research process, implications of this study, and possible opportunities for further research.

CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, RESEARCH FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

<u>Summary</u>

This study carried out a participatory hermeneutic inquiry involving collaborative research conversations with participants who wished to share their narratives about the role race plays in their everyday lives as staff and administrators of color working within post-secondary institutions. Through the use of primary and secondary analysis using a critical hermeneutic theoretical framework, the narratives shared became a living text that may bring new interpretations to the role race plays for staff and administrators working in higher education. I initially completed my pilot study in fall 2008 and found there was sparse research in the area of staff and administrators of color working within higher education. My hope is that this study will add to the research literature on race relations when looking at race and ethnicity issues within higher education administration. As the recent research literature suggests, new and developing interpretations of race may encourage us to explore and challenge conventional notions of what social justice is and how it plays within organizational life.

My research conversations provided the foundation for primary and secondary analysis for my study. This analysis found that race plays an important part of an individual's narrative identity. Since race is a socially constructed phenomenon and is culturally embedded within our society (Sarich and Miele 2004) it is part of the everyday lives of my participants and ingrained within the stories they shared. The sharing of narrative with others may expand the horizons of one's lifeworld and may bring forth conversations toward reaching understanding through communicative action. The experiences that my participants recalled and shared provided new insights and

interpretations on race and race relations and may encourage new developments on staff retention, satisfaction, and the creation of socially just policies within higher education organizations. As narratives about discriminatory practices, cultural insensitivities, and lack of institutional support are shared, the lifeworld of others may expand and conversations re-started about the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color in institutions of higher education.

The research process of my participatory hermeneutic research inquiry allowed me the opportunity to work collaboratively with participants. This provided me with the possibility for interpretation of the data collected, in which both the researcher and research participant emplot shared narratives and experiences into a living text that is appropriated by the researcher and shared through the lifeworld with others. This allowed participants to share their stories and take the research to areas of conversation that may not have been thought of by this researcher. While I provided guiding questions for the research, the stories shared by my participants sometimes provided new insights and further developed the theoretical research categories I used and led to new ideas and thoughts on the role race plays in their lives.

In the following section, I will share my findings from this participatory research study. These findings may restart the conversation on race within post-secondary institutions and provide the opportunity to reinterpret race and race relations within the staff and administrative framework of institutions of higher education and perhaps other frameworks within American society.

<center>**<u>Findings</u>**</center>

Through research conversations with my participants and analysis of the text through a critical hermeneutic theoretical lens, my interpretation of the research findings are analyzed through the following threads of discussion: (1) Pre-figured Lives Shared Through Narrative, (2) A Lifeworld of Marginalization, (3) Restarting Conversations Toward Refigured Futures of Understanding.

<center>**Pre-figured Lives Shared Through Narrative**</center>

Many of my research participants shared stories of past experiences with discrimination, tokenism, and cultural insensitivities. These experiences shaped their narrative identities and their everyday lives working within higher education. The following findings shared through their narratives provide a text for one to experience and reinterpret within their own lifeworld in relation to others.

<u>Categorized Labels</u>

The participants of this study fall under racial and ethnic categories that were created by society and culturally embedded within the fibers of our everyday lives. The narratives shared by my participants provided examples of how people of color should not be limited as to how to define their individual racial and ethnic identities. Each individual's narrative identity tells a different story as to why they identify with particular racial and ethnic categories that are not listed under the Federal racial and ethnic guidelines that many organizations and agencies use as identifiers. The individuals in my study defined themselves through socio-political identities and racial/ethnic categories that were relevant to their individual pasts and how they wish to see themselves in the

<center>98</center>

future. It is imperative to keep their individuality intact as to share the stories that helped create their on-going narrative identities as citizens within U.S. society.

Informal Discrimination

Many of my research participants experienced informal or covert discriminatory acts when applying for positions of upward mobility or when they interacted with others within their respective departments within their universities. For many, their skill set was beyond what was required of the positions they applied for, but they were overlooked for the positions due to "preferred" requirements to keep them out of the position that was usually given to Caucasian counterparts or those with less skill and education. While not an overt form of discrimination, the underlying discriminatory acts to keep many people of color from achieving upward mobility is an issue that occurs and needs to be brought to light through the narratives shared by those who have experienced or seen it. It may help break barriers that keep a glass ceiling on the upward mobility of staff and administrators or color working in post-secondary institutions.

Tokenism

The narratives shared by my research conversation partners contained stories of tokenism where they were asked to be the "face" of diversity for their respective departments to address recruitment needs and diversity initiatives. In order to recruit more students of color for academics and in some cases athletics, many staff and administrators of color were requested to help recruit candidates with the underlying assumption that being a person of color, the potential recruits could relate to them and feel more comfortable with a decision to attend their university.

In other circumstances, the narratives shared brought to light that sometimes being the only person of a certain racial or ethnic category in a position of power, places the burden of being the sole representative of one's race or ethnicity. There is scrutiny for every action or inaction one takes and the pressure to represent one's race/ethnicity in a positive light. To increase the number of people of color in senior management positions would alleviate some of this pressure and burden, but the statistical realities of the low number of people of color to actually achieve such a position, made some of my research participants strive harder to achieve higher educational levels and try to open that door for others, if not for themselves.

<u>Cultural Insensitivity</u>

Instances of cultural insensitivity abounded in the narratives shared. From examples of stereotyping people of color based on negative media representation to attributing one's action towards an entire racial or ethnic people group. Many participants felt that negative stereotypes pigeonholed them and prevented them from achieving upward mobility within their respective universities. These stereotypes and cultural insensitivities were placed on my research participants by co-workers, supervisors, and colleagues who may not have experienced people of color from various backgrounds and related to them as individuals versus a pre-judged people group.

A Lifeworld of Marginalization

The participants of this study shared their narratives and lifeworld experiences working within higher education, as being one of marginalization. Their stories about a lack of recognition for achievements and contributions, a lack of support for further education and retention, and the prevalence of keeping silence about racial and ethnic

issues may be representative of other staff and administrators of color working in higher education.

Recognition

The staff and administrators of color that I conversed with shared that many times they felt that the contributions they add to the organization were not recognized. As people of color, they revealed stories about their past experiences in school and how they were able to use their experiences, good or bad, to help other students and colleagues achieve success. The life experiences that these staff and administrators of color remember and share with others, is not valued or given recognition when looking at promotion or valued skill set.   It is often overlooked and not seen as added value to the organization. By sharing their narratives, my participants may expand the horizons of the lifeworld and may help reinterpret what staff and administrators of color may bring to the table and benefit the larger university community.

