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Abstract

This research study captured the stories of 11 university faculty about their lived experiences with the university’s social justice mission. Key findings revealed: (a) faculty of color described experiencing racism on campus, (b) faculty of color felt marginalized on campus, (c) faculty developed their understanding of the mission over time, (d) the mission was experienced differently by faculty of color than by White faculty, (e) peer group support was vital for retaining faculty of color, and (f) there was little evidence of collective overt challenges to the dominant ideology of the university. The study used a case study methodology to understand how tenured and tenure-track faculty made meaning of and understood a university’s mission at a private university in the western United States. Campus documents were analyzed and 11 faculty members were interviewed. Data were analyzed using the in vivo coding method and were interpreted through a critical race theory framework. Results indicate that more can be done by universities in the United States to create inclusive campuses and to retain faculty of color. Suggestions for actionable steps are offered. These results are significant because they inform higher education leadership that the work of implementing their mission is never over and that the higher education community must continuously strive to be more inclusive, equitable, and accessible.
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Chapter 1: Overview

The purpose of this dissertation was to uncover university faculty members’ lived experiences with the social justice mission at one university. Specifically, the study sought to uncover the extent to which there was variance between these experiences based on race identity, length in career, religious affiliation, and faculty rank. This chapter provides an overview of the thesis. The chapter will first present the problem statement and the researcher’s motivation for the study, which was to understand and make visible the issues facing faculty on a university campus in this current era of overt and covert racism. Next, it presents the research question, which focuses on the lived experiences of faculty and how they make sense of a university’s mission. Following this is a section presenting the tenets of the theoretical framework, critical race theory (CRT), and a discussion of how this theory was applied to the study. It then introduces a tree diagram that illustrates the relationship between the critical race theory framework, the context of higher education, the lived experiences of faculty, and the systems and cultures that impact the context. Next, it provides an overview of and introduction to the case study research method. Finally, it provides the significance of the study and its context within the literature. This first section considers a brief history of race and racism in higher education to provide a background for the context of today’s universities.

Higher education in the United States (U.S.) has a troublesome foundation that universities of today struggle with. It can be argued that, from its creation, higher education in the United States was designed as a system of division, segregation, and inequity (Museus, Ledesma, & Parker, 2015; Wilder, 2014). The U.S. university system was founded by slave holders, with money acquired through slave trading, to educate White men and to convert Native Americans and freed slaves to the “Christian” way (Wilder, 2014). This educational model of
colonialism and conversion persisted through the Civil War and the creation of land grant colleges and Black colleges (Thelin, 2011). Segregation of Whites and African Americans in higher education continued through the Jim Crow era of the 1960s (Thelin, 2011). As universities became integrated and multicultural, blatant, overt racism increased on campuses (Museus et al., 2015; Thelin, 2011). As the civil rights movement progressed and legal victories allowed for progress in racial equity, blatant, overt racism became less socially acceptable (Museus et al., 2015). Racism on university campuses mirrored broader societal trends, from legal segregation to integration and from blatant exclusion to systemic racism (Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Museus et al., 2015).

Incidents of racism on American university campuses are frequent and ongoing (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008; Louis et al., 2016). After the U.S. national election of 2016, incidents of racism increased throughout the United States (Dreid & Najmabadi, 2016; Guha, 2017; Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2017; Layton, 2017). Large events covered by the media occur every month (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2017). Recently, a Trinity College professor left the state of Connecticut after receiving death threats responding to his Twitter and Facebook posts that spoke out against White supremacy. Another incident that was directed toward faculty involved Princeton University professor Keenga-Yamahta Taylor. She received death threats after her commencement speech in which she called President Trump a “racist and sexist megalomaniac.” (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2017). In some cases, racist incidents were poorly handled by a university, resulting in protests by students, staff, and faculty, and ultimately in resignations of prominent campus leaders (Hartocollis & Bidgood, 2015; Legion & Pérez-Peña, 2015). The increasing attention and perceived frequency of these incidents challenge all higher education campuses, but they are
especially challenging for universities that have missions that include a focus on social justice. In this challenging political time, it is increasingly difficult for colleges and universities guided by social justice missions to consistently implement that mission for all members of the university community.

Many universities include social justice as a key term in their missions, which tends to be interpreted as an equitable approach to educating all people or as a type of charity work that helps poor people (M. Smith, 2012). This study considered one campus as it struggled with challenges common to mission-based campuses. These challenges include the struggle between its stated mission and how that mission was lived on campus. First-person lived experiences of the people who are integral to the campus provide unique perspectives on how the mission is really lived on campus (Muñoz, 2009). Examples of first-person experiences included: faculty of color experienced microaggressions on campus, they were made to feel different than other faculty, they experienced a heavier workload, and they struggled to make education accessible for all students (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015; W. A. Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). This study considered a private, predominantly White university in the western United States and considered how the campus understood, embodied, and practiced the social justice-focused mission of the university.

The challenging history of the founding of higher education in the United States and the persisting structures of inequity pose challenges for the current, multicultural, diverse student and faculty population. Legacy beliefs, structures, and institutional cultures that favor White people negatively affect people of color on campus in multiple ways. Universities work to counteract these historical practices through focusing their work on social justice, as guided by their institution’s mission. However, incidents of blatant and subtle racism persist and pose
challenges for the modern diverse university.

**Problem Statement**

The student population of universities in the United States is more diverse than ever, so a diverse faculty population is necessary in order to retain and support these students (M. E. Brown & Treviño, 2006; Rosser, 1990; Wells, 1998). There is a lower rate of people of color among the faculty population (C. L. Brown, 1998). The commitment of university leadership is vital to diversifying the faculty (Adserias, Charleston, & Jackson, 2017; M. E. Brown & Treviño, 2006; Rosser, 1990; Wells, 1998). To represent these students and faculty, universities need to enact diversity plans that are more than representational and that are supported by action (Chesler, 2004). The leadership of many universities is failing the students and can do more to support and retain them than ineffective “diversity efforts” (C. L. Brown, 1998; Rosser, 1990). This is a significant challenge due to the existence and prevalence of endemic institutional racism in higher education (Chesler, 2004).

Acts of racism on university campuses in the United States are neither unusual nor isolated. The researcher set out to describe how faculty experienced the campus mission. This study surfaced the tensions and challenges experienced by faculty of color that were not experienced by the White faculty. This study considered acts of covert racism, called microaggressions (Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007). The cumulative negative effects of being a victim of repeated microaggressions include increased blood pressure (Hill, Kobayashi, & Hughes, 2007), increased feelings of stress, increased negative health effects associated with extreme stress (W. A. Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011), lower retention rates for both faculty and students of color (Palmer, Wood, Dancy, & Strayhorn, 2014; Piercy et al., 2005), and longer time to graduation for students (Fischer, 2010). This study considered the tension between the
university’s mission, which focuses on social justice and the respect for the whole person, and
the faculty experiences of microaggressions.

Acts of racism can be categorized into two groups: overt racism, which is obvious,
intentional, and conscious, and covert racism, which is subtle, unintentional, and unconscious
(Halcon, 1988; McCabe, 2009; Rollock, 2012). These three elements were chosen because of the
interplay and effect that campus culture and mission have on members of the community and
how almost invisible detrimental acts (microaggressions) exist and negatively affect members of
the university community. This dissertation is uniquely situated because this case study site was
not special or unique, and it represented the challenges faced by universities of all sizes and
affiliations across the United States. Many studies have identified types of cultures in higher
education (Smart, Kuh, Tierney, George, & Smart, 1997; Smart & St. John, 1996; Tierney,
1988). Studies have considered components of the culture of higher education, focusing
specifically on the mission or values of the organization (B. R. Clark, 1971, 1972; Giberson et
al., 2009; Lee, 2007). Many of these studies considered the type of culture of the higher
education institution, with a specific focus on the faculty or academic staff of a university
(Constantine et al., 2008; Ferreira & Hill, 2008; Lee, 2007; Louis et al., 2016; Smart et al.,
1997). Several studies considered how campus leadership can affect the campus culture (B. R.
Clark, 1972, 1980; Fuller, 2015). Researchers have described the types of racism experienced by
both students and faculty of color (McCabe, 2009; Pittman, 2012; Solórzano, 1998; Turner,
Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). This dissertation is also uniquely situated in the literature because
there was no study found that considered mission-based education in higher education and
viewed the institutional culture of higher education through the theoretical framework of critical
race theory. There was also no study that looked at a social justice mission, campus culture, and
microaggressions as experienced by the faculty. The purpose of this research was to uncover university faculty members’ lived experience with the social justice mission of a private, predominantly White university in the western United States.

**Research Question**

The primary research question shaping this dissertation is: How do university faculty members describe their lived experience with the social justice mission of a university? The sub-question guiding the study is: To what extent do the represented experiences of the faculty vary based on the demographic factors of race, rank, stage of career, and religious affiliation?

**Theoretical Framework – Critical Race Theory**

**Tenets of Critical Race Theory**

CRT has multiple tenets, and authors may disagree as to which tenets are included (Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). These tenets can include (a) the permanence of racism; (b) experiential knowledge, storytelling, and counterstorytelling; (c) Whiteness as property; (d) critique of liberalism or the challenge to dominant ideologies; and (e) a commitment to social justice (see Figure 1) (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).
The tenets of CRT are multi-faceted and authors do not agree which tenets are most important (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Most CRT authors write about racism being endemic in American society, the American legal system, and the American school system (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015). The tenet of *experiential knowledge* is a commonly shared tenet. It holds that the lived experiences of the person of color are valuable, important and critical to understanding both the system and the individual’s experiences within it (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). *Whiteness as property* refers to the privilege of being White; Whiteness is something the person carries with them that allows them access to places and activities that people of color have not been allowed to access (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). The *critique of liberalism* questions the liberal trust in the legal system to do the right thing.
The legal system is not doing the right thing, resulting in the disproportionately high incarceration rate of men of color (Alexander, 2010). A commitment to social justice is a commitment to ending racism, sexism, and poverty and a commitment to empowering marginalized and subordinated peoples (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

**Storytelling and counterstorytelling.** Several tenets of CRT were considered in conducting this study. Like many other studies using CRT, this study relied on storytelling by the participants because their direct experiences included the richest emotions (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004), which may not be heard consistently by the campus leadership, and were not consistent with the institutional saga or story (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Additionally, the tenet of counterstorytelling was important because the collected narratives described the experiences of faculty of color that differed from White faculty. Counterstorytelling surfaced the counternarrative that demonstrated that the social justice aspect of the mission was experienced differently by different faculty.

**The value of experiential knowledge.** Similar to storytelling, this tenet of CRT holds that the experiences of people of color are important within the systems of education, law, etc. (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Harper, 2009). Critical race theorists hold that this knowledge is central and vital to understanding the experiences of people of color (Solórzano et al., 2000). The use of experiential knowledge allows the use of stories other than the ones told by the dominant groups (Iverson, 2007).

**Whiteness as property.** Whiteness as property came about as a theme in the study. This tenet affects the experiences of people of color on a predominantly White campus because they may be seen as out of place and treated as outsiders. The university in the United States was founded to educate White people; the entire American higher education system was created to
benefit White people (Wilder, 2014). This is Whiteness as property in the higher education context (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). The ability of White faculty to not think about issues of inequity or social justice is consistent with the tenet of Whiteness as property (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Whiteness is a privilege that each White person owns, and allows the White person to exist in the dominant structures without feelings of exclusion (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Harris, 1993; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). Although White persons may be aware of the existence of exclusionary factors, they themselves are not impacted by those factors (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Harris, 1993). They can simply go about their research, mentoring, and teaching without feeling marginalized, as will be shown in the results of this study.

A critique of liberalism. A critique of liberalism was a guiding tenet because Private Western University prides itself on its liberal reputation; however, many university structures do not serve all members of the community equally. In observations, there were many instances of people claiming to not see color, of presenting what can be described as a color-blind racism (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). A critique of liberalism argues that the current rate of change in education is not fast enough and that the slow pace of change only benefits the dominant cultures and structures (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007). The voices of faculty of color at PWU present a challenge to liberalism because they spoke out about wanting the university to be more inclusive but also expressed their frustration at the rate of change not being fast enough.

A commitment to social justice. A commitment to social justice was a value stated as shared by the university and members of the community. It was also a prevalent marketing phrase used by the university. Social justice is included as a concept in the university’s mission, and this aspect resonated with many members of the community. However, there was not an
agreement about what social justice means. CRT holds that social justice is both a process and a goal (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). It is a process to change the existing structures so all people have equal access and it is also a vision for a future where all are safe, secure, and have equitable access (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015; Solórzano & Villalpando, 1998). It should be noted that the definition found in the research literature is about changing the system, and this definition does not include any mention of charity work (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Hiraldo, 2010; Iverson, 2007; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

The permanence of racism. The final tenet of CRT considered in this study is the permanence of racism. Though this tenet did not inform the development of the interview protocol, it is relevant to the results. This is believed to be the most important tenet of critical race theory (McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). This tenet holds that racism is pervasive in the United States and that all people of color experience it (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). It is not random or isolated. It is endemic to all systems in the United States, including educational and legal systems (Bell, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1998; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). This is consistent with the experiences of the participants and their narratives of their experiences with the mission on campus. The faculty of color, regardless of faculty rank, described their experiences with racism on campus, experiences that the White faculty were aware of, or in one case did not describe at all, which also ties to the CRT tenet of Whiteness as property. The tenet that racism is pervasive in higher education would indicate that racism is pervasive on most or all higher education campuses (Solórzano et al., 2000).

Tree Diagram of Systemic Racism and Critical Race Theory

The relationship of critical race theory to the system of higher education can be illustrated through the use of a tree diagram (Figure 2). This diagram will be expanded on throughout this
dissertation to provide more clarity in reference to the research literature and the results of this study. The explanation of the diagram begins at the bottom, under what represents the soil. Under the surface, not readily visible to all people, particularly to White people, are the structural and systemic influences of systemic racism and White supremacy. This aspect of the educational system is somewhat hidden because it is not readily visible to members of the dominant culture. However, these influences give rise to the tree that represents higher education. At the surface level is the institutional mission and institutional culture. The mission can be literally visible to all because it is published on promotional materials and around campus; the culture is experienced by all even though it is not necessarily a tangible visible thing. These aspects then give rise to the tree, which represents the first-person lived experiences of the faculty at the university. Critical race theory allows us to see this tree and all of its details.
Figure 2: Tree diagram of institutional racism’s influence on university culture including critical race theory.
This section has provided an overview of critical race theory and its impact on empirical research and this study. The next section will describe the research method and provide an overview to the procedures that were used, including coding and reliability.

**Research Method Overview**

The research included two main categories: campus artifacts and interviews. Through analysis of 331 campus artifacts and 11 personal interviews, this researcher attempted to capture examples of how the faculty made sense of and assigned meaning to the mission at one university campus. The 331 artifacts included all-campus emails, print materials, website content, and other campus materials. The faculty participants were selected through personal recommendations and networking, and then it was up to the participants to determine whether or not to complete their participation in the study. The faculty group included full and part-time faculty who were tenured or pretenured. Participants were required to have been employed at the university for at least one academic year and included those who taught undergraduate students, graduate students, or both. Participants were limited to those who were primarily teaching faculty: anyone who was primarily an administrator was excluded from the study.

Data was collected and stored electronically in qualitative analysis software. Data included anonymized interview transcripts, print materials such as brochures and fliers, all-campus emails sent by the faculty to the campus community, all-campus emails sent by the administration to the campus community, and other artifacts. These were scanned into electronic format and coded according to Saldaña’s (2015) method of qualitative data coding and analysis. The first round of coding yielded 968 first-round codes. These codes were grouped into broader categories in a second cycle of coding using pattern coding that yielded 18 second-level codes. The six most frequently used codes were selected and developed into themes.
All materials were anonymized. Interview participants were provided with permission forms for their signature and the anonymizing procedure was described to them both in outreach emails and at the start of the interview period. The participants were given the opportunity to review and edit their responses. The sample size for the study was planned to be at least 10 participants, and 11 completed the interviews. This provided enough data for analysis and provided some consistency in themes and experiences.

**Potential Significance**

The primary goal of this study was to understand how faculty experience the mission of a university. The study considered the struggle that the study site experienced with living its mission in the current climate in the United States. This study site proved to be an exemplar of an institution that struggled with the challenges of implementing its mission consistently across its campus community.

This study contributes most immediately to the case study site and more broadly to the literature about the challenges faced by faculty of color in academia. First, the results of the study provide a different perspective on the experiences of a small but growing faculty group and provide insight into the challenges that they frequently experience. These challenges often have detrimental effects that lead to faculty burnout and health problems. Second, the study provides further data to support the work of the administration and provides further justification that the campus-wide work on cultural competency is having a positive effect. Nevertheless, the results also demonstrate that current efforts have had a limited effect and that the work of inclusion and equity never ends. Third, this study contributes to the literature about the experiences of faculty of color and furthers the conversation about the realities of campus life for these members of the community. Fourth, this study provides further evidence for why universities may struggle to
retain faculty of color, who are a vital group on campus.

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided an introduction to this dissertation. The purpose of this research was to uncover university faculty members’ lived experiences with the social justice mission at one university. Specifically, the dissertation sought to uncover the extent to which there was variance between these experiences based on race identity, length in career, religious affiliation, and faculty rank. This chapter provided an introduction to the problem statement and a motivation for this research. This chapter also presented the research question and the theoretical framework, critical race theory. This chapter introduced the tree diagram that will be used throughout this dissertation to illustrate the relationship between the system of higher education, the university mission and culture, and the experiences of faculty, as viewed through the lens of critical race theory. The chapter continued with a description of the research method and a discussion of how the study fills a gap in the existing literature. In the next chapter, a literature review provides the theoretical and empirical basis for a study of social justice, university mission statements, racial microaggressions, and critical race theory.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Incidents of racism on American college campuses occur frequently. Large, blatant events of racism are regularly covered by the media (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2017). These racist incidents can be poorly handled by the campus and university system leadership, resulting in protests by students, staff, and faculty, and ultimately, in resignations of prominent campus leaders. Administrators have stepped down due to inadequate responses to issues of racism and racial sensitivity on campus (Hartocollis & Bidgood, 2015; Legion & Pérez-Peña, 2015). In this challenging time, universities struggle with issues of racism invading their campuses.

When Barack Obama was elected, the media argued that racism in the United States was over. Lum (2009) argued that our American society no longer “sees” race, that ours is a post-racial environment. He argued that race is no longer viewed as a limiting factor, that we are all equal in the eyes of the media and the law. This all evolved naturally, he argued, from the end of the civil rights movement, because that marked the end of racism in the United States. Though there has been a decrease in lynching since the civil rights era, racism is alive and well in the United States (Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007). After the election of President Donald Trump, incidents of blatant racism rose drastically across the country and also on university campuses (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 2017). Among some White people, color-blind racism persists, which includes beliefs, practices, and attitudes that race is no longer relevant (Constantine et al., 2008). These studies show that for faculty, race is completely relevant.

