

1-1-2011

Faculty of Color and Scholarship Redefined: Teaching and Learning for Intercultural Competence

Peng Fu
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Fu, Peng, "Faculty of Color and Scholarship Redefined: Teaching and Learning for Intercultural Competence" (2011). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 252.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.252>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Faculty of Color and Scholarship Redefined:
Teaching and Learning for Intercultural Competence

by
Peng Fu

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership: Postsecondary Education

Dissertation Committee:
Christine Cress, Chair
Janine Allen
Andy Job
Yer Thao
Shelley Reece

Portland State University
2011

Abstract

Utilizing Boyer's (1990) four scholarship functions of professorial engagement and Wilber's (1998) four frames of organizational context, this inquiry examined faculty of color's experiences at a primarily White urban research university in their pursuit of facilitating students' intercultural competence. Specifically, through narrative inquiry, the study examined institutional factors associated with faculty of color's ability to integrate an intercultural competence focus in their scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching. Results indicate that research participants are strongly committed to the teaching, learning, community engagement, and scholarship of intercultural competence. However, institutional emphasis on the scholarship of discovery has forced them to invest most heavily in the scholarship of discovery rather than the other three functions of the professoriate. Moreover, while intercultural competence appears to be an institutional value, no specific definition exists and no intercultural performance criteria are outlined in promotion and tenure policies. Recommendations for supporting faculty of color's intercultural endeavors across the four functions of scholarship are framed in explicit organizational policies that affect implicit organizational norms, including: formal mentoring, equitable teaching and committee loads, and integration of intercultural competence into the institutional mission with attendant promotion and tenure criteria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Significance of the Study.....	10
CHAPTER TWO	
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND DISCUSSION OF RELATED	
LITERATURE.....	
The Goals and Purposes of American Higher Education.....	12
Faculty of Color’s Cultural Capital and Values to Higher Education.....	14
Conceptual Framework.....	19
Faculty of Color’s Professional Experiences and Challenges in the Academy.....	21
Multicultural Education as the Pathway to Intercultural Competence.....	30
Faculty of Color’s Contributions to Broadening the Four Functions of Scholarship..	33
The Research Gap.....	38
CHAPTER THREE	
METHODOLOGY.....	
Research Question and Purpose Restated.....	40
Research Method.....	41
Research Design.....	41
Data Collection Strategies.....	44
Ethical Issues.....	57
Data Analysis and Interpretation Strategies.....	59
Limitations of the Study.....	68

CHAPTER FOUR	
FINDINGS.....	70
Lack of Familiarity with Boyer’s Scholarship Definitions.....	79
Participants’ Strong Commitment to the Scholarship of Engagement.....	81
The Privileging of the Scholarship of Discovery and its Effect.....	85
Participants Striving to be Interculturally Competent.....	90
Supportive Organizational Culture for Teaching Intercultural Competence.....	94
Participants’ Commitment to Teaching Intercultural Competence.....	97
Lack of Formal Criteria for Evaluating the Teaching of Intercultural Competence..	101
Obstacles Stemming from External Institutional Practices.....	105
Obstacles Stemming from Organizational Cultural Norms.....	107
Obstacles Stemming from Internal Individual Beliefs.....	111
Obstacles Stemming from External Individual Behaviors.....	113
Socialization Issues Specific to Foreign-born Participants.....	115
Overall Summary of Key Findings.....	119
CHAPTER FIVE	
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL	
CHANGE.....	125
Suggestions to Improve External Institutional Processes and practices.....	127
Suggestions to Improve Institutional Cultural Norms.....	131
Suggestions to Improve Institutional Climate.....	135
Suggestions to Improve Campus Teaching and Learning Climate.....	140
Suggestions for Future Research.....	143
Implications and Conclusion.....	144
REFERENCES.....	148
APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER	163

APPENDIX B: INFORMATION ON BOYER'S SCHOLARSHIP

REDEFINITION.....165

APPENDIX C: STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT.....167

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....169

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 An Interactive Organizational Model Adapted from Wilber (1998) 19

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Full-time Instructional Faculty in Degree-granting Institutions, by Race/Ethnicity, Sex, and Academic Rank: Fall 2007	23
---------	--	----

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

American society and the world beyond are drastically changing due to the forces of domestic diversity and international globalization. The world we inhabit today is becoming increasingly small and more interdependent than ever as a result of global interconnectedness across national and cultural boundaries. “Global transportation, communication, commerce, and migration have transformed our world into a politically, economically, and environmentally interdependent web” (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 116). In the context of a global economy, clear communication across cultural lines among an international workforce is of fundamental importance (Spring, 1995). In America, the U. S. Census Bureau (2008) predicts that our nation will become more racially and ethnically diverse by mid-century, and minorities are expected to become the majority in 2042 with the nation projected to be 54 percent minority in 2050. This demographic shift is increasingly reflected in the makeup of student populations on American college and university campuses. As Susan Hockfield (2010), the current president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points out, “[a] richly diverse America does not await us, it is upon us; it is our present and our future” (p. III). Thus, diversity and globalization have rendered the education of interculturally competent citizens as one of the most urgent tasks facing American higher education.

The realities of today’s world have brought a heightened awareness of the importance of understanding cross-cultural perspectives at both national and global levels (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). In its national report entitled, *College Learning for the New*

Global Century, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007) urges higher education institutions and American society at large to recognize that global interdependence and cross-cultural encounters are reshaping the world. Hence, higher education must affirm the critical relationship between educational excellence and the teaching and learning of knowledge and practices focused on diversity and globalization that address the social, cultural, economic, and political realities in today's world.

Anderson (2008) argues that the readiness of American higher education to confront its responsibilities is directly correlated with the degree to which it has embedded diversity and global concerns into its basic educational philosophy and academic curricula. Ortiz (2000) states that the relationship between cultures and worldviews determines what we value and how we perceive the world in both concrete and abstract ways. When diversity and global concerns are strategically linked to teaching and learning outcomes (Anderson, 2008), students will have opportunities to develop intercultural competence with enriched perspectives, expanded horizons, greater degree of sensitivity to bias, greater understanding of ambiguity and paradox, and skills critical for professional and personal successes. In sum, "the image of an *ideal* graduate [is one] who possesses a high degree of world-mindedness and who is perfectly suited to live and work in different places on the globe as a socially responsible and interculturally knowledgeable citizen" (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007, p. 181).

As the term implies, the prefix "inter" in intercultural competence encompasses domestic as well as international contexts and emphasizes cultures interacting (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Intercultural competence can be defined as the understanding of

one's own cultural conditioning that affects personal beliefs, values and attitudes; knowledge of the worldviews of culturally different individuals and groups; and the ability to use culturally appropriate communication skills (Sue et al., 1982) to interpret, relate, interact, and work effectively with people who are from different cultural groups in both domestic and international environments.

In their three-dimensional developmental trajectory of intercultural maturity, King and Baxter Magolda (2005) link the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains of development with the initial, intermediate, and mature levels of intercultural development. They explain that, in the cognitive domain, an individual at the mature level of intercultural competence demonstrates his or her ability to use multiple cultural frames, and his or her skills to consciously shift perspectives to an alternative cultural worldview. They state that, in the intrapersonal domain, an individual with a mature level of intercultural competence has the courage to openly challenge his or her own views and beliefs, and has the skills to consider social identities such as race, class, and gender in both national and global contexts. They point out that, in the interpersonal domain, a mature level of intercultural competence demonstrates both an individual's willingness to work for the rights of others, as well as his or her ability to engage in meaningful and interdependent relationships with diverse others that are grounded in the understanding and appreciation of human differences.

Despite the recognition that American higher education institutions have a responsibility to prepare all students for life in an increasingly interdependent world (Schuerholz-Lehr, 2007), American colleges and universities have not been adequately

preparing their students to function effectively as interculturally competent world citizens. Deardorff (2004) points out that few colleges and universities have elevated students' development of intercultural competence as an output of their educational initiatives. Green (2000) asserts that few American college graduates are interculturally competent enough to function in different cultures, or have any deeper understanding of the rest of the world. Hence, "[i]n times of increased global interdependence, producing interculturally competent citizens who can engage in informed, ethical decision-making when confronted with problems that involve a diversity of perspectives is becoming an urgent educational priority" (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin as cited in King & Baxter-Magolda, 2005, p. 571).

Teaching intercultural competence is directly linked with the roles of faculty. As Ernest Boyer (1990), the former president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, argues in his seminal report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, the role of the scholar should "be defined in ways that not only affirm the past but also reflect the present and adequately anticipate the future" (p.75). He argues that "if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered" (p. 13). He states that "diversity brings with it important new obligations", "greater attention to students, to teaching, to the curriculum, is [*sic*] being demanded", and faculty need to "extend beyond the classroom" to embrace "both the academic and civic dimensions of collegiate life" to "serve the new constituencies" (p. 76). He also points out that "our world has undergone immense

transformations”, and “the human community is increasingly interdependent.” Therefore, the time has come “to build bridges across the disciplines, and connect the campus to the larger world”, because “[s]ociety itself has a great stake in how scholarship is defined” (p. 77). He reminds us that if the nation’s higher education institutions “cannot help students see beyond themselves and better understand the interdependent nature of our world, each new generation’s capacity to live responsibly will be dangerously diminished” (p. 77).

As such, Boyer (1990) asserts that the meaning of scholarship must be redefined if American higher education institutions are to remain vital and relevant to the realities of our contemporary life. He proposes that the meaning of scholarship should be expanded to a set of four separate yet overlapping functions: “the scholarship of *discovery*; the scholarship of *integration*; the scholarship of *application*; and the scholarship of *teaching*” (p. 16).

The scholarship of discovery refers to the vigorous investigative research and the pursuit of knowledge and intellectual discovery in the form of scholarly publications. It is the scholarship of discovery that is largely valued and rewarded in most American higher education institutions.

The scholarship of integration means “making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way” by “giving meaning to isolated facts” and “putting them in perspective” (Boyer, 1990, p. 18), for “it is through ‘connectedness’ that research ultimately is made authentic” (p. 19).

The scholarship of application means service and engagement to the larger community that is directly linked with faculty's "special field of knowledge" (Boyer, 1990, p. 22) so that "theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other" (p. 23). In a separate speech he made several years later, Boyer (1996) supplemented the meaning of the scholarship of application by stating that "the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems – and must reaffirm its historic commitment to the *scholarship of engagement*" (p. 18), a term that has been widely adopted in academe.

Last, but not least, Boyer (1990) elevates teaching as the fourth function of scholarship, since "teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but [also] *transforming* and *extending*" knowledge (p. 24), the foundation for developing interculturally competent graduates.

Concurrently, a diverse faculty body is essential for representing the voices and perspectives of our diverse world. Engaging with diverse faculty allows students to learn to function as interculturally competent global citizens, meet new challenges, and seize new opportunities in an increasingly complex and interdependent world. Because of their divergent cultural backgrounds and life experiences, faculty of color are uniquely endowed to make important contributions to American higher education in general, and to educate students for intercultural competence in particular.

In its *Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity*, the U. S. Office of Management and Budget (1997) states that the revised standards include five categories for data on race: American Indian or Alaska Native,

Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and White; as well as two categories for data on ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. This revision notice further states that “[t]he racial and ethnic categories set forth in the standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics as well as ancestry” (p. 2). Hence, in this research study, “faculty of color” refers to faculty members in the academy coming from these racial and ethnic backgrounds as identified in this revision notice by the federal government. And “faculty of color” in this research study is indeed thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics when examining faculty of color’s professional experiences in the academy.

Anderson (2008) makes the argument that, while the intellectual discourse on diversity in higher education has focused a lot of attention on issues of demographics, recruitment and retention, and the results of climate scans and surveys, higher education institutions must also recognize, value and utilize the intellectual diversity that faculty of color embody --- new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth. Caroline Turner (2003) adds that contributions of a diverse faculty enhance teaching and learning as well as the development of scholarship; and faculty of color bring new knowledge, different perspectives, and competing ideas to the academy that expand and enrich teaching and learning as well as scholarship. Citing Elma Gonzalez, a UCLA science professor, Turner (2003) also states that the range of research subjects expands in proportion to the diversity of the faculty pursuing research questions

that interest them; therefore, the expansion of scholarship in the academy depends on higher education institutions' ability to value and utilize the intellectual diversity of faculty of color.

Higher education institutions need to make efforts to fully utilize the intellectual diversity of faculty of color in the pursuit of educational excellence. Reif (2010) asserts that a more diverse faculty is a stronger faculty in all academic dimensions, since our differences enrich our lives as well as our thinking. In its newly released, *Report on the Initiative for Faculty Race and Diversity*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2010) states that faculty diversity is central to educational excellence for several reasons:

- It is intrinsic in the mission of excellence ... that we engage a truly diverse faculty; we must diversify our faculty or we lose in competitive advantage and in mission.
- A part of MIT's mission is to be of service to humanity – to hope to accomplish such a bold endeavor, one must also be inclusive of humanity.
- A diverse faculty is key to communal scholarship and intellectual scope.
- If we do not succeed in the diversification of faculty across the nation, we constrain ourselves and limit our success in all fields of endeavor. (p. 3)

MIT's president Susan Hockfield (2010) sums up wisely that “[a] productively diverse community... will make us better at what we do: broader and deeper as thinkers; more effective as collaborators; more creative as teachers; and more understanding as colleagues and friends” (p. III).

Over the past several decades, a large number of books and journal articles examining the educational experiences of faculty of color have been published. According to Turner, Gonzalez and Wood (2008), in the past twenty years between 1988 and 2007, more than 300 authors have written 252 journal articles, dissertations, reports, books and book chapters about the status and experiences of faculty of color in academe with topics mainly focused on mentorship, job satisfaction, “isms” with regard to race, class, gender and sexual orientation, tenure and promotion, isolation and marginalization, and lack of diversity in the academy. However, except for the journal article entitled, *Faculty of Color Reconsidered: Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship*, written by Anthony Antonio (2002) based on his analysis of a database developed from the 1995 Faculty Survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, virtually no research studies have examined faculty of color’s experiences of executing the four functions of scholarship in their academic pursuit: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching.