Support

The lack of support was another theme that resonated in the research conversations with participants. Many expressed the lack of support to promote diversity and keep the effort on going. The universities that these participants worked for provided limited events and discussions opportunities to help support diversity from a staff and administrative level. As many participants shared, the organizational effort was that of a diversity day or training session with no follow-up or on-going effort to engrain diversity within the organizational culture. If training and value for diversity was an ongoing effort, the need to specialized days may diminish and the value of difference and acceptance, may bring about a more socially just institutional community.

Other participants discussed the lack of support for staff and administrators of color with regard to internal opportunities and education. If universities want to keep the best and brightest working within their institutions, they need to look at staff and provide them with educational and mentorship opportunities that would help with retention and job satisfaction. Many staff and administrators of color did not have mentorship support or the opportunity to further their education at their home institution (particularly at Stanford University). The need for support both educationally and psychologically to navigate individual or collective goals was reiterated by many participants who wished for formal mentorship programs and support for their educational aspirations.

Silence

In order to move up within the organization, many staff and administrators of color felt they needed to keep silent about racial or ethnic issues. Many felt that they could not challenge racial injustices or bring up unfair practices because either no one believed that these injustices existed or bringing up these issues would prevent their upward mobility within the university. At other times, keeping silent about racial and ethnic issues was preferred by Caucasian colleagues, in order to keep the pretense of politeness and acceptance of diversity alive within the work environment. If some of these issues were brought up, it was met with either disbelief or uncomfortable silence where the staff person of color who brought the issue up, was left with the burden of concrete proof or to steer the conversation in a direction where others may feel comfortable enough to participate. There is a need to break the silence and allow conversations to restart, so that uncomfortable silences become less common and realities

of staff and administrator's lifeworld come to light and expand the horizons of the lifeworld shared with others.

Conversations Toward Refigured Futures of Understanding

My participants shared their narratives in the hope to re-start the conversation on race within academia. Too often the stories of discrimination and cultural insensitivity abounded in the conversations I had. It is through the narratives of others that a text is created and may form new understandings and interpretations on issues of race for staff and administrators working within institutions of higher education.

Environments for Conversation

In order to re-start the conversation on race within academia, many of the participants shared that a safe environment was essential for such a conversation to happen. An environment where participants were oriented towards truly reaching new understanding without malice or pretense; where participants may be honest with their feelings, fears, questions, and answers, to get to the heart of the issues at hand. This ideal environment may lead to new understanding and interpretations to the role race plays in the lives of staff and administrators of color and may lead to new ways in which to address the needs of individuals and the larger organization.

Mutual Understanding

The participants who were able to have conversations that were oriented towards reaching understanding were able to reinterpret their issues and come up with new solutions. From reinterpreting definitions and one's place within society, the communicative acts that helped reconfigure the issues discussed helped address both individual and larger issues that were communicated. The examples shared by my

participants helped show how communicative action and conversations toward understanding could help reinterpret issues of race within academia and bring about potential changes that address the needs of all aspects of organizational life and create socially just institutions.

Implications

The findings from my research study suggest that conversations about race/ethnicity and its role in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color need to re-start. A discourse on race may lead to new interpretations of the issue and potentially expand the lifeworld of others who hear and share the narratives brought to life in this study. While a dialogue on race and ethnicity may start on any level, implications exist for leaders within higher education and those who are developing and implementing policy. This may help shift organizational cultures within institutions of higher education and build socially just communities within academia at institutions across the United States.

Implications for Institutional Leadership

Leaders in post-secondary institutions may use this text to help reinterpret how race and issues of diversity are viewed on the staff and administrative level. The narratives shared may bring into light the need for more transparent hiring practices and promotability from within the organization. Viewing diversity as an asset and valuing contributions from staff and administrators of color may open up the dialogue to have honest conversations about the experiences and issues that many staff and administrators endure and face. As leaders within institutions of higher education, there is a need to bring up issues of diversity and peel back the façade of polite acceptance to delve deep

into issues that lie in the underbelly of the organizational life that many people choose to ignore to keep the hegemonic structures within society going.

To keep the voices of the marginalized at bay creates an environment of hostility and moral bankruptcy, so as leaders within higher education institutions, there must be an effort to promote diversity not only a few days a year, but celebrate and promote diversity within the on-going daily structures of the university. This may lead to new understandings about race and ethnicity, as well as provide opportunities for those staff and administrators of color who have been traditionally marginalized to have a voice and potentially take on positions of leadership that may shift an organizational culture from one with a polite veil of tepid acceptance of diversity to one that is truly dedicated to acceptance of individuals and all aspects of cultural diversity. Through the use of on-going training programs similar to those used for sexual harassment, the shift in culture may occur and lead institutions towards social justice initiatives within everyday organizational life.

Implications for Institutional Policy

The findings of this study may help develop and implement socially just policies that are beneficial to all staff and administrators within a university. Through the sharing of narratives from staff and administrators of color, a voice is given to those who have been traditionally marginalized both within society and within organizational policy making structures. Providing a text for others to appropriate within the horizons of the lifeworld may provide differing opinions and view points on the policy development level and provide more inclusive policy development models. By giving a voice to the those who have been traditionally marginalized, it may create socially just policies that

take into consideration the underrepresented and may help minimize any unintentional consequences or actions that may occur during the implementation process of policy making.

Within the implementation structure of policy design, the inclusion of others such as staff and administrators of color, may help with policy buy-in and lead to future policies of inclusion and social justice. The inclusion of other viewpoints may lead to reinterpretations on how policy is implemented or how issues are viewed. If mutual understanding is reached within the policy design structure, the opportunities for cultural growth and community building may occur, which may lead to a more culturally competent university and community that is inclusive and respectful of difference and cultural and individual identities. The opportunities to reinterpret what is, versus what ought to be, may create a newly interpreted lifeworld that staff and administrators of color may live within, while working in post-secondary institutions.

Recommendations for Future Research

During my research study, opportunities for future research surfaced with regard to areas of diversity and staff and administrators of color working within higher education. The following four recommendations for future research may provide more depth to the research literature and may promote socially just institutions of higher education.

1. Diversity Initiatives

Limited diversity inclusion and initiatives within universities were brought up by many of my research participants, so a possible study into the inclusion of diversity initiatives in everyday organizational life may benefit institutions of higher education and

add to the research literature. Celebrations of diversity once a year or for limited times a year is not enough, so there needs to be a research inquiry on how to incorporate diversity within organizational structures to help create socially just institutions of higher education. Studies into this area may provide insight on job satisfaction, retention, and the overall quality of organizational life in post-secondary institutions.