This second chapter reviews the theoretical and empirical literature relevant to this study, presenting where the study is situated and supported by the current literature. The purpose of this
dissertation research was to discover university faculty members’ lived experiences with the social justice mission at one university. Specifically, the dissertation sought to learn the extent to which there was variance between these experiences based on race identity, length in career, religious affiliation, and faculty rank. The first section of this chapter discusses the concept and definition of social justice and how it is affected by institutional racism. The next section describes the literature about university institutional missions and their effect on the university environment. The chapter then discusses racial microaggressions and their effect on the members of the campus community. The chapter then describes organizational culture in higher education. Finally, the chapter describes critical race theory, including its historical basis. These elements of the literature review combine to inform the results of this study about how faculty experience the university’s mission on campus. Specifically, the literature and the expanded tree diagram presented later in the chapter provide a context for how institutional racism and racially biased systems underlie the experiences of people on campus. These experiences are affected by the university’s mission and organizational culture, and in this dissertation they are viewed through the lens of critical race theory. That lens makes issues of racism on campus visible. This dissertation provides evidence for how the mission affects the lives of faculty on campus, and whether those experiences vary based on race identity, length in career, religious affiliation, or faculty rank.

**Social Justice and Institutional Racism**

The first section of this literature review considers the concepts of social justice and racism and how they are interpreted and experienced in the higher education context. The concept of social justice has a long history. It has roots in the three major Western religions and Greek philosophy (Tietje, 2014). Social justice is informed by the philosophical concept of
desert, wherein someone is treated as she or he deserves (Celello, 2017). Concepts of social justice are seen throughout the development of Western philosophy, including in works by Jesuit thinkers and Pope Pius (Tietje, 2014). Social justice is concerned with “how different groups of people have been historically afforded or denied justice relative to societal norms that systematically privilege members of some groups while disadvantaging others” (C. Clark & Fasching-Varner, 2014, p. 2009). The literature used in this review and thesis tends to use a similar definition (Harper, 2009; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Raphael, 2011). The system perpetuated by the historical founding of higher education institutions, systemic racism, undermines the goals of social justice.

One barrier to achieving social justice is institutional racism. As defined in Appendix A, “Institutional racism is structural in nature and typically covert; the consequences of organizational structure, policy, or practice favor one group or disadvantage another group” (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998, p. 318). Institutional racism describes the structure that allows both overt and covert racism to exist (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015). It is based on the strongly held belief that one group is superior to others, and then perpetuates the unequal positions of people based on their race (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015). Harper (2012) defined racism as:

Individual actions (both intentional and unconscious) that engender marginalization and inflict varying degrees of harm on minoritized persons; structures that determine and cyclically remanufacture racial inequity; and institutional norms that sustain White privilege and permit the ongoing subordination of minoritized persons (p. 10).

Harper argued that in studies of faculty of color, racism is rarely identified as institutional in nature. Universities’ use of social justice as a key feature of their institutional mission is in apparent opposition to institutional racism.
University Mission Statements

Most private and many public institutions have mission statements that guide their work. These statements are often referenced as the justification and motivation for actions, changes, campus programming, coursework, hiring, and growth. They are public statements of the university’s purpose, overarching vision, and responsibility (Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006; Jaquette, 2013). A campus’s mission statement can also provide guidance for conversations around budget allocation, opportunities for growth when finances are solid, and guidance for reallocation when finances are less secure (Meacham, 2008). Campus mission statements are often vaguely worded and confusing to constituents (Black & Latta, 2015). Having a mission statement provides stability across changing academic landscapes and across changes in leadership (Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006). For religious universities, the mission statement is the public statement of the “religious character of the institution” (Feldner, 2006).

It is vital for mission-based universities to engage in periodic and consistent evaluations and assessments of their mission and its implementation. Universities must develop statistically reliable instruments to assess perception, commitment, and implementation of the mission to ensure that it is having a positive effect on the campus community (Ferrari & Velcoff, 2006). When the mission statement is out of step with the campus culture, difficulties can arise. If the values of the institution, as expressed through the mission statement, are seen as precarious, they are problematic and not implemented. Secure values are represented in a mission that is implemented consistently (B. R. Clark, 1956). Other vital components of a well-implemented and well-integrated mission are mission agreement and mission consistency (Fjortoft & Smart, 1994). Mission agreement is “the level of consensus that exists among organizational members regarding their view of the purpose of the institution” (Fjortoft & Smart, 1994, p. 431). Mission
consistency is the “congruence between institutional activities and espoused mission” (Fjortoft & Smart, 1994, p. 432). In order to have a university campus with a strong adherence to mission, campus values must be secure, and mission agreement and mission consistency must be present.

When a university campus has a mission statement that includes a commitment to diversity or social justice, there is an additional level of commitment required by the campus to implement the mission effectively. All diversity efforts must be linked to the mission (Pérez, 2013). The leadership of the university must be involved and actively engaged with all aspects of the diversity initiatives (C. L. Brown, 1998; Pérez, 2013; Rosser, 1990; D. G. Smith & Parker, 2005; Wells, 1998). Careful attention needs to be paid that activities, projects, speakers, and courses about diversity issues focus on moving the institution forward towards creating an inclusive environment. Diversity projects do not equal diversity progress (D. G. Smith & Parker, 2005). To ensure that the diversity mission statement of the university is being implemented, there must be a strong commitment by the entire community such that values of diversity and inclusion are woven throughout the entire campus community. One barrier to the implementation of successful diversity and inclusion movements is subtle forms of racism, which will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

**Racial Microaggressions**

Racism can be defined as:

First, the basis of group characteristics is assumed to rest on biology – racism is a biological concept. Second, Racism has, as a necessary premise, the superiority of one’s own race. Third, racism rationalizes institutional and cultural practices that formalize the hierarchical domination of one racial group over another. (Jones, 1997, p. 11)

Scholars have described different hierarchies of racism, from the individual level to a broader,
cultural racism (Garcia & Johnston-Guerrero, 2015; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Young, 2002). Figure 3 illustrates how researchers have conceptualized racism throughout society. It has been argued that racism is pervasive throughout society (Garcia & Johnston-Guerrero, 2015; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Young, 2002). In Figure 3, this is represented by civilizational racism. This also gives rise to epistemological racism and societal racism. Epistemological racism can occur when researchers who describe themselves as decidedly anti-racist in their work nevertheless employ epistemological methods that are culturally oriented in a culture different than their own. Civilizational racism also gives rise to societal racism, which is a racism that is encountered throughout society. It is similar to institutional racism, but it exists outside of institutions, within the general society. Institutional racism is the racist practices that are pervasive throughout institutions and structured systems. Institutional racism allows individual racism to develop, which is acts of racism perpetuated by an individual either obviously (overt) or subtly (covert). The next section goes into greater details about covert racism.
As defined in the previous chapter, microaggressions are a subtle form of racism. They are verbal or non-verbal, subtle assaults. They are inflicted unconsciously. They are covert, hidden, occur every day, and typically the inflictor is not aware that the words or actions have caused harm. In this section, a discussion of microaggression research addresses many aspects of the literature. This section discusses how researchers have identified several types of microaggressions, including some that are specific to a particular racial group. Additionally, research about types of microaggressions that are specific to the higher education setting will be discussed. This research is important because of how it affects members of the faculty. The
specific types of microaggressions encountered by higher education faculty will be discussed in the following section.

**Types of Microaggressions**

Researchers have attempted to categorize microaggressions. One school of thought focuses on microaggressions that are not particular to any race, but rather are generally inflicted on people of color. Sue, Capodilupo, et al (2007) argued that microaggressions are divided into three categories: *microassaults, microinsults* and *microinvalidations* (Figure 4). Microassaults can be verbal or nonverbal and are often consciously inflicted. They are explicit, racially derogatory attacks intended to hurt the victim. Name-calling is one example. Microinsults are often unconscious communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and are intended to demean the victim’s racial heritage. One example of a microinsult is a snub that implies that the victim is less qualified than the perpetrator. Microinvalidations are often unconscious communications that seek to exclude or invalidate the thoughts or feelings of the victim, a person of color. Figure 4 demonstrates how each lower category is a subtype of the previous categories and provides further explanation for each category and examples of microaggressions.
Researchers have identified many different types of microaggressions; often, these microaggressions are focused on a particular racial group. For example, researchers identified four categories of microaggressions against African American males: microaggressions that imply that the person is a criminal or a predator; microaggressions that imply that the person is street-smart and an expert on “ghetto” culture; microaggressions that imply that the person is an athlete; and microaggressions that imply that the person is anti-intellectual, or simply stupid (W. A. Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007; W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007). Additionally, Sue, Bucceri, et al. (2007) identified nine different categories of microaggressions against Asian
Americans: (a) the implication that the person is an alien in their own land; (b) the assumption that the individual is intelligent simply by being Asian American; (c) the denial that someone who is Asian American can experience acts of racism; (d) exoticization and sexualization of Asian American women; (e) minimizing of interethnic differences, that is, “all Asians look alike;” (f) valuing one culturally influenced communication style over another; (g) second-class citizenship; (h) invisibility; and (i) undeveloped incidents or incidents that do not fit any of the previous categories. Several areas of researchers’ categorization of microaggressions can be compared.

McCabe (2009) also identified categories of microaggressions, including the perception of Black men as threatening, which is similar to Sue’s (2010) observation that African American males are viewed as criminals and predators. Additionally, researchers found that interviewees reported often being the recipient of microaggressions that imply that Latinas or Asian American women are seen as sexually available and exotic (McCabe, 2009; Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007). These categories all share the common concept of devaluing the individual. The underlying assumption is that the person is different and does not belong in the group or organization. This is similar to the concept of othering, wherein the dominant culture identifies someone as different and thus in a position of lesser power (Johnson et al., 2004). The process of othering allows the individual to be viewed as less valuable and thus permits the group or culture to engage in demeaning behavior and racial microaggressions.

Microaggressions in the Higher Education Setting

Previous studies have reported on microaggressions that can be found in almost any setting; they were not focused on the context of the higher education institution. This section will focus on microaggressions specific to a higher education context. Pérez Huber and Solórzano
(2015) proposed a framework for understanding how microaggressions fit into a broader context of higher education campus culture, institutionalized racism, and White supremacy. As described in the previous chapter, institutional racism is the covert, structural practices of a system or organization that favor one group over another (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Pérez Huber and Solórzano (2015) argued that the structure of White supremacy inherent in campus culture and the related microaggressions allow the structure of institutionalized racism to exist. This in turn permits racial microaggressions to occur. They further argued that college campuses exist as a microcosm of the overall American society of White supremacy. They argued that this further distills the challenges that people of color face in society within an environment that can be perceived as safe, but often is not (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015). One area of research discusses microaggressions that occur in the higher education setting and how they affect people of color, while another branch of research focuses on how microaggressions are experienced by faculty of color on campus.

**Types of Microaggressions Experienced by Campus Faculty**

As is common in social science research, much of the literature previously discussed focused on participants who were college students. This does not negate those findings. The same findings are further expanded when considering the unique role of campus faculty members. An additional area of the literature looks at the specific and unique effects of microaggressions that are experienced by college faculty. Authors consider both the institutional and the individual microaggressions experienced by faculty (Constantine et al., 2008; Halcon, 1988). These microaggressions are similar to those described previously, and they serve as constant, covert reminders of the power of one group over another and remind the victim group of their inferiority of skills, qualifications, and intelligence.
Several authors described types of systemic microaggressions or macroaggressions that are inflicted against campus faculty. These include tokenism, having faculty of color’s qualifications questioned, and typecasting. Halcon (1988) argued that tokenism in academia is the implication that faculty of color are hired not for their abilities but rather for their race: they fulfill the role of the token faculty member in that racial or ethnic group. Johnsrud and Sadao (1998) argued that African American faculty experienced tokenism when being selected for committees, resulting in several faculty of color serving on many more committees than their White colleagues. Another example of faculty’s experiences was feeling that their qualifications were questioned by coworkers (Constantine et al., 2008; Solórzano, 1998). The typecasting syndrome is a by-product of tokenism; for example, Hispanic people are thought to only be able to occupy faculty appointments in roles that are stereotypical such as in ethnic studies, Spanish language, or English as a second language (ESL) programs (Halcon, 1988). Another form of tokenism discussed in Halcon (1988) is the “one minority per pot” syndrome, which manifests in academic departments’ reluctance to have more than one person of color on their faculty. The implication is that that faculty member is not as qualified as White faculty, and that the whole faculty only needs one person from each underrepresented group.

Other institutional, systemic problems included inadequate mentorship for new faculty of color (Constantine et al., 2008), expectations that new faculty of color would serve either in perceived low-value service roles (Constantine et al., 2008) or in roles perceived to only benefit students of color (Halcon, 1988). The literature has shown that there are many common examples of faculty of color experiencing systemic racism, or macroaggressions, including a heavier workload in lower status roles or committee appointments. Systemic and institutional issues of racism persist across campuses, involving both people’s actions and the physical
structures of the institution itself.

Campus norms and structures also perpetuate White normative practices, thus alienating people of color. The structure of an academic hall, and thus the method that the majority of coursework is delivered, is focused on individual achievement, not collective understanding. This is a very European cultural norm that excludes people from cultures that emphasize community and collaboration (Muñoz, 2009). The tenure and promotion process for faculty also focuses on individual achievement within a narrow definition. It does not emphasize community or organizational work as much as the typical academic pursuits of research and teaching (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). The culture of higher education is focused on White normative structures and values, which serves to isolate and potentially eliminate faculty of color.

Several authors describe institution-wide practices that African American faculty experienced on their campuses (Constantine et al., 2008; Solórzano, 1998). Faculty reported feelings of being acutely aware of their appearance, including feeling self-conscious because of their hairstyle, clothing, or manner of speech (Constantine et al., 2008). Faculty also reported feeling invisible and also a feeling of otherness such that they felt that they did not belong on the campus because of their race (Constantine et al., 2008; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Solórzano, 1998). Common experiences for faculty of color included a burdensome workload, individual feelings of self-consciously and hyperawareness, and an overall feeling of isolation and alienation. These many types of microaggressions and racialized aggressions are summarized in Figure 5.
In summary, microaggressions are a subtle, everyday form of racism inflicted on people of color. Research on the higher education setting has identified further types of microaggressions, including the institutional, systemic microaggressions called macroaggressions, and have divided systemic macroaggressions into types including tokenism. Researchers have attempted to describe the numerous types of microaggressions, including microassaults, microinsults, microinvalidations, and microaggressions directed at specific racial
groups. The overall structure of higher education is White normative, which serves to isolate faculty and students of color. When interviewed about their positions, faculty of color reported specific feelings of isolation, self-consciousness, and experiences of being assigned to a burdensome workload of lower status committee and academic appointments.

Effects of Microaggressions and Possible Solutions

The many different types of microaggressions have been shown to have significant effects on people of color and specifically on faculty of color. These physical effects include mundane environmental stress, a reaction similar to posttraumatic stress disorder, and the stress of constantly worrying that one’s actions will support a stereotype. The cumulative effects of these stresses can affect the physical and emotional well-being of the victim and often result in a lower retention rate for faculty of color. This has caused faculty of color to develop specific coping mechanisms in order to attempt to remain in the higher education setting. All is not lost, however: there are options available to institutions of higher education to help combat this problem.

Types of Stresses

Researchers have identified at least three types of stresses experienced by people of color in response to racism. Mundane, extreme, environmental stress (MEES) (Pérez Huber & Solorzano, 2015; W. A. Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007), racial battle fatigue (W. A. Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007), and increased blood pressure (Hill et al., 2007) have all been identified in people of color as negative physical effects of repeated microaggressions. W. A. Smith, Allen & Danley (2007) argued that MEES is a type of stress that affects African American males. It is a common and everyday experience (mundane), it has a large detrimental effect on the victim and his worldview (extreme), and it is institutionalized and biased against the African American male
MEES has been found to be caused by microaggressions in one-third of the studied cases (W. A. Smith et al. 2011). MEES can lead to racial battle fatigue (RBF), which is a heightened psychological and emotional response resulting from a constant barrage of microaggressions. Similar to battle fatigue or posttraumatic stress disorder, RBF is caused by repeated racial assaults (W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007). The effects of prolonged racial microaggressions can have long-term psychological and physical effects on the victim.

Being the victim of prolonged attacks like microaggressions takes a toll on the victim. Racial battle fatigue is a condition similar to that experienced by someone who has been in combat. W. A. Smith, Allen and Danley (2007) defined racial battle fatigue and reported that African American college students reported specific reactions to numerous acts of microaggressions, including “frustration, shock, avoidance or withdrawal, disbelief, anger, aggressiveness, uncertainty or confusion, resentment, anxiety, helplessness, hopelessness, and fear” (p. 562). People of color develop racial battle fatigue after experiencing countless acts of microaggression (W. A. Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). The cumulative effects of microaggressions can have psychological impacts on the victims, including changes in their behavior.

After being the victim of numerous acts of all kinds of racism, the victims are at risk of displaying the negative behaviors that are being stereotyped. This is described as stereotype threat, which Steele (1997) described as a situation when someone feels there is the potential of being stereotyped simply because of one’s membership in a group that is often stereotyped. He defined stereotype threat as “the social-psychological threat that arises when one is in a situation or doing something for which a negative stereotype about one’s group applies” (p. 610). He contends that the individual is threatened with being negatively stereotyped, with being judged,
or with the chance of acting in agreement with the stereotype. This causes the individual continual, cumulative feelings of stress due to the feeling of being negatively judged due to her or his race. These repeated stresses have psychological and physical effects on the victim.

The effects of microaggressions have been shown to be physical and psychological. One study observed participants and their responses after experiencing racial microaggressions on campus. This study showed that people who experienced microaggressions experienced a temporary rise in their resting blood pressure (Hill et al., 2007). Repeated exposure to microaggressions thus causes repeated, prolonged times of elevated resting blood pressure, which will have lasting physical effects on individuals throughout their academic career.

**Coping Mechanisms for Faculty**

Campus faculty, when faced with numerous microaggressions and a campus culture of institutional racism, find many ways to cope. Johnsrud and Sadao (1998) described faculty adopting what they described as a bicultural stance: the faculty members maintain their dominant culture outside of the higher education setting while adopting a set of White-normative and White-dominant values and norms that allow them to participate and succeed in the academic setting. This biculturalism manifests in the faculty members changing their speaking patterns, or code-switching, and changing their patterns of interaction in order to blend in with the higher education culture (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Thus faculty of color, unlike their White counterparts, do not feel that they can act as their true selves in all contexts: they need to constantly evaluate which persona to display in which context.

Faculty of color create coping mechanisms in order to survive the repeated microaggressions experienced in the higher education setting. Faculty of color work to develop communities of color with other faculty, either on the same campus or across the higher
education field (Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Halcon, 1988). In these communities, they strive for collaboration and collegiality in order to survive, to thrive and to fight back against the negative forces. Halcon (1988) described several other types of coping mechanisms. One option is for faculty to give in and assimilate to the White dominant culture. Another option for faculty of color is to give up their scholarly pursuits and work to fight racism at all costs. These people tend to experience burnout quickly. A final option for faculty of color is to move on from the university, which means they leave the institution for another institution or to private industry (Halcon, 1988). None of these coping mechanisms support the ongoing development of the scholar or the institution.

The repeated exposure to racial microaggressions has numerous negative effects on faculty of color. Victims can experience psychological responses similar to battle fatigue and have negative physical responses like a rise in blood pressure. In response to these repeated assaults, faculty of color develop numerous coping mechanisms. These coping strategies can include the need for multiple cultural personas that are displayed depending on the context. These strategies can also include variations on fight or flight responses. All of these responses are necessary for the individual to undertake in order to survive in the higher education setting, but they are not beneficial to the individual or the higher education institution.