To date, Boyer’s (1990) redefinition of scholarship has brought about certain degrees of modifications to the traditional reward system in many higher education institutions across the nation. As O’Meara (2002) reports, 62% of chief academic officers in four-year institutions stated that Boyer’s report had played a role in discussions of faculty roles and rewards. Since faculty of color can potentially play a critical role in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence both personally as an extension of their cultural backgrounds and professionally as an extension of their scholarship, a closer

examination of the academic experiences of faculty of color in their pursuit of the four functions of scholarship is clearly warranted.

Hence, this study sought to fill this research gap by making a narrative inquiry to examine the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching. The goal is that this research study can provide useful information about faculty of color's pursuits of the four functions of scholarship so that policy-makers and administrators can offer appropriate support to the scholarly endeavors of faculty of color, understand the tremendous values they bring to higher education, and better utilize their intellectual diversity in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in a world that is being reshaped rapidly by diversity and globalization. Although this research study focuses on the experiences of faculty of color in the academy, it is important to note that many mainstream faculty have been successfully preparing students for our interdependent world, and they are playing an equally important role in the pursuit of educational excellence and the development of students' intercultural competence.

CHAPTER TWO
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
AND DISCUSSION OF RELATED LITERATURE

American society and the world beyond are drastically changing as a result of increasing domestic diversity and globalization. The social, cultural, economic, and political realities have rendered the education of culturally and globally competent citizens as one of the most important tasks facing American higher education. American higher education institutions have an obligation to provide students with the opportunities to experience all aspects of diversity as part of the foundation for learning by interweaving diversity into the academic curricula and creating an understanding of how diversity and globalization are impacting our lives and the world at large (Abrahamson, 2009).

A diverse faculty body is vital for higher education institutions to successfully carry out this educational task so that American college students can develop the skills to function as interculturally competent global citizens who can analyze issues from multiple perspectives, and have the capacity to interact and work effectively with culturally diverse people in both domestic and international settings. Equipped with their intellectual diversity of new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth (Anderson, 2008), faculty of color are uniquely poised for meeting this educational need both personally as an extension of their cultural backgrounds and professionally as an extension of their scholarship.

With the adaptation of Wilber's (1998) organizational model as its conceptual framework, this chapter examines faculty of color's professional experiences and the special challenges they face in the academy. Faculty of color's cultural capital and the values they bring to American higher education are presented. Multicultural education as the pathway towards intercultural competence is discussed. Faculty of color's contributions to broadening the four functions of scholarship is analyzed. And the research gap on the four functions of scholarship is addressed.

The Goals and Purposes of American Higher Education

American higher education is one of the best education systems in the world, renowned for its diversity, innovation, and accessibility. With more than four thousand colleges and universities, this system employs 1.3 million faculty members and educates 17.5 million domestic students as well as international students from around the world (U. S. Department of Education, 2008). Besides "its role in preparing students for emerging industries that drive the global economy," what makes American higher education truly unique is the fact that it "strongly affirms... knowledge, values, skills, and social relations required for producing individual and social agents capable of addressing the political, economic, and social injustices that diminish the reality and promise of a substantive democracy at home and abroad" (Giroux, 2006, p. 2). This affirmation reflects the long-cherished goals and purposes of American higher education, and helps to explain why America is not only the biggest economy but also one of the most vibrant democracies in the world.

The most consistent theme in the goal literature of American higher education is the education of the “whole person.” Education should be directed toward the growth of the “whole person” through the cultivation not only of the mind and the intellect but also of the heart and affective dispositions, including the moral, emotional, and social aspects of the personality (Bowen, 1977). Education of the “whole person” through higher learning strives to create conditions which stimulate students’ intellectual, moral, and emotional growth, so that they may ground their skills in a more mature and humane framework of values. Such an education intentionally tries to stimulate students to reformulate their goals, their cognitive maps of the world, the way they think, and their views of their own roles in society, with the purpose to nurture the development of their standard of value, their sense of civic responsibility, the capacity for religious reconciliation, skills, understanding, a sense of purpose, and all the rest required to be well-integrated individuals (Bowen, 1977).

The importance of the education of the “whole person” is evidenced by this unbreakable linkage between higher education and the society it serves. Higher education is perpetually intertwined with the fabrics of society, guided by society’s moral codes and strongly influenced by society’s social, cultural, and political discourses. Bowen (1977) depicts an accurate picture of this unavoidable nexus among higher education, society and individuals by pointing out that:

When millions of college-educated people are inducted into a society, they are bound to affect that society. Similarly, when the ideas derived from the intellectual-artistic pursuits of the academy make their way into a society, these ideas are bound to

influence the course of social development. Higher education thus sets in motion a dynamic process leading to changes in society, which in turn will lead to further changes in both individuals and society. (p. 50)

Education of the “whole person” is also an education about civic responsibilities and the roles of social agents students need to consciously assume as a result of such an education. Without these social, moral, and civic objectives, higher education would be an incomplete and insufficient education. The most demanding and significant educational objective of our time is to help students to become better-integrated world citizens with a sense of command over their own destinies and a sense of how they fit into their complicated social and political environment (Bowen, 1977). Higher education not only reflects the values of the larger society, but also has the potential to act intentionally in fostering the moral and civic learning of its students (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens (2003) believe that the need to educate the “whole person” is even greater than ever, since global interdependence is continuously insistent, and the country’s increasing racial and ethnic diversity has brought tensions, dilemmas, as well as the enrichment of its culture. They point out that if students are to become involved and responsible world citizens, higher education’s goals must go beyond the development of intellectual and technical skills by including a full account of competence, such as intercultural competence.

Faculty of Color’s Cultural Capital
and Values to American Higher Education

To be able to teach for intercultural competence among students, faculty of color must be interculturally knowledgeable citizens themselves. Faculty of color bring unique perspectives from their personal experiences and socio-cultural histories to higher education, and their bicultural life experiences are their greatest strength in carrying out this educational task.

Culture is defined as the cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through both individual and group striving (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). Therefore, biculturalism refers to the capacity to learn and absorb two different kinds of experiences and two different sets of belief, value and meaning systems that define two different cultures. Contrary to acculturation that involves learning a new culture while diminishing one's identification with the previous culture, biculturalism, on the other hand, is the achievement of adapting to the dominant culture well enough to function effectively in it without sacrificing the belief systems of one's ethnic culture (Sadao, 2003). The daily lives of faculty of color are a constant juxtaposition between the past and the present, between their primary culture and the dominant mainstream culture. And this constant struggle between two worlds, two cultures, and two realities gives them deep insights, rich world view and diverse perspectives on life that can help broaden students' range of viewpoints, and create a learning environment that is conducive to students' critical reflection and strengthening of students' intercultural competence and worldview.

While conducting his research on the relationship between intercultural experiences and the interdisciplinary work of university faculty, Vincenti (2001) concludes that the literature review shows substantive overlap between the benefits of intercultural experiences and qualities needed for intercultural effectiveness and interdisciplinary work. In their discussion of the relationship between faculty's personal and professional situatedness and their pedagogical approaches, Clandinin and Connelly (1999) state that faculty's identities, past experiences, present minds, and future plans are often manifested in their work. In their research on teacher thinking, Clark and Yinger (1977) conclude that educators' practices are often the results of the interpretation of their life experiences and their sense making of the world around them.

The identities and perspectives of faculty of color are largely informed by their bicultural life experiences that often have enormous impact on their abilities to educate students for intercultural competence. Their social, political, and cultural realities afford them a unique and important voice in American higher education, since the past and the present intersect in people's voices, infuse pedagogy, and sculpt the conditions and processes involved in coming to know (Walsh, 1991). It is important that we "consider past experience, language, and culture as strengths to be respected and woven into the fabric of knowledge production and dissemination, not as deficits that must be devalued, silenced and overcome" (Rendon, 1992, p.62). Furthermore, "[their] mastery of different languages, [their] ability to cross racial and ethnic boundaries, and a general resilience associated with the ability to endure hardships and overcome obstacles will

clearly be recognized as a new cultural capital” (Trueba, 2002, p.24) that is much needed in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence.

Faculty of color bring diverse perspectives and variety of viewpoints to higher education institutions; and this intellectual diversity allows higher education institutions to understand, function, and respond to the changing society and the world beyond more effectively. According to Weick’s (1979) application of the theory of requisite variety, the success of higher education institutions depends on obtaining diversity within the institutions that is as great as the diversity in the larger society; and a lack of diversity prohibits institutions from having different perspectives and often results in failure or inability to adapt to a diverse society. Furthermore, institutional diversity keeps higher education institutions congruent with the diverse larger society and maintains higher education institutions’ relevance in a fast changing world.

Gurin (1999) states that students who have experienced the most diversity both inside and outside of the classroom settings show the greatest development and growth in critical thinking skills as well as in intellectual and academic skills. In their detailed study on campus diversity and civic engagement, Hurtado, Ponjuan, and Smith (2007) report that faculty of color play significant roles in increasing diversity awareness on campuses and in students’ learning outcomes, because diverse faculty can impact student learning outcomes as a result of distinctive pedagogical practices and serve as role models for students of color on campuses. These faculty members represent hope and possibilities for minority students who are still struggling and searching for their own identities and voices in their educational journey. Hurtado et al. (2007) also state that

faculty of color's distinctive pedagogical practices and their intellectual diversity enrich the knowledge base of mainstream students, enhance their learning experiences and broaden their perspectives on life and the world around them; and mainstream students who have been exposed to such experiences tend to be more open-minded and less prejudiced, and they are highly motivated and actively engage in diversity and civic activities after four years in college.

Faculty of color bring tremendous value to American higher education. Drawing from the literature (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1991; Green, 1989; Mickelson & Oliver, 1991; Washington & Harvey, 1989), Antonio (2002) contends that faculty of color make unique contributions to American higher education because they provide diverse role models for all students in higher education, provide more effective mentoring to students of color, bring new perspectives to higher education by engaging in minority-related and other areas of nontraditional scholarship, and give minorities a greater voice in the governance of the nation's colleges and universities. Furthermore, faculty of color contribute to what is taught, how it is taught, and what is important to learn in higher education institutions (Smith, 1989). A diverse faculty body is essential to the quality of higher education; colleges and universities should make efforts to attract the best and the most qualified scholars who can explore in their teaching and research the frontiers of knowledge and approach their work with creativity, with dedication and with a sense of hope (Torres, 1998) for a brighter future in a diverse democratic society.

Conceptual Framework

Wilber (1998) believes that both individuals and organizations' existence fundamentally depends on their extensive networks of relationships; these extensive networks of relationships are both internal as well as external with social/psychological and behavioral/procedural aspects. As illustrated by figure 1, these extensive networks of relationships include the following four dimensions: 1) internal individual beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings; 2) external individual behaviors; 3) internal group or institutional beliefs, values, and attitudes known as organizational cultural norms; and 4) external group or institutional processes and practices. While external behaviors, processes, and practices are observable; internal beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings can be known yet are unobservable.

An Interactive Organizational Model

	Internal	External	Larger purposes & outcomes
Individual	<i>Beliefs, values, attitudes, feelings</i>	<i>Behaviors</i>	<i>Interculturally competent teachers</i>
Group or Institution	<i>Organizational cultural norms</i>	<i>Processes, practices</i>	<i>Interculturally competent institutions, interculturally competent students</i>

Figure 1, Adapted from Wilber (1998)

During the past several decades, policies such as affirmative action and race-conscious admissions practices have helped to enhance the structural diversity in higher education by increasing the numbers of minority faculty and students on campuses. A campus with a diverse student body and diverse faculty promotes positive social and intellectual interactions among people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds,

broadens the range of students' viewpoints, and creates a learning environment that is essential to the quality of higher education.

Yet, structural diversity alone can no longer address the complex nature of faculty's academic work environment, since "[a]n organization's culture is not internally coherent to all individuals" (Tierney, 1997, p. 14). As Tierney (1997) points out that people are not all the same, and each individual brings his or her own unique background and insights to an organization; the challenge is how to use these individual attributes to build an organizational culture that is nurturing and supportive to all its members (Tierney, 1993).

Cress and Hart (2005) assert that "if we want to fully understand the nature of the academic environment, we must examine the entire complement of realities" (p. 113). When we attempt to understand faculty of color's professional experiences and the challenges they face in the academy, we need to take the social/psychological and behavioral/procedural dimensions of their realities into consideration, since these dimensions "are all profoundly interrelated and deeply connected, in what look like intrinsically necessary ways" (Wilber, 1998, p. 66). As Susan Hockfield (2010) points out, "[u]ltimately, a community reaps the benefits of diversity only when it looks beyond the numbers alone and actively creates a culture where everyone feels valued and included – an environment in which everyone can do their very best work" (p. III) by becoming interculturally competent students and faculty in an interculturally competent institution.

Faculty of Color's Professional Experiences and their Challenges in the Academy

In order to create an institutional culture and environment that can best support faculty of color's academic work and their pursuit of scholarship, we must first understand faculty of color's experiences and the challenges they face in the academy; since campus climate is the lived experiences of faculty lives that in turn can have an impact on the academic excellence of the entire institutional community (Cress & Hart, 2005). In this section, faculty of color's experiences and challenges in the academy are grouped together according to Wilber's (1998) four-dimensional organizational model and are presented as follows: 1) external group or institutional processes and practices; 2) internal group or institutional beliefs, values, and attitudes known as organizational cultural norms; 3) internal individual beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings; and 4) external individual behaviors.

External institutional processes and practices

“One of the great challenges faced by U.S. institutions of higher learning ..., is the engagement and full utilization of the population's talent” (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010, p.1). Despite years of diversity policies and practices, the least successful of all the diversity initiatives on campuses are those in the area of faculty diversity (Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi & Richards, 2004). The increase of the presence of faculty of color on college and university campuses continues to be slow (Antonio, 2003); and a thorough examination of both quantitative and qualitative data by Turner, Myers and Creswell (1999) reveals continued underrepresentation of faculty of color in

the nation's colleges and universities. The following statistics reflect the inadequate institutional processes and practices in the area of faculty diversity in American higher education.