2. Inclusive Policy Design Models

Related to diversity initiatives is further study into inclusive policy design models within organizations. Policies that affect the whole population within post-secondary institutions and in particular those who have been traditionally marginalized should be inclusive to meet the needs of all who are affected. Designing and researching policy development models that provide a voice to all, may provide socially just policies within higher education. While there is abundant literature within the area of policy design and implementation, looking specifically at policies of diversity within higher education organizations may strengthen the broad scope of this research area.

3. Hiring and Promotion Practices

Another area of study within post-secondary institutions is looking at institutional hiring and promotion practices, with special focus on issues of race and ethnicity. Gathering data and narratives on the hiring and promotion experiences faced by staff and administrators of color may lead to new interpretations to the hiring practices at universities across the United States and may lead to changes in policy development within human resources and university life. Additionally, data gathered and analyzed within this area of study may add to the research literature and look at institutional issues

of social justice through a critical hermeneutic lens, which may provide new understandings and interpretations to the issues at hand.

4. Retention and Attrition

Following along the lines of institutional hiring practices, a possible study into the retention rate of staff and administrators of color may add to the research within higher education. Looking at possible formal mentoring programs that promote retention for staff and administrators of color or even all staff and administrators may lead to new understandings on employee retention and best practices within institutions of higher education. Through the sharing of narratives and using a participatory research inquiry framework, the data may provide new interpretations about employee satisfaction, productivity, and what may retain an employee for numerous years of service.

While these areas of research were brought to my attention through the research conversations I had with my participants, the areas of possible study I listed above may yield further recommendations for future research for others in the research field.

Reflections

My journey throughout this research process started with my own personal experiences and memories of my life working within institutions of higher education for over fifteen years. As a person of color who has worked at various levels as a staff or administrator in higher education my lifeworld experiences and stories shared with others, brought out a passion to explore areas of race relations, social justice, and the field of higher education. What led me down the path of participatory hermeneutic research inquiry started with my first course in critical hermeneutics that expanded the horizons of my lifeworld to include theories developed by Ricoeur and Habermas that spoke to the

issues I was most interested in researching. These theorists opened new worlds of understanding and interpretation that led me to the research project I have just completed.

Looking back and remembering the conversations I had with other staff and administrators of color, the camaraderie that I felt with all my research participants and the stories shared drove the passion to create a text where their voices and stories may be heard by others. The narratives they provided give the reader a glimpse into their world and create a text that others may appropriate and interpret into their own lifeworld. My hope is that their narratives may provide others with new interpretations to the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color and re-start the conversation to reach new understandings to this issue.

Bibliography

Blank, Rebecca M., Dabady, Marilyn, and Citro, Constance F, eds.
  2004   National Research Council: Measuring Racial Discrimination. Washington, DC:
        The National Academies Press.

Durkheim, Emile
  1893   The Division of Labor in Society. Trans. George Simpson. New York: The Free
        Press.

Denhardt, Janet V. and Denhardt, Robert B.
  2003   The New Public Service: Serving, not Steering. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Franklin, John Hope
  2005   The Two Worlds of Race: A Historical View. Daedalus 134.4 (Fall 2005): 118
        (16): 118-133.

Fraser Wyche, Karen and Browne Graves, Sherryl
  1992   Minority Women in Academia: Access and Barriers to Professional
        Participation. Psychology of Women Quarterly (16): 429-437.

Guglielmo, Thomas A. and Lewis, Earl
  2003   Changing Racial Meanings: Race and Ethnicity in the United States, 1930-1964.
        In Race and Ethnicity in America. Ronald H. Bayor, ed. Pp. 167-192. New
        York: Columbia University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen
  1984   The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1 Reason and the
        Rationalization of Society. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon
        Press.

  1985   The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 2 Lifeworld and System: A
        Critique of Functionalist Reason. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon
        Press.

  1989   Jürgen Habermas on Society and Politics a Reader. Edited Steven Seidman,
        Boston: Beacon Press.

  1989   The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category
        of Bourgeois Society. Trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence.
        Cambridge: The MIT Press. [original in German 1962]

  1996 Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and
        Democracy. Trans. William Rehg. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Herda, Ellen A.
  1999   Research Conversations and Narrative/A Critical Hermeneutic Orientation In
            Participatory Inquiry. Westport, London: Praeger.

Hu-Dehart, Evelyn
  1996 P.C. and the Politics of Multiculturalism in Higher Education. *In* Race. Steven
            Gregory and Roger Sanjek, eds. Pp. 243-256. New Jersey: Rutgers University
            Press.

Jones, Betty B.
  1993   Working with the "Only One" in the Division. Paper presented at the Annual
            International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other
            Institutional Leaders, Phoenix, February 17-20.

Kidwell, Clara Sue and Velie, Alan
  2005 Native American Studies. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

León, David and Nevarez, Carlos
  2006   Promoting Latino Faculty and Senior-Level Administrators. Declarative
            Statement presented at the California Chicano-Latino Intersegmental
            Convocation Policy Summit, Sacramento, October 3-4.

Meagher, Timothy J.
   2003   Racial and Ethnic Relations in America, 1965-2000. *In* Race and Ethnicity in
            America. Ronald H. Bayor, ed. Pp. 167-192. New York: Columbia University
            Press.

Mirza, Heidi Safia
   2006   Transcendence over Diversity: Black women in the Academy. Policy Futures in
            Education, 4(2): 101-113.

Montagu, Ashley
  2000   The Concept of Race in the Human Species in the Light of Genetics. *In* The
            Idea of Race. Robert Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lott, eds. Pp. 100-107.
            Indianapolis: Hackett Publications (Original in 1941).

Omni, Michael and Winant, Howard
  2000   Racial Formation in the United States. In The Idea of Race. Robert
            Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lott, eds. Pp. 181-212. Indianapolis: Hackett
            Publications (Original in 1994).

Ortiz, Flora I.
  1998   Career Patterns of People of Color in Academia. *In* The Multicultural Campus:
            Strategies for Transforming Higher Education. Leonard A. Valverde and
            Louis A. Castenell, Jr. eds. Pp. 121-136. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Pollock, Mica
  2004   Colormute. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Reyes, Maria de la Luz and Halcón, John
  1997 Racism in Academia: The Old Wolf Revisted. *In* Latinos and Education. Antonia
            Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Hengry Guitíerrez, eds. Pp. 423-438. New
            York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul
  1981   Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Trans. John B. Thompson.
            Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

  1985   Time and Narrative Vol. 2. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer,
            Chicago: University of Chicago Press

  1988   Time and Narrative Vol. 3. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer,
            Chicago: University of Chicago Press

  1991   A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination. Edited by Mario J Valdes.
            Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

  1992   Oneself as Another. Trans. K. Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

  2004   Memory, History, Forgetting. Trans. K. Blamey and D. Pellauer,
            Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosaldo, Renato
  1996   Race and Other Inequalities: The Borderlands of Arturo Isla's *Migrant Souls*.
            In Race. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, eds. Pp. 213-225. New
            Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Sandos, James A. and Cross, Harry E.