Possible Solutions

Campus-wide solutions. Many authors outline solutions to campus racism that can serve as the beginning of a model of improvement. The process starts with a shared, understood campus priority of making racial inclusion a goal (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Solórzano et al., 2000; Yosso et al., 2009). There must be a campus-wide plan for change (Hurtado et al., 1999; Yosso et al., 2009) that must include ongoing assessments of the campus
climate (Hurtado et al., 1999). The activities on campus must include recruitment of students and faculty of color (Solórzano et al., 2000), and any campus-wide programs must involve the faculty in their development (Hurtado et al., 1999) and must be woven throughout the curriculum (Solórzano et al., 2000). All activities, at their core, need to focus on the mission of the institution (Solórzano et al., 2000). Through conscious, continual, collaborative work, higher education institutions can progress towards eliminating the impact of racial microaggressions.

**Campus climate.** Campus climate is distinct but connected to the campus culture. The campus climate is how people feel about their experiences on campus. It is affected by the campus culture. Often, students, staff, and faculty claim that the campus climate and culture are to blame for the prevalence of blatant racist acts and microaggressions (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). The definition of a *campus climate* is the racial environment of the campus that affects all students, faculty, and staff either positively or negatively and can determine the success or failure of students of color (Yosso et al., 2009).

Pérez-Huber and Solórzano (2015) defined the features of a positive racial campus climate as: it is inclusive of all members of the campus community; it has a curriculum that reflects the experiences of people of color; it includes programs that support recruitment, retention, and graduation of students, faculty, and staff of color; and it has a mission that supports the organization’s commitment to diversity. They argued that universities instead enact policies of a “diversity of convenience” (p. 664), present in superficial and reactionary policies designed to increase the numbers of students, faculty, or staff from underrepresented groups. This actually contributes to a negative racial climate. The campus climate influences the campus culture, which in turn influences the prevalence of acts of everyday racism or microaggressions (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015).
Yosso, et al (2009) argued that many colleges claim to hold social justice as a core value and have placed “diversity” as a key goal of their strategic plans. They include “social justice” in their online and print marketing materials. Their employees often describe their strict adherence to the college’s mission. However, this can be described as a *diversity of convenience*. The campus will demonstrate their population diversity in easy ways, for example, in visible marketing pieces. A campus with diversity of convenience will not undertake the long-term, often difficult process of changing the campus culture and climate to support a diverse student and employee population. (Yosso et al., 2009). It is imperative for the campus to take conscious action to improve the campus climate in order to support a diverse student and employee population.

Hurtado et al. (1999) outlined many tenets believed to be necessary to improve the campus climate for racial inclusion at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). These include: affirming that the goal of racial inclusion is a priority; a systematic assessment of the campus climate in terms of diversity; development of a plan for change that includes specific timetables, resources, and activities; an ongoing evaluation of activities; and practices involving faculty and professional staff in ongoing planning and implementation efforts (Hurtado et al., 1999). Yosso et al. (2009) outlined what should be included in a positive racial climate:

Genuine racial diversity or pluralism refers to underrepresented racial and ethnic groups being physically present and treated as equals on the college campus. All administrators, faculty, and students affirm one another’s dignity by demonstrating readiness to benefit from each other’s experience and willingness to acknowledge one another’s contributions to the common welfare of the college. Evidence of genuine diversity would include programs to compensate communities the university has historically underserved and
initiatives to remedy social inequalities the institution has perpetuated. Such efforts may disrupt the institutional status quo and destabilize the university’s historical racial power base. Instead, colleges tend to endorse diversity to the extent that it serves White students. (p. 664)

Solórzano et al. (2000) argued for what should be included in campus-wide planning in order to foster a positive racial climate. This includes:

(1) the inclusion of students, faculty, and administrators of color [in the planning processes and procedures]; (2) a curriculum that reflects the historical and contemporary experiences of people of color; (3) programs to support the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students of color; and (4) a college/university mission that reinforces the institution's commitment to pluralism. (p. 62)

The common thread of this research is that campus leadership, in order to improve the campus racial climate, must engage the entire campus community in meaningful dialog about change as well as develop long-range strategic plans focused on improving the culture of the institution so it will be inclusive of all members of the community.

Organizational Culture

Organizational Culture in Higher Education

Research about organizational culture at higher education institutions is also derived from the field of sociology. Organizational culture is developed through symbols, shared beliefs, attitudes, values, and organizational sagas, and it is also developed through ritual and myth (B. R. Clark, 1971; Pettigrew, 1979; Schein, 2010; Smircich, 1983). In higher education institutions, symbol, myth, and saga exist, and often have a deeper and longer-established meaning than in corporations because rituals, founders, and traditions in higher education are often hundreds of
years old, much older than those found in a corporate organization (B. R. Clark, 1971; Pettigrew, 1979; Smircich, 1983).

Examples of symbol, myth, and saga can be seen throughout the unique culture that is American higher education. Symbols include statues of the college’s founder, the student newspaper, a notable structure on campus, a sports logo, or academic regalia unique to a particular university. Examples of shared beliefs can include the core values or principles around which a campus or academic department functions or a particular academic stance to which all of the faculty ascribe. Examples of attitudes in an academic setting can include a shared value of a student-centered approach or the attitude that the adjunct faculty are not paid enough so they refuse to hold office hours. Values can include a campus’s shared belief in the college’s mission statement or in valuing making education accessible to low-income students. Examples of higher education rituals include orientation events for students; Greek system initiation activities; Saturday football games; and graduation regalia, music, and structure (B. R. Clark, 1980; Dill, 1982; Masland, 1985). The sociological perspective of culture research is thus the most appropriate perspective from which to study a higher education institution.

Most organizational researchers focus on the general concept of an organization, which is often set in a for-profit company. Some theorists (Cameron & Ettington, 1988; B. R. Clark, 1972; Maassen, 1996; Masland, 1985; Schein, 2010; Smart & St. John, 1996; Tierney, 1988) have applied this research to the unique organizational culture of the higher education setting. Organizational symbols, beliefs, and values remain at the core of the study of organizational culture. Maassen (1996) argued that all three aspects affect the development of the culture at an institution of higher education. His work expanded on Geertz’ (1973) anthropological definition by describing institutions of higher education as including the collection of behaviors, values,
and beliefs unique to a specific group of academics. These theorists took the seminal work of organizational culture studies and applied those theories and knowledge to the unique setting and cultures of the higher education institution with the goal of explaining, studying, and categorizing it.

**Varied Descriptions of Higher Education Culture**

Many researchers have approached the difficult and messy task of describing the unique cultures of higher education institutions. B. R. Clark (1980) argued that there are four levels of higher education culture. The first culture of the faculty member is that of the discipline, for example, the discipline of history or chemistry. The second culture is that of an academic, including their academic rank, for example, assistant professor or professor. The third culture is that of the particular institution, for example, University of Central State. These three cultures combine to create the complete culture of the faculty member, for example, a physics professor at State University or an adjunct anthropology professor at Liberal Arts College. The fourth culture is that of the whole field of academia in the United States; for example, both of the above individuals would be part of the professorship, the combined faculty of all of the higher education institutions in the United States (B. R. Clark, 1980). The many different identities of members of the college community create the culture of the institution, as do the myths and symbols of the particular campus.

As discussed previously, cultures of higher education institutions are understood through analysis of saga, heroes, symbol, and ritual (Masland, 1985). To understand the culture of an institution of higher education, the cultural researcher needs to analyze multiple measures: how members of the organization approach the saga and founding stories and the institution; how the institution portrays heroes, including founders or current leaders; what symbols are present in
artifacts, including student newspapers, promotional documents, campus artwork, building design, and mission statements; and what rituals exist, including academic, athletic, and social traditions (Masland, 1985). This definition builds on Schein’s (1984, 2010) definition by providing specific examples of the components of higher education culture.

Another researcher offers a broader approach to analyzing the culture of a higher education institution. Tierney (1988) had a list of questions, called the framework for organizational culture (Table 1), which he developed in order to look at the culture of the higher education institution as a unique cultural entity. This framework probes the categories of environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership as areas to analyze to understand the culture and organization of a college or university. Tierney (1988) argued that this framework describes the key concepts for a cultural researcher to investigate. He argued that if the researcher did not consider these concepts, the research would be viewed as inadequate.

Table 1

A Framework of Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural term</th>
<th>Concepts for study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>How does the organization define its environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the attitude toward the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hostility? Friendship?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>How is it defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is it articulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it used as a basis for decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much agreement is there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>How do new members become socialized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is it articulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do we need to know to survive/excel in this organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>What constitutes information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who has it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How is it disseminated?

Strategy
How are decisions arrived at?
Which strategy is used?
Who makes decisions?
What is the penalty for bad decisions?

Leadership
What does the organization expect from its leaders?
Who are the leaders?
Are there formal and informal leaders?

Note: (adapted from Tierney, 1988, p. 8)

Four Culture Types

Another theory of higher education culture attempts to categorize cultures by types. Multiple authors describe four specific culture types that apply to the higher education institution (Cameron, 1985; Cameron & Ettingen, 1988; Smart & St. John, 1996). The four culture types are: clan, hierarchy, market, and adhocracy. Research shows that more often than not higher education institutions tend to have a clan culture (Kaufman, 2013). The clan culture consists of a leader who is a mentor and facilitator, intrapersonal bonding among community members is based on loyalty and tradition, and the strategic emphasis of the organization is on human resources and cohesion (Cameron, 1985). The adhocracy culture type is typified by an entrepreneurial leader. Bonding between employees is through innovative actions and work. The overall strategy of the organization focuses on growth and developing new resources. The market culture type is led by someone who is a motivated producer. Employee bonding is through accomplishing goals, and the organization’s strategic emphasis is on achievements and competitive actions. The hierarchy culture type’s leader is an organizer. Employee bonding is through rules and policies, and strategy focuses on stability and performance (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). A few colleges have the other culture types but the predominant one has been found to be the clan culture (Smart & St. John, 1996). Though the clan type is most common in higher
education institutions, some researchers disagree about which culture type leads to a more successful higher education institution.

There is disagreement about which culture type is more effective in higher education. Smart and St. John (1996) argued that colleges with the clan culture type are more effective. However, Obenchain, Johnson, and Dion (2004) argued that although the clan culture type is more prevalent, innovation is more prevalent in Christian colleges that have the adhocracy culture type than in those that have a clan culture type. Not surprisingly, the adhocracy culture is typified by leaders who are innovators or entrepreneurial, employee bonding is over innovation and development, and emphasis is on growth and development (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Depending on the measure, either the clan or adhocracy culture type can be interpreted as being most effective, although there is no disagreement that the clan culture type is the most common in the higher education setting.

**Critical Race Theory**

**Historical Trajectory**

The history of critical race theory (CRT) is relatively short, dating to the mid-1970s (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993). It originated in legal studies with critical legal theory; the resulting scholarship was called critical legal studies (CLS) (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; McCoy & Rodricks, 2015). CLS held in part that legal scholarship needed to expose the systemic class biases that were inherent in the American legal system (Ladson-Billings, 1998). However, critics argued that CLS did very little to change the legal structures that were in place (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Critics also felt that CLS did not go far enough in its criticisms of the legal system; they felt the field largely ignored race as an issue. Partially out of this thought, CRT was developed.
**Seminal Works**

CRT developed from legal scholarship and its seminal authors include legal scholars. The concept of CRT is often attributed to Derrick Bell and his essays about the unfair treatment of African American people under the law (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015; W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007; Solórzano et al., 2000). Bell was a legal scholar who transitioned to writing for a more general audience (Bell, 1979, 1992). Delgado & Stefancic (2000), in their seminal legal work, described some underlying beliefs of CRT, including the belief that racism is normal in American society. They argued that legal changes that guaranteed Whites and Blacks equal access and treatment under the law did very little to counteract the everyday racism that people of color encounter in all aspects of society. Other seminal legal works include Delgado and Stefancic’s (2012) book, which condenses the scholarship into a readable introductory text. In addition, Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, and Crenshaw (1993) collected essays that examine free speech and critical race, providing a seminal work for issues of racism on university campuses.

Seminal works in CRT that specifically focused on the education system include those by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), Ladson-Billings (1998), and Solórzano and Yosso (2002). Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) discussed American society’s reliance on property rights as opposed to human rights. Ladson-Billings (1998) proposed the application of CRT to an educational setting, focusing on several aspects of school structure. She discussed the curriculum and how the stories and images of people of color are erased, marginalized, or simplified in the common curriculum. She discussed the deficit perspective that pervades the common curriculum, a practice and perspective that sees people of color as inherently deficient.
Contemporary Authors

More recently, scholars have focused on microaggressions in the higher education setting (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015; W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007; Solórzano et al., 2000; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). Among other topics, they have studied how African American, Latino/a, and Asian students experience racism on university campuses. One aspect of their work specifically focuses on everyday racism, or microaggressions: the subtle, painful slights that occur repeatedly and routinely, often culminating in a negative or hostile campus or work climate. Their research provides many examples of the negative, harmful effects of microaggressions and also provides actionable suggestions for how campuses can begin to address the issues of systemized racism.

Empirical Studies

Critical race theory has been used as the theoretical framework for many studies in a higher education context, a sampling of which are considered here. Several studies researched the effects of microaggressions on faculty or students. One found that the presence of racial microaggressions negatively impacts job satisfaction for faculty of color (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Two others looked at students. One found that racial microaggressions have a negative effect on the campus racial climate (Solórzano et al., 2000). Another study found that Latina/o students, although they experienced racial microaggressions on campus, were able to overcome the negative effects through their development of academic navigation skills and building community on campus (Yosso et al., 2009). Some other studies looked at faculty experiences on campus. One study used counterstorytelling about the experiences of Black male faculty at predominantly White institutions and documented their experiences with Black misandric ideology (Harper, 2009). Another study documented the discrepancy in faculty of color and their
achievements compared to White faculty (Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). This study found that faculty of color achieved success at lower rates than White faculty and were represented in higher numbers in less prestigious departments, ranks, and institutions. Other studies used CRT to analyze the physical structure and layouts of college campuses (Muñoz, 2009), the language that universities use to address racial issues on campus (Davis & Harris, 2016), and the language used in diversity plans (Iverson, 2007). Critical race theory, through its historical development and application to the university setting, was an effective and illuminating theoretical framework for this study.
In summary, the interconnection of the literature can be summarized in a diagram (Figure 6), which will be expanded upon later in this document to include the results of this study. In this diagram, institutional racism and systems of White supremacy are under the surface.
and not visible. What is seen are the institutional mission and the institutional culture of the organization. These structures give rise to the tree that is supported by racial microaggressions. The results of these microaggressions are on the left side of the tree: burnout, high turnover, high blood pressure, racial battle fatigue, and mundane extreme environmental stress. The coping mechanisms are included on the right side of the tree: assimilation, leaving academia, code switching, and taking a bicultural stance. Later in this document there will be an explanation of how the results of the study and the theoretical framework influence this system and results.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the procedures for the study and the chosen methodology. The purpose of this chapter is to provide details about the study methodology, purpose, site and participants, research design, research question, and ethics. This chapter details the procedures followed in this single-site descriptive case study. It describes the research design, which includes interviews and collecting other artifacts from the campus. It discusses the procedures for collecting, organizing, coding, storing, and securing all types of data. Given that a component of the research includes face to face, non-anonymous interviews, the ethics of interviewing is discussed, as well as how the researcher dealt with issues of validity and reliability.

The study sought to learn about how faculty make sense of and assign meaning to the university mission on a specific university campus. The researcher captured examples of how faculty felt about the mission and their work on campus through analysis of campus artifacts and interviews about faculty members’ first-person lived experiences.

The goal of this study was to gain insight into how faculty experience the university’s social justice mission. Specifically, this study considered how faculty felt about the institution and their place in the campus community; whether they felt included or excluded; if they felt respected, valued, and like a valuable member of the campus community; and how they came to understand the university’s mission. To understand their experiences, the university context was analyzed through artifacts including print materials, campus-wide emails, and campus documents. The following section will provide greater details about the case study methodology.

**Case Study Methodology**

Every research study could be approached using different methodologies; there is no one correct method. This study used a case study method to understand how a specific group, the
faculty, experience a social phenomenon, the university mission, in a particular context, one university campus. To achieve this understanding, artifacts and interviews were analyzed to understand the complex interrelationships on the university campus. This single-case design allowed the researcher to gain deep insight into one campus. A single-case study methodology was followed to increase the rigor of the study. The study used document review to typify the context and identify institutional factors that shaped it. The study also used interviews with 11 faculty members to understand their lived experiences in that context.

As a part of the case study design, this study considered the campus culture. To better understand the campus culture, many different types of artifacts were analyzed. These included first-person narratives from interviews and campus artifacts, including print pieces, email announcements, issues of the alumni magazine, faculty evaluation procedures, and newsletters. This allowed the researcher to understand the context of the campus. Similar to Geertz’s (1973) thick description, to better understand the implementation of the mission, both the context of the mission and the experiences of the participants needed to be considered.

Case studies include interviews and storytelling as vital forms of evidence. Critical race theory holds that first-person narratives are vital forms of reference and evidence (Kvale, 2008; Seidman, 2013; Stake, 2000). Although critics argue that a single-case study cannot be generalized, Stake (2000) argued that knowledge can be gained from studying one case, such as one campus.

The case study method was chosen because the researcher wanted to understand how faculty experience the university mission in one particular context, the campus of PWU. Case studies are best suited to complex systems, such as a university campus. The study considered multiple types of evidence, including artifacts, history, story, and lived experiences. Case study
methodology is not without criticisms, including that it has a lack of rigor. Theorists propose procedural solutions to combat criticisms and guarantee a high level of rigor.

**Research Design**

The study included four phases: the planning of data collection, the recruitment of participants, the collection of data, and the analysis of the collected data. Data were collected through interviews that were conducted in person or by telephone. Artifacts were collected by the researcher through personal contacts on campus. Data were analyzed in two rounds: in-depth *in vivo* coding and organizing into broader categories. Depending on the content, data were stored in secure locations, either electronically or in analog format. The next sections will describe the phases of the study in greater detail, as outlined in Figure 7.

**Institutional Review Board**

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained both from Northeastern and from Private Western University. Approval from both institutions was obtained at approximately the same time. Revisions were submitted to both institutions and final approval was given after these revisions were implemented. Documentation of both approval documents is provided in Appendices F and G.

**Phase 1: Planning**

The first phase of the study was preparation for the human subjects component of the study. Documents were collected for several years in anticipation of the human subjects portion of the study, and collection continued throughout the study. However, the majority of the documents were gathered during the first phase of the study. The interview protocol was also developed and tested during this phase. This process revealed that many follow up questions were needed in order to provide greater clarity. Finally, a plan was developed for contacting
potential participants, both by word of mouth and through direct communication from the researcher. Contacting potential participants through word of mouth is called snowball sampling, in which one person leads a researcher to the next participant because members of the participant group were not all known (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). During this planning process, IRB approval was obtained from both Northeastern and the study site (Appendices G & H). The next section will describe the recruitment procedure.

**Phase 2: Recruitment**

Recruitment continued during the data collection period. Participants were contacted via email (Appendix B). This email was distributed through key contacts and through direct outreach to individuals by the researcher. As described in the IRB, only one email was sent: there was no follow up email if the potential participant did not respond. In response to the email, participants completed a survey (Appendix C) that indicated their willingness to participate in the study. Participants who completed the survey were contacted to schedule an interview. While this phase was progressing, additional documents were being collected as well. The next section will describe the third phase of the study, the data collection phase.