According to the statistics recently released by the U. S. Department of Education (2008), faculty of color make up only 17 percent of the 1.3 million faculty members in the nation's degree-granting colleges and universities. The latest statistics from the U. S. Department of Education (2008) also indicate that about four fifths of the faculty in the nation's degree-granting colleges and universities are White, with 43% being White males and 36% being White females. Of the 17% faculty of color in the academy, 7% are Asian, 6% are Black, 4% are Hispanic, and about 1% are American Indian. The more prestigious institutions often have the smallest percentage of faculty of color (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002); for example, the percentage of under-represented minority faculty at Massachusetts Institute of Technology stands at 6.4% (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010).

Representation rates for faculty of color among tenure-track and tenured faculty ranks continue to be low, and the disparities have remained relatively unchanged in many years (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). As evidenced by the 2007 survey in Table 1 below, the proportionate representation of both White males and females in faculty ranks increases as they ascend the academic ladder from assistant professor to professor; while the proportionate representation of minority males and females in faculty ranks increases as they descend the academic ladder from professor to assistant professor (Aquirre, 2000). Furthermore, according to the same 2007 survey in Table 1 below, faculty of color

comprise 37% of all lecturers and instructors in the academy, and both academic ranks are less prestigious and non-tenure track positions.

Table 1 Full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2007

Academic rank	Total	White	Minority						Race/ethnicity unknown	Nonresident alien ²
			Number	Percent ¹	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alaska Native		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
2007										
Total	703,463	540,460	119,906	17.3	37,930	24,975	53,661	3,340	11,875	31,222
Professors	173,395	147,867	22,734	13.2	5,839	4,128	12,239	528	1,309	1,485
Associate professors	143,692	115,274	24,255	17.1	7,855	4,714	11,082	604	1,628	2,535
Assistant professors	168,508	117,618	34,940	21.2	10,642	6,329	17,290	679	3,593	12,357
Instructors	101,429	77,609	19,470	19.7	7,480	5,800	5,225	965	2,350	2,000
Lecturers	31,264	23,470	5,326	17.4	1,602	1,492	2,081	151	661	1,807
Other faculty	85,175	58,622	13,181	15.9	4,512	2,512	5,744	413	2,334	11,038

SOURCE: *Digest of Education Statistics* (2008), U. S. Department of Education.

Chang, Altbach and Lomotey (2005) report that the efforts for recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty have generally met with little success over the past several decades, and faculty of color are still severely underrepresented in the academy. Research indicates that there are many factors involved for the successful recruitment and retention of faculty of color in higher education. Turner, Myers, and Creswell (1999) state that faculty of color's love for teaching and their sense of accomplishment, supportive administrative leadership, mentoring relationships, collegiality, and interaction with other faculty of color all positively contribute to the successful recruitment and retention of faculty of color in higher education institutions.

Internal institutional beliefs, attitudes, and values (organizational cultural norms)

In its 2010, *Report on the Initiative for Faculty Race and Diversity*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology's provost Rafael Reif states that:

for many of our faculty from URM (underrepresented minority) groups, their experience at MIT is distinctly and sometimes painfully different from that of their majority peers. We are not succeeding in making all members of our faculty feel equally welcome and valued as scholars – and this distressing disparity of experience is a reality we must recognize and address. (p.V)

Many scholars have cited the persistent negative and chilly work environment as the major factor for the failure of recruitment, retention and development of faculty of color in American higher education. In his study of women and minority faculty in the academic workplace, Aquirre (2000) describes an entrenched culture that questions minority faculty's rightful place in the academy and often considers them as "affirmative action hires". Nieto (2006) adds that these are among some of the questions that many faculty of color contend with while faculty of European descent never have to consider.

Once entering the academy, faculty of color are often expected to present the "minority viewpoint" in their committee work, and are often overcommitted on service-related projects in their departments and universities; as a result, their research and academic work may suffer (Nieto, 2006). Many faculty of color reveal that they have received very little or no mentoring from senior faculty colleagues while being socialized into the academy (Stanley, 2006). The lack of mentoring relationships with senior faculty is often cited as one of the major reasons in the attrition of women and faculty of color (Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989). Many faculty of color have reported that

mentoring relationships not only help to foster their professional development, but also help to facilitate their emotional and social adjustment within the institutional culture where they often face social alienation and professional isolation (Tillman, 2001). Stanley (2006) also reports that mentoring has strong impact on faculty of color's professional lives, and it helps faculty of color with their teaching and research and enables them to develop a presence of leadership in their fields.

Racial and ethnic diversity influences an entire institution, including its culture, its values and its ethos (Antonio, 2003). Susan Hockfield (2010) asserts that “[c]reating a culture of inclusion is not an optional exercise; it is the indispensable precondition that enables us to capitalize on our diverse skills, perspectives and experiences” (p. III).

Morgan (2006) points out that organizations *are* cultures because organizations are mini-societies that have their own distinctive patterns of culture and subculture. He defines cultures as ongoing and proactive processes of reality construction through which all organizational members jointly create and re-create the world in which they live.

Building organizational culture means building communities based on inclusive relationships characterized by trust, support, encouragement and mutual respect, and it also means transforming the mind-sets, paradigms and beliefs, and requires the participation and efforts of people at every level of the organization (Morgan, 2006).

Tierney (1997) also reminds us that, when people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds join the academy, they are involved in the creation – not the duplication – of organizational culture; and we need to strive to create academic communities that honor excellence and differences rather than similarities.

Internal individual beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings

Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, and Han (2009) point out that feelings of “otherness” and experiences of racial and ethnic bias are often identified as major factors that shape faculty of color’s commitment to higher education. Faculty of color state that their race and ethnicity influence the reception they receive in the academy (Bower, 2002). They often feel voiceless and invisible since their ideas are often easily dismissed due to subtle and overt discrimination (Cress & Hart, 2005). They report that they have fewer opportunities to develop any meaningful working relationships with majority faculty (Elmore & Blackburn, 1983); and they find that understanding, empathy and warmth are often lacking among their colleagues (Harvey & Scott-James, 1985). Some state that they are so isolated among their colleagues that they feel more comfortable interacting socially with their students of color (Turner & Myers, 1999). For many faculty of color, their experiences with their majority colleagues comprise either a major factor for their academic success or a deciding factor for them to leave and move on to another institution (Stanley, 2006).

Elsa Valdez (2006), a professor of Sociology at California State University, San Bernardino, describes her early years as a professor at a small conservative liberal arts university by stating that “... I found it difficult to get to know many of the faculty. Some of the faculty were very uncomfortable around me, and I especially sensed their discomfort in the faculty dining room” (p. 225).

Amanda Kim (2006), a postdoctoral scholar at the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan, states that “[w]hat I find to be the

most difficult in my interaction with others in the majority culture is when my voice is dismissed or silenced” (p. 135). She describes her agony over her inability to speak up by asking the following poignant questions:

I acknowledge my complicity in silencing myself, but I also know the costs involved in refusing to be silent. That is the place of my struggle. What will I risk? How much will I risk to have a voice in the dominant culture? (P. 136)

Intercultural competence among all institutional employees is the key to create an inclusive and supportive working environment where all members of the institutional community, regardless of their cultural and ethnic backgrounds and their positions and ranks within these institutions, can treat each other with mutual respect, compassion and dignity. Faculty of color need to be treated as competent and deserving members of their institutions instead of mere affirmative action token hires. They also need to be encouraged to have meaningful involvement and professional interactions with their White majority colleagues and become closely involved with departmental matters as well as issues at the institutional level so that they will no longer feel isolated, marginalized, invisible, and voiceless. These approaches will help to alleviate the feelings of isolation and rejection felt by faculty of color, give them a sense of belonging, solidarity, and community, and further strengthen their devotion and commitment to their institutions.

External individual behaviors

The difficulties and challenges faculty of color experience in the academy are also reflected in their academic behaviors and their pursuit of the scholarship of teaching, the

scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of discovery. Although Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens (2003) state that multicultural education is of institutional concern on many campuses that support this kind of academic work, faculty of color who teach courses with multicultural content and perspectives often face resistance from White students (Stanley et al., 2003), as evidenced by student evaluations of courses and teachers (McGowan, 2000; Delgado-Romero et al., 2007). Chang, Altbach and Lomotey (2005) report that the demands for a meaningful integration of multicultural perspectives into the curriculum to present a wide range of ideas reflecting the diverse social, cultural and economic realities in American society have been met with opposition from faculty who favor the traditional curriculum and from administrators who worry about the costs for the creation of new specializations and courses.

Stanley (2006) states that research and scholarship focused on ethnic and multicultural issues by faculty of color are often considered non-mainstream and are not always rewarded in the academy; this practice has put faculty of color at a disadvantage in the tenure and promotion process wherein mainstream research is often most valued and rewarded. Promotion and tenure are opportunities to advance through the academic ranks and are often considered as indicators of career success in academe (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000). Yet, “successful promotion and tenure has been one of the most contentious issues facing faculty of color” (Jayakumar et al., 2009, p. 541), especially when their teaching and scholarship are focused on diversity and multicultural issues. And faculty of color’s knowledge and research interests can work against them when

they pursue tenure and promotion (Diggs et al, 2009). According to a qualitative study done by Baez (1998), faculty of color are often promised institutional acceptance of alternative research methods and scholarship before accepting academic positions, yet their research and scholarship are not rewarded during the tenure and promotion processes since they are not considered as valued mainstream research and scholarship. On the other hand, “even when faculty of color are not satisfied with their jobs overall, they are likely to be retained if they perceive their scholarship to be valued by departmental colleagues, or if they are given autonomy and independence” (Jayakumar et al., 2009, p. 551).

Inquiry, teaching, and learning at a multicultural university flourish by virtue of an interactive and interdependent diversity of cultural differences (Antonio, 2003). Therefore, teaching, learning, and scholarship with multicultural content need to be supported at both the departmental and the institutional level. Scholarship on ethnic and multicultural issues needs to be recognized as true and worthy scholarship and receive support and encouragement from mainstream majority faculty and people in the position of decision-making. The best way to achieve such a goal is to adjust the reward system to value teaching and research focused on diversity and multicultural issues (Cress & Hart, 2005). When faculty of color realize that their scholarly work is validated and their contributions are valued, they will choose to commit themselves to their chosen profession and continue to be retained in higher education.

Multicultural Education as the Pathway to Intercultural Competence

In her highly acclaimed book, *Cultivating Humanity*, philosopher Martha Nussbaum (1997), drawing heavily from the Western philosophical tradition, argues that three specific capacities are essential to the cultivation of humanity necessary to create interculturally competent citizens in today's world: the first is the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one's traditions by living a life that questions all beliefs and accepts only those that survive reason's demand for consistency and justification; the second capacity demands citizens to have the ability to see themselves not just citizens of local region or group but human beings bound to all other human beings in the world by ties of recognition and concern; the third capacity is called the narrative imagination, an ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person's story, and understand the emotions and wishes and desires that person might have.

Then, what would an education for intercultural competence look like in a contemporary university curriculum? Nussbaum (1997) asserts that this education must be a multicultural education that insists on the importance of teaching that the imagination can cross cultural boundaries, and that cross-cultural understanding rests on the acknowledgement of common human needs and goals amid many local differences that divide us. She calls on educators to show students the beauty of a life that is open to the whole world, the joy of the citizenship that questions rather than simply applauds, and the fascination in the study of human beings in all their variety and complexity rather

than in the zealous pursuit of superficial stereotypes; otherwise, the future of democracy in this nation and in the world will be bleak.

Born in the Civil Rights struggles of 1960s, the movement of multicultural education focused on the lack of equality of educational opportunity for minority students (Spring, 1995). Today, multiculturalism permeates the discourse of many disciplines, yet none is so profoundly affected as the field of education (Phillion, 1999). “[I]n a world of multiple and conflicting perspectives, experiencing and learning from differences is a crucial part of the educational process” (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, p. 44, 2003). Students must develop multicultural literacy and intercultural competence if they are to become knowledgeable, caring, and effective citizens in today’s world (Banks, 2007).

Banks and Banks (2004) define multicultural education in the, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, as “a field of study designed to increase educational equity for all students that incorporates, . . . , content, concepts, principles, theories, and paradigms from history, the social and behavioral sciences, and particularly from ethnic studies and women’s studies” (p. xii).

Banks (2004) identifies the five dimensions of multicultural education as: (1) content integration, (2) the knowledge construction process, (3) prejudice reduction, (4) an equity pedagogy, and (5) an empowering school culture and social structure. Christine Bennett (2001) also states that multicultural education encompasses four broad principles:

- (a) the theory of cultural pluralism; (b) ideals of social justice and the end of racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination; (c) affirmations of culture

in the teaching and learning process; and (d) visions of educational equity and excellence leading to high levels of academic learning for all children and youth. (p. 173)

The primary objective of multicultural education is to increase students' cultural repertoire in their private culture by helping them to abandon the belief that there is only one single style of living or there is only one single way of thinking that befits everyone, and help them to learn that their own modes of behavior and belief are as important and functional to them as other patterns are to others (Pai, 1990). One of the important goals of multicultural education is to help all students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to participate in intercultural interactions and in personal, social, and civic actions that will help make our world more democratic and just (Banks, 2007). To achieve these objectives, students need to develop critically reflective thinking skills that will lead to more inclusive and integrating perspectives about the diverse social, cultural and political realities in American society and the larger world beyond. Those transformed perspectives will enable students to embrace, appreciate and understand a wider range of cultural patterns and diverse experiences. Their transformed perspectives will also liberate their minds from the bondage of habit and custom, and allow them to function with sensitivity, alertness and intercultural competence as citizens of the whole world (Nussbaum, 1997).

The positive impact of multicultural education on students and their learning has been firmly established through many published research and studies. In a national study of 15,600 students from 365 colleges and universities over a period of four years, all

students surveyed, regardless of their race and ethnicity, state that their overall level of satisfaction with their college experience is positively influenced by attending cultural awareness workshops, by socializing with students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, by taking courses from faculty who use instructional methodology with content on ethnic and racial issues, and by campus policies and practices that promote diversity initiatives (Villalpando, 2002).