  1983   "National Development and International Labor Migrations: Mexico 1940-1965."
            Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 18, No. 1 (January, 1983), pp. 43-60.

Sarich, Vincent and Miele, Frank
  2004   Race: The Reality of Human Differences. Colorado: Westview Press.

Schaefer, Richard T.
   2004   Racial and Ethnic Groups. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Smedley, Audrey
  1999   Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview. Colorado:
            Westview Press.

Takagi, Dana A.
  1996   Post-Civil Rights Politics and Asian American Identity: Admissions and Higher
             Education. *In* Race. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, eds. Pp. 229-242. New
             Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Takaki, Ronald
  2008   A Different Mirror: A history of Multicultural America. New York: Back Bay
             Books.

Trueba, Enrique (Henry) T.
  1998   Race and Ethnicity in Academia. *In* The Multicultural Campus: Strategies for
             Transforming Higher Education. Leonard A. Valverde and Louis A. Castenell,
             Jr. eds. Pp. 71-94. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Valverde, Leonard A. ed.
  1997   Future Strategies and Actions: Creating Multicultural Higher Education
             Campuses. *In* The Multicultural Campus: Strategies for Transforming Higher
             Education. Leonard A. Valverde and Louis A. Castenell, Jr. eds. Pp. 19-29.
             Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Wing, Bob
  2005   "Crossing Race and Nationality: The Racial Formation of Asian Americans,
             1852-1965." *Monthly Review*, Vol. 57, No. 7 (December 2005), pp. 1-18.

Web Resources

Barrett, Devlin
  2009   Holder: US a nation of cowards on racial matters. Electronic document,
             http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090218/ap_on_go_ca_st_pe/holder_race
               accessed March 6, 2009.

CBS and Associated Press
  2008   FBI Probes Possible Obama Death Threat. Electronic document,
              http://www.cbs.news.com/stories/2008/08/25/national/main4383593.shtml,
                accessed November 14, 2008.

Espinoza, P. (producer)
  1999   The Border [Television Series] San Diego, CA: KPBS. Electronic
               document, http://www.pbs.org/jpbs/theborder/index.html accessed March 1,
                 2009.

Vogel, R.D.
  2004   Stolen Birthright: The U.S. Conquest and Exploitation of the Mexican People.
               From http://www.houstonculture.org/hispanic/conquest5.html

APPENDIX A
IRBPHS Approval E-mail

April 2, 2009

Dear Mr. Gamez:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS)
at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for human
subjects approval regarding your study.

Your application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #09-024).
Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that
time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file
a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation
(including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS.
Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must
be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, EdD, ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
----
IRBPHS University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building - 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu
----
http://www.usfca.edu/humansubjects/

APPENDIX B
University of San Francisco
Letter of Invitation and Research Questions

Participant's Name and Title
Company or Organization
Address

Date

Dear Mr. /Ms. /Dr:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the exploration of my dissertation topic. As you know, I am a doctoral student in the department of Organization and Leadership at University of San Francisco. My dissertation involves a hermeneutic approach to finding new interpretations on the study of race and its role in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color within higher education. The research involves sustained conversations with a consortium of working professionals in the field in order to open up new avenues and approaches to the research problem.

I am inviting my conversation partners to explain how they approach my research topic in the practice of their everyday work lives, including their motivations, observations, and stories of their own personal journey. By engaging in such conversations, I hope that this research will influence post-secondary institutions into re-examining existing polices and create socially just institutions.

In additions to the opportunity to share ideas, I request your permission to record and transcribe our conversations. By signing the consent form, our conversations will act as data for the analysis of the research topic at hand. Once transcribed, I will provide you a copy of our conversation for your perusal. You may add or delete any section of the conversation during the research process. After I receive your approval, I will use our conversation to support my analysis. The data that you contribute is not held confidential.

While the conversations and transcripts are collaborative, the writing that comes from them is the researcher's product, and may include some editing by the respondent. By signing the consent form, you acknowledge that you have been given complete and clear information about the research and that you have the option to make the decision at the outset about whether or not to participate. You have the option to withdraw at any time without any adverse consequences.

Bellow, you will find a series of proposed questions. These questions are primarily for use as guidelines to direct our conversation. My hope is that our conversation provides an opportunity for us to learn something together through the exploration of the topic I described.

Reflecting on your experience, please consider the following questions:

1. How do you identify your cultural/ethnic background?

2. What do you think people of color experience working in the field of higher education on a staff/administrative level? If you have any stories, please feel free to share them

3. Looking over your career in higher education, has there been any moments where you had a dialogue with someone about race in academia with both you and the other coming to a new/mutual understating in regards to the reality of race? If so, please share your story. If not, what do you think it would take for such a conversation/dialogue to occur?

4. If someone asked you to share your narrative/story as a person of color in higher education, how would you explain it to them?

5. Imagine you are in the public sphere and given the opportunity to freely discuss your experiences as a person of color in higher education, what would you say and bring to the table if both you and the other were geared toward reaching mutual understanding? Any thoughts or ideas on changing the relationship?

6. If you could imagine an ideal environment or new reality within the world of higher education, please describe what it would be

Again, I thank you for your willingness to meet. Please contact me at <deleted> or e-mail me at <deleted> if you have any further questions. I look forward to seeing you soon.

Sincerely,

Francisco Gamez

Researcher, Doctoral Student
University of San Francisco
School of Education
Department of Organization and Leadership

APPENDIX C
University of San Francisco
Letter of Confirmation

Date

Participant's Name and Title
Company or Organization
Address

Dear Mr. / Ms. / Dr:

I would like to sincerely thank you for the opportunity to have a conversation with you exploring the role race plays in the everyday lives of staff and administrators of color. I am confirming our meeting on _____. Please let me know if you need to change our arranged date, time, or place of meeting.

With your permission, I will tape record our conversation, transcribe the recordings into a written text, and submit it to you for review. I would like to discuss our conversation again and include any follow-up thoughts and comments you might desire. Please know that data for this research are not confidential and will be used in the dissertation and any subsequent publications.

The exchange of ideas in conversation is the premise of participatory research. This process encourages you to comment upon, add to, or delete portions of the transcripts. In addition, this process allows you the opportunity to reflect upon our conversation, and possibly gain new insights on the research topic. Only after you have approved the transcript, will I proceed to analyze the text of our conversation.

Again, I thank you for your generosity in volunteering your time and energy for this research conversation. I look forward to meeting with you as well as to our conversation.