**Phase 3: Data Collection**

Data collection consisted of the collection of documents and artifacts and interviews with participants. In the third phase, 331 documents were collected and reviewed. Eleven participants were interviewed in person and online. Interviews were transcribed and the transcripts were imported into qualitative coding software. Each transcript was checked for accuracy by both the researcher and the participant. Documents were scanned into electronic format and imported into the coding software. More information about data collection can be found in a later section. The next section will describe the final phase of the study, data analysis.
**Phase 4: Data Analysis**

The final phase of the study was data analysis. MaxQDA qualitative data analysis software was used to organize the process. Documents and transcripts were loaded into the software. During the first round of coding, they were coded using the in vivo method of qualitative data analysis. In the second round of data analysis, these codes were grouped using pattern coding. From these second-round codes, the six groups with the greatest number of first-round codes were selected to be developed into themes. There were six final themes in this study. The data analysis process is described in greater detail in a later section.

*Figure 7. Phases of research design.*
Sample Design and Study Population

The study had three main components: site, artifacts, and participants. The site was a private university; the artifacts included print materials, documents, and images; and the participants were faculty at the university. Analysis of these three components allowed the researcher to understand how the university’s stated mission was experienced by members of its community.

One key component of the study was the participants. Participants were faculty who taught at Private Western University (PWU). They were recruited from the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. They taught one or more courses on the main campus. They had at least one full year of continuous teaching experience at the university. Faculty members from all academic divisions were invited to participate. There were 11 participants, including at least one participant from each of the four academic divisions: School of Education, School of Liberal Arts, School of Science, and School of Business. The study had a goal of 10 participants, and 11 were interviewed. Data saturation was achieved (Kvale, 2008; Morris, 2015). Data saturation is when additional interviews do not yield any further information, themes, or insight (Kvale, 2008; Morris, 2015). The sufficiency of 11 participants is reinforced by research cited in Kvale (2008). This allowed for the best blend of researcher time and resources and yielded quality data for analysis.

Participants were current members of the faculty at Private Western University. They included people aged 18 and over and people who identified as male or female. They were full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. Participants were contacted by email (Appendix B). No additional email or other request to participate was sent. Whether someone was a member of the included group was entirely determined by the individual participant’s response to the screening
survey. Their self-reported time of service was not verified. Participants were recruited through homogeneous snowball sampling (Creswell, 2002; Miles et al., 2014). Homogeneous snowball sampling means that people in the same group referred other potential participants to the researcher. All participants were tenured or tenure-track faculty at PWU, so they were from a homogeneous group.

The site was another key component of the study. PWU is a private university in the western United States. It enrolled fewer than 5,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The university had a strong stated adherence to its mission and was religious in its orientation. The college was located in a suburban location, about 10 miles from the nearest large city. The student and employee population of the college was majority White; it was a predominantly White institution (PWI). In 2015-2016, it employed over 450 staff and 215 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty and about 250 part-time adjunct faculty. Approximately 24 percent of the full-time faculty identified as people of color. In contrast, the population of the surrounding area was over 52 percent people of color. These demographics are slightly lower than the national statistics, where approximately 29 percent of assistant, associate, or full professors are people of color (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). The participants identified as faculty of color, White faculty, or “other,” which indicated that their racial identity depended on the context. The potential participant group was 215 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty. Of that group, 103 (47.9%) people were sent emails either by the researcher or by members of the potential participant group. Thirteen (12.6%) people responded to the request to complete the screening survey, and 11 (10.6%) people were interviewed.

The site had a strong commitment to its mission and was religiously oriented. The mission was included in every employee job posting and job interviews were required to include
at least one question about how the candidate would support the mission in her or his work.

Faculty tenure and promotion materials and documentation required that all faculty describe how their work for the preceding year supported the mission. In staff evaluation procedures, all staff members were required to describe their mission-oriented work for the previous year.

Additionally, the campus had a great deal of religious and secular iconography, saga, and stories about the university founder’s religious affiliation. There were numerous printed materials about the religious beliefs, the mission, and the founder. It should be noted that this study purposefully did not consider the religious orientation of the university in order to maintain a narrow focus.

This decision is included in chapter 5 as an opportunity for further research.

**Demographics**

Eleven participants were interviewed about their experiences with the university’s mission and mission-based education. Five of the participants identified as people of color, four identified as White, and two identified as “other,” indicating that their racial identity tended to depend on the context and situation. The participants were men and women; religious, non-religious, and no preference stated; heterosexual, homosexual, and no sexual identity stated.

Although the screening survey and interview questions only asked about length of service and identity as a person of color, in the context of interviews the participants disclosed more information. The participants are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

*Summary of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
<th>Identify as Person of Color?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayo Wilbur</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilje Ljungborg</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esme Ljung</td>
<td>&gt; 16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavi Adamson</td>
<td>&gt; 16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Castro</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas of Responsibility

All participants were full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty at one university. They worked in academic departments across campus, in the schools of liberal arts, business, science, and education, teaching both undergraduate and graduate students. The participant group included faculty who were tenure-track or tenured; they were assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. They included program directors, department chairs, faculty senate members, and other faculty leadership. They participated in numerous areas of teaching, advising, mentoring, coaching, tutoring, research, collaboration, curriculum development, service, and publishing.

Experience and Education

Four participants were early career faculty (less than 5 years of employment at the university), four were mid-career (6 to 15 years of employment) and three were established career (more than 16 years of employment). The newest employee had less than 3 years of employment and the most established employee had over 20 years of employment. All had earned terminal degrees in their fields.

The university had many distinct faculty ranks, three of which were considered in this study: assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. Four of the participants were assistant professors, four were associate professors, and three were full professors. The PWU faculty handbook defined assistant professor as someone who has a terminal degree and has the
potential to be effective in teaching and service. An associate professor will have demonstrated ability as a teacher, researcher, and in providing service to the college and may or may not have tenure. A full professor, who will have tenure, will have demonstrated all of the abilities of an associate professor, and also a consistently high level of teaching, research, and service.

Tenure is an employment status that is unique to education institutions. When someone is awarded tenure, she or he can only be terminated for cause, severe institutional financial circumstances, or program discontinuation (American Association of University Professors, 2017). Five participants were tenure-track and six were tenured. PWU required tenure-track faculty to annually compile an extensive written portfolio about their teaching, research, and service to the college during the previous academic year. Tenured faculty continued this process while they were at the rank of associate professor. When they achieved the rank of full professor, this process was no longer required by the institution. A listing of the participant-reported demographics can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of color</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial identity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not religious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion stated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study consisted of three main components: the site, the artifacts, and the participants. The site for the study was a private university in the western United States. The site was not particularly remarkable or unique, which is why it was an excellent example of how a university struggles with implementing its mission. The participants were faculty who were willing to share their experiences with this researcher. The artifacts were public documents and images that were unremarkable when taken individually but collectively provided insight into the culture and practices of the campus. The next section will describe the data collection methods in greater detail.

**Data Collection**

In the data collection phase of the study, data were collected in two primary areas: visual materials and interviews. Visual materials consisted of many different types of campus documents, including all-campus emails, promotional brochures, websites, alumni magazines, and student newspapers. These were collected for 2 years in anticipation of the human subjects portion of the study. Data were also collected during interviews, which were conducted in person and over the phone with 11 members of the faculty. This yielded numerous data that were then analyzed. This section details the data collection procedure.

Data were gathered through two primary means, following the case study method: visual materials and first-person experiences. Yin’s (2013) six sources of evidence in a case study
include documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observations, and physical artifacts. Physical artifacts included campus-wide emails, print materials, website content and images, and campus iconography. This allowed for a deeper understanding of the university context and culture (B. R. Clark, 1972). Documents and artifacts were selected if they were relevant to the research question and could be easily acquired (Yazan, 2015). Images and text were scanned into electronic form and imported into MaxQDA data analysis software for coding and organization. Artifacts and documents comprised one part of the data; first-person accounts formed the other.

**Visual Materials**

The analysis of visual materials included numerous print and physical objects and media. These included all-campus emails, marketing brochures, pamphlets about core religious teachings, accreditation reports, website content, alumni magazines, and campus newspapers. These physical materials provided the public face of the institution: how the institution directly or indirectly, overtly or inadvertently, presented itself to the outside world. These documents were selected in order to gather information about the image that the institution sought to project through its media presence, advertising, promotional materials, and recruitment information. Documents were also selected that provided insight into the ongoing development of the institution, including accreditation reports and diversity statements. Communication documents were selected because they could provide insight into official statements by college leadership. These documents were available to all campus community members and were not considered confidential. Documents that were reviewed are listed in Table 4.
Table 4

*List of Documents Reviewed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Number of Documents Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation documents</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-campus emails</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate survey</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus magazines</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus newspapers</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie classification documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity frameworks, supporting materials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty employee handbooks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation procedures and forms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty senate meeting minutes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty senate meeting supporting documentation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment print materials</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University annual demographic statistic report</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University mission statement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University website</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of Documents Reviewed</strong></td>
<td><strong>331</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviews**

The second category of data collected was interviews with participants. Humans transmit knowledge through language and story (Seidman, 2013). The purpose for conducting an interview is to transmit and co-construct knowledge between the researcher and the participant (Kvale, 2008). Humans construct knowledge through conversation and storytelling, so interviews, as a semi-structured form of conversation, help the interview participants and researcher construct knowledge together (Kvale, 2008; Seidman, 2013). The study used semi-structured, in-depth interviews. This type of interview allowed the participant to talk in depth about the topic, with the interviewer interjecting probing questions in order to extract as much knowledge from the participant as possible (Morris, 2015). The purpose for in-depth interviews
was to understand the lived experiences of the participants, consistent with critical race theory (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Seidman, 2013). In-depth interviews demonstrated the value of the lived experiences of the participants and provided first-person perspectives on them.

There are strengths and weaknesses to conducting interviews. As Morris (2015) argued, the interview could allow the researcher access to rich personal data but the participant may also not be entirely truthful with the researcher. In-depth interviewing allows a researcher to ask follow-up questions to probe a topic further (Morris, 2015). The data gathered for this study was generalized to a group due to the small number of participants and limited context (Kvale, 2008; Seidman, 2013). In an interview, there is a great amount of flexibility for the participant to talk about various relevant subjects (Morris, 2015). This can generate a long interview transcript that requires a lot of time or money to transcribe (Kvale, 2008). As with any method, there are positive and negative aspects to interviewing. In-depth interviewing, placing its value on the lived experiences of the participants, was an appropriate method for this study (Morris, 2015).

The questions for the interview were developed with the theoretical framework, critical race theory, in mind. As described in Table 5 all questions were designed in consideration of CRT and its characteristics. For example, many questions emphasized the importance of first-person lived experiences with the mission of the university. Additionally, the question about community was designed to elicit first-person experiences, but it also had the potential to elicit responses that were indications of Whiteness as property and the permanence of racism. Several questions questioned the dominant narrative of the university, which developed from the challenge of liberalism and counterstorytelling. Both the questions and the results became clearer through the lens of the theoretical framework.
### Table 5

*Critical Race Theory’s Influence on Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Tenets of CRT</th>
<th>Characteristics of Tenets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What made you want to work at Private Western University?</td>
<td>Storytelling; Commitment to social justice; Experiential knowledge</td>
<td>Initial attractions to institution, possible personal connection to mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?</td>
<td>Critique of liberalism; Commitment to social justice; Experiential knowledge</td>
<td>Willingness to challenge the dominant structure and report accurate reflection of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him or her about what it is like to work here?</td>
<td>Critique of liberalism; Commitment to social justice</td>
<td>Willingness to challenge the dominant structure and story to provide honest assessment to colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?</td>
<td>Storytelling; Critique of liberalism; Commitment to social justice; Experiential knowledge</td>
<td>Personal experiences, willingness to challenge the dominant structure and narrative, desire to change the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is your community at PWU?</td>
<td>Storytelling; Counterstorytelling; Whiteness as property; Critique of liberalism; Permanence of racism</td>
<td>Allegiances, alliances, belonging, connections, cultural dominance; acceptance in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?</td>
<td>Commitment to social justice</td>
<td>Their work impacts and changes the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on campus.</td>
<td>Storytelling; Counterstorytelling; Whiteness as property; Critique of liberalism; Commitment to social justice; Permanence of racism; Experiential knowledge</td>
<td>Personal narratives, feelings of being included/excluded by dominant culture, challenging dominant structures and narratives, acceptance or exclusion from campus community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were selected to represent a variety of lengths of service and whether they identified as a person of color. Most chose to identify their gender identity, religious preferences, and academic department affiliation even though they were not specifically asked about them. Participants represented all of the major academic divisions of the university, various religious affiliations, and two gender identities.

Participants were allowed to choose the location for interviews. Several chose in-person meetings, while others selected telephone interviews. In-person interviews took place in offices or in the faculty lounge. The interviews lasted between 55 and 92 minutes, depending on the length of participant responses. Interview questions were designed with guidance from the theoretical framework. The interview protocol was piloted with three nonparticipants to test the wording, pace, and whether the question elicited clear responses. Following the piloting process, the questions were revised slightly and follow-up questions were drafted.

Interviews were conducted by phone or in person. In-person interviews were audio recorded using the built-in recording app on an iPhone with permission from the participant. Telephone interviews were recorded with the call recording app TapeACall Pro. All interviews were transcribed using the transcription service Rev.com. As the interview was conducted, the researcher made notes on points to follow up on and key phrases used by the participant. All data collection was guided by the research questions (Stake, 1985). The interview protocol (Appendix D) described the procedures and confidentiality and allowed the participant the option to exit at any time. Sample responses to interview questions are provided in Appendix L.
The data collection phase of the study took approximately eight weeks. At the conclusion of data collection, the next phase of the study was entered. In this next phase, the data was analyzed. The next section will describe the data analysis procedure in detail.

**Data Analysis**

Once the visual materials and first-person experiences were gathered, data analysis began. The analysis of data could have started at any time and could have continued throughout the process of gathering data (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1985; Yazan, 2015). The data consisted of interview transcripts, print materials, public emails, and photographic images. They were analyzed on an ongoing basis (Merriam, 1988). The first round of analysis consisted of a complete review of all of the data gathered (Merriam, 1988; Saldaña, 2015). Analytic memos were written to capture reflections, notes, topics, and questions for further exploration; in other words, the researcher had a conversation with the data (Merriam, 1988; Saldaña, 2015). The second round of analysis consisted of line-by-line in vivo coding of the materials using MaxQDA data analysis software. The third round of analysis consisted of organizing the topics that were identified and grouping them into codes (Merriam, 1988). Trends and similarities were inferred from those metacodes because qualitative case studies require categorical data (Stake, 1985). The themes, trends, and similarities are reported in Chapter 4. Data were analyzed while interviews were ongoing. The researcher found some gaps as the interviews progressed, so the interview protocol was altered to slightly accommodate these gaps (Morris, 2015). Follow-up questions were added to gain clarity regarding topics that were introduced by the participants.

**Before First Cycle Coding: Transcriptions and Organization**

Many documents needed to be organized and reviewed prior to the formal coding process. All visual materials were scanned into electronic format and organized in electronic
folders by type (website, newspapers, emails, etc.) The interviews were transcribed by the transcription service Rev.com and were checked by the researcher against the original audio recording. After each interview was transcribed, notes were made about each participant and her or his responses to the interview questions in a large spreadsheet, a sample of which can be seen in Appendix L.

**First-Cycle Coding: In Vivo Coding**

The first cycle of coding was begun as interviews were being conducted. It involved coding visual materials and interview transcripts. In total, 331 documents and 11 interview transcripts were coded. The first-cycle coding was conducted using the in vivo coding method (Saldaña, 2015). This method involved highlighting key words or phrases and coding them using that key word or phrase as the code. The qualitative data analysis software MaxQDA was used to generate 968 first-cycle codes. With the help of MaxQDA, a large excel spreadsheet was generated with these codes and coding segments, a sample of which is found in Appendix K. The second cycle of coding is described in the next section.

**Second-Cycle Coding: Pattern Coding**

After the first-cycle codes were developed, the researcher used a mind-mapping feature in MaxQDA to sort the first-cycle codes into larger groups. This process yielded 18 second-cycle codes, organized by pattern or similar topic. Several of these second-cycle codes only had a few first-round codes associated with them, so the researcher took the six most frequently used second-round codes and selected those for theme development.

**After Second-Cycle Coding: Theme Development**

After the 968 first-round codes were developed into 18 second-round codes through pattern coding, the six most frequent pattern codes were developed into the final themes. These
six themes are described in Chapter 4. An overview of the data analysis coding process is seen below in Figure 8. Samples from each of the code segments can be found in Appendix J.
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**Figure 8. Coding cycles**

**Data Storage**

Two categories of data required two types of storage and two types of data security: insecure and secure documents. Insecure documents and public artifacts from the campus were stored in a Google drive folder that was synced across the researcher’s computers. Documents like anonymized interview transcripts were stored in a password-protected Google drive folder. Data were stored in electronic files on Google drive via the researcher’s NEU Gmail account. Due to the nature of these files, access was limited to the researcher and her advisor. There were two main files, one that was shared with the researcher’s advisor and one that was shared with no one. The audio and transcription files were stored in a secure folder that was shared only with the
researcher’s advisor. The audio files were deleted and destroyed when the study concluded. The anonymized transcription files were retained after this study concluded for inclusion in further research studies. Both audio and transcription files were identified with the participant’s pseudonyms and date of interview.

Secure documents, such as the list of participants, their contact information, and their pseudonyms, were stored on paper in a locked cabinet at the researcher’s home. During the study, this information was only stored on one paper document that was kept with the researcher. The screening responses by the participants were stored in an excel spreadsheet that was locked with a password. This folder was maintained in an electronic file that was shared with no one. This information will be kept for three years from the conclusion of the study and then destroyed.

**Trustworthiness Strategies**

The researcher used several strategies to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. The researcher began a research notebook prior to beginning the human subjects portion of the study. This was used to capture ongoing reflections, field observations, and other personal notes. This notebook was used for field notes during the interviews, for field observations, and for reflections immediately following the interview. Analytic memos were also created during data analysis, which included the researcher’s ideas, reactions, and questions that arose during the analysis phase. All participants reviewed their interview transcripts, which allowed for member checking. These methods, along with others that are unique to the methodology, were designed to increase the trustworthiness of the study results.

Ethical treatment of research participants is vital for their protection and for the protection of the study, the researcher, and the sponsoring institution. The qualitative researcher,
whose research does not benefit from anonymous data, has a duty to maintain a strict adherence to ethical standards. Morris (2015) described several key considerations for the ethical interview researcher. The researcher must collect and report data as accurately as possible. Participants should be informed of any risks and be allowed to make their own decisions about whether or not to participate. In a small case study like this one, extra care was taken to mask the identities of the participants. In-depth interviewing is an intrusive method, and although it does not typically cause direct harm, the researcher must still take precautions in case the participant experiences distress (Morris, 2015).

To collect and report data accurately, the researcher recorded the interviews and used a confidential transcription service for speed and accuracy. The researcher checked each transcription against the audio file for accuracy. Additionally, the researcher provided the transcripts of the recordings to the participants and asked for their edits. No participant opted to edit his or her transcript. This final approved transcript was coded as data. In addition, the emails sent to the participants with their transcripts were deleted two weeks after being sent so there was no electronic record connecting the individual to her or his pseudonym.

Participants’ names were kept confidential. Each participant was assigned a pseudonym. During the study, the participant names, pseudonyms, and contact information were stored on paper, and at the conclusion of the study this information was transferred to a locked filing cabinet at the researcher’s home. Audio files of the interviews were labeled by pseudonym and interview date, and transcripts used the pseudonym. Direct quotes in this thesis use pseudonyms. The case study site is referenced with a pseudonym.