Faculty of Color's Contributions

to Broadening the Four Functions of Scholarship

Faculty of color in higher education have been at the forefront of multicultural education and have been taking the leadership role in educating students for intercultural competence by making special contributions to the broadening of scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching (Antonio, 2010).

“Multicultural research ... makes explicit the wide range of views, values, perspectives, and experiences within ethnic, racial, and cultural groups” (Banks, p. 56, 2007) and produces “concepts, paradigms, and theories that challenge mainstream academic knowledge and expand and substantially revise established canons, paradigms, theories, and explanations (Banks, p. 8, 1993). Critical race theory has its roots in the work of Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009), and the adaptation of this theory into the education field is one of the significant contributions which faculty of color have made to the scholarship of discovery in educational research in recent years.

Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), who are largely responsible for this adaptation, state that critical race theory stems from the race-based critique of the critical legal studies movement in the early 1980s and the lack of attention paid to race in critical legal scholarship (cited in Lynn et al., 2002). For faculty of color who are seeking to do transformative work that addresses issues of race and racism in education, critical race theory provides the necessary tools to create a discourse that engages larger questions of racial inequality and its impact on education and society (Lynn et al., 2002). Lincoln (1993) further points out that critical race theory differs from traditional methodologies in that it helps educators to develop theories of social transformation wherein knowledge is generated specifically for the purpose of addressing and ameliorating conditions of oppression, poverty, or deprivation. Thus, critical race theory is committed to social justice by emphasizing a transformative response to racial, gender and class oppression (Matsuda, 1991). Critical race theory also recognizes that the experiential knowledge of people of color is legitimate, appropriate and critical to understanding, analyzing and teaching about racial inequalities in education and society (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). Furthermore, critical race theory mandates that social activism be a part of any critical race theory project (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005).

With the adaptation of critical race theory in educational research comes the innovation of “critical race methodology” (Solorzano & Yosso, 2005) that focuses on the stories and experiences of students of color and faculty of color in education. These stories and narratives give voice to the educational experiences of minority students and faculty, and reflect critical race theory’s emphasis on the importance of the personal and

community experiences of people of color as sources of knowledge (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). Narratives and storytelling have been employed in educational research in various ways, including Solorzano's (1998) study on Chicana/Chicano graduate students and Delgado Bernal and Villalpando's (2002) examination of the experiences of scholars of color (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). Tate (1994) contends that the experiences and voices of people of color need to be heard in academic discourse, since they help others to think in different ways about complex, context-dependent domains like schools and communities. These narratives and stories of minority students and faculty's educational experiences put a human face to educational theory and practice, and provide a context to understand and transform established belief systems and practices in education (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002).

Interdisciplinary inquiry encourages diversity of thoughts and creative thinking; and intercultural experiences facilitate the development of interdisciplinary work and enhance its effectiveness (Vincenti, 2001). Faculty of color are associated with holding holistic teaching and learning goals and teaching interdisciplinary courses (Antonio, 2002). Antonio (2010) points out that over 21 percent of faculty of color have taught an ethnic studies course, thus contributing to the expansion of the scholarship of integration. He also reports that over 21 percent of faculty of color have taught an ethnic studies course, compared to 7 percent of their White colleagues who have taught such a course.

One of the consistent central goals of American higher education is to educate students to be productive citizens and civic leaders in a democratic society. Yet, some recent studies have found that many college students share a trend that is toward self-

interest and away from attitudes and values reflecting social responsibility (Antonio, Astin & Cress, 2000). “Goals of personal advancement and gratification too often take precedence over social, moral, or spiritual meaning” (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, p. 7, 2003). To combat this trend, many colleges and universities have renewed their commitment to civic education and are refocusing their attention on teaching and learning of democratic citizenship on campuses. One of the pedagogical reforms aimed at strengthening this new commitment to the education of democratic citizenship is the development of service learning that has featured prominently in many faculty of color’s scholarship of engagement.

Service learning is a course-based service experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on that service activity in order to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). And service learning applies existing knowledge in a practical setting that can also lead to the creation of new knowledge about practice (O’Meara, 2002). Antonio (2010) states that, in the area of scholarship of engagement, faculty of color are 63 percent more likely than their White colleagues to make a connection between their profession and the ability to affect change in society.

The success of service learning requires broad faculty support and participation in developing the courses, teaching the classes and promoting students’ involvement in community service (Antonio, Astin & Cress, 2000). Based on the data collected for a triennial national survey of college faculty in 403 colleges and universities across the

country conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Antonio, Astin and Cress (2000) find that the involvement in and commitment to community service of faculty of color are higher than those of White faculty in four areas: (a) involvement with student groups engaged in service (faculty of color are higher by 13 points); (b) support of goals for providing services to the community (10 point difference); (c) commitment to instilling an ethic of service in students (11 point difference); and (d) belief that community service should be a graduation requirement (12 point difference). They state that the high level of commitment to and engagement in community service by faculty of color occur because the discrimination experienced by faculty of color likely makes issues of inequality and injustice in society more personally salient, consequently motivating them to work toward social change through community service.

Faculty of color give high priority to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence and other affective and moral development in their pursuit of the scholarship of teaching. Antonio (2010) points out that, in the area of scholarship of teaching, faculty of color are 30 percent more likely than their White colleagues to value the affective, moral and civic development of students as well as experiences outside the classrooms. After conducting analysis on a database developed from the 1995 Faculty Survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Antonio (2002) posits that faculty of color are much more likely than their White colleagues to place high importance on the affective, moral and civic development of students, and they are more oriented toward the application of their work for social change, since faculty of color are 75% more likely than White faculty to pursue a position in the academy because they

draw a connection between the profession and the ability to affect change in society. Cress and Hart (2005), based on their study on the 1999 National Survey of College and University Faculty conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, report that 67% of faculty of color, as compared to 45% of White faculty, believe that teaching to enhance students' knowledge and appreciation of racial/ethnic groups is essential; and over two-thirds of faculty of color assert that promoting racial and cultural understanding in their classrooms is very important and failure to do so undermines students success and the academic integrity of the institution.

Research Gap and Conclusion

Our contemporary life is driven by diversity and global interdependence, the impetus to Boyer's (1990) redefinitions of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching. Diversity and globalization have brought about enormous social, cultural, economic, and political changes that are impacting higher education in an unprecedented manner. Hence, traditional scholarship with its sole emphasis on research and publication can no longer fulfill American higher learning institutions' educational responsibilities and their social obligations. If American higher education is to continue to remain vital and relevant, higher education institutions must be more proactive in rethinking the meanings of scholarship and its implementations into both the academic curricular and faculty reward system.

Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered* has "formulated a powerful rationale for broadening what counts as scholarship," and has stimulated "a national conversation

about the ‘scholarships of teaching, application, and integration in addition to the more familiar ‘scholarship of discovery’” (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003, p. 46). In the first decade after the publication of Boyer’s (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, a considerable literature was developed (Kreber & Cranton, 2000) with its main focus on the scholarship of teaching (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Rice, 1991; Weimer, 1992; Boileau, 1993; Diamond & Adam, 1993; Richlin, 1993; Ronkowski, 1993; Taylor, 1993; Paulsen & Feldman, 1995; Menges & Weimer, 1996; Morehead & Shedd, 1996; Cunsolo, Elrick, Middleton, & Yoy, 1996; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Kreber & Cranton, 1997; Berberet, 1999; Kreber, 1999; Kreber, 2000; Kreber & Cranton, 2000). Yet, virtually no study has been done to examine faculty of color’s experiences of pursuing the four functions of scholarship. In the last decade, the debate on the meanings and redefinitions of scholarship has ebbed; and the paucity of research on the four functions of scholarship has become quite noticeable.

Hence, this study sought to fill this research gap by making a narrative inquiry to examine the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching. The goal is that this research study can provide useful information about faculty of color’s pursuits of the four functions of scholarship so that policy-makers and administrators can offer appropriate support to the scholarly endeavors of faculty of color, understand the tremendous values they bring to higher education, and better utilize their intellectual diversity in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in a world that is being reshaped rapidly by diversity and globalization.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on various aspects of the methodology for this research study. The research questions are restated; the rationale for using qualitative research method and narrative research design in this study is explained; strategies for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data is discussed; the validity and limitations of the research study is addressed; and the implications of the research study is also stated.

Research Questions and Research Purpose Restated

This research study investigates faculty of color's experiences of pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching with the hope to encourage higher education institutions to better support faculty of color's scholarly endeavors and to better utilize the intellectual diversity of faculty of color in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. The specific questions for this research study are: (a) What are the experiences of faculty of color in their pursuit of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching in American higher education institutions? (b) How do faculty of color purposefully incorporate the teaching and learning of intercultural competence into their scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching?

Qualitative Research as the Method for the Study

Qualitative research is inherently multi-method in focus and the combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials and perspectives adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to educational inquiry (Flick, 2002). Qualitative research is a situated activity that involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach to the world; and qualitative researchers use various empirical materials such as personal experiences, introspection, life stories, cultural texts, and productions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) to interpret and make sense of human experience in order to transform the world itself.

This examination of faculty of color's experiences of pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching sought to interpret and understand faculty of color's personal, professional, and scholarly experiences with the aim to affect change and improve educational practice in American higher education institutions. The impetus to broadening the meanings and functions of scholarship is largely informed by the rapid changes and new challenges we are facing in a world driven by diversity and globalization. This close association with the world and strong emphasis on human experience made the inquiry of the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship fall mainly into the realm of qualitative research.

Narrative Inquiry Informs the Research Design for This Study

Narrative inquiry is a subtype of qualitative research that is embedded in and shaped by broad social and historical currents, an amalgam of interdisciplinary analytic lenses,

diverse disciplinary approaches, and both traditional and innovative methods revolving around an interest in biographical particulars as narrated by the ones who live them (Chase, 2005). In his defense of narrative's virtues, Arthur Bochner (2001) passionately states that narrative inquiry

moves away from a singular, monolithic conception of social science toward a pluralism that promotes multiple forms of representation and research; away from facts and toward meanings; away from master narratives and toward local stories; away from idolizing categorical thought and abstracted theory and toward embracing the values of irony, emotionality, and activism; away from assuming the stance of the disinterested spectator and toward assuming the posture of a feeling, embodied, and vulnerable observer; away from writing essays and toward telling stories. (pp. 134-135)

Narrative inquiry is increasingly being used in studies of educational experiences, because the educational importance of narrative inquiry is that it brings theoretical ideas about the nature of human life as lived to bear on educational experiences as lived (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Narrative inquiry as a way of knowing helps educational researchers to understand the meaning, social significance, and purpose of an educational phenomenon or experience rather than to formulate a logical or scientific explanation (Kramp, 2004). As Bochner (2001) points out, we narrate to make sense of ourselves and our experiences over the course of time; hence, narrative is our way of recollecting the meanings of past experiences and disclosing to us the truth in our experiences.

American higher education is deeply rooted within the society it serves; and the social, cultural, and political realities in our daily lives are constantly reflected in the educational missions of higher education. The experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship are socially and culturally constructed human activities that are deeply influenced by and closely connected with the fabrics of our society. Therefore, the research design for this study was informed by narrative inquiry with the purpose to investigate the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of teaching, and the teaching for intercultural competence. Through constructing and reconstructing the experiences of the research participants in this study, narrative inquiry not only helped us to understand their academic experiences, but also offered guidance for future educational practices regarding the meanings and functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in American higher education.

Creswell (2008) has outlined seven steps in conducting narrative inquiry, which served as the guideline for conducting this research study. This researcher took the first step to identify a phenomenon to explore that addressed an educational problem (Creswell, 2008). Guided by Creswell's outline in conducting narrative inquiry, this researcher purposefully selected individuals from whom she could learn about the phenomenon; collected stories from these individuals; retold these individuals' stories; collaborated with the participants during the narrative inquiry; and wrote a story about the participants' experiences.

Although the interview questions were framed around Boyer's (1990) definitions of scholarship and Wilber's (1998) four dimensional model for organizational change in order to seek answers for the two research questions, all research participants freely shared their personal and professional experiences without being constrained by the interview questions during the interviews.

Strategies for Collecting Data

Research Site

Pacific Metro University was purposefully selected as the research site for this study. PMU is a comprehensive public university located in Oregon's major metropolitan area. With a student enrollment of 27,972 for the school year of 2009 – 2010, PMU remains the largest university of the state university system. The university's overall mission is to provide students with an excellent education based in the real world (President's fall symposium speech, 2005). In his fall symposium speech, the university president points out that

[i]f we are to continue to be true to our mission, then we must focus on the global community. As the world has become more interconnected, as our nation's economic stability increasingly depends on global partners, and as peace has always been an elusive goal, our nation's future depends on each of us being culturally competent from a global perspective. (p. 2)

PMU also boasts a nationally recognized University Studies general education program. One of the four goals for the general education at PMU is for students to gain awareness of the diversity of human experience by enhancing their appreciation for and

understanding of the rich complexity of the human experience through the study of differences in ethnic and cultural perspectives, class, race, gender, sexual orientation, and ability.

At PMU, Boyer's (1990) four functions of scholarship have been incorporated into the university's promotion and tenure guidelines. While defining the four expressions of scholarship, PMU's (2009) promotion and tenure guidelines state that "[d]iscovery is the rigorous testing of researchable questions suggested by theory or models of how phenomena may operate"; "[i]ntegration places isolated knowledge or observations in perspective"; "[i]nterpretation is the process of revealing, explaining, and making knowledge and creative processes clear to others or of interpreting the creative works of others" (p. 5); and "[a]pplication involves asking how state-of-the-art knowledge can be responsibly applied to significant problems" (p. 6). PMU's (2009) promotion and tenure guidelines declare that faculty's scholarly accomplishments can be demonstrated through activities of research, teaching, and community outreach.