Sincerely,

Francisco Gamez

Researcher, Doctoral Student
University of San Francisco
School of Education
Department of Organization and Leadership

APPENDIX D
University of San Francisco
Research Participants

Research Participant	Job Title	Post Secondary Institution
Dr. Cora Dupar	Assistant Director of Advisng	University of San Francisco
Dr. Mary Grace Almandarez	Assistant Dean, Multicultural Student Services	University of San Francisco
Monica Bernal, J.D.	Manager, Graduate Student Affairs	University of San Francisco
Lauren Johnson	Program Assistant	University of San Francisco
Lourdes Andrade	Student Services Officer	Stanford University
Annie Craft-Kitcheon	Admissions Assistant	Stanford University
Keiko Price	Assistant Director of Advising (Student Athletics)	Stanford University
Anonymous (this subject participated anonymously due to the sensitivity of the subject matter)	Manager, Communications	Stanford University

Transcription for research conversation with Dr. Cora Dupar
November 13, 2008
2:00pm

Key
F: Francisco Gamez
C: Dr. Cora Dupar
… Pauses

Narrative Identity (mimesis, emplotment)

Communicative Action (Validity Claims,
Rational Argumentation,
Dialogue/Discourse)

Lifeworld

F: So how would you identify your cultural/ethnic background?

C: **Hmmm… well… I guess… first of all I'm American and I'm a black American. I… you know I never did really… I guess I still like to refer to myself as a black American and still don't feel comfortable saying African American because I really don't see where the African part comes from. You know… that if I am really African or not… so a black American.**

F: …uh huh…

F: Do you feel it's because you are not connected to Africa?

C: Right

F: Do you feel its too politically correct or something?

C: Well… it may… it may...it may… it may be politically correct and it may sound better… Maybe…I don't really know… I don't know the origin as to why it is changed and I never looked into why it was changed from the terminology of black Americans to African Americans. I'm sure it was a political move to change the name because using the word "black" sometimes has a negative connotation and I think that is part of the reason why it was moved to African American. It's like… who's idea was it to change it? Why was it deemed that we have to be called African Americans? I don't know.

F: So then can you also describe your background working in higher education?

C: I've been working in higher ed now for 30 years. I started in support positions and I moved my way up to managerial positions. During the 30 years I've moved up in various positions and various departments during my 30 year span….

F: OK, and since looking at your past experiences as a person of color, what do you think the people of color in the past 30 years (that you worked in higher ed), have faced in the institution and the organization? And if you have specific stories you want to share, you can share that or anything you want to discuss.

C: I was thinking about something a while ago… and tying it up to Shelby Steele's book the *Content of Character*… and what I think the issue is for me… is that … we as black people or African Americans or however you want to term it…. We're not judged by the content of our character, we are judged just by the color of our skin. And a lot of time that stops us from moving on and getting those higher positions or we are hired on… on the lower end of the totem pole, to do the grunt work, if you will.

As long as I've been working here for the 30 years…I've…well… I can probably count on my hand… how many people of color that I have actually run into and worked with…because this is not the institution that you see a lot of people of color and working in various departments.

I know when I was working here in all those years… maybe its changed, but that was not the way it was… and it always is the issue that you are the underdog if you will… we don't matter that much… ok, we will give you a job because we want to add a little spice…here … or the institution …a lot of times… what happens is that when we apply for positions and I know from my experience… when you apply for positions, you have to be 100 percent better than the next person in line.

I remember several years ago… I applied for a position in a department that I had been working in for years and knew the job inside and out, I was in school working on my bachelors degree…and the job position said… the posting said… degree and/or equivalency of the position. I said OK, I have this in the bag, I've been working at this institution, I have the knowledge, I have the experience, and I'm working on my degree… I'm almost done, so this should give me a sure in for the position… and of course, I did not get the job. The reason that was given to me was that I scored really high on the interview and everything else, but I didn't have a degree… and yet they hired a white woman to come in and be my supervisor who had no knowledge and no experience in this institution or department. She had a degree in anthropology and she was to be my supervisor? So that was … that was really hard for me to take… and she and I did not get along…since I did not respect her. How can someone come in and tell me how to do my job when I know how to do my job and I had to help her do her job? And that just wasn't fair… and its just that whole thing of not trusting you because you are a person of color… people thinking you cant do the job…you know… even though you don't have the degree, but that is one way of keeping me out and not getting that position.

F: So you think they use things like that to keep people of color from not getting positions?

C: Yes! I think that is number one… ==so I vowed from then on… I said that, that was one thing that would never be used against me… they would never be able to tell me that I can't get a position because I don't have a degree. So that really pushed me to strive and move on…and work through to get my undergraduate degree, get my graduate degree and then on to my doctorate.==

F: OK, great….And just looking over your career in higher ed, including that event you had, were there any moments that you felt you had a dialog with somebody… it could be with someone of color... or another person… a white person or some administrators, where they actually started talking to you….to come together to get an understanding of your situation, and you entering into the dialog as well… trying to understand their view... and both of you walking away with a new understanding or interpretation of the situation? Where you don't have to agree or compromise, but walk away with a new interpretation or understanding of the problem, or any issues.

C: Quiet honestly no… I've never had that type of conversation with anyone…umm…and… honestly… I guess that is just my issue to work through. I don't like talking about race and those kinds of things. I guess because I'm not ready to have that kind of dialog right now because I know I would get angry… so I don't even go there or even go down that path… because I would get angry.

F: OK… and…What do you think it would take to get to that point, where you wouldn't be angry? Or just in general for anyone to get to that point… where both parties/multiple parties are ready to join in and have that type of dialogue or conversation?

C: I think what would help is that if someone comes to the table and they really want <mark style="background:cyan">to have an honest dialogue and be fair and not just come into the conversation with stereotypes and imposing beliefs. Just coming in and just saying… I'm just curious about how you feel about xyz…umm… what are your experiences with xyz?</mark> And not coming in and just… say, imposing something on you that would put me on the defensive.

F: OK, so sort of like sharing what your reality is and what your everyday situation is and they also sharing with you theirs.

C: Yes.

F: And you both coming in together and walking away … and saying. .. you know… I could understand where they are coming from and they do the same.

C: Yeah, right... something like that… and then… because you really... when you think about and talk about race issues… <mark style="background:cyan">you really have to have a comfortable environment</mark>

122

to discuss those issues because it is such a touchy subject for everyone involved … so it really needs to be a very comfortable and a very safe environment to be able to discuss those things.

F: Well … then imagine…if you're talking about a comfortable environment… say you are allowed to go into the public sphere which is sort of… like an open forum where anyone can speak without prejudice and no one caring about what your status is in society… to go in and share your opinion and story with the public masses… what would you say? What would you bring to the table, to bring people to an understanding of what your experiences are?   Assume there are other people out there listening, who are geared toward reaching an understanding from that dialogue.