All participants were over the age of 18, were fluent in the English language, and were university employees. Recruitment materials referenced participants’ right to not participate and
advised them that they could terminate participation at any time. No participants ended the interview before the conclusion of the questioning. Depending on whether or not the interview was conducted in person, the participant was provided either the non-signed (Appendix E) or signed (Appendix F) consent form. A signed form is not necessary, as the NEU template of a non-signed consent form is an acceptable form of approval (Kvale, 2008). For in-person interviews, the signed form was emailed ahead of time and the participant was encouraged to read it and send questions to the researcher. During the interview, the participant was given the form to sign after the researcher reviewed it and asked the participant if he or she had any questions. The non-signed consent form was emailed to the participants who were interviewed over the phone and their verbal permission was obtained in the interview. The interview only proceeded after a signature or verbal consent had been obtained. Consent forms will be stored in a sealed envelope in a locked filing cabinet at the researcher’s home until three years after the completion of the study.

In order to minimize harmful impact, the participants were provided a list of resources offered by the college, including the Employee Assistance Program counseling resources. This list of resources was provided in the consent form that was sent to all potential participants after they completed the screening survey.

**Study Assumptions**

With a study about a difficult topic like mission and social justice on a university campus, many assumptions need to be made. To prove each of these assumptions would fall outside of the scope of this study. For that reason, the researcher’s assumptions are stated here.

- Many universities have mission statements that guide the work of the entire campus.
- All universities with a mission struggle to achieve their mission.
• The universities that include social justice in their mission will always work to create equitable access to education.

• The campus communities at mission-centered universities are dominated by people with good intentions who want the best for all people.

• Racism exists and is pervasive in the United States.

• Institutional racism, the systematic valuing of a group of people over other groups of people, exists in most, if not all institutional structures in the United States.

• Institutional racism exists in higher education in the United States.

• Racism has many forms, including blatant and subtle acts.

• White privilege exists and it exists in higher education in the United States.

• A part of having privilege is that one does not need to worry about issues of race (or class, gender, ability, etc.)

• Simply because an individual has not experienced racial microaggressions does not mean that they do not exist.

• Faculty of color experience overt and covert acts of racism on campus.

• Racial microaggressions have a negative effect on people of color.

**Positionality Statement**

I have many areas of privilege. The only area in which I am not a part of the privileged group is my gender. Given this privileged life, I acknowledge my inherent biases. I have never known what it feels like to be denied freedom of movement or freedom of access because of my race or heritage. I have experienced gender microaggressions (winking, lewd looks, lewd comments). It has been argued that a researcher outside of an othered group cannot represent the
other group (Briscoe, 2005). Therefore, I had to work to see other people’s epistemology and
best understand the results of the study.

One inherent challenge for White people is to not downplay or misinterpret the
experiences of a person of color because they have not experienced the same issue. It is common
for people in a dominant group to diminish or lessen in value the lived experiences of an
oppressed group, simply so they are not as painful to hear (Wise, 2013). I worked to not allow
myself to judge another’s experience with emotion. I worked to be objective and attempted to see
the world through the participants’ experiences. I worked to accept participants’ experiences and
their interpretations of it.

**Trustworthiness and Validity**

The quality of a case study can be tested through known methods. Yin (2013) argued that
there are four design tests for any case study: construct validity, internal validity, external
validity, and reliability. To address construct validity, a case study researcher should employ
multiple measures, including using multiple sources of evidence like artifacts and interviews,
establishing a solid chain of evidence and solid data collection procedures, and having key
participants review the case study report. To address internal validity, case study researchers
should select from recommended tactics in their data analysis procedures, including pattern
matching, explanation building, addressing rival explanations, and using logic models. To
increase external validity, a case study researcher should employ theory in the research design.
To increase reliability, a case study researcher should use an established case study protocol and
develop a case study database (Yin, 2013). Examples will follow of how this study addressed
these issues.
**Construct validity.** *Construct validity* is the measure of how accurately the case study’s evaluation tools capture the concepts being studied (Yin, 2013). Yin argues that to address construct validity, a researcher should use multiple sources of data, have clear procedures for data collection, and have participants review their interview transcripts for accuracy. Multiple sources of evidence were collected in this study, including archival records, personal observations, interviews, documentation, and physical artifacts. All participants were given the opportunity to review their interview transcripts. The participants were not asked to review the findings due to the small sample group and the risk of jeopardizing confidentiality.

**Internal validity.** *Internal validity* is the demonstration by the study data of a clear causal relationship. It is addressed by demonstrating the lack of false relationships and through the rejection of alternative hypotheses. Yin (2013) argued that in order to address internal validity, a researcher should employ one or more recommended tactics to analyze data. This is a limitation of this study.

**External validity.** *External validity* is the degree to which the results of a case study can be generalized to other, similar cases. Yin (2013) argued that the best way to address external validity is to use a solid theoretical framework to guide the research. To address external validity, this study used critical race theory, as described in previous chapters, as the guiding theoretical framework. Given the generalizability of critical race theory, this increases the generalizability of this study’s outcomes.

**Reliability.** Issues of reliability come up frequently in regards to case study research. Yin (2013) argued that *reliability*, the consistency of the case study research, can be increased by following procedures somewhat similar to quantitative research, including following an established case study protocol and creating a searchable database of all of the collected data. To
address reliability, the researcher developed a research chain of evidence and protocol (Appendix H) that was informed by the seminal authors of case study research. The researcher stored evidence in an organized electronic storage system that was facilitated by data analysis software, with an index database to facilitate retrieval.

**Threats to Validity.** Many potential threats to internal validity exist, including risks associated with the passage of time and the experiences of participants. Creswell (2002) listed these threats as history, maturation, selection, and mortality. He described history as events occurring between the start and the end of the research period that can be threats to the result of the study. The proposed research period was approximately two months and the participants could experience mission-related activities during that time. However, no participants described any additional experiences that affected their interview responses and no other mission-oriented events occurred on campus during the study period.

Another threat to internal validity is the maturation of the participants, that is, their growth and change over time (Creswell, 2002). The study period was relatively short and the participants did not describe participating in any additional mission-oriented activities during the study period. To minimize the risks, participants had a relationship with the university of at least one year and continued to have that relationship throughout the research period, so they were exposed to similar campus-wide events.

Creswell (2002) identified the selection of participants as another risk to the internal validity of the study and argued that a random selection of participants minimizes this threat. Faculty of all races, genders, tenure statuses, and length of service were contacted and invited to participate. The participants were all selected randomly from the full-time faculty. Specifically, the recruitment email was sent to members of the faculty who had served on campus-wide
committees in the past 3 years. From that group, several faculty forwarded the recruitment email to faculty email lists. In response to the recruitment email, 13 people completed the screening survey and 11 people were interviewed. Although this was not a completely random sample, this researcher attempted to approach a varied group of potential participants.

Participants had the option of terminating their participation in the study at any time. Cresswell (2002) argued that to preserve the validity of the study, enough participants should be chosen to provide a representative sample and also to account for participant mortality. An original goal of 10 participants was set, and 11 people completed interviews. Two potential participants completed the screening survey but did not respond to requests for interviews.

To protect the study participants and the case study site, the researcher followed ethical protocols. Participants granted consent and were informed of their rights. The Institutional Review Board procedure was followed. Through prescribed procedures, the researcher checked for validity and reliability, thus increasing the quality of the research.

The previous section described the various measures used to increase the trustworthiness of the research study. These trustworthiness measures included procedures for increasing and protecting validity. This section also included the assumptions that were understood prior to conducting the study and the researcher’s positionality statement.

**Conclusion**

This chapter outlined the methods that were undertaken in the study. Through providing documentation of the procedures, including sample communication, surveying instruments, the interview protocol, the alignment of the research question to theory and interview questions, and examples of consent forms, this chapter outlined how the researcher addressed validity and
reliability. The researcher hoped to create a generalizable study that could inform other campuses and provide awareness for other universities and institutions in higher education.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter details the results of the study, including the key themes that emerged from an analysis of campus documents and artifacts and interviews with participants. An overview of the participants is provided. Their demographics, areas of responsibility, experience, and education are discussed. The participants are grouped into three non-exclusive groups: system changers, curriculum changers, and the mentor. A preliminary analysis of the findings is provided, including quotes and evidence from the participants. This is followed by the six themes that emerged from the data. Finally, there is an analysis of the data in response to the research question. The final chapter of this dissertation will consider these results in light of the literature.

Groups of Participants

The participants were assigned to three distinct groups based on themes that ran through their individual interviews: system changers, curriculum changers, and the mentor. These groups are not absolute descriptions or mutually exclusive because all participants described overlapping areas like mentoring students.

System Changers

The system changers were people who wanted to make the university a more welcoming, more accepting place by changing the system on a deep level. They had hope that this could happen. They were early and mid-career faculty, both tenured and tenure-track. They all identified as people of color. They identified as religious, Christian, and also with no religious affiliation. They had a personal stake in issues of social justice on campus, and they all identified issues and incidents that had affected them personally, directly, and significantly. They found community on campus with other faculty of color, with their students, and with faculty in their disciplines. They felt a strong connection with the mission, although some felt that the mission
has a greater impact than others. They all identified that they were often asked to speak for people of color and were often victims of both micro and macroaggressions. They remained hopeful that, through their work and the work of others, the campus and higher education community would become more inclusive of all people. These participants included: Bilje Ljungborg, Lindsay Castro, Nyx Prince, Qian Kurzman, and Yaroslava MacMathan.

**Curriculum Changers**

The curriculum changers were people who recognized that the system of higher education needed to change to benefit all people and not just a privileged group, but they did not describe the personal impact of inequalities like the system changers did. One way that they identified that the university could change to be more inclusive was through changing the curriculum to be more inclusive. They were early, mid, and established career faculty. They identified as people of color and as White people. They identified as either non-religious or did not state a religious affiliation. They found community with their students first and foremost, and also with their discipline colleagues, the campus community, and the global academic and religious community. They participated in mission-oriented activities, including local, national, and international scholarship work. They prided themselves on new and innovative approaches to curriculum. These participants included: Ayo Wilbur, Esme Ljung, Liron Hedley, Sri Warner, and Tirta Morin.

**The Mentor**

The mentor had been employed at the university for many years. He was an established career faculty member who did not identify as a person of color. In his interview, he identified the importance of social justice issues and specifically about making education accessible to all learners. He believed strongly in the mission and participated in many mission-oriented activities
including international research and scholarship opportunities. He described extraordinary lengths he went to in order to mentor, coach, and support his students. He felt the strongest community with his students, and he provided numerous examples of extraordinary advising work. He prided himself on his creative approaches to curriculum and course development and campus committee work. This participant was Kavi Adamson.

**Research Question**

The purpose of this study was to understand how tenured and tenure-track faculty made sense and meaning of the mission at a private university in the western United States. The study sought to uncover the first-person lived experiences of faculty as they learned about the university mission and its impact on their professional lives. Critical race theory was used to frame the analysis of the data in this study. The primary research question shaping this dissertation work was: How do university faculty members describe their lived experience of the social justice mission of a university? The subquestion guiding the study was: To what extent do the represented experiences of the faculty vary based on demographic factors of race, rank, stage of career, and religious affiliation?

The interview questions were designed to learn about participants’ experiences with the mission. Interview questions were as follows:

1. What made you want to work at Private Western University?
2. When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?
3. If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him/her about what it is like to work here?
4. What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?
5. Who is your community at PWU?

6. How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?

7. Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on campus. Contributions can include, among others, research, advising, mentorship, outreach, and other non-teaching work.

8. What are some examples of how you believe the university supports the mission?

**Preliminary Analysis of Findings**

The purpose of this study was to draw attention to the lived experiences of faculty in regard to a university’s mission and how the university’s stated mission was actually lived on campus. The primary research question shaping this dissertation work was: How do university faculty members describe their lived experience of the social justice mission of a university? The subquestion guiding the study was: To what extent do the represented experiences of the faculty vary based on demographic factors of race, rank, stage of career, and religious affiliation?

A case study methodology was used to gain a better understanding of the university. This allowed the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the context in which the faculty participants worked. Campus documents were analyzed as part of the case study. These documents included printed advertising materials, the university website, all-campus emails, printed materials about the university mission, faculty evaluation procedures and forms, alumni magazines, and student newspapers. In addition, 11 members of the faculty were interviewed. Data were coded according to the process outlined in Chapter 3. This process included three cycles: first-cycle coding used the in vivo method and resulted in 938 first-round codes; second-cycle coding used pattern coding and resulted in 18 second-cycle pattern codes; and third-cycle coding resulted in six emergent themes, which are detailed here. Following is a discussion of the
prevalent themes seen across the data.

**Emergent Themes**

Analysis of campus documents created a very detailed image of the campus and its community. The analysis of the documents yielded information about how the campus portrays its mission, its focus on social justice and the poor, its value for people of color in its community, its focus on good works, and its ongoing work with diversity. Through analysis of interview transcripts and document review, six key themes emerged. Documents and participants described the importance of the campus mission, including the importance of social justice. Both sources emphasized the diversity of the campus community. Additionally, both sources emphasized the extensive amount of transformational and charity work that was being undertaken at the university.

Several key themes emerged from interviews with the participants, each lasting between 45 and 90 minutes. Although the interview questions asked generally about the university’s mission, each participant raised the issue of social justice as a salient portion of the mission. Their understanding of social justice was very personal and based on their lived experiences, and all found this portion of the mission to be one that impacted them on a deep, personal level. All participants also described a progression in their understanding of the mission, while also noting that the mission was interpreted individually. The participants reported an inconsistent understanding of the definition of social justice on campus. This included both a perspective that social justice was charity while also being seen as a movement to create equitable access to systems in society. As a part of this understanding of social justice, some of the faculty described the related institutional culture, and how that culture benefits some members of the community over others. The participants also noted that there was a new cohort of faculty, what they
described as a critical mass of faculty of color. They reported the importance of this new faculty group in contributing to the forward momentum of all of the good works occurring at the university.

**Understanding of the mission.** A review of the university’s documents, including its website and print materials, indicated a strong campus-wide commitment to the mission. The mission itself was stated on the website, and five points of pride were repeated across the campus in iconography and art and also echoed throughout print and web materials. There were several campus offices devoted to enacting the mission. The participants noted the prevalence of offices, people, and jobs focused on mission implementation and cited these offices and personnel as being important to their developing understanding of the mission.

The participants described undergoing a developmental process in understanding the mission. Participants’ understanding of the mission had two distinct phases: first impressions and deeper understanding. When asked about their initial impressions of the campus, three participants noted that they were first dissuaded by the religious orientation of the university, but as they investigated further, they found the social justice mission to be welcoming. One participant said:

I felt like [the religious orientation] might be … oppressive in certain kinds of ways. But then the social justice side made me think, “Well, it seems like [social justice is] tempering [the religious aspect], and it's possible that there's a side of [religious] social justice that would be pretty cool.” So I was willing to apply [for the position] and be open to that.

Although others felt that the university appeared more conservative in its stance via its promotional materials than they experienced on campus, some expressed worry about not being
welcomed because of the religious affiliation of the university. For example, one participant said:

Do they want me here actually? That was something that I thought about. Would they want me here? I would say don't worry, it's not what you think, and the great thing again is that it is actually a great place to work in many ways, because of the small community feel.

Greater involvement in mission-related activities and scholarship was reported by faculty who had been employed longer at the institution. Not surprisingly, the longer a participant was associated with the institution, the more she or he would have had opportunities to participate in mission-related activities, including conferences, scholarship, and travel. Others felt that the social justice aspect of the mission was so salient that it attracted them to the institution. One participant noted, “Because the social justice [and] service diversity pieces are so strongly expressed in the language of the mission, it has a different feeling to me.” As their understanding of the mission developed over time, most participants said their understanding of the social justice portion of the mission also developed and resonated more deeply.

**Social justice.** Campus document analysis provided a somewhat murky definition of social justice. The accreditation organization provided a clear definition: Social justice is respect for all persons and advocacy for the poor. The internal documents did not emphasize advocacy for marginalized or disenfranchised people, rather they used social justice as a broader and more vague term. Participants emphasized the ideas of respect for all people, advocacy, and the need to change the systems that create marginalization. One said:

I think there's a very specific interpretation of social justice, but when it comes to ... Oh, they're recently declaring [PWU] as a sanctuary campus. That didn't work. When it
comes to talk, it sounds like there's a lot of emphasis, a lot of patting themselves on the back about social justice.

Two primary areas of thought emerged from interviews about how social justice is defined on campus: social justice as charity and social justice as action. Several participants noted that as they became more familiar with the campus, they found that social justice was implemented “unevenly,” and some noted that this was an issue throughout higher education, and not unique to this university. One said:

[The university] supports the mission unevenly. That's just an overarching answer. I think there are moments when it really understands its mission in ways that are very literal and very much rhetorical, that don't move beyond the words of the mission and animate … the spirit of the mission. …[S]ome of the more recent conversations about issues around race. …[T]hat was a good example of where a lot of people … weighed in to talk about how they were really saddened by hearing that a colleague had been called a racial epithet. But it just never really went beyond expressions of feeling disappointed. Which translates a really superficial kind of support of the mission. And I think that, in all honesty, the president's response didn't go much further than that either.

Some participants reported that there were many different interpretations of the mission and what the social justice aspect meant. These definitions included that social justice was seen as charity or missionary work or “[m]ission being missionary,” “paternalistic,” “serving people,” and “mak[ing] a difference in the world.” Participants felt that some members of the campus community viewed social justice as charity and identified the limitations of this perspective. One said:

The institution's understanding of social justice is helping the poor, but that is a very
limited understanding, because that [understanding] is about philanthropy, that is about charity; whereas social justice is about changing the structures that perpetuate inequality, that perpetuate these issues. I don't think the focus [on campus] is on the structures, the systems of inequality that have an impact on these issues, on its community. I think it's mostly focused on the charity aspect of it, which I don't think is productive. That's not going to get anybody far.

Another participant took issue with the focus of well-intentioned community work, saying, “There are some areas where people think that they are respecting human dignity by [participating in] particular programs like community engagement work that is actually more charity than it is community engagement.” They reported that this community engagement work did not change existing structures of inequality. One participant noted that some members of the university community did not understand that social justice work is about empowerment and changing systems, and not about charity and top-down decisions.

Many of the participants expressed their commitment to changing the structures that create social inequality and prevent equitable access to education. They spoke of their “commitment to justice,” “trying to promote equity in education,” and of their work in “agitating for a better school.” All of the participants, in one form or another, felt that this social activism and social justice work was deeply rooted in the mission. One said, “The material there [in the mission] at least to do this sort [activism] of social justice, [is] reflected both in the mission and in people on campus.” Some participants noted that there were many people involved in social activism work on campus and emphasized the importance of collaboration to make change. One said, “We really are on this social justice thing together.” Other participants reported the ongoing work of living the mission. One said, “We, like on a daily basis, [are] serving the mission.”
Some participants noted, however, that there is always more work to be done. One said, “There are a lot of people here that are committed to trying to make a difference and I think there's always a couple steps forward and a couple steps back, but on the whole, I think we're making progress.” One participant noted that there were three groups of faculty concerned about social justice: the agitators, the benignly indifferent, and the opposition. Several participants noted the opposition to social justice work on campus. One said, “There are still a lot of [people who] … are … trying to … arrest the movement towards the … radical ideas about social justice. I think some of that is just structural.”