Creswell (2008) advises that in qualitative research, researchers purposefully and intentionally select sites that can best help them to understand their central phenomenon; and the sites that researchers select should also provide greater access since researchers will need to go to the sites to conduct interviews and observations. The selection of PMU as the research site provided this researcher with a rich ground to investigate both the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence, since the university is deeply committed to a worldwide understanding of cultures, customs, economics, and political

processes necessary for success in work, relationships, and life (President's fall symposium speech, 2005). At PMU, students develop their intercultural competence through coursework that emphasizes an international perspective, and working with faculty who have a passion for connecting theory to the world (President's fall symposium speech, 2005). Hence, this research study at PMU has direct implications for PMU's policy-makers, administrators, and faculty regarding the meanings and functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. Being a doctoral student at PMU also afforded this researcher easier access to the research site to conduct interviews with the research participants.

Participants and Sampling Strategy

One of the characteristics of qualitative research is that qualitative researchers value and listen to the views of the participants in their exploration of an issue or phenomenon. The central perspective of qualitative research in education emphasizes the importance of participants' views of educational issues, stresses the settings or context in which they express their views, and highlights the meanings participants personally hold about these issues (Creswell, 2008). Because of this characteristic in qualitative research, sampling strategies for selecting research participants are especially important in the research process. Researchers identify their research participants by selecting people who can best help them understand the research question and lead them to an understanding of the research question (Creswell, 2008).

This researcher used purposeful sampling to intentionally select participants who could help her to learn and understand the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the

scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching at PMU. To ensure purposeful sampling in selecting the research participants, this researcher used the strategy of theory or concept sampling and homogeneous sampling.

Theory or concept sampling is a purposeful sampling strategy in which the researcher samples individuals because they can help the researcher generate or discover a theory or specific concepts within the theory (Creswell, 2008). Although this strategy did not help this researcher to generate a specific theory, the selected research participants did help generate the salient concepts for this research study that diversity and globalization are the impetus to the redefinition of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; that there is an urgent need for teaching and learning of intercultural competence on college campuses; and that faculty of color have the potential to play an important role in the efforts to ensure the vitality and relevance of American higher education in today's world.

Homogeneous sampling is a purposeful sampling strategy in which researchers sample individuals based on membership in a subgroup that has similar traits or defining characteristics (Creswell, 2008). This sampling strategy was necessary for this research study because this researcher must explore the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in order to find answers for the two research questions. This researcher acknowledges that faculty members from different racial and ethnic groups have different and nuanced cultural traits and characteristics. Yet faculty of color's experience in the

academy as a whole is fundamentally different from that of mainstream faculty. Because of faculty of color population issues, this researcher chose to emphasize faculty of color's shared experience in the academy and their biculturalism as their common traits and defining characteristics in this research study.

Sample size

Creswell (2008) states that, in qualitative research, it is typical to study a few individuals or a few cases because the overall ability of a researcher to provide an in-depth picture diminishes with the addition of each new individual. He also points out that one of the main objectives of qualitative research is to present the complexity of the central issue instead of the quantity of the information provided by research participants. Patton (2002), on the other hand, asserts that there are no rules for sample size in qualitative research, and sample size depends on what the researcher wants to know, the purpose of the inquiry, what is at stake, what will be useful, what will have credibility, and what can be done with available time and resources.

The sample size for this research study included six tenured and tenure track faculty of color at PMU who were the main research informants and participated in the research interviews. Introductory letters inviting participation to this research study were sent out to twenty-eight tenured or tenure track faculty of color at Pacific Metro University at the beginning of February, 2011. Half of the recipients' names were provided by this researcher's colleagues, the other half were obtained through the Institute for Asian Studies and the Black Studies Department at PMU. Six faculty of color accepted the

invitation and agreed to participate in the research study by granting this researcher one-on-one interviews at their respective offices.

All research participants were faculty of color because this study sought to examine the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. Although all six research participants were foreign born, three of them left their respective birth countries during their early childhood so that they do not believe the cultures of their birthplaces bear any significant influences on their belief and value systems both as individuals and academics. As such, these three research participants were treated as U. S. born instead of foreign born faculty in this study. Foreign born faculty of color often face different language and cultural challenges in the academy since most of them spent their formative years outside mainstream American culture. The inclusion of the three foreign born faculty gave this researcher a richer and fuller understanding of not only the make-up of the whole academy, but also the academic and professional experiences of faculty of color as a whole.

All research participants are tenured or tenure track faculty who provided useful information about their experiences pursuing the scholarship of discovery in the form of publication, an activity that is often not the top professional priority for non-tenure track faculty with very heavy teaching loads. This research study is not a large scale national survey; instead, it focused on the experiences of faculty of color at one single institution. All six research participants were able to provide enough information that was representative of the experiences of faculty of color in this institution. With limited resources, this

researcher's ability to provide an in-depth picture would be diminished with the addition of more research participants (Creswell, 2008). Since faculty of color are highly concentrated in the fields of humanities and social sciences because of opportunity structures and personal choices (Bernal & Villapando, 2002), all six research participants were selected from these fields to participate in this research study.

Interview Preparations

After the human subjects research application proposal was approved by the review committee, this researcher started the process to prepare for the interviews to collect data. The first step this researcher took was to identify the research participants by using the theory or concept sampling strategy and homogeneous sampling strategy. Once the potential research participants were identified, this researcher contacted them by letter to invite them to participate in the research study with follow-up emails to confirm their participation. In the letter, this researcher explained the purpose and goals of the research study and how their input and perspectives would help this researcher better understand the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence.

After having garnered their consent to be the research participants, this researcher set up specific times to conduct interviews. Interviews were conducted only at the time when it was most convenient for the informants. To make the interview process more comfortable and convenient for the research participants, all interviews were conducted at the research participants' respective offices. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) believe that the conditions under which the interview takes place, such as place and time of day,

shape the interview. This researcher achieved her ultimate goal by arranging the interviews at the times and places that were most convenient for the research participants.

When meeting with the research participants to conduct the interviews, this researcher first asked them to read and sign the informed consent forms before the interviews began. This researcher also asked for their permissions to audio-tape the entire conversations during the interview. Audio-taping interviews is highly recommended since it will give researcher an accurate record of the conversation and free interviewer from the difficult task of having to listen and write down answers at the same time (Creswell, 2008). However, Patton (2002) also recommends note-taking during interviews, believing that note-taking helps interviewer to formulate new questions as the interview moves along. When interviewing the research participants, this researcher audio-taped the conversations to safeguard the accuracy of the data being collected. At the same time, this researcher also took brief notes to highlight important thoughts and points that helped to generate new questions that led to new information and new understandings of the central issue.

Creswell (2008) also reminds researchers to be flexible during a planned interview by following the conversation of interviewees. He also suggests the use of probes to obtain additional information from informants. Probes are subquestions under each question that researcher asks to elicit more information, clarify points or to have the interviewee expand on ideas (Creswell, 2008). Based on past experiences of conducting interviews, this researcher believes that probes are useful tools to successfully conduct interviews and obtain rich information from informants. During the interviews, this researcher was

able to ask the right probe questions by listening closely and seeking clues from what the research participants were talking about. By asking some good spontaneous probe questions, this researcher had the opportunity to encourage the research participants to share their deeper and richer insights about their professional experiences and academic lives. Some of the probes for the research study interviews are included in the interview protocol that can be found in Appendix D.

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) remind us that the way an interviewer acts, questions, and responds in an interview shapes the relationship and therefore the ways participants respond and give accounts of their experiences. Throughout the whole duration of data collection, this researcher strove to be professional and courteous toward the research participants during all interviews. This researcher gave them sincere thanks for participating in the research study at the end of each interview, assured them of confidentiality regarding the information they provided for the study, and provided copies of the interview transcript to those who wished to have one.

Interviews

A qualitative interview occurs when interviews are conducted between researcher and research participant, transcripts are made, meetings are made available for further discussion, and they become part of the ongoing narrative record (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Glesne and Peshkin (1992) and Merriam (1998) all assert that interview has become the most commonly used qualitative tool in educational research. Tierney and Dilley (2002) point out that qualitative interview can be used to gather information that

can not be obtained using other methods; surveys might offer mass data about a particular issue, but they lack the depth of understanding that interviews provide.

There are several types of interviews that can be conducted to collect qualitative data. This researcher chose one-on-one interview as the primary method to collect data for this research study. Creswell (2008) defines one-on-one interview as a data collection process in which the researcher asks questions and records answers from only one participant in the study at a time. He also points out that one-on-one interviews are ideal for interviewing participants who are articulate, not hesitant to speak, and can share ideas comfortably.

One-on-one interviews proved to be ideal for the research participants in this study since they are all tenured or tenure track professors in the fields of humanities and social sciences who by nature and occupation are articulate and can share ideas comfortably. Since time is often the most precious commodity for faculty members, this researcher conducted one session of a two-hour interview with each research participant. All research participants except one were able to complete the interviews in one sitting by answering all questions and no one opted to take a break during the interview. A second interview was arranged with the research participant who was unable to answer all questions in the first meeting because of time constraint. A two-hour interview in one sitting also helped research participants to maintain their train of thoughts when reflecting on their experiences of pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. This researcher also heeded the advice of Chase (2005) who posits that qualitative researchers whose studies are based on in-depth

interviews aim specifically at transforming the interviewer-interviewee relationship into one of narrator and listener so that they can understand how people create meanings out of events in their lives.

Patton (2002) asserts that qualitative inquiry strategically, philosophically and methodologically aims to minimize the imposition of predetermined responses when gathering data. Therefore, when conducting interviews with the research participants, this researcher asked open-ended questions so that they could use their own words to express what they needed to say to make sense of their experiences. A truly open-ended question does not presuppose which dimension of feeling or thought is salient for the interviewee and allows the interviewee to select the most salient responses from his or her own full repertoire (Patton, 2002). This approach is what Chase (2005) terms as “inviting stories” during interviews by encouraging interviewees to share specific and particular stories of their experiences that are especially meaningful to them. The purpose for asking open-ended questions is that researchers can look for overlapping themes in the open-ended data by counting the number of themes or the number of times participants mention the themes (Creswell, 2008). During interviews with the research participants, this researcher adopted Patton’s format of open-ended questions by asking questions such as How do you feel about ____? What is your opinion of ____?, or What do you think of ____? These open-ended questions helped to encourage the research participants to share stories that were most important and meaningful to them, and their responses in turn helped this researcher to generate themes during data analysis.

When conducting open-ended interviews, this researcher also asked precise singular questions, because the wording used in asking questions could make a significant difference in the quality of responses elicited (Patton, 2002). When asking singular questions, no more than one idea should be contained in any given singular question; otherwise, interviewee is free to go off in any direction and can become confused, uncomfortable and sometimes hostile when he or she is given multiple stimuli and is unsure of the focus of the question (Patton, 2002).

All interview questions for this proposed research study were developed by using Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship and Wilber's (1998) model as a framework for organizational change with the purpose to examine the effect of implicit and explicit implications of organizational culture on the roles of professoriate.

In sum, this researcher conducted one-on-one interviews with the research participants and asked singular and open-ended questions with the aim to invite the participants to share their specific and particular stories that were meaningful to them and insightful for this researcher's understanding of the central issue of the research study.

Interview Protocol

An interview protocol is a form designed by the researcher that contains instructions for the process of the interview, questions to be asked, and spaces provided for note-taking during the interview (Creswell, 2008). An interview protocol helps to remind the researcher the questions he or she needs to ask, provides a means for the researcher to take notes, and ensures that the interview goes as smoothly as possible. This researcher

designed an interview protocol to provide structure and guidelines for the interview process when she interviewed her research participants. For details contained in the interview protocol for this study, please see the attached Appendix D on pages 159 to 162. The interview protocol served as a helpful guide during the interviews with the research participants. However, this researcher was mindful that there was also the need to remain flexible when unexpected yet important themes emerged during the interviews. This researcher was guided by the interview protocol, but was not rigidly restricted by it. After all, an interview is a conversation between two thinking individuals about a central phenomenon that is meaningful for both of them as a researcher and a research participant.

Building Rapport and Collaboration with Research Participants

Collaboration in qualitative research, especially in narrative inquiry, means that the researcher actively involves research participants in the inquiry as it unfolds (Creswell, 2008). Collaboration involves negotiating relationships between researcher and research participants in order to minimize the potential gap between the narrative told and the narrative reported (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Noddings (1986) sees the collaborative research relationship as one equal and caring community that benefits both researcher and participants; hence, equality between participants and researcher, creation of a caring community, and shared purpose and goals all serve as important factors in a successful research relationship.

In order to develop and build rapport and collaborative research relationships with the research participants, this researcher explained the research study purpose clearly to the

participants at the beginning of their collaboration; kept them informed of the data collection process; made sure their voices were heard and valued; and made it clear that they were equal partners in the research study, not merely passive informants. At the end of each interview, this researcher presented each research participant with a box of fine chocolates to show her appreciation of his or her contributions to this research study.

Ethical Issues

In qualitative research, researchers seek to understand a central phenomenon from research participants who may be asked to disclose details of their life experiences. Hence, this research process requires a great degree of trust between researchers and research participants. Because of this revealing nature in qualitative research, ethical issues may arise during research processes. Patton (2002) offers an ethical issues checklist which includes nine areas that need to be considered by qualitative researchers when conducting interviews: explaining research purpose; promises and reciprocity; risk assessment; confidentiality; informed consent; data access and ownership; interviewee mental health; data collection boundaries; and ethical versus legal issues.

This researcher clearly and truthfully explained her research purpose to the research participants when she made the initial contacts with them by letter to invite them to participate in the research study so they had the opportunity to make informed decisions about their participation.

This researcher pointed out to them that their participation in the research study would contribute to the well-being of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students; and help to

inform and improve educational practices at PMU. And this researcher also made an offer of reciprocity to be helpful to their teaching and future research in any possible way.