C: Well… I guess… probably what I would first do ... How I would first approach it…if someone has some preconceived notion or prejudice, if you will. **Probably the first thing I would want to say or ask to open the dialogue is to ask… Why do feel the way you do? What has brought you to this point in your life that you may not trust or be comfortable with someone of color? What exactly are your feelings? Why are you feeling this way? And trying to get that person to voice what they want, what they feel, and then maybe I would feel more comfortable in explaining… That maybe because I'm a person of color…** if I have not done anything personally to you… if I have not hurt you or your family… why do you feel the way you do? That would be my idea and thoughts to open up the conversation. Why? I have always wondered why do people dislike other people of color? If they don't know that individual or know where they came from or who they are? Why? And trying to just get people… to get to know you as a person and what you can bring to the table and what you are about, not… not just because of the color of my skin. I'm an individual just as you are. We have the same blood running through our veins. We have the same physiological make up…so why? ... Why? … I mean…Just why? Do you get it?

F: Yeah I get it… because that is a conversation that a lot people of color face. When they talk to other people who are not of color or who don't experience what we have experienced. Why do you think that's happening and why do you think its so uncomfortable for the other person to talk about it? Just because it seems like sometimes we are willing to talk about it and talk about our experience and there seems to be a wall coming from the other side and them not wanting to acknowledge it. Because it seems that society sometimes labels you that if you actually feel these types of things, then you're a racist. Or you are prejudice, but we are all prejudice in our actions based on our biases and stuff… and I just wonder sometimes why people find this conversation so difficult, especially people who are not of color?

C: Well… I think… and this is just my perception and my thought… **if you really don't know yourself... why you dislike someone… then how can you explain it? If you really don't know... if you've been taught that all your life… and that's what you've known just because that's what you've been taught, then how can you have a dialog about something that you know nothing about? You can't give a valid enough reason as to why you dislike someone of color.** I think that's one of the biggest

things...because a lot of people have been taught "that" by their parents or however the line goes, but they really don't know themselves. That's just my belief. They really don't know.

F: Yeah and they don't go into themselves to…

C: Figure it out… they just know what they know and that's how its always been. Its just like when you have a very old person from the … say… someone born in the 1920's or 1930's and they are still alive… well they will have "that" idea… that people of color… because of the way they have been raised and how they grew up all their life. And they aren't gonna change and nothings gonna make them change…its something that is inherent… and its just there and it's gonna be there.

F: So you think those people are not looking at their past, their past history and the social context of it...and how it affects them as a person today and how they are not even imagining a future where they can get along with people of color?...There is an individualistic aspect to it instead of grouping people based on the color of their skin, the slant of their eyes, or whatever…

C: Umm… I think so… I really do… it's a really good point… and I think that that's the way it is. Their past is their past and they have ideas about how they lived in their past. I don't think they see a connection in the future of what their past life experiences and thoughts are bringing to the future and now. I don't think they see that connection.

F: So how do you see that connection for yourself, when you look at your past and what you want to imagine in the future? Because through imagination there is the possibility for anything, so what would you actually want to see in the future and how does that affect you today as a person? Both the past and future.

C: Well my family is from the southern parts of the states and I came here when I was very young. So I never experienced the overt racism that my parents experienced… and… what I've heard about and what my parents have told me, other than what is going on now. It makes me feel so ill… I wish it could change and it could be better… and better by everyone just getting along and respecting each other as a human being , as an individual person… and respecting that person as a human being and individual persona and being able to engage, as you say… have the dialogue and try to work through all of these issues. But you know… my thought is … that racism will never ever go away… that's just my thought.

I don't think we will ever have this world without race… maybe I won't see it in my lifetime… but between now and my future years.. I really don't see a change because ... the hate… is soo deeply embedded in people… it is soo deeply rooted. Its just like a tree… when you have a large tree and that large tree has these humongous roots that can go on for miles and miles… there is no way you will be able to destroy those roots because they are embedded, so deeply embedded… and it

would take years and years of chipping away, and we haven't even gotten to that point to start chipping away.

Maybe with the new presidency, maybe that will start putting a dent on something, but its not gonna change... its not gonna change... as long as we have hate groups...because they are teaching their children to hate and of course... what is that leading to... if you are breeding or raising children... I shouldn't have said breeding... (laughter)

I mean when you are raising children, you are raising them to hate. Now if they don't have it in their moral fiber to at some point and time to change, then when they have children, they will raise their children to hate. So that is why I don't think it will ever go away... racism will stay here...it will stay here.

F: How would you break that cycle? I see what you are talking about how there is that perpetual cycle of racism and learning to hate…hating people of color or finding ways to covertly, not overtly discriminate against another person… how do you think that cycle can stop? Or any ideas you can imagine to make parents stop teaching their children to hate… instilling their children with this and have that white privilege… how do you think you can stop that cycle?

C: That is a difficult question…..number one, I haven't really thought about it in that way because I just come to believe that it won't change. I don't know… **Well, just like in any relationship, communication is the key… so that is one bridge or one road or one road to the bridge or however you say it. Communicating and keeping the lines of communication open... and having a dialog about these issues… I mean… honestly... I just don't see it**.

F: So, you said that in your lifespan racism will not end, especially here in higher education where it's a little more prevalent… so what do wish for or imagine for your daughter… for your future grandchildren… or what do you hope and imagine… about just the possibility that might be out there?

C: Well it's just like my parents… they never instilled in me hate or taught me to hate anyone. And I do the same …I've followed the same with my daughter and I'm sure she will follow the same with her child. **So at least in our family and our circle, and if she (her daughter) is around friends of likeness that have the same ideas that she has… then it can spread that way, but you have to have champions if you will, that will get out there and... and… stand for what's right… and that's a way that we can help to move away from what we have.. We have to have people who are willing to stand up and fight for what is right and be a champion for the cause and that is one way it will happen. It can happen in my daughter's lifetime and her child's lifetime and so on and so forth.**

F: Do you feel this is a generational type of thing..

C: Yes

F: Where your parents share that narratives as far as not hating, working as individuals, moving forward, and you passed it on to your daughter, in hopes your daughter will spread that on to her friends and to the grandchildren.

C: Right … and just like in higher education… if we have younger people coming in, which is usual… or even not so much as younger people… but people who come in with those new ideas… and that's the way higher education will change. As long as we have those old school people still at the helm, then things will not change in higher education. We need new blood to instill these ideas in higher education to move away from where we are now.

F: So how do you think the new people…say it can be anyone… white, people of color, whatever the new crop is coming into higher education….working as staff and administrators within the organization… with as you said… with the old school people who are in upper management which are traditionally older white male dominated… Do you see that there will be openings for the new blood to come in or do you think the old school needs to die off or leave?