Further document analysis indicated that the university was aware of the disconnect between what was written about social justice and what was experienced by community members. The campus was involved in an ongoing self-evaluation and improvement process using a proprietary evaluation framework about inclusion. The framework included evaluations designed to identify and resolve disconnects between stated values and behaviors expressed by members of the community. To make progress in this framework, the institution needed to recognize and address these incongruences. This disconnection was reflected in several interviews. For example, one participant said:

Living out that mission on campus, it's frustrating when I walk across campus and I see things that have been done, whether it's words that have been vandalized on something, or … language that has been spoken that's not acceptable or hurtful, that those are things that make me see that we have work to do here and so even though we have this mission and that we are all trying to understand it and work towards it, there is a lot of work that we don't live it out in a consistent way here and that I don't think we model best practices. Not just how we teach in the classroom but we don't model our best practices with our
best behavior.

Some participants reported the tension between the different definitions. Others noted that there were a lot of effective messages about social justice work but it was misguided. One said:

There's a lot of good talk when it comes to the mission, but there are some areas where people think that they are respecting human dignity by particular programs like community engagement work that is actually more charity than it is community engagement. There are a number of programs on campus that still set up a hierarchy of power where we have so much and we will give to you poor people at risk, not at promise. People we will give you all this stuff and then we will disappear in a day or two, or a week or two, or in a month, or in a year or whatever. We'll come back and give you some more because you can't do for yourselves.

Where the university says that it's demonstrating respect for all peoples and also fostering and supporting one's human dignity an agency within one's identity and yet it's not, in that respect. There's a good intent and even great impact too, but not necessarily in alignment with what I think is the core intention which is also about partnership, solidarity and understanding truly of who we are as people.

Participants reported the inconsistency between what was stated in the mission and how social justice was implemented on campus. They described the tension felt on campus as similar to many other campuses across the United States, in response to social justice movements and protests. One said, “There's a lot of support for Black Lives Matter, and then some backlash, and then there has to be some conversation about it.” Participants found great strength in the social justice portion of the mission, although how the term was interpreted varied greatly. Some
participants struggled with the tension between how the social justice portion of the mission was worded and how it was implemented. A few participants identified how invisible portions of the campus culture influenced how social justice was interpreted.

**Relational culture.** The participants described many aspects of the culture of the institution, most notably what one described as a “relational culture,” or a campus culture based on personal connections and relationships. Several participants reported that there was a dominant structure that affected functioning within the university community and also affected how one could help bring about change in the institution. Additionally, they also noted that there was an invisible way of doing things at the university that was “relationship-based,” “a very White community, based on middle-class or wealthy, White culture,” based on “legacy interests,” based on power and politics. One said:

There's a set of practices and values and norms that are not challenged, that is assumed is the right way to do things. Which is based on middle-class or wealthy, White culture. For people who were not raised in that specific culture, it seems very odd that it's not challenged, but it's assumed. There's a lot of people … on this campus who are starting to challenge it, but I think there's also a lot people who can't see that yet. They don't realize that that's just a set of practices and cultures and values. They assume it's just the right way.

To make things happen, it was reported that it was vital to know how to function within the structure of the university, to know who to talk to, and to always justify an action by referencing the mission. Participants reported that members of the university community acted with good intentions, but others felt distrustful of good intentions as they felt that intentions do not go far enough. One said:
We have this Hispanic-serving institution designation, we're getting money from that … we're getting money to support things that we should have already been doing for our students. I just don't trust intentions. And that's because I don't think that a lot of people here really know why they're really doing it. … I don't think they necessarily came to teach … [Hispanic] … students. Some people, yes. Some people are here [to teach Hispanic students] but some people are not and sometimes they don't know it.

The invisible relational culture of the institution was described as being very powerful and for a barrier to inclusion and participation in the institutional community.

**Feelings of exclusion.** The mission of the university highlighted the importance of respecting the whole person and creating an inclusive community. Most of the participants cited examples of how the university was living these portions of the mission and spoke extensively of their involvement in this work. However, several participants who identified as faculty of color described incidents of feeling excluded because of their race or cultural heritage, and of not feeling respected or included all of the time. Although most of them felt safe overall on campus, several described incidents that made them feel like they were not included in the community. These incidents included: (a) being asked to be a lone voice for their respective cultural group; (b) being asked to be a member of more diversity committees than their White counterparts; (c) being asked to perform additional duties beyond the scope of their discipline like translating documents or writing essays about diversity; and (d) being the victim of numerous microaggressions and macroaggressions. These participants expressed exhaustion in dealing with these experiences and indicated that they relied on their peers to help them cope with these issues. One said:

I reached out to my program. One of my colleagues in that space had said that she needed
to know what to do. My response was that I just need you, and everyone else in my program to know why it's so urgent that I'm on all of these committees, and how it exhausts, and it is also urgent for you to also be on these committees… I do all these things, but I shouldn't be the only one … To be working with, … and contrary to the structures within the university to try to change things [to] connect with other people. That again, is an urgent push. My colleague did not respond after that.

You asked me what to do. I will tell you what to do, and then you don't do it. You didn't really want to do that. You just wanted to appear that you were compassionate. That is what I get a sense of from this process. Let us appear that we're doing something. Let us appear that we are compassionate, and that we care, and we will make these small steps, and then continue as usual. It's deeply concerning.”

Many faculty of color participants described being the victim of repeated racial microaggressions. For example, several faculty of color described incidents of being referred to by the name of another member of the faculty, who was also their same race. After correcting the mistaken individual, one participant reported being called the same wrong name repeatedly.

Other participants described acts of racial microaggressions by White faculty, staff, and students. The participants reported some incidents to the human resources department, but others felt that it was not worthwhile because of the frequency of racial and gender microaggressions in higher education. One said:

There were also problematic appreciations of my contribution to the campus as far as like, "Oh, yes, sure I'll be another picture on your diversity catalog. Sure, now I'm … talking about the death of Black and Brown peoples through state sanctioned violence … now you're taking that and co-opting it as a way of saying this is what we do at [PWU].
It's not what we do at [PWU], it's what I do at [PWU]. ... Being a part of a particular marketing message which is not actually authentic to the university itself, but authentic to me.

Additionally, several faculty, although they did not identify themselves as feeling vulnerable due to their race or heritage, noted that they were aware of such issues occurring. They acknowledged that they had a different perspective because they had not experienced feelings of vulnerability due to their race, although several female participants reported “common gender stuff,” including gender microaggressions in campus. One said:

When I say insidious behavior that doesn't belong to necessarily one person, but belongs to the whole. How we fit together within the machine. So, the microaggressions start in spaces of when a man restating what I just said. Then everyone applauds because it's a great idea. You know, I've said things in meetings that nobody listens to ... this is like common gender stuff. So, I've said things in meetings and then a White man who's sitting right next to me will say the same thing. Nobody listened to me, but now White man who said it ... And then it's like, "Oh, there's this urgency, we do need [to fix this inequity]!

They felt that the university was a great place to work and also acknowledged the challenges with inclusion that are experienced on a university campus. One said:

Coming to work at [PWU]...[it] is a very rewarding place [to work], because there are many areas where you can get involved with passions that you might have that are in addition to your work life.... But I think that there's also challenges that are particular here, and there's challenges that we as an institution are still working on in being inclusive … and being respectful of each other.
Several participants stated that their experiences were not unique to this one campus, that they were common throughout academia.

A critical mass of new faculty. In recent years, a large number of faculty were hired at PWU. The majority of them were faculty of color. Most of the faculty of color reported the importance of a large number of newer faculty of color that were hired in recent years. One said, “There's finally enough faculty of color that we could form a group.” They spoke of the importance of this peer group in providing the support they needed to navigate the challenges of being an early or mid-career member of the faculty. The proprietary institutional analysis framework indicated the importance of increasing the diversity of the community, but the institution must be accountable for not only recruitment but also the retention and integration of new community members into the community. Six of the participants noted the importance of this group of faculty in voicing concerns relevant to “a ground swell of faculty of color on campus who are committed to social justice.” They described how this peer group, in some cases, was the most important support network they had on campus. They also described the uniting focus of many faculty of color and their commitment to speaking out for marginalized members of the community.

Good works. The participants and document analysis indicated that the campus had numerous offices devoted to implementing the mission on campus and beyond. There were offices devoted to mission implementation on campus, including support, education, and service opportunities for students, faculty, and staff. There were offices focused on local, regional, national, and international service trips and work. The campus had an entire division devoted to mission implementation.

The participants noted the extensive amount of good work that was going on at the
university. One noted a “climate of inclusiveness” for people in marginalized groups that created “a welcoming environment that felt accepting of diversity,” adding, “we are very open and embracing.” Several participants reported that the Intercultural Center on campus influenced their decision to work at PWU. The student-centered model was noted repeatedly, such as the “real humanistic approach that's very person-centered and a student-centered classroom.” It was reported that this was not a benign acceptance; rather it was one that “challeng[es] people in a way that still welcomes then and brings them together.”

The participants described the good works extensively, for example: “good people here trying to do good things,” “people here at [PWU] just overall are a little more trying to do the right thing, especially for the students,” “respect for dignity, and the diversity of our different experiences within the classroom.” The participants each noted how important talk of social justice, respect for the whole person, inclusivity, and community were at the university. The participants also noted that good talk does not necessarily lead to action and noted the importance of continuing to work to make progress towards equity. “We need to all be committed to continuing to dialogue and continuing to push each other in difficult ways.” The participants reported that the extensive good works must continue in order to continue positive and effective change.

**Key Findings from Analysis**

The data suggests that different populations experience the mission differently at different phases of their career. The analysis of campus documents and artifacts and interviews with faculty indicated several key findings regarding faculty members’ experience. The understanding of the university mission is a developmental and iterative process. Although they were asked about the mission in general, the participants found the social justice aspect of the
mission to be the most salient and applicable to their lives. The faculty of color tended to have a different experience with the social justice aspect of the mission than White faculty. The faculty of color participants was more likely to feel marginalized on campus. The faculty of color described experiencing racial microaggressions on campus. It is important to have a faculty of color group to provide support to its members.

**Finding 1**

The understanding of a campus’ mission is a developmental, iterative process that will be different for each faculty member. The participants all described being provided various of introductions to the mission and all reflected about how their understanding of the mission developed over time. Many participants noted the importance of having multiple ways to approach and interact with the mission, such as through numerous scholarship activities, and credited these multiple points of access with increasing their comprehension and internalization of the mission.

**Finding 2**

Faculty of color experienced and made sense of the mission on campus differently than White faculty, regardless of their length of time teaching, tenure status, or discipline. This theme emerged across different data points through document analysis and interviews. The faculty of color expressed strong, personal reactions to the mission and how it was implemented on campus, while the White faculty had a more detached reaction to the mission and how any inconsistency between stated and implemented mission may have affected others.

**Finding 3**

Racial microaggressions existed even on a university campus with a mission that focused on social justice. The majority of the participants described experiencing racial microaggressions
on campus. They described the tension they felt regarding a campus mission that focused on social justice and respect for all persons but did not translate to the behaviors of all members of the community.

**Finding 4**

Faculty of color expressed feelings of being marginalized on campus. White faculty did not express feelings of marginalization. The faculty of color expressed feelings of otherness and marginalization on campus, typically because of the actions of another faculty member. The intersectionality of gender and race arose as a minor theme, as several women faculty of color noted gender microaggressions by their fellow faculty members.

**Finding 5**

A faculty of color group is vital to supporting its membership through the challenges of academia, including the tenure and promotion process. The majority of the faculty of color identified a peer group of other faculty of color as being their main support mechanism for navigating the many challenges of academic life. The strategic work of the leadership to recruit more faculty of color was identified as creating a critical mass of new faculty that changed the demographics of the faculty as a whole.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented the findings of this case study of Private Western University, including results from the document analysis and participant interviews. Through analysis of the data, several key themes were identified around the faculty participants’ experience with the university’s social justice mission. These themes indicated that faculty’s understanding of the university mission was developmental and iterative. These themes also indicated that even though a university’s mission focused on social justice, the mission would be experienced
differently by different people, which can vary according to the person’s race. This differing experience is caused in part by faculty of color experiencing racial microaggressions on campus. Microaggressions also led faculty of color to feel marginalized and disconnected from campus. Participants cited a faculty of color peer group as being important to their happiness and ability to cope with the issues on campus. It is important for university campuses to understand that there is always work to be done to improve how a university lives its social justice mission on campus so that all members of the community feel included and valued.
Chapter 5: Interpretations, Conclusions, and Implications

The motivation for this study was to understand and make visible the first-person, lived experiences of the faculty at one university. Specifically, the researcher set out to learn about how the stated mission impacted the faculty. To understand this question, one university in the western United States was selected because it was similar to many other universities in size, location, demographics, and thus strengths and challenges. Hundreds of campus documents, promotional materials, web pages and public communications were analyzed using qualitative data software to learn how they portrayed the mission of the university. Additionally, 11 tenured and tenure-track faculty were interviewed about their first-person, lived experiences with the mission. This data was analyzed using the Saldaña method, and themes were developed and synthesized. These themes were interpreted through the literature and the theoretical framework to create the findings for the study, which are presented in this chapter.

This chapter provides a conclusion and a coda to this study. Previous chapters outlined the motivation for conducting this study, the study’s location and participants, the research question that framed the study, the method used for conducting the study, the theoretical framework that guided analysis of the data, and the findings. This chapter will include the study conclusions, implications, reflections, and opportunities. More specifically, this chapter will describe the study conclusions and how they relate to the findings presented in the previous chapter. This will include the basis for the conclusions; consider the findings in light of the literature; and describe how the theoretical framework, critical race theory, guides those conclusions. The sections about implications for practice and future opportunities provide recommendations for how similar sites can create a mission-oriented campus that would be more welcoming to faculty. This chapter includes a reflection by the researcher about what she gained
Study Conclusions

The review of campus documents and interviews with participants created a compelling and informative profile of the PWU campus. The campus documents and promotional materials were all of high production value, with a unified marketing campaign that focused on the diversity and accessibility of the campus environment. More in-depth campus documents portrayed a campus like many others in the United States, one that is struggling to meet the needs of its students and to live its core values in a meaningful way while not drifting from its mission, teachings, and beliefs. Interviews with community members, specifically with faculty participants, gave more depth and clarity to this struggle and demonstrated how challenging it is to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse campus community.

Through the analysis of numerous campus documents and artifacts and interviews with 11 faculty participants, several conclusions can be drawn: (a) the understanding of a university’s mission is developmental and iterative, (b) tension exists between the stated university mission and how it is lived on campus, (c) racial and gender microaggressions and racial macroaggressions occur on a campus that has a mission focused on social justice, (d) faculty of color experienced the university mission differently than White faculty did, (e) faculty of color were more likely to feel marginalized on campus than White faculty did, and (f) peer group support was vital for retaining faculty of color.

This study set out to understand how faculty at a private university made meaning of the university’s mission. Through analysis of artifacts and interviews, it became clear that faculty experienced the mission deeply, but also unevenly and inconsistently. Through review of the literature, it was learned that these experiences were not unique to the study site (B. R. Clark,
The early literature of organizational studies described the importance of the institutional saga, or central story (B. R. Clark, 1956). In the higher education context, the organizational saga develops in institutions with a strong purpose and mission, then expands to influence the academic culture and fosters the development of a strong sense of community (Hunter, 2016). The organizational saga surrounds the university campus, creating the mystique of what the mission-focused campus community should be; however, the actual practice of implementing that mission is often disconnected from this stated mission and saga.

A clear, consistent commitment to mission was found throughout the university’s marketing materials, including brochures, website content, core curriculum materials, religious teachings, and other print materials. The mission was stated clearly and was readily found throughout the campus in iconography, art, and language etched and installed on buildings. When participants were asked about their understanding of the mission, unique aspects of the mission resonated with them, and most found the social justice component to be paramount. All participants also indicated that their understanding of the mission was very superficial at the start of their employment but had deepened through their time at the university. The participants who noted that their understanding was the deepest were also the participants who had the longest time of employment and not surprisingly had been involved in many mission-related activities and events on and off campus. In their experience, the mission was secure and mission agreement and mission consensus were high (B. R. Clark, 1956; Fjortoft & Smart, 1994).

One group of faculty participants, who were all faculty of color, found great meaning in the mission and also experienced the implementation of the mission very differently than how they understood it. White faculty also found great meaning in the mission, however they did not
feel the inconsistency of implementation as much as faculty of color did. This tension between what the mission stated and what it implied is not unique to the study site: it is well documented as a common challenge for mission-based institutions (B. R. Clark, 1956; Feldner, 2006; Fjortoft & Smart, 1994).

Several participants noted good works that were occurring on campus. There were many people who were very pleasant to work with and who worked to do the right things to benefit the students and the broader community. Several examples were cited of the “good work” that PWU has done over time. This became a salient example of institutional saga, stories that grew over time and formed part of the image of the university (B. R. Clark, 1971; Maassen, 1996; Masland, 1985; Pettigrew, 1979; Schein, 2010; Smircich, 1983).

Tierney (1988) offered a useful evaluation tool for considering the finding that participants described a relational culture at the university. As seen in Table 5 (found in Chapter 2), he provided a framework for understanding the culture at PWU through its environment, mission, socialization, decisions, and leadership. The PWU environment is inconsistently inclusive because it feels accepting for some and excluding of others. The university does community engagement work while also attempting to develop a regional advertising presence. Its mission is stated repeatedly in promotional materials, iconography, and documents, but it is understood inconsistently and applied differently to different groups and situations. It is reportedly used as a basis for decisions, but the definition of the mission that is used varies between social justice as systemic change or as charity. In public statements, mission agreement was high, but in interviews, mission agreement was described as being inconsistent. New members of the organization became socialized to the culture slowly, over time. The culture was repeatedly described as relational, which meant that who one knows is vital to one’s success.
Depending on who one knows, one’s experience of being socialized will vary. Information is transmitted largely through the relational culture, although the public image is relayed through broadly distributed messages. Decisions were supposedly made in support of the students and the mission, but the dual definition of the social justice mission caused tension. There seemed to be little penalty for bad decisions made by the dominant group. Participants expressed different expectations of the PWU leadership. Faculty of color felt that more could have been done to create an equitable environment, and most White faculty recognized inequities and acknowledged the importance of having strong leaders to make this a reality. The leadership of PWU at the time of the study was 80 percent White.

Part of the basis for the disconnect between stated and lived mission as experienced by faculty was their experience with racial microaggressions on campus. All of the faculty of color interviewed noted having been the victims of racial or gender microaggressions or racial macroaggressions. Many participants struggled with this inconsistency, finding it challenging that a university committed to social justice allowed these events to occur. Unfortunately, issues of racial and gender microaggressions and racial macroaggressions are not unique to this one campus, to private universities, or to one region of the country (W. A. Smith, Yosso, & Solorzano, 2007; Solórzano, 1998; Solórzano et al., 2000; Sue, 2010; Sue, Capodilupo, et al., 2007; Sue, Bucceri, et al., 2007; Yosso et al., 2009). The frequency of microaggressions and macroaggressions caused faculty of color participants to feel marginalized and disconnected from the university. This also is not unique to the study site; this issue has been studied and reported on previously (Blackshire-Belay, 1998; Grunwald & Peterson, 2003; Louis et al., 2016; Turner, 2002).

Another finding indicated that faculty of color reported that they found great support not
from institutional programs, but from their peers. Faculty of color noted the importance of this
group of colleagues for making sense of issues and challenges, as a sounding board, for having
opportunities for collaboration on projects of interest, and on collegiality and friendship.

Literature has shown that faculty of color peer or affinity groups are a vital component to
supporting and retaining faculty of color (Butner et al., 2000; Grunwald & Peterson, 2003; Louis
et al., 2016; Rovai, Gallien, & Wighting, 2005; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002).