This researcher informed the research participants that she would take all necessary precaution measures to make sure that there was no risk for them to participate in the research study. To safeguard their confidentiality, this researcher opted to conceal all research participants' true identities by referring them as "one research participant," "the other research participant," "a male research participant," or "a female research participant." The conversations between this researcher and the research participants during the interviews were absolutely confidential. And the audio-taped interviews are locked away in a safe place and will be destroyed after the study is completed.

When meeting the research participants individually for a one-on-one interview, this researcher gave them the informed consent forms and asked them to read and sign their names on the forms before she began to conduct the interviews. This researcher also explained to the research participants that the interview audio-tapes would be in her possession and she would be the only one to have access to these tapes.

Since all research participants are tenured or tenure track faculty members at PMU, this researcher did not encounter any mental health problems from them. All research participants were articulate and thoughtful about their answers to all questions during the interviews. Their involvement by being responsible research participants ensured the successful completion of this research study.

This researcher observed data collection boundaries by maintaining a professional and ethical working relationship with the research participants. This researcher also respected

their personal boundaries and did not pry into private information that was not related to this research study.

The approval of the human subjects research application proposal this researcher submitted to the campus Human Subjects Research Review Committee signaled that this research study was both ethical and legal. During the research process, this researcher kept the counsel of her doctoral advisor and the campus Human Subjects Research Review Committee to make sure all aspects and all steps of the research study were both ethical and legal.

Strategies for Analyzing and Interpreting Data

Transcribing Data

Transcription is the process of converting audiotape recordings made during interviews into text data (Creswell, 2008), and transcripts are the typed interviews that are the main data of interview studies (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). According to Oliver, Serovich, and Mason (2005), there are two main types of transcription, naturalized transcription and denaturalized transcription. In naturalized transcription, every utterance or nonverbal cue is transcribed in detail and the result is a full and faithful transcript; denaturalized transcription, on the other hand, has less to do with transcribing nonverbal parts; interview noise, such as pause or laughter, is removed, grammar is corrected, and the result is a polished and revised transcript (Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005).

This researcher began the process of transcribing data once she had completed the interviews with all research participants. The denaturalized transcription approach was adopted by this researcher, since a polished transcript ensures more reliable interpretation

of the data. A heading was put at the start of each interview and helped this researcher organize the data; and the heading included the person interviewed, time and site of the interview, and subtitles that summarized the material covered in each part of that interview (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) also recommend that enough room be left in the left-hand margin for coding and comments, and long monologues need to be broken into frequent paragraphs to facilitate coding and comments. This researcher left enough room in both the left-hand margin and the right-hand margin so she could insert codes in the left-hand margin and emerging themes in the right-hand margin.

Organizing Data

Once the process of data transcription has been completed, researchers need to organize the data before they code and analyze it. Data organization is critical in qualitative research not only because of the large amount of information gathered during a study (Creswell, 2008), but also because of the direction it can give to a researcher's post-fieldwork efforts (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Creswell recommends that researchers organize data into file folders by participant, site or location, while Bogdan and Biklen (2007) mention that most researchers like to file their files chronologically. This researcher organized and filed her data into folders by participant so that she could keep track of all the data collected from different individual research participants. Before she began to code and analyze the data, this researcher made clean copies of all the data and kept these copies as the originals for future reference.

Coding Data

Data analysis in qualitative research is the process of systematically searching and arranging interview transcripts, field notes and other materials that have been accumulated to enable researchers to come up with findings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). A preliminary exploratory analysis requires researchers to obtain a general sense of the data by reading the transcripts in their entirety several times and writing memos containing ideas, concepts and hunches during the readings of the transcripts (Creswell, 2008).

Further process of data analysis in qualitative research begins when researchers start to code data (Creswell, 2008). Creswell defines coding as the process of segmenting and labeling text to form descriptions and broad themes in the data; and codes are labels used to describe a segment of text. He further states that the objective of the coding process is to make sense out of text data, divide it into text segments, label the segments with codes, and collapse these codes into broad themes.

Bogdan and Biklen (2007) explain that it takes several steps to develop a coding system: researchers first need to comb through data for regularities, patterns, and topics covered in their data, then write down words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns; these words and phrases will become coding categories that provide a means of sorting the descriptive data researchers have collected.

Before starting to code the data, this researcher read each transcript individually several times in order to get a clear sense of the data and to see whether any preliminary ideas and concepts emerged. Then, this researcher began to code each transcript individually by consulting Bogdan and Biklen's (2007) list of coding categories for

sorting and analyzing descriptive data in qualitative research. Their list of coding categories includes setting/context codes pertaining to the general information on setting and topic, definition of the situation codes, codes for perspectives held by subjects, codes for subjects' ways of thinking about people and objects, process codes identifying sequences of events and changes over time, activity codes, event codes, strategy codes, relationship and social structure codes, and narrative codes describing the structures with which informants choose to tell their stories.

Bogdan and Biklen's (2007) list was helpful for this researcher, but it certainly did not exhaust all possible coding categories. This researcher developed many of her own coding categories as she made progress with her data coding. Once having completed coding all interview transcripts, this researcher made a list and assigned each coding category a number, and this list served as a glossary when she entered the data interpretation stage.

In sum, this researcher began the data coding process by initially reading through the transcripts, dividing the transcripts into segments, labeling the segments with 10 to 15 codes, removing overlapping and redundant codes, then collapsing the codes into 3 to 5 themes for each part of the interview protocol that the research participants had discussed most frequently and had the most evidence of support, since it was best to write a qualitative report providing detailed information about a few themes rather than general information about many themes (Creswell, 2008). During the coding process, frequent notes writing proved to be very useful in sorting out the themes as well as in helping the researcher organize the writing of her report.

Describing and Developing Themes from Data

In order to answer major research questions and form an in-depth understanding of the central phenomenon, researchers need to describe and develop themes from the data through description and thematic development (Creswell, 2008). Creswell offers sound advice on how to analyze qualitative data to form answers to research questions through description and thematic development. In his opinion, developing details through description is important, because researchers need to analyze data from all sources to build a portrait of individuals or events, and detailed description can transport reader to a research site and help him or her to visualize people and understand the central phenomenon that is being analyzed.

Themes are similar codes aggregated together to form a major idea in the database, and they form a core element in qualitative data analysis (Creswell, 2008). Creswell identifies four types of themes: ordinary themes that a researcher expects to find during a study, unexpected themes, hard-to-classify themes, and major and minor themes.

Creswell (2008) suggests that researchers can add rigor and insight to their research study by layering or interconnecting themes during qualitative data analysis. He explains that layering themes builds on the idea of major and minor themes but organizes the themes into layers from basic elementary themes to more sophisticated ones by subsuming minor themes within major themes and including major themes within broader themes; thus, the entire analysis becomes more and more complex as researchers work upward toward broader and broader levels of abstraction. The other thematic

analysis approach researchers use is to interconnect themes in order to display a chronology or sequence of events during data analysis (Creswell, 2008).

To answer the research questions and obtain a deeper understanding of the central phenomenon in the study, this researcher first created the context in which the central phenomenon occurred by describing in detail the backgrounds and life experiences of the research participants involved in the research study. To create a realistic and authentic context, this researcher also used many facts and quotes directly from the data source as well as action verbs and movement-oriented modifiers and adjectives to allow the reader to enter into the situation and thoughts of the people represented in the report (Patton, 2002). However, this researcher was also mindful about the use of description, since endless description could become its own muddle (Patton, 2002), especially when the research participants in this study demonstrated such analytical competence in dissecting their professional experiences and academic lives with sharp observations and thought provoking reflections. The frequent use of the facts and quotes directly from these six different data sources was in itself an act of triangulation.

For thematic development, this researcher applied the application of layering themes and interconnecting themes to add rigor and insight to the research study. To convey the complexity of the central phenomenon in the study, this researcher provided viewpoints from six different research participants and data sources as evidence for any single theme (Creswell, 2008). This researcher also analyzed the data for contrary evidence that did not support the themes and provided contradictory information about them, since contrary

evidence also added complexity to central phenomenon in research study (Creswell, 2008).

Reporting Findings

After researchers have coded and analyzed data for themes, they need to report findings to their research questions. The primary form for reporting findings in qualitative research is a narrative discussion in the form of written passages in which researchers summarize in detail the findings from their data analysis (Creswell, 2008).

When writing the narrative discussion to report findings, this researcher followed Creswell's (2008) advice by including dialogues that provided support for themes; used metaphors, analogies, and quotes from interview data to capture feelings, emotions, and ways the research participants talked about their experiences; wrote in detail about an individual, event or activity when necessary; and emphasized multiple perspectives, contrary evidence, and tension and contradictions in the research participants' individual experiences with the hope to produce a complex yet substantive written report based on the data analysis.

Interpreting Findings

Qualitative research is interpretive research (Creswell, 2008), and interpretation involves explaining and framing ideas in relation to theory, other scholarship, action, as well as showing why the findings are important and making them understandable (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) concur that qualitative research is endlessly creative and interpretive, and qualitative interpretations are constructed. They further explain that the researcher first creates a field text consisting of field notes and

documents from the field; then the researcher-as-interpreter moves from this text to a research text of notes and interpretations based on the field text; and this text is then re-created as an interpretive document that contains the researcher's attempts to make sense of what he or she has learned.

Interpretation is often found in a final section of a study under headings such as "Discussion", "Conclusion", "Interpretations", or "Implications" (Creswell, 2008). According to Creswell, this section should include a review of major findings and how research questions have been answered, researcher's personal reflections about the meanings of the data, personal views compared to or contrasted with the literature, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Since the interpretation of data involves framing ideas in relation to theories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007), this researcher interpreted her data for this research study around Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship and Wilber's (1998) model as a framework for organizational change with the aim to understand the implicit and explicit implications of organizational culture on the roles of professoriate.

This researcher began her interpretation of the data by first providing an overview of the findings and addressed briefly how research questions were answered in each part of the four sections of the interview protocol. The purpose of this passage was to recap and summarize the major findings after the detailed description and themes passages had been completed.

This researcher was very cautious about her personal reflections on the meanings of the data, since social values, world views, and different theoretical perspectives

researchers hold shape how they approach, interpret and make sense of the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This researcher strove to let the facts, her insight, and her desire to be objective guide her interpretation and reflection of the data.

This researcher interpreted the data against the background of related studies and literature to see how her findings would support or contrast with previous research and the views expressed in related literature. This researcher also offered an honest assessment of the limitations of her research study and suggestions for future research.

Validating Findings for Accuracy and Credibility

Validating findings means that researchers determine the accuracy and credibility of their findings through specific strategies (Creswell, 2008). To ensure accuracy and credibility of the study, this researcher collected data from multiple research participants about the same research questions; these multiple research participants offered multiple perspectives and multiple interpretations of their life experiences that led to a fuller understanding of the central phenomenon in the research study.

Another primary strategy to ensure accuracy and credibility in qualitative research is conducting an external audit. External audit is the process in which a researcher asks or hires a person outside the project to conduct a thorough review of the study and report back in writing the strengths and weaknesses of the research study (Creswell, 2008).

Although this researcher did not hire a person outside the project to do an external audit, her doctoral advisor and her dissertation committee members essentially perform the function of the external auditor. They have and will continue to review all aspects of the

research and let her know the strengths and weaknesses of the research study, and offer help and guidance for improvement.

Limitations

Qualitative researchers suggest limitations and weaknesses in their studies, and these limitations may address problems in data collection, unanswered questions by research participants, or better selection of informants or sites for their studies (Creswell, 2008).

For this research study, this researcher interviewed six tenured or tenure track faculty of color at PMU; therefore, instead of a large scale national survey, this research study focused only on the experiences of faculty of color at PMU pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence.

Secondly, because of faculty of color population issues in the academy, faculty of color from different racial and ethnic backgrounds were grouped together as a subgroup for this research study. As such, the sample for this research study lacked diversity in representing different racial and ethnic groups in the academy; and the nuanced cultural traits of the racially and ethnically different groups may have been overlooked.

Thirdly, qualitative research is interpretive research and researcher's personal views can never be kept separate from interpretations (Creswell, 2008). To avoid bias in her study, this researcher strove to be mindful about how she interpreted the findings and how her social values, world views, and theoretical perspectives influenced her interpretation of the data.

The Positionality of the Researcher

The teaching and learning of intercultural competence is of great interest and importance for me both personally as well as professionally. My lived experiences as an Asian American inform me of the need of the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in an increasingly integrated society; and my teaching experiences as a faculty of color convince me of the power of the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in an increasingly complex world. This inquiry is built upon my past teaching and research and will serve as an extension of my continuing exploration of the four functions of scholarship in teaching and learning of intercultural competence.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This chapter is organized according to the results from the data collected and the themes emerged from the data analysis in relationship to the two research questions that have guided this study: (a) What are the experiences of faculty of color in their pursuit of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching in American higher education institutions? (b) How do faculty of color purposefully incorporate the teaching and learning of intercultural competence into their scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching?

To seek answers for these two research questions, a four-part interview protocol is created with all interview questions developed by using Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship and Wilber's (1998) model as a framework for organizational change with the purpose to examine the effect of implicit and explicit implications of organizational culture on the roles of professoriate. Findings from the data collection and themes that emerged from the data analysis are grouped together under the four separate parts of questions of the interview protocol.

Part One

General Questions regarding research participants' personal and professional backgrounds:

- *What are the areas of your expertise?*
- *What is your academic rank?*
- *How long have you been teaching in higher education?*

- *What is your racial and ethnic background?*
- *Where do you come from? Please share some information about your personal background and life experience as a person of color.*
- *What influenced your decision to pursue an academic career?*
- *How have your personal background and life experience informed your belief and value systems as an academic?*
- *Why did you decide to participate in this research study?*
- *What aspects of this research study interest you the most?*

Data solicited from above interview questions offer a general composite of the research participants' personal and professional backgrounds, their belief and value systems as academics, and their expectations for this research study. These six research participants come from three different schools and colleges and represent six different academic disciplines at Pacific Metro University. All six research participants received their master's and doctoral degrees from American higher education institutions. And Among them, three are full professors, two are associate professors, and one is an assistant professor; and four of the research participants also play leadership roles either in their academic units or on campus wide committees. Their affiliation with Pacific Metro University ranges from five years to twenty years.