(Laughter)

C: I think they will have to die off…. (Laughter)

C: I mean seriously, I mean, they aren't gonna change… case in point. Look at the Supreme Court justices… I mean they aren't going anywhere, until they basically "kick the bucket." Who is gonna come in after them? So that is the other issue. Hopefully someone is coming up in the ranks that will be at that age, that doesn't have those old ideas… and they can move into those positions… and that is the only way I can see the Supreme Court and higher education will change. That's the way you get rid of old ideas… because they die with the person…and it just depends on who is coming along to step in and what they are bringing to the table. And that is another issue… is that person gonna bring in something new or will that person continue on with the same old stuff….

F: So the hope and future of higher ed is to have the new generation to come in and move forward?

C: Yes

F: And do you think it is important that this new generation remembers and honors the past, while keeping a historical context to move forward?

C: Oh yes! For sure... so you don't make the same mistakes. We have to know whence we came to know where we're going to build a better future. You have to look at the past and see what went on, how things were handled, what didn't work, why it didn't work, so you can make it better for the future.

F: So what would be your idea or fantasy of what higher ed would be 20 years from now or even 10 years from now?

C: Well…if I was around… I would love to see a rainbow of colors. Everyone working together… in all different colors and different levels of staff and administration. All different people. Women, men, you know everyone because we all...no matter if we are straight, gay, black, white, pink, blue, or whatever, we all make this world and we are all a part of this world. We all need to be a part of the decision process since it affects everyone. And that is what I would like to see. And hopefully maybe it will get to that point.

F: Well since you have more experience working here at USF, when you look into the higher ranks as far as staff and administrators, because most of the time when we talk about staff and administrators of color, we usually see them in the lower trenches or middle management, do you see people of color at this institution rising above middle management?

C: Well… especially when you think of Deanships… well.. I think I've seen… hmm… lets see…how many deans? Hmm... maybe... one… Maybe just one dean that I've seen and know of, that is African American, and that's the dean of the library, and umm… and a female African American once….and there hasn't been that many.

And from my experiences that I've seen from the sidelines... that when a person of color is in that higher position, they are scrutinized more. They really have to walk a tight ship or straight line and everything that they do or any mandates that they put forth are always questioned for whatever reason. For whatever reason… because they don't trust them or whatever. I don't know… To answer… I haven't seen many.

F: Its kind of an interesting thing that they are always scrutinized…do you think that staff at the lower and middle management level… see that these leaders of color are being scrutinized? As far as being public figures or do you think that it's more of a private /covert thing that only if you are privy to that info?

C: I think so, that and only if you are aware of what's going on. A lot of times we are not aware of what's going on around us. We just come in, do our jobs, do whatever and don't really pay attention to the little nuances and little innuendos that go on. So if you don't see that and pay attention to it, then you won't see it. Then more so, if you are around that individual and have contact with that individual, then you would have the tendency to see that, more so than someone in another staff or administrative position, who wouldn't have the privy to see it.

F: Do you think people don't see it because… like a lot of universities especially in the bay area… they have these diversity initiatives? They try to celebrate diversity on campuses, it's sort of like this campaign is prevalent, even though it's not necessarily

127

what the university practices. Do you think that sort of politically correct attitude in the bay area… when talking about black or African American…that you have to be careful how you phrase things and talk about things? Do you think that contributes to that covert racism and underlying issue that no one talks about?

C: I think so. I'm always suspect when someone is trying to do something… umm… what the word I'm looking for? When you have these multicultural events, it just seems like… I don't know… it doesn't seem real. It seems like the thing to do, to keep the masses satisfied. I always feel that that sort of thing is not genuine. If you are gonna be genuine about something, you just do it out of the goodness of your heart. You don't make it or try to make it… you do it out of the goodness of your heart and the genuiness comes across.

F: So you don't want Feb black history month
C: Yeah
F: Or the whatever multicultural month
C: Yeah, why does it have to be one stupid month? OK,,,, we gonna celebrate this month… we gonna talk about you… we gonna do things, then after that, forget it.
I'm like… well can we…?
Oh no, we will talk about that next year.
Ok next year… we will focus on you again next year.

F: Why do you think its dropped like that? Things are dropped and then next month its Latino month and next month is Asian American month.

C: That's why its not a genuine thing. It's the thing to do, to be politically correct.. Celebrate everyone's life all the time.

C: I mean… sorry.. I might be digressing… just thinking about taking history classes. I never liked US History… because I didn't see any representation of who I was or my people… there may be a little blurb that is always about slavery... it's like… we're a forgotten group of people…at certain times… then there are times, lets give them some accolades, so we can keep them quiet and let them know we are thinking about them. Then its just forgotten.

F: Its funny you talked about history books, because that's one of my main issues with them. The history books when I grew up and I'm sure when you grew up were totally different and even now are different, but they still only included usually a paragraph or page on slavery with a picture or two. You're lucky if you get a paragraph and picture about Japanese internment camps during WWII, your lucky if your text mentions of the Bracero program and how it affected Mexicans and Latinos when they came to this country. With all these groups, how it has affected them throughout generations and through different domains like education, healthcare, etc.

C: Yes, you are absolutely right. Its so interesting that you brought this up.

128

And if you think about it again, it shows you again how this country is separated because you have your US History books and then you have to have books on being black American, Latino American, Asian American… and there it goes… separate… separate.. separate.

F: So the category of race is always there and separates us?

C: Yes… combine it all… compile it… make it a big ass book! And its just… it still is that perpetuation of separation.

F: So it's not until we are all combined and sort of that metaphor of that history book. Until it is that super big book that includes all.

C: Yes… we are all Americans! We are just different shades and hues and everything, but we are Americans first and I think that's what has been forgotten and what is forgotten. We are Americans!

F: So then, what would you say…and think about all that you've said at this point… if someone asked you to share your narrative or story as a person of color...say in higher education?   You can bring other aspects of your life and how that has affected you here and your career. You've been in higher ed for 30 years now and normally you don't stay in higher ed unless you really like what you do. So just sharing your story… say you had to write the autobiography of Dr. Cora Dupar…

C: Well I think….from my personal stand point… why I've been able to live or work for so long in higher ed… and move up into positions.. I think a lot has to do with me and my personality and the type of person that I am. I think that number one, it has gotten me as far as I've gotten. I believe that I've been fortunate enough to encounter individuals who have respected me for me and I've encountered individuals that have been non-people of color that have believed in me and wanted to help me through and see me go further. So that has happened to me. I've been fortunate for that….I mean… there are good people still around in this world and there are people who are not prejudice. I've been lucky enough to experience that.