**Through the Lens of Critical Race Theory**

As stated in Chapter 1, critical race theory has numerous tenets, depending on which
author is consulted. For this study, five tenets were considered. The first tenet, the one that
provided the greatest influence, was the concept of storytelling and the value of first-person lived
experiences. The experiences of the participants provided the most information about how
faculty made meaning of the university’s mission. The university population was majority White,
and the CRT concept of Whiteness as property provided insight into some of the findings. The
tension between the stated and lived mission can be interpreted through the tenet of a critique of
liberalism. Finally, the commitment to social justice was prevalent throughout the data.

Storytelling in CRT holds that the first-person, lived experiences of people of color are
the most important way to understand the system and the individual’s place in it (Solórzano et
al., 2000). The experiences of all the faculty participants were important for providing in-depth
experiential knowledge about how the mission is interpreted and lived on campus. The
participants provided evidence that there was tension between the stated and lived mission. If
only artifacts were analyzed, the results would have been biased towards a marketing perspective
that typically portrayed the institution in perfect light. Through the interviews, it was revealed
that not all members of the community experienced the mission in the same way. Additionally, it
was shown that faculty of color had a distinctly different experience than White faculty. Storytelling was also evident through personal narratives expressed in all-campus emails and news articles about challenges experienced by faculty of color with racism on campus.

Another CRT tenet, Whiteness as property, can provide an explanation for the different experiences of the faculty of color and White faculty (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). White privilege exists in all aspects of the United States, including higher education, and it exists on both private and public university campuses nationwide (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). This privilege allows White faculty to not experience racial microaggressions simply because they are a part of the dominant culture of being White. Their race allows them to not experience racism. Several White faculty members noted their awareness of microaggressions and different experiences with the mission, but they noted that they did not experience racial microaggressions.

The tension and disconnect between the stated mission and the experienced mission can be attributed to the critique of liberalism. This tenet of CRT questions the belief by self-proclaimed liberal-minded people to trust that the system will do the right thing (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). Through Whiteness as property and White privilege, by their own admission, White faculty did not experience the mission in the same way that faculty of color did. Participants who were faculty of color did not experience the mission as it was stated, and some questioned whether that discrepancy would ever change.

Finally, almost all participants expressed their commitment to social justice. In addition, many campus artifacts focused on social justice and the campus’s commitment to the poor. Although participants defined social justice similarly to the literature, focusing on ending racism, sexism, and poverty, as well as a commitment to empowering marginalized and subordinated
peoples, campus artifacts and print materials focused on helping subordinated people and people who have experienced poverty (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). A summary of how these results integrate with the literature can be found in Figure 9.

*Figure 9. Tree diagram of systemic racism including results*
Implications

Implications for Practice

The results of the study and the literature imply many opportunities for PWU and institutions like it. Interventions to eliminate institutional and systemic racism can take individual and institutional forms. Following organizational theory, organizational change comes about through both individual and organizational changes (Burke, 2013; Katz & Kahn, 1978). To have broader systemic effects, changes need to expand beyond the infrequent diversity training meetings that are typically undertaken in higher education (Griffith et al., 2007).

Universities like PWU need to foreground the language of equity and inclusion and need to make inclusion a central goal of the institution. This work needs to evolve from a central campus plan for creating a culture and climate that supports all members of the community. This plan would make these initiatives a central theme woven throughout the entire curriculum, rather than being isolated in certain subjects or schools. The campus leadership needs to be visible and actively involved in the development of campus programs about inclusion and equity. While the language of equity and inclusion is infused throughout the campus and curriculum, ongoing assessments need to be implemented to evaluate their effectiveness and presence. The work of equity and inclusion is both supported by and supports the ongoing recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty of color, and conscious decisions need to be made to support these marginalized groups.

A logical question is what can be done on a practical level by universities like PWU? The campus needs to make it a priority to make racial inclusion a goal (Hurtado et al., 1999; Solórzano et al., 2000). The language of inclusion and equity needs to be normalized on campus. This needs to be modeled by leadership. Inclusive language for equity should be adopted across
This action needs to expand beyond written plans and one-time workshops: diversity projects are not diversity progress. Discussions of equity and inclusion need to be included in every departmental conversation. Community members need to feel safe enough to “speak truth to power” and to point out inequitable and othering topics, behaviors, or plans. Additionally, participation in ongoing campus discussions, workshops, and speaker presentations needs to be made mandatory for all full-time employees, with penalties attached. There need to be formal or informal consequences when issues of racism arise, and there needs to be a formal system of accountability for all employees, including tenured faculty. The participants reported that there was no required diversity training for faculty at PWU, although it is required for staff. Several participants stated their frustration with the lack of required diversity or cultural competency training for faculty. They felt that requiring this type of training would benefit the campus community and culture.

There needs to be a campus-wide plan for changing the culture and climate to support all community members that includes specific timetables, resources, and activities (Hurtado et al., 1999; Yosso et al., 2009). This plan needs to be actionable, specific, and achievable. The plan should include mentorship of faculty of color to pursue program, department, and campus leadership positions.

Diversity initiatives need to be woven throughout the curriculum and everyday practices of the university (Pérez Huber & Solórzano, 2015; Solórzano et al., 2000). All activities on campus must focus on the institution’s mission (Solórzano et al., 2000). In order to cement the commitment to diversity and equity, these values need to be secure, embedded into all aspects of campus work (B. R. Clark, 1956). To create secure values, curriculum, discussions, projects, activities, and events need to support and be focused on the mission and core values of the
university. This focus needs to be stated clearly and plainly, not merely implied.

Faculty, staff, students, and leadership need to be involved in the development of campus-wide programs about cultural competence, diversity, and inclusion (Hurtado et al., 1999). This development process should not be undertaken only by faculty of color, nor should any one person be asked to represent or speak for their ethnic, cultural, or linguistic group, or any other identity that they hold. The development of these programs needs to include leadership, representative faculty and staff, and student leadership. In parallel to the development of these programs, there should be clear policies and procedures when a racial (or other identity group) macroaggression occurs, like someone being called a racial slur. One participant noted the lack of a clear procedure beyond reporting the incident: there was no clear educational outcome, no clear reporting path, and no opportunity for resolution and improvement for the affected individuals or the community. Additionally, attention needs to be paid to student issues and demands regarding equity and diversity, because their experiences and feedback can redirect the university’s diversity efforts to better meet the needs of the students (McMurite, 2016).

Ongoing assessments of the campus climate need to occur (Hurtado et al., 1999). There need to be reliable, valid tools to assess perceptions and commitment to inclusion and equity by all members of the campus (Velcoff & Ferrari, 2006). These assessments should be used biannually at a minimum. These assessments, typically quantitative in nature, should also include qualitative methodologies including interviews and focus groups to gather the first-person lived stories of the members of the community (Yosso et al., 2009). The combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies will allow the gathering of both broad and focused data.

In order to change institutional racism in higher education, there needs to be a conscious and deliberate recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty of color (Pérez Huber &
There need to be formalized structures in place to support and retain faculty of color, including mentoring, support, and collaboration opportunities. Mentorship roles of faculty or students should be included in faculty evaluation and promotion documents and be considered a part of the faculty’s service to the university. Additionally, evaluation methods that allow for biased evaluations of the faculty by students, including qualitative responses that focus on the faculty member’s appearance, gender, race, culture, linguistic heritage, physical ability, or other immutable characteristic, should not be considered in the evaluation process. Interview data should be gathered from faculty of color to gain insight into what is and is not successful in supporting them (Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pedersen, Parker, & Teraguchi, 2006).

The participants noted that for all of the strengths at PWU in terms of living the mission, there is still much work to be done. Several participants noted that someone joining the university should expect to enter a culture where social justice and equity work is ongoing. It was reported that there are undergraduates at the university, students of color, who are not happy about their experiences on campus because of issues of marginalization. One participant said, “the undergraduates were very vocal about their feeling of the atmosphere on campus, and that feeling of otherness on campus.” It was reported that the existing relational structure might make it difficult for some in the university community to understand what faculty are experiencing. One participant said, “I think it's harder for people who belong to groups that are represented and also part of the dominant culture to understand what needs to be done for those who are in marginalized groups.” It was felt that the university has been slow to publicly react when student protests happen on campus. In short, there is work to be done.

Other systemic modifications that could be undertaken to help dismantle institutional
racism focus on changing policies and procedures that are part of the higher education model. If the tree model is to be considered, what uproots that tree? There are many initiatives that universities could undertake that would create change. First, universities need to hire more faculty of color (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Second, universities could work to further eliminate the belief that the reason there are so few faculty of color is because there are fewer people of color than White people in the graduate school pipeline (Rosser, 1990; D. G. Smith, 2000; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). In addition, hiring practices for faculty and administration could change (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Typically, a faculty or administrative search includes a search firm or internet advertising in a known set of locations, like *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and also uses networking through social media sites, professional group affiliations, personal networking, alumni networking, sorority and fraternity networks, etc. The requirements for faculty and administrative positions typically include traditional definitions of scholarship, service, leadership, and teaching. If institutions broadened these definitions to include other types of service, leadership, and teaching, the institution would be able to include more candidates from different backgrounds. For example, if community leadership were considered equal to campus leadership, and if avocational teaching were considered equal to campus teaching, the candidate pool would be larger. Additionally, if the campus tenure process were similarly broadened to include wider definitions of teaching, service, leadership, and scholarship, issues of retention might decrease. Other systemic changes would provide more support for individual and institutional change.

Another way universities can create change is by providing a level of accountability associated with anti-racist training and work (Griffith et al., 2007). One example is requiring ongoing participation in anti-racism workshops in order to have access to campus travel funds,
sabbatical funding, or other off-campus activities. Another area of accountability is to require participation and use of anti-racist training as a part of promotion or tenure procedures. Another way for faculty and staff to be held accountable is to expand the role of Chief Diversity Officer to include incidents of racism and other types of marginalization against faculty and staff. This person could be an advocate for faculty and staff, speak up in cabinet meetings about biased systems and procedures, and be a confidential resource for employees who have been marginalized. This person, as a voice for people of color, could provide a much-needed amplification of the voices that are typically ignored and silenced by the system of institutionalized racism. Most importantly, White people with power on campus, including institutional and faculty leadership, need to do their own personal work to identify and counteract their personal blind spots and biases (Hobson, 2014; Warikoo & de Novais, 2015). Institutional and systemic racism were created by White people to benefit White people; it persists because of White people wanting to benefit White people (Wilder, 2014).

**Implications for Future Research**

This study provided several opportunities for future research. The first opportunity is to replicate the procedure across additional campuses to increase the validity of the findings. Interviewing more faculty across additional campuses would provide a wealth of information about how faculty experience different missions on different campuses. This would allow there to be comparisons across cases and across many more participants. These campuses could be in the same Western region, or they could be in completely different regions across the United States. Another opportunity would be to interview faculty at one or more historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Given the demographics of the students at HBCUs, it would be interesting to hear about the faculty’s experience with such universities’ missions. This would
allow for comparisons across different student and faculty demographics and also geographic differences, since most HBCUs are in the eastern portion of the United States. It would be interesting to research what HBCUs include in their mission statements and how their faculty experience those missions on campus.

**Reflections as Scholar-Practitioner**

Through both the coursework and the dissertation writing phase at NEU, I have become aware of how my understanding of institutions as a whole has changed. Prior to starting my doctoral studies, I was very focused on my own work or the work of my school. Through this process I have been forced to look at the overall institution and to see how many commonalities exist between campuses, and between higher education and other types of institutions. There will always be times of financial strength and times of financial struggles for any institution. The procedures that are successful at a large private company are also best practices for managing the finances of a higher education institution. The best practices for supporting, retaining, and training employees are consistent across industries and settings. Likewise, the challenges of developing, supporting, and retaining a diverse workforce is an issue across industries, as are the barriers to inclusion. Microaggressions and racism exist across industries, settings, and locations. The combined process of coursework and dissertation writing has given me a broader perspective.

Additionally, through the dissertation writing process, I honed my research skills and was able to better focus my attention on topics that mattered and were salient. I was able to see how the organizational culture literature connected to a higher educational context. A salient example came about recently when some colleagues wondered why institutional decisions were made. I realized that even without knowing the specifics of conversations and decision-making processes
at the highest levels of the organization, I had general suppositions for the rationale behind the decisions because of the education and training I have had through this doctoral program. I also had the professional wisdom to know to keep my mouth shut because spouting on about somebody’s theory of organizational change would not have helped the conversation.

**Limitations**

When the study was planned, several limitations were predicted. First among the limitations was the small sample size. Given that this study was a case study set at one campus with 11 participants, it could be anticipated that a broader sample size would provide more data. However, given the limitations of the study, the sample size was chosen to provide meaningful data with overlapping themes. In addition, the generalizability of the study will be difficult because of this smaller sample size.

The case study was conducted at one university campus. It could be argued that the issues encountered at this campus were isolated. However, as described in the literature review, the issues encountered by the faculty in regard to mission incongruence are common issues that are well documented. This limitation is also addressed in the opportunities for future research through suggestions to replicate the study at different universities with different demographics and missions.

It could be argued that the choice of critical race theory as a theoretical framework was a limitation because one of its core tenets is the pervasiveness of racism in American society and structures, including its legal and educational systems. It could be argued that using this theory lent itself to bias in finding racism where there might not be any present. While noting the irony of this limitation, the choice of any theoretical framework could be seen as a limitation because no framework is a perfect match for a study. Developmental learning theories or linguistic
development theories could also be applied to the data from this study; they would provide different findings. Likewise, the case study methodology could be a limitation in that it does not probe as deeply into the lived experiences of the participants. Interpretive phenomenological analysis or a discourse analysis could provide deeper understanding of the participants’ experiences with less or no emphasis on the particular context.

**Conclusion**

In this study, the researcher gained understanding about how a university’s mission was experienced by one portion of the community, its faculty. The literature review provided insight about organizational culture, mission statements, and microaggressions. Through a case study methodology, data was gathered about the campus, its promotional materials, website, mission activities, faculty evaluation procedures, and its public presentation. Additionally, through interviews with faculty members, the actual impact of the mission was recorded. Faculty experienced the mission unevenly: faculty of color experienced the mission in a different way than White faculty did. As a result of these reported experiences with the mission, several recommendations and opportunities for further research were provided.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Definition of Key Terminology

Institutional Racism

“Institutional racism is structural in nature and typically covert; the consequences of organizational structure, policy, or practice favor one group or disadvantage another group.” (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998, p. 318) “Those established laws, customs, and practices which systematically reflect and produce racial inequalities in American society. If racist consequences accrue to institutional laws, customs or practices, the institution is racist whether or not the individuals maintaining those practices have racists intentions.” (J. M. Jones, 1997, p. 438)

Microaggression

“Racial microaggressions are … subtle verbal and nonverbal assaults directed toward people of color, often carried out automatically or unconsciously… and … [the] cumulative assaults … take a psychological and physiological toll on people of color.” (Solórzano & Pérez Huber, 2012, p. 1489)

Organizational culture

The organizational culture in a higher education setting is “persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus.” (Kuh & Whitt, 1988)

Predominantly White Institutions

Predominantly White Institutions are colleges and universities in which the student enrollment consists of at least 50% White people (M. C. Brown & Dancy, 2010).

Racism
The idea that some races are superior to others (Halcon, 1988). “First, the basis of group characteristics is assumed to rest on biology – racism is a biological concept. Second, Racism has, as a necessary premise, the superiority of one’s own race. Third, racism rationalizes institutional and cultural practices that formalize the hierarchical domination of one racial group over another.” (J. M. Jones, 1997, p. 11).

**Social Justice**

The action of advocating for marginalized people and the poor, and acting with respect and honor for the whole person. This is derived from the religious accreditation organization overseeing the University.
Appendix B: Letter for Participants

Dear Colleague,

My name is Colleen Keirn and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts. I am writing to ask for your help in my dissertation research.

I am currently conducting a study as a part of my doctoral dissertation to explore the on-campus experiences of full-time faculty. Specifically, the study focuses on tenured/tenure track faculty and their experiences with how the mission is lived on campus.

Phase 1 of the study consists of a brief questionnaire that includes basic demographic information and length of teaching career at . All tenured/tenure track faculty are invited to participate in this questionnaire. This includes full-time faculty who are either tenured or pre-tenure.

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents are invited to volunteer for Phase 2 of the study. Phase 2 will consist of an interview to learn more about volunteer participants’ experiences on campus. Participants in Phase 2 will be given a $20 gift card to Powell’s Books as a token of my appreciation.

Please consider participating in this study. Additionally, if you know another full-time tenured/tenure track faculty member who you think might consider participating in this study, please feel free to forward this email to them in order to assist with recruitment of additional participants. Participation is entirely voluntary.

The introduction page of the questionnaire provides more information about the study. The link to the questionnaire can be found at:

Feel free to contact me at my Northeastern email: or by phone/text if you have any questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Colleen Keirn
Doctor of Education Candidate
Northeastern University
Appendix C: Selection Questionnaire
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

I would like to invite you to participate in a web-based online survey. The survey is part of a research study whose purpose is to explore how faculty experience the mission on campus; that is, how is the mission lived on campus. This survey should take about 5 minutes to complete.

You were selected to take part in this research study because you are a full-time member of the [faculty department] faculty who has taught at [institute] for more than one year, are tenured or tenure tracked, and are not on [specific leave status]. You must be at least 18 years old to take this survey.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you for taking part in this survey.

There are no direct benefits to you from participating in this study. However, your responses to the interview questions may help us learn more about how the mission is experienced on campus.

Who will see the information about me? The survey data will be visible to the student researcher and her faculty advisor. Your part in this study will be handled in a confidential manner. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual as being affiliated with this project.

The principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson and the student researcher will be the only people to have access to the data gathered, including anonymized interview transcripts. At the conclusion of the study all identifying data will be destroyed. The consent forms will be kept for a minimum of three years in a locked cabinet at the researcher’s home.

In rare cases, an authorized person or people from the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board may request to see the data to ensure the research is being done properly. If so, I will communicate this to you.

Can I stop my participation in this study? At any time, you are welcome to remove yourself from participating in this research study. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to and you can refuse to answer any question at any time.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems? If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact the researcher, Colleen Keirn by telephone at [phone number], or by email: [email]. She is the person mainly responsible for the research. You can also contact the principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson by email: [email].

Who can I contact about my rights as a participant? If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact: Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel. (617) 373-4588 | Fax. (617) 373-6600 | Email: n.regina@neu.edu

Will I be paid for my participation? You will not be paid for your participation. However, you will be given a $20 bookstore gift card at the interview meeting.

Will it cost me anything to participate? There is no monetary cost to participate in this research study.

Is there anything else I need to know? At any time you can opt out of the study. By clicking on the “I agree to continue” button below, you are indicating that you consent to participate in this study.
Thank you for your interest in my study. My name is Colleen Keirn and I’m a doctoral student at Northeastern University. My research interest is in how a college’s mission is lived on campus. My dissertation will be a case study.

The interview research will have two phases. This questionnaire is the first phase and will help me learn a bit about you, and will hopefully provide you with some answers to your questions. The second phase will involve interviews with people who indicate their interest in continuing to participate in this study.

Some information about me and this study:
mission has areas of distinction. A lot of the materials on campus focus on this. I want to learn about your experiences with the mission as a member of the faculty.