Two of the research participants are male and the other four are female. Three of the six research participants are of Asian decent, and two are of African decent, and the other one is of Hispanic ethnicity. Although all six research participants are foreign born, three of them left their respective birth countries during their early childhood that they do not

believe the cultures of their birthplaces bear any significant influences on their belief and value systems both as individuals and academics. As such, these three research participants were treated as U. S. born instead of foreign born faculty in this study.

When asked what influenced their decisions to pursue an academic career, the majority of the research participants stated that they ended up in academia because of the caring and supportive professors who mentored them and encouraged them to pursue the academic path during their years as graduate students. One research participant stated that

personally for me, at an earlier age, if I had not met the professors who looked like me, who were interested in the same things, and who could direct me in things I might be interested in instead of wandering around, that would have changed a lot. As it is, I am so grateful that I ended up where I did at Berkley and met faculty who did work within Asian American Studies and who did say that this is important stuff you should explore.

Another research participant pointed out that he “came away from that with the importance of mentoring; having people who care about you [and believe] that you matter, just how that alone can mean the world to someone.” The theme of the importance of mentoring was repeated again and again throughout all six interviews and is discussed in detail later in this chapter and in the following chapter as well.

All research participants asserted that their personal backgrounds and life experiences have informed their belief and value systems as academics. As one research participant explained eloquently that

all those things I learned and I struggled with informed my early consciousness. I have done a lot of meditations on those things and understand the experiences of others who are having similar kinds of experiences if we live in a country like the U. S. My experiences are not new experiences, but quintessential American experiences. So getting the chance to focus on and think about something that is so relevant in this country has been a joy. I think that it is partly self-serving in one sense, but it's also a representative struggle of many here and abroad.

Antonio (2002) posits that faculty of color are 75% more likely than mainstream faculty to pursue a position in the academy because they draw a connection between the profession and the ability to affect change in society. In their discussion of the relationship between faculty's personal and professional situatedness and their pedagogical approaches, Clandinin and Connelly (1999) state that faculty's identities, past experiences, present minds, and future plans are often manifested in their work. In their research on teacher thinking, Clark and Yinger (1977) conclude that educators' practices are often the results of the interpretation of their life experiences and their sense making of the world around them. Their research findings are best illustrated by the statement of another research participant when she revealed that, coming from "a very working-class first-generation immigrant family", she had

grown up where there was not necessarily a vocabulary to talk about [race and racism] or I did not know how to understand what was happening. Going to graduate school and learning a kind of analytical vocabulary and framework to give shape to my experiences and other people's experiences make me feel that was something that was

important for me to do and to share with students a vocabulary that they can use to understand these hidden processes.

She feels strongly that

those kinds of experiences of seeing the struggles of my parents and other first-generation immigrants going through racism and bigotry definitely have shaped my desires to bring those issues to light because I think people are not talking about them enough.

She believes that what “we are doing in the ivory tower has relevance beyond the ivory tower”, and she is “not simply working in a vacuum, and that there is an ultimate goal of social change and social justice.”

One of the foreign born research participants observed that “[i]t became very apparent to me that the way American society is structured is not a level playing field as people tend to typically think of as a land of opportunity and everybody can make it.” She continued by stating that

in some curious ways, I would have advantages that African-Americans would not have. That was very obvious to me. Being an outsider, the dominant society was willing to engage with me in a way that was very different from what and how they would be willing to engage with their own native minority and under represented populations. And I say that being very concise of the advantages I have been afforded that they do not have. Part of my work as an academic is to understand what is happening and why it happens that way.

Each of the research participants gave a couple of reasons for his or her participation in this research study. Some of them said that they wanted to give back and see it as a requisite of their job. Some wanted to take this opportunity to reflect upon the four functions of scholarship, which is something that they usually do not think about. Yet the common reason for their participation in this research study among most of the participants is their belief that this kind of qualitative research studies needs to be done because PMU “as an institution has challenges about working with under represented and first-generation students. We also have challenges of retaining faculty of color.” “So a research that is trying to understand the factors that contribute to understanding the experiences, the challenges, and the struggles of faculty of color is timely, important, and relevant.” They hope that qualitative research studies such as this will “shed light on some of the experiences we are having at P[M]U” and on “the particular demands, hidden labor and hidden costs of being a faculty of color.”

One research participant’s comment on the term of “person of color” as a politicized term instead of a descriptive term both highlights the need as well as underlines the difficulty of conducting research studies on “faculty of color” when they have to be grouped under such a problematic term because of population issues. When asked to elaborate on the term of “person of color” as a politicized term instead of a descriptive term, this research participant stated that

[h]ow African Americans encounter race and racism is very different from how Asian Americans do and how they are represented in mainstream media. When I talk about “people of color” as a politicized term, I think of that as a coalitional umbrella

category that recognizes perhaps both the individual experiences of various groups; but also even within the [same] group, there are different classes, backgrounds, religious beliefs. It is a just very heterogeneous [term]. There are so many differences within these so called racial groups. To think about it in an even broader umbrella term like “people of color”, I feel it is often times animated by a shared vision for equality in relation to racial injustices. That is what I mean by a politicized term, because it is not descriptive in a sense that it really accurately describes what it means to be African American, or Asian American, or Native American, because we all have such different histories.

Besides their desires to have their experiences highlighted and heard, most research participants expressed their wish and expectations for institutional change. When asked what aspects of this study interest them the most, one research participant replied that she would want to particularly know the areas of commonality you found across the interviews, especially how people talk about their personalized experiences and how it moves into academia and how it influences the academic life. Because the impression is that academia is the elitist institution where people are more critical and more thoughtful; so the problems we would see in the wider society about inequities, we would not find it in academia, yet it is very persistent. So I want to know what explains it. There is a lot of quantitative data, but I think you are doing qualitative research. So I am interested to see how people talk about their experiences and how the process gets developed.

Ultimately, as another research participant pointed out that “[d]own the road, if there is something that can be done, or policies and systematic structural changes that can be developed in response to this research, that will be great!”

In summary, in answering the questions in part one of the interview protocol, the research participants shared information about their personal and professional backgrounds, stated their belief and value systems as academics, and voiced their expectations for this research study. All research participants asserted that their personal backgrounds and life experiences have greatly informed their belief and value systems as academics; and they believe their academic work has relevance to the larger world and can bring about social change and social justice in society. They also believe that qualitative research studies such as this one need to be done because PMU as an institution still has challenges about working with under represented students as well as retaining faculty of color. Besides their desires to have their experiences highlighted and heard, the research participants expressed their wishes and expectations for structural and procedural changes at both departmental and institutional levels regarding the pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence at PMU.

Part Two

Questions regarding the research participants’ experiences of pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching:

- *What are your definitions of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching?*
- *Do you think these four functions of scholarship are important?*
- *If yes, how have your personal background and life experience informed your conviction?*
- *What do you do to apply the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuits? Would you please give me specific examples?*
- *How have your personal background and life experience informed your practice of the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuits?*
- *Are the four functions of scholarship valued equally in your organization?*
- *What are some of the existing policies and practices that either hinder or facilitate faculty's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship in your organization?*
- *How has the organizational culture influenced your practice of the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuit?*

Questions in part two of the interview protocol are designed to seek answers for the research question of *What are the experiences of faculty of color in their pursuit of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching in American higher education institutions?* Through data analysis, the following themes emerged: 1) the lack of familiarity with Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship among most of the research participants; 2) the research participants' strong commitment to the scholarship of engagement and students' moral and affective development; and 3) the privileging of the scholarship of

discovery and its effect on the research participants' practice of the four functions of scholarship.

The Lack of Familiarity with Boyer's Definitions of the Four Functions
of Scholarship among Most of the Research Participants

Boyer (1990) defines the scholarship of discovery as the vigorous investigative research and the pursuit of knowledge and intellectual discovery in the form of scholarly publications; the scholarship of integration means "making connections across the disciplines" [by] "placing the specialties in larger context" (p. 18); the scholarship of engagement means service and engagement to the larger community that is directly linked with faculty's "special field of knowledge" (p. 22); and Boyer elevates teaching as the fourth function of scholarship, since teaching ensures the continuity, expansion and transformation of human knowledge.

Among these six research participants, only two of them demonstrated clear knowledge of Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship during the interviews. The other four research participants were all very aware of the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of engagement, yet showed confusion over the definitions of the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of teaching. One research participant thought "the scholarship of teaching is about publishing on how I teach", and another research participant also stated that "[s]cholarship of teaching is writing about the philosophy of teaching and making it into a scholarship."

The confusion was more profound over the definition of the scholarship of integration. One research participant believed that "[t]he scholarship of integration, in my notion, is

that teaching should not be just teaching activity, publication should not be just publication activity, and service should not be just service, they have to be overlapping, each activity informs each other”; while another research participant simply put the definition of the scholarship of integration as “how we provide a safe environment for knowledge to be expressed and reinvented.”

The reason for the research participants’ confusion over the definitions of the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of teaching can be explained by the fact that these two functions of the scholarship are less valued and thus less emphasized at the institutional level; while the scholarship of discovery, as one research participant pointed out, carries “the greatest currency” for all tenured or tenure track faculty members. And all research participants’ affinity to the scholarship of engagement is obviously driven by PMU’s commitment to community engagement.

The interesting reality is that, despite this confusion, all six research participants, knowingly or unknowingly, are carrying out the four functions of the scholarship diligently. For example, the research participant who thought “the scholarship of teaching is about publishing on how I teach” has been recognized several times for her excellence in teaching not only by her students but also by the institution. Another research participant has a profound understanding of the importance of the scholarship of integration. He believes that the scholarship of integration “does lead to new knowledge, and I do not think that was recognized as much”; and he further explained his conviction by stating that

work that is relevant in business and psychology, they come together, and by combining them, they are able to do much more work than when they exist independently in their fields. The integration piece forces interdisciplinarity so that insights from independent disciplines, when brought together, could shed even greater light on social issues and problems which we try to solve. So I really value that.

The Research Participants' Strong Commitment

to the Scholarship of Engagement and Students' Moral and Affective Development

After conducting analysis on a database developed from the 1995 Faculty Survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Antonio (2002) states that, in the area of the scholarship of teaching, faculty of color are much more likely than their White colleagues to place high importance on the affective, moral, and civic development of students, and they are more oriented toward the application of their work for social change.

The data analysis of this research study supports Antonio's (2002) statement; and the research participants expressed their strong commitment to students' moral and affective development during the interviews. One of them said that teaching

is getting students to more than learn the academics and understand the concepts, but to encourage them to bridge from that point to think about how they can be better citizens and make a difference in the world that they exist in. So for me [it] is not just to go to school and get a degree, but what you would do with it and how it would be useful for you in whatever you choose to do once you are done.

She further explained by stating that

I think of teaching and the materials I teach not just in terms of the substantive content, understanding the theoretical and conceptual ideas within a particular subfield. I also see the way I teach as an opportunity to create good citizens, whenever there is an opportunity for us to have discussions that go beyond just the theoretical, [but] how it could be applied, how it is used, who would use it and why, to whose advantage and whose disadvantage.

Another research participant pointed out that, because of his personal background and life experiences,

there is definitely a conviction for social justice. If all that I do here is to produce scholarship, is to just to write papers that ten people read them in my discipline, that is an incredible waste of time and not a good use of the opportunity given by academia, which is [that] you have the potential to connect with so many minds.

One of the female research participants also echoed his desire to connect with students' minds by stating that

part of the teaching that I have found very rewarding is the mentorship aspect. So I feel I have responsibilities to reach out to students who do not feel what they are studying at school has any relevance to what they experience outside of school. I feel I have responsibility to make that connection.

Based on the data collected for a triennial national survey of college faculty in 403 colleges and universities across the country conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Antonio, Astin and Cress (2000) find that, in the area of the scholarship of engagement, the involvement in and commitment to community service of

faculty of color are higher than those of White faculty in four areas: (a) involvement with student groups engaged in service (faculty of color are higher by 13 points); (b) support of goals for providing services to the community (10 point difference); (c) commitment to instilling an ethic of service in students (11 point difference); and (d) belief that community service should be a graduation requirement (12 point difference).

The data analysis of this research study reveals that all six research participants are strongly committed to the scholarship of engagement. One of the research participants stated that

[w]hen I was a GA, P[M]U was going through service learning. I got really immersed into it, having conversations about community-based learning. It was not a really strange thing for me, I was totally socialized into it. All my teaching has to have some community engagement component. I grew up at P[M]U, P[M]U has trained me well in doing these things [of scholarship of engagement].

The following two examples represent the research participants' application of the scholarship of engagement in their academic work and demonstrate how the scholarship of engagement can help the academy "become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems" (Boyer, 1996, p. 18). One of the research participants described her collaboration with the city of Portland by explaining that

I also work with the city of Portland. For two and a half years, they were developing mandatory training for the managers [of the city of Portland]. I was hired by the city of Portland to develop this curriculum to train the managers for cultural competence, it

is called Culturally Competent Managing Training. We had five modules, each one of them was four hours. The city of Portland recruited about 20 people who were volunteers to become cultural competence trainers. They are a mixture of minority people and White people, some are gays and some are not. We tried to train these people so they could teach the curriculum we developed. The manual had a lot of exercises and the learning came from the interaction. The trainers really had to understand the concept so we co-taught and did the training together. That is how we trained the managers because I did not feel comfortable to just give them the manual and say my job is done. It is really commendable on the part of the city of Portland, yet the outcome is still difficult to assess. The symbolic message of this mandatory training is important.