F: Have you experienced a lot of the opposite as well? Or have your experiences been mostly good or perhaps a mixed batch?

C: If I would weigh it on a scale. I would say that the scale would be tipping more toward… for the most part, good experiences… to be honest.

F: And so, when you were moving on in your career and thinking about your past and how you were looked over for that promotion and how that changed who you were…when you decided that…. you were not gonna let that happen to you again…so you pursued your education as far as getting a doctorate, which saw you moving up in the university toward more management positions…

How would you advise someone who wanted to work in higher ed with the climate that it is today? Do you think it's changed over the past 30 years? Is it constantly shifting? What would you recommend to those people of color to help them navigate within the university?

C: Number one, for someone coming in, that person would definitely need to be comfortable with his or her self and what they can bring to the table. Make sure that they have their degree (laughter), to be educated, and strive to be as honest as one can possibly can.

F: And how do you think that honesty would work, in a politically charged climate? Sometimes working at USF, there is that façade that everything is fine and we all get along , but there also seems to be some political workings in the background as far as scare resources, getting back at others, etc… or do you think that really doesn't exist here?

C: Well the point with being honest, its my belief that... and I know I do it myself all the time as well… I do watch how I say something or what I say to someone because number one… there is always that fear that you may say something that will come back and bite you in the ass or saying something that may offend another individual.

 Trying to be honest to the point where you know how to communicate something to someone in the right context and right way…and I always try to work that way or try to think before I open my mouth. Because of course, that can get you into trouble. I always try to think before blurting something out. I mean there have been times where I have been really angry and have to go somewhere and calm myself down, so I know what I'm gonna do and handle that situation. A lot of it is working on yourself and being true to yourself and feeling good about what you are doing and how you go about doing it.

F: So going back ….do you think … as you said upper management gets more scrutiny as far as being a person of color, do you think… you are more careful about what you're going say, because you think you are under more scrutiny? Sort of like that… don't anger the black woman kind of situation. Or do you think its just something you were taught from your family?

C: Well, that and then… it brings something to mind….that you can become labeled. I remember when I used to work up in Lone Mountain and I really had a temper thing going on at the time. I would get really angry and kind of just like losing my mind and I always remember… my supervisor at that time… my husband says he always remembers the time he came up there looking for me… and she (the supervisor) said to him.... what did she say? Oh yeah… you need to calm her down, because she is like a raging bull. So … you would get those labels and that's why I said you know, I really need to calm myself down and look at how I say something and the way I say it.. That's the whole thing about being scrutinized and how you can be labeled.

F: And did your white colleagues get the same type of labels if they acted out or do you think they were more critical of…

C: I think they were more critical because I was a person of color. That was my feeling. Because I always feel like…that if a person of color makes a mistake, they will be more scrutinized; much more so than a Caucasian person. They're gonna be passed off as… so and so is just having a bad day and make it nice, nice for them. But, on the other hand… "…ooh she is just terrible" when it comes to that person of color. So there is still that distinction.

F: And do you think that those people who make those distinctions say the supervisor… the Caucasian supervisor are aware of it or do you think its so engrained in our society where they just kind of automatically, without thinking…don't think how they are labeling people?

C: I think for the most part, that's how people are. They don't think about what they are saying or what's coming out of their mouth. It's just so engrained. It's just like if someone is drinking and they get drunk. By them being drunk, it's going to erase their inhibitions and they will do stuff and say stuff that they would normally not do. I always believed that if that's what's coming out of your mouth, it's always been there, because if it wasn't there, it wouldn't come out of your mouth.

F: So going back to that question about what it would take to come to the table where both parties are geared towards reaching an understating and you both came in wanting to understand the other…and you actually brought race to their attention. Do you think it would change the way they relate to other people and how you relate? Would you understand that they never intended to be discriminatory, but it's just such common practice and they weren't thinking and they need to be more aware of it in their relationships? Would it change the relationship so that both parties can move forward?

C: Well, yes, but it could go either way because that person may not have really realized what they have said or what they have done. It can go either way… they may not realize it or they did and really don't care. It could change how they interact with you and it could change how they interact with everybody else, but it could go either way. I think its an individual situation and how they take that in and how they process it and whether they want to be conscious of it or cognizant of what they have done. It's an individual matter.

F: Do you think you can walk away from it and see where they are coming from and not take offense to it or know you can correct them about it? Or do you think its more of… I can see their perspective, not necessarily agree or compromise… but sort of expand how you think by expanding your reality and how your interactions affect you?

C: You know… I could be accepting, but I mean…. Say if it happened a second time, then I know I can go to that person and talk to that person about it, but it comes to that

point, if that person keeps making those mistakes… What's that about? If they keep making those mistakes, you get tired of going back and they will get tired of you going back to them….so….

F: You brought up a good point... where if you keep correcting somebody and that person may be tired of the correction as well. Do you think that contributes to that silence in a lot of institutions where we don't talk about race or race relations… Do you think people are just tired of it? Tired of correcting? Tired of hearing it? They just want it to go away?

C: I think it's a combination of all of it… you're tired of correcting people, you tired of hearing it, you don't want to face what it is, because it hurts so much. People don't want to be corrected and you are tired of correcting people. Its like when you think about… it just made me think of that whole situation where that radio guy Imus…and the way he spoke about those black girls on that basketball team.. That kind of stuff came out of his mouth, but again… that was in him… that's the way he really thought about black people and about those girls. That's the way he really thought because if it wasn't there… deeply embedded in him, it wouldn't have come out.

So… the change, communication, just kind of moving toward changing things…and teaching to not hate….Yeah… it has to start from the family.. It has to start from the root of the family. Because the children coming up now, they are going to be the future leaders of our world and it has to start from the family. Children only know what you teach them and starting from the family…and again and having diverse people in the world of education, so we can change these text books and other things… and educate the teachers so they don't teach some of the crap that's out there. It's a vicious cycle. Its cyclical…Its just vicious.

F: And it has to go across domains… so looking at the family, education..

C: Yes, everything… politics… family…everything… every domain.

F: So any final thoughts about what may change or thoughts in general about higher ed and race?

C: I just always hope that this will be a better world for everyone and every walk of life. In higher ed, in our personal lives, and just everywhere. I just wish it would be. And I don't understand why people have to hate another person. I mean, dislike someone for what they did to you personally, not because the color of your skin. As Shelby Steele said and that's the only thing I liked about what he said, "don't judge me by the color of my skin, but the content of my character." Who I am and what I bring to the table and how I treat you, judge me on that. Look past this color thing.

F: And all the assumptions that go along with that.

C: Exactly! Yes!!!

F: Well thank you for your time…

C: Well thank you!