Confidentiality:
All survey and interview responses will be kept confidential. Each participant will be referred to with a gender-neutral pseudonym in the interview transcripts and in the final dissertation. Quotes will be used minimally and when used, attributed by pseudonym only. If pronouns need to be used, in order to further mask identities, participants will be assigned opposite pronouns to the ones indicated on this survey. If a participant identifies as a gender non-binary person, they will be randomly assigned one of the binary gender pronouns. Faculty rank will not be reported. All who are selected to be interviewed will be identified as “tenure tracked” and no other specificities will be collected regarding rank. Your department, discipline, or school will not be collected and if incidentally included in the interview, they will be removed and not reported. Other specifying information will be removed from interview transcripts and not reported. Other results will be reported in aggregate.

Voluntary Participation:
Your participation in this survey and the follow-up interview is voluntary. You may end the survey or interview at any time.

Interviews:
Volunteers who agree to be interviewed will be contacted by me to set up a time to meet, talk on the phone, or connect via Google Hangout. So that I can best capture your words, I will ask to be able to audio record the conversation. The interview should take no more than 60 minutes.
audio recording will then be transcribed by transcribers at Rev.com and you will be identified on that recording and in the transcript by your pseudonym only. After it is transcribed, you will be given the chance to review the transcript, make any changes, clarify any language, or add or delete any portion.

Spreading the Word:
If you know someone who you think would be interested in participating in this study, please feel free to share the survey link with them. I thank you for your help.

Thank you:
Most importantly, thank you very much for your time in responding to this survey. I know your time is very valuable. My hope is the survey will take you less than 10 minutes. If you have any questions about this survey or the follow-up interview, please feel free to email me at my Northeastern
So that I may potentially contact you again, I need some basic contact information. This will be kept confidential and will not be attached to your statements or information.

* 1. Contact Information

Full Name

Email address that you check regularly

Phone number that you check regularly

2. What is your preferred method of contact?

- Email
- Phone Call
- Text

* 3. How long have you been teaching at Northeastern University?

- Less than one academic year (<1 year)
- More than one but less than five academic years (1 - 5 years)
- More than six but less than 15 academic years (6 - 15 years)
- 16 or more years (>16 years)
4. What type of faculty position do you hold at [ ]?
   - Part time
   - Full time, not tenure tracked/ tenured
   - Full time, tenure tracked/ tenured
   - Tenured
   - Other (please specify)

5. Do you identify as a person of color?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Other (please specify)

By indicating "yes" below, you agree to have me, Colleen, contact you by email and/or phone (phone only during normal business hours) to follow up about participation in this study.

6. Are you willing to participate in the interview portion of the study?

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey. If you have completed the survey and agreed to participate in the interview portion, I will be contacting you soon to set up a time to talk. If you have indicated that you do not wish to participate, you will not be contacted again about participation in this study. If you have any questions about this study or this survey, please feel free to contact me at [email address] or phone/text [phone number]. Thank you again for your time.
Appendix D: Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

Date:_____ Interviewee Pseudonym: ______________

Institution: [ ] Interviewer: Colleen Keirn

Research Question: How do faculty experience the University’s mission on campus?

To Do:

1. Provide permission form, get signed
2. Provide gift card
3. Read protocol re: recording
4. Record
5. Take notes
6. Answer questions

Part I:

Introductory Protocol

This interview will start out sort of formal, because I have to include standardized language, but then I hope we can have a conversation. I find that is more true to who I am so I hope that is OK with you.

Because your responses are important and I want to make sure to capture everything you say, I would like to audio record our conversation today. Do I have your permission to record this interview? [If yes, thank the participant, let them know you may ask the question again as you start recording, and then turn on the recording equipment].

I will also be taking written notes. I can assure you that all responses will be confidential and only a pseudonym will be used when quoting from the transcripts. The audio recording will be labeled with a pseudonym and will be sent directly to a transcription service called Rev.com. The audio file will be destroyed after it is transcribed. This transcript will be used to inform my dissertation and will potentially be used as research for an article that I hope to publish from the dissertation work. Do you have any questions about the interview process or how your data will be used?

You have been selected to speak with me today because are someone who might be able to help me understand the experiences of faculty of color on campus. My research project is a case study of [ ] and how faculty of color experience racism on campus.

Through this study, I hope to gain greater insight into what faculty of color see, hear and encounter. My hope is that these first-person lived experiences contribute an irrefutable part of the story of [ ] that can then inform privileged people like me about how are actions effect others.
This interview should last about 60 minutes. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to ask you. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning. If you have questions during the interview, please feel free to ask them. Do you have any questions at this time?

**Part II: Interviewee Experiences with the University Mission**

1. What made you want to work at [ ] ?
2. When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?
3. If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him/her about what it is like to work here?
4. What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?
5. Who is your community at [ ] ?
6. How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?
7. Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on campus. Contributions can include among others, research, advising, mentorship, outreach, and other non-teaching work.
8. What are some examples of how you believe the university supports the mission?

**Closing:**

*Thank you for your time today. Those are all of my questions. Do you have anything else that you would like to share with me today?*

*I will be back in touch with you when I have the transcripts of our conversation. I will email them to you for your review and to see if there is anything more you would like to add. Thank you again for your time, this has been very helpful to me.*
Appendix E: Unsigned Consent Form

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies

Name of Investigator(s): Principal Investigator: Bryan Patterson, Ph.D.; Student Researcher: Colleen Keirn, Ed.M.

Title of Project: How do Faculty Experience the University’s Mission on Campus: A Case Study of One University’s Approach to Living its Core Values

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

We are inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, but the researcher will explain to you in further detail the purpose of the project and your participation. Please feel free to ask any questions to address any concerns you may have. At your earliest convenience, please let me know if you plan to participate or not. If you decide to participate and before the interview can commence you will be required to sign the consent form in person.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?
You were selected to take part in this research study because you are a full-time member of the faculty who has taught at for more than one year, are tenured or tenure tracked, and are not on .

Why is this research study being done?
The purpose of this research is to explore how faculty experience the mission on campus; that is, how is the mission lived on campus.

What will I be asked to do?
If you decide to take part in this research study, you will take part in an interview that will last about 60 minutes. During this time, there will be several questions asked about your experiences on the campus. If time runs short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning. After the interview, Colleen Keirn or a confidential transcriber will transcribe each interview and provide you with a copy of the interview transcript to proofread for accuracy.

The primary interview questions will be:
1. What made you want to work at ?
2. When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?
3. If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him/her about what it is like to work here?
4. What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?
5. Who is your community at ? How did you first learn about this community?
6. How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?
7. Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on campus. Contributions can include among others, research, advising, mentorship, outreach, and other non-teaching work.
8. What are some examples of how you believe the university supports the mission?

Where will this take place and how much of my time will it take?
You will be interviewed in a confidential location and time of your choice at your earliest convenience. The interview can be in person, over the phone, or via VSee teleconferencing. The interview will last no more than 60 minutes.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?
Due to the potentially confidential nature of the topic, you may experience some emotional discomfort resulting from participation in this study. It is expected that this discomfort will be minimal.
If you experience any discomfort and wish to seek psychiatric or legal assistance, please contact
Employee Assistance Program: Phone: Call toll-free, 24 hours a day, seven days a week:
TDD: Website: Company Code:

Will I benefit by being in this research?
You will not receive any benefits for participating in this research study. However, your responses to the
interview questions will assist in demonstrating how the mission is experienced on campus.

Who will see the information about me?
You will be assigned a gender-ambiguous pseudonym. That pseudonym only will be used in transcribing
interviews. A hand-written (non-digital) paper list of participants’ names and assigned pseudonyms will be
kept in a locked filing drawer in the researcher’s home. This information will be kept only for the duration
of the study and then destroyed. Only the researcher will have access to this information.

The principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson and the researcher will be the only people to and have
access to the data gathered, including anonymized interview transcripts. At the conclusion of the study all
identifying data will be destroyed. The consent forms will be kept for a minimum of three years in a locked
cabinet at the researcher’s home.

Direct quotes will be used rarely, if at all. If you will be quoted, a pseudonym will be used and different
gender pronouns will be used. If quoted, you will not be identified by discipline, school, specific rank or by
exact number of years of service.

In rare cases, an authorized person or people from the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board
may request to see the data to ensure the research is being done properly. If so, I will communicate this to
you.

Will I be audio or video recorded?
With your signature below, you agree to be audio recorded in an in-person interview. If the interview is via
VSee teleconferencing, you agree to have the session audio recorded. These recordings will be sent to a
transcriber with only your pseudonym attached and they will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.
Only the transcriptions will be retained after the conclusion of the study for the purpose of further analysis
and publication.

What will happen if I suffer any harm from this research?
If you suffer any harm as a result of this research no special arrangements will be made for compensation
or for payment for treatment.

Can I stop my participation in this study?
At any time, you are welcome to remove yourself from participating in this research study. Your
participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to
and you can refuse to answer any question at any time.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?
If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact the researcher, Colleen Keirn by
telephone at: or by email: She is the person mainly responsible
for the research. You can also contact the principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson by email:
### Unsigned Consent Form -- Keirn

**Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?**

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact:

Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection,
960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.
Tel. (617) 373-4588 | Fax. (617) 373-6600 | Email: n.regina@neu.edu

**Will I be paid for my participation?**

You will not be paid for your participation. However, you will be given a $20 bookstore gift card at the interview meeting.

**Will it cost me anything to participate?**

There is no monetary cost to participate in this research study.

**Is there anything else I need to know?**

At any time you can opt out of the study.

You may keep this form for yourself. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Colleen Keirn
Researcher
Appendix F: Signed Consent Form

Name of Investigator(s): Principal Investigator, Bryan Patterson, Ph.D.; Student Researcher, Colleen Keirn, Ed.M.

Title of Project: How do Faculty Experience the University’s Mission on Campus: A Case Study of One University’s Approach to Living its Core Values

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

We are inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, but the researchers will explain to you in further detail the purpose of the project and your participation. Please feel free to ask any questions to address any concerns you may have. At your earliest convenience, please let me know if you plan to participate or not. If you decide to participate and before the interview can commence you will be required to sign the consent form in person.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?
You were selected to take part in this research study because you are a full-time member of the faculty who has taught at for more than one year, are tenured or tenure tracked, and are not on reduced services.

Why is this research study being done?
The purpose of this research is to explore how faculty experience the mission on campus; that is, how is the mission lived on campus.

What will I be asked to do?
If you decide to take part in this research study, you will take part in an interview that will last about 60 minutes. During this time, there will be several questions asked about your experiences on the campus. If time runs short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning. After the interview, Colleen Keirn or a confidential transcriber will transcribe each interview and provide you with a copy of the interview transcript to proofread for accuracy.

The primary interview questions will be:
1. What made you want to work at?
2. When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?
3. If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him/her about what it is like to work here?
4. What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?
5. Who is your community at? How did you first learn about this community?
6. How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?
7. Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on campus. Contributions can include among others, research, advising, mentorship, outreach, and other non-teaching work.
8. What are some examples of how you believe the university supports the mission?

Where will this take place and how much of my time will it take?
You will be interviewed in a confidential location and time of your choice at your earliest convenience. The interview can be in person, over the phone, or via VSee teleconferencing. The interview will last no more than 60 minutes.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?
Due to the confidential nature of the topic, you may experience some emotional discomfort resulting from participation in this study. It is expected that this discomfort will be minimal.

If you experience any discomfort and wish to seek psychiatric or legal assistance, please contact Employee Assistance Program, at:

Signed Consent Form -- Keirn
Will I benefit by being in this research?
You will not receive any benefits for participating in this research study. However, your responses to the interview questions will assist in demonstrating how the mission is experienced on campus.

Who will see the information about me?
You will be assigned a gender-ambiguous pseudonym. That pseudonym only will be used in transcribing interviews. A handwritten (non-digital) paper list of participants’ names and assigned pseudonyms will be kept in a locked filing drawer in the researcher’s home. This information will be kept only for the duration of the study and then destroyed. Only the researcher will have access to this information.

The principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson and the researcher will be the only people to and have access to the data gathered, including anonymized interview transcripts. At the conclusion of the study all identifying data will be destroyed. The consent forms will be kept for a minimum of three years in a locked cabinet at the researcher’s home.

Direct quotes will be used rarely, if at all. If you will be quoted, a pseudonym will be used and different gender pronouns will be used. If quoted, you will not be identified by discipline, school, specific rank or by exact number of years of service.

In rare cases, an authorized person or people from the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board may request to see the data to ensure the research is being done properly. If so, I will communicate this to you.

Will I be audio or video recorded?
With your signature below, you agree to be audio recorded in an in-person interview. If the interview is via video teleconferencing, you agree to have the session audio recorded. These recordings will be sent to a transcriber with only your pseudonym attached and they will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study. Only the transcriptions will be retained after the conclusion of the study for the purpose of further analysis and publication.

What will happen if I suffer any harm from this research?
If you suffer any harm as a result of this research no special arrangements will be made for compensation or for payment for treatment.

Can I stop my participation in this study?
At any time, you are welcome to remove yourself from participating in this research study. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to and you can refuse to answer any question at any time.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?
If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact the researcher, Colleen Keirn by telephone at [removed], or by email: [removed]. She is the person mainly responsible for the research. You can also contact the principal investigator, Dr. Bryan Patterson by email: [removed]

Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?
If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact:
Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection,
960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.
Tel. (617) 373-4588 | Fax. (617) 373-6600 | Email: n.regina@neu.edu
### Will I be paid for my participation?
You will not be paid for your participation. However, you will be given a $20 bookstore gift card at the interview meeting.

### Will it cost me anything to participate?
There is no monetary cost to participate in this research study.

### Is there anything else I need to know?
At any time you can opt out of the study.

If you decide to participate in this research study, please complete the consent form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name of Researcher/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered Consent Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature name of Researcher/Administered Consent Form
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### Appendix I: Research Chain of Evidence

#### Table H1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question(s)</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do faculty make sense of and assign meaning to the university mission on a private campus located in the Western United States?</td>
<td>What made you want to work at Private Western University?</td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>Location, mission, liberal arts, size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When you were first hired, what do you remember learning about the mission of the university?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents, artifacts</td>
<td>Resonated with some, others did not know much about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If your friend applied for a job here, what would you tell him/her about what it is like to work here?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents, artifacts</td>
<td>Community, mission centered, liberal arts oriented, collegial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What have you come to understand about the mission through your time here?</td>
<td>Interviews, documents, artifacts</td>
<td>Understanding develops over time; mission relied on to get funding; deepened understanding of social justice; it is more accepting than original interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is your community at PWU?</td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>Discipline peers, affinity group peers, like-minded people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel your work furthers academic excellence on campus?</td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>High expectations for students; research and publications; take pride in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please tell me about when you feel that your contributions are appreciated and supported on</td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>Teaching is valued; scholarship is recognized; service is acknowledged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are some examples of how you believe the university supports the mission?

| Interviews, documents, artifacts | Community members do a lot of work in support of the mission; many offices on campus were devoted to mission work; uneven implementation; mission as missionary or charity work; superficial understanding by community |
Appendix J: Coding Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant</td>
<td>The culture of the institution in regards to how things get done.</td>
<td>I think it's harder for people who belong to groups that are represented and also part of the dominant culture to understand what needs to be done for those who are in marginalized groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are minority students who are not happy about their college life on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future</td>
<td>Future opportunities for the University to grow and improve</td>
<td>real humanistic approach that's very person-centered and a student-centered classroom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>there are a lot of people here that are committed to trying to make a difference and I think there's always a couple steps forward and a couple steps back, but on the whole I think we're making progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>The good works that are ongoing on campus</td>
<td>make a difference in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social</td>
<td>The work being done by members of the University community in order to</td>
<td>make a difference in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>improve the institution and make education accessible for all learners.</td>
<td>make a difference in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is</td>
<td>How social justice is defined by different members of the University</td>
<td>make a difference in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>make a difference in the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix K: Code Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Segment</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>And that's scary because they are not intending any harm but they're actually not seeing the students as equal to the other ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>I don't think it's executing it really well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>I think the intentions are in the right place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>it doesn't feel like it's too genuine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>there's a lot of good talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>there's a lot of lip service put into it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>When it comes to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>a set of practices and values and norms that are not challenged, that is assumed is the right way to do things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>a very white community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>an understanding of white supremacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>based on middle-class or wealthy, white culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>I don't think that all voices are being heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>I just don't trust intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>I think the intentions are in the right place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>legacy interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>relationship-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Dominant Structures</td>
<td>we're pandering to a certain kind of multiculturalism that they're opposed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>challenges that we as an institution are still working on in being inclusive with one another, and being respectful of each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>here's still more work to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>how is it mandated for the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>I think it's harder for people who belong to groups that are represented and also part of the dominant culture to understand what needs to be done for those who are in marginalized groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>moral decisions and ethical decisions that happen on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>the undergraduates were very vocal about their feeling of the atmosphere on campus, and that feeling of otherness on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>There are minority students who are not happy about their college life on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>They all happen to be persons of color they can't deeply understand it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>they're walking into an ongoing struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>university is sometimes slow to publicly react to situations that seem to be in direct conflict with the mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>we don't have a required diversity training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>we have work to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Future Work</td>
<td>what about those who provide the service to the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>it's not like they're walking into a train wreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>real humanistic approach that's very person-centered and a student-centered classroom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>&quot;We're the tower. And there's tons of work that is happening, and we are not that work to this campus.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>a climate of inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>a ground swell of faculty of color on campus who are committed to social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>a small way is doing really well, but could be better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>a welcoming environment that felt accepting of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>Can we do better? Yeah, absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>challenging people in a way that still welcomes then and brings them together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>each group brings their own cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>embrace diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>Faculty of Color group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>furthering communication and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Good Works</td>
<td>good people here trying to do good things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Good Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>Social Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>I can always bring up the social justice radical ideas about social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>social inequality and social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>social justice is about changing the structures that perpetuate inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>that's a social justice issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>the institution's understanding of social justice is helping the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>The material there at least to do this sort of social justice, reflected both in the mission and in people on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>there are a lot of people here that are committed to trying to make a difference and I think there's always a couple steps forward and a couple steps back, but on the whole I think we're making progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>we really are on this social justice thing together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\Social Activism</td>
<td>we, like on a daily basis was serving the mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>we may have very different ideas about what the best interest of the college may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>the idea of social justice is a kind of [Christian] paternalistic idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>The college does need to get to a place where we don't have students walking out of classrooms because they're fed up anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>a lot of practices on campus that do not really fit with that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>there's a very specific interpretation of social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>there's a lot of mission on serving people make a difference in the world education and providing access to it in a fair way for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>charity, missionary value-based mission charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice\What is Social Justice</td>
<td>And it's empowering and not just charity kind of top-down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix L: Sample Responses to Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Ayo W.</th>
<th>Bilje L.</th>
<th>Esme L.</th>
<th>Kavi A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>why want to work at PWU?</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>less appealing on paper than in real life, seemed really conservative on paper core values and mission resonated</td>
<td>aligned with personal values</td>
<td>good people doing good things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how mission made you want to work at PWU?</td>
<td>didn't know about the mission at this point</td>
<td></td>
<td>didn't remember much being discussed about the mission at this point</td>
<td>had previous connection with PWU, always felt at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what part of mission resonated at beginning?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>social justice, work about issues of equity, common good, quality education, care for the needy or the hungry</td>
<td>being of service, acceptance of differences, embracing diversity, student-centered but didn't realize these values were tied to the campus mission</td>
<td>meet the students where they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what remember learning about mission at beginning?</td>
<td>brief intro to mission but it resonated</td>
<td>introductory meeting really resonated at faculty orientation</td>
<td>not a lot of discussion of the mission when they started</td>
<td>the respect for all people, the respect for different faiths, traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>