Another research participant works with local high schools with the aim to increase high school students' access to higher education. He stated that

One of my projects is I work in high schools. I teach at the high schools. I try to connect the universities, high schools, and middle schools. I have taught a class at high school for a number of years for lots of reasons. It keeps you current and humble because what works at the universities does not necessarily work in high schools with high school students. So you have to innovate in your teaching, because they are much less forgiving of you giving them lecturing. But also it is to understand the challenges that students at that level face and what they bring with them to the university. So part of what I am trying to do is, within my own scholarship, to make a conceptual bridge between those two institutions. But now I am working with a range

of high schools. We have five high schools in the city. We have a project, a program that teaches the first-year hygienic program at those high schools. So there is a range of activities to really bridge the culture of those two institutions, the university and the high school. I am meeting with someone at St. Helens, they have a middle school and they want to do something, because 18% of their adults ever go to college. There are a lot of places within the region where the access to education is really not there. So I try to figure out where access is limited and to create opportunities and create collaborations to increase access to higher education.

The Privileging of the Scholarship of Discovery and its Effect
on the Research Participants' Practice of the Four Functions of Scholarship

Promotion and tenure are opportunities to advance through the academic ranks and are often considered as indicators of career success in academe (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000). Yet for almost a century, the scholarship of discovery has always been the primary criterion for faculty's promotion and tenure in American higher education institutions. As in almost all higher education institutions across the nation, the culture of privileging the scholarship of discovery over the other three functions is also the norm at PMU. When asked whether the four functions of scholarship are valued equally at PMU, a unanimous "No" was given by all research participants. One research participant bluntly pointed out that "[t]hey are definitely valued, but not necessarily valued equally. If I have to rank them, the scholarship of discovery is the main goal for tenure track faculty, then scholarship of integration, then scholarship of teaching, then scholarship of engagement."

What is more alarming is the monetary value associated with the privileging of the scholarship of discovery. Another research participant put it this way by saying that the scholarship of discovery is more profitable, and teaching, too. The community is our laboratory [because of what we do], so scholarships of engagement and integration are also important, yet they are less profitable. [When I say the scholarships of discovery and teaching are profitable, I mean] you can get grant money to explore new knowledge and discovery. If you get money, I get to hire more adjunct faculty and then we have more classes and sections, and more students come through the system. As a consequence, a dichotomy has developed between the long cherished institutional tradition of community engagement and the dire need to publish in order not to “perish.” One research participant explained this dichotomy in great clarity by stating that

[w]ith respect to pursuing those four [functions of scholarship], there are a couple of forces that are operating, and they are both present and strongly felt at the institution. On one hand, you have this hyper-privileging of the scholarship of discovery, of publishing. On the other hand, you also have this great concern for the scholarship of engagement and the scholarship of teaching and learning; and there is [also] some focus on the scholarship of integration in the interdisciplinary area.

To solve this dilemma, all research participants strive to convert their scholarship of engagement into the scholarship of discovery, if their scholarship of engagement is publishable material. The research participant who grew up at PMU and is completely committed to her pursuit of the scholarship of engagement is clearly aware that

[t]he activity of the scholarship of discovery is definitely valued the most. But once the activities of integration, engagement and teaching are turned into the traditional scholarship, meaning journals and books, then it is valued. For me, I have to be very conscious about that, making sure that the engagement and self-supporting activity do not stay just as activity, but [are] turned into a traditionally recognized scholarship.

The institutional culture of privileging the scholarship of discovery has strongly influenced all research participants' practice of the four functions of scholarship. One research participant reflected on her awakening to this institutional culture by stating that [t]hey put so much emphasis on publication and paper presentation in conferences, so I become more selective about what kind of conference and project I should start. At the beginning of my career here, when a school teacher approached me for a writing test for third-graders, I would spend hours to make one, but it did not turn out to be a publishable material. Later on, I became more savvy and would refer them to somebody else.

Another research participant also voiced her conformity to the institutional culture by stating that

[the institutional culture] has had a serious influence because I take my cue or my indication from what the institution requires of me. In terms of being promoted, I do have to pay attention and respond appropriately because that is how I am evaluated. From a professional level, I have been very much guided by that. I do attempt to find spaces to do some of the teaching and building citizens; and I think the administration appreciates it, but does not yet have a system to evaluate and reward it.

A male research participant agonized over the pull of the four functions of scholarship by stating that

I would say the organization's ethos has not been very supportive in that way. I think I along with lots of other faculty have valued those other components and have gone after them. Sometimes it works, we were able to get publications in the process. But sometimes it does not and it gets in the way of getting as many publications as deemed appropriate. So it has been at great cost in some ways.

In summary, data analysis of the research questions in part two of the interview protocol reveals that, despite the fact that all research participants are carrying out the four functions of scholarship diligently, most of them had confusion over the definitions of the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of teaching because these two functions of the scholarship are less valued and thus less emphasized at the institutional level. The data analysis also reveals that all six research participants are strongly committed to the scholarship of engagement by partnering with the communities outside of the campus and to students' moral, civic, and affective development by emphasizing the importance of good citizenry in their teaching. The data analysis also indicates that the culture of privileging the scholarship of discovery over the other three functions of scholarship is strongly present at PMU; and this institutional culture has influenced all research participants' practice of the four functions of scholarship and forced them to invest their time and energy heavily on the scholarship of discovery in order to receive promotion and tenure.

Part Three

Questions regarding the research participants' experiences of teaching for intercultural competence:

- *What is your definition of intercultural competence?*
- *In your opinion, what skills, knowledge, and abilities an interculturally competent individual should possess?*
- *Do you think you are an interculturally competent individual and scholar?
Please explain.*
- *Do you believe that teaching intercultural competence is one of the most urgent tasks facing higher education in today's world?*
- *If you do, how have your personal background and life experience informed your conviction?*
- *How do you teach and prepare your students for intercultural competence?
Would you please give me an example of your best practice in teaching intercultural competence?*
- *How have your beliefs and values informed your teaching of intercultural competence?*
- *Does the teaching and learning of intercultural competence feature prominently in your organization?*
- *If it does, how does your organization define intercultural competence?*
- *How does the organizational culture influence the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in your organization?*

- *Is the teaching of intercultural competence rewarded during the tenure and promotion process in your organization?*

Questions in part three of the interview protocol are designed to seek answers for the research question of *How do faculty of color purposefully incorporate the teaching and learning of intercultural competence into their scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching?* Through data analysis, the following themes emerged: 1) research participants striving to be interculturally competent individuals and scholars; 2) supportive organizational culture for the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; 3) research participants strongly committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; and 4) the lack of formal criteria of evaluating and rewarding the teaching of intercultural competence.

Research Participants Striving

to Be Interculturally Competent Individuals and Scholars

Intercultural competence can be defined as the understanding of one's own cultural conditioning that affects personal beliefs, values and attitudes; knowledge of the worldviews of culturally different individuals and groups; and the ability to use culturally appropriate communication skills (Sue et al., 1982) to interpret, relate, interact, and work effectively with people who are from different cultural groups in both domestic and international environments.

To be able to teach for intercultural competence among students, faculty of color must be interculturally knowledgeable citizens and scholars themselves. The data collected for

this research study suggest that all research participants place high importance on both the concept and the teaching of intercultural competence. Clearly they have a deep understanding of what constitutes intercultural competence with one research participant explaining that

[i]ntercultural competence is having a set of skills, awareness, attributes, and dispositions to understand and work and collaborate with people who do not necessarily share your perspective, do not share your experiences, and do not share your points of view; [and] those differences, rather than being a liability, actually end up being an asset to your interaction in your collaboration.

Another research participant added that

[intercultural competence] is the ability to be able to value other cultures and differences between different cultures, and also the ability to objectively analyze culturally diverse situations and identify any sources that causing conflicts coming out of different cultures. And it is also the ability to use multiple approaches and strategies to maintain harmony and solve conflicting situations.

In addition, most of the research participants believe that intercultural competence also includes the ability to understand issues related with gender, class, sexual orientation, homelessness, and people with mental illness.

All research participants believe that teaching intercultural competence is one of the most urgent tasks facing higher education in today's world. One of the research participants who heads an academic unit pointed out that

part of [the reason] is that we are not as monolithic as we used to be. If you are interested in properly training, recruiting, and retaining people from multiple cultures, you have to make an active effort to include intercultural competence in higher education for staff, faculty and students.

Another research participant who heads a different academic unit stated passionately that I do think [it is important], especially for higher education. As we have an increasingly integrated global environment and increasing problems of how to share the resources we have, it is most important that people who are most skilled in terms of academic skills and professional skills should have intercultural competence as a fundamental part of their training. It makes for a more peaceful world, a world of great understanding!

The research participants' conviction of the importance of teaching intercultural competence in higher education is informed and reinforced by their personal backgrounds and life experiences. One research participant stated that

as a graduate student, [I had] contact with people from very different cultures and people whose languages I could not speak, and whose countries went into civil war and were in conflict with each other. Meeting people on a very personal level takes a conflict or problem that seems global and insolvable and puts you in human contact in a way that transcends the idea that people are fundamentally different. You realize the things we worry about, our families, our children, our parents and housing and so on, we are so similar on a basic level. It becomes incomprehensible why we have so

many conflicts. The flip side is that if we knew each other better, if we had opportunities for more contact, we would have less conflict.

Another research participant shared his conviction by stating that

I think the experience of being “Othered” and discriminated against, feeling the pain of it for yourself and for those you care about and when you see other people experience discrimination on the basis of something that is completely uncontrollable, the basis of some social category that this belongs to, you feel a passion of motivation. For at the very least, [you] want to understand it. But more importantly [you] want to be an ally or to be in the struggle and in the fight against discrimination, oppression, and inequality.

A female research participant even suggested that

in some cases I would redefine the term itself to talk about inter-racial competence. I make the distinction between cultural and racial because discussions about culture sometimes actually sidestep the question of race. It is easier to talk about culture, because then you are just talking about different rituals, or different ways of seeing, or different religious practices without thinking about the ways we talk about those things are shaped by our understandings of race. I also think that by not talking about race, then we do not talk about the problems of racism. [Then a problem can be construed as only] a cultural misunderstanding as opposed to an example of racism.

All research participants are acutely aware that the acquisition of intercultural competence is a continuous learning process and becoming interculturally competent

individuals and scholars requires constant efforts and work. One research participant stated eloquently that

what we are talking about is very dynamic because the issues are changing, the groups are changing, the constructs are changing, our sensibilities are changing. So we must always be in the becoming. So I think it requires certain amount of vigilance and paying attention to who I am and what is happening to the world around me once changing and not letting go of that vigilance. In as much as I make it a practice and I can keep up my vigilance, then yes. But recognizing that I am not always as vigilant as I should be, and I am always finding out ways in which I can be more vigilant.

Another research participant shared the same belief by stating that

maybe I am interculturally competent, but it is how I continue to seek being interculturally competent that really matters. Things change, even within our own cultures, things change. Culture is very dynamic and not stagnant. You do have to make a constant effort to keep up.

One of the female research participants also realized that

[i]t takes a lot of humility, willingness to be wrong and openness and not afraid to look foolish. But I think I can talk about issues, given my background and what I have been doing in terms of training. I feel I can talk about a broad range of issues somewhat competently. I am aspired to be interculturally competent.

Supportive Organizational Culture
for the Teaching and Learning of Intercultural Competence

Supportive organizational culture in higher education institutions means building teaching and learning communities based on relationships characterized by trust, support, encouragement and mutual respect among people at all levels of the institution; and teaching and learning can only flourish in such an environment where thoughts and exchange of ideas can be freely expressed. All research participants in this study stated that their academic units have been very open to new ideas and very supportive of their teaching of intercultural competence and other diversity related content in their courses. And this open and supportive organizational culture has given them the freedom to pursue their academic interests; and their teaching and other academic activities at PMU have been positively enhanced by this supportive organizational culture. One research participant contended that

[w]e have a lot of freedom in how we teach our courses. I do not have anybody monitoring my syllabus to make sure I do it in this particular way. It gives us a sense of independence and trust that we know what we are doing with respect to what we are teaching. There is a lot of support in that respect.

Another research participant pointed out that

[w]e as an academic unit tries to embrace those notions, encourages the faculty members to be inclusive and address intercultural competence. One of our faculty members led this effort advocating that we need to have a specialization for diversity management. It is good that people are taking initiatives.

A male research participant also stated that

I do not think I have encountered any obstacles to the teaching of intercultural communications or intercultural competence. I think there is encouragement, there is receptivity to it. Clearly the need is there. Let's say if I want to develop a new course on the impact of classism on [something], I think people will be very supportive, I think my department will be supportive. I find ways to cross list it and so on so forth. I think there is great openness at the university to develop that competency if faculties provide the initiative and the energy behind it.

Despite the organizational openness and receptivity to diversity related topics and the supportive organizational culture for the teaching and learning of intercultural competence at PMU, data analysis also reveals that the actual implementation of the teaching of intercultural competence is completely left to each individual faculty to interpret and execute in his or her courses without any organized effort to promote and endorse it at the departmental level or at the institutional level. One research participant stated that

[w]e talk about it, but I am not sure it has really internalized in everybody's teaching. Also there are different ideas of what constitutes intercultural competence and diversity. We never had those discussions, it is a politically correct thing, so everybody espouses it.

She continued by stating that

the culture is a little bit passive. For example, right now the sustainability is a big scholarly agenda for the university and for whatever we do. There is an underlying

culture that pushes people to actively do something that is related to sustainability. I do not see that kind of energy behind the intercultural competence.

Another research participant related the situation at her department by stating that [a]t the department level, [the support] is obvious... [and we are] intercultural communication friendly. But it is more like language and literature. We say culture, but culture is being put in the back corner. [S]o I am not sure if intercultural competence receives prominent attention. Intercultural communication and competence do not get as much attention as they should be within the department.

Research Participants Strongly Committed to the Teaching and Learning of Intercultural Competence

While conducting his research on the relationship between intercultural experiences and the interdisciplinary work of university faculty, Vincenti (2001) concludes that the literature review shows substantive overlap between the benefits of intercultural experiences and qualities needed for intercultural effectiveness and interdisciplinary work.

All six research participants in this study speak two or three languages and have had experiences of living in other cultures. Their personal backgrounds and life experiences have informed them of the importance of the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. They are strongly committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in their pursuit of the four functions of scholarship. In their pursuit of the scholarship of engagement, they often engage the community to solve problems related with minority issues and issues of diversity and social justice with the hope to affect

social change. Because of the pressure to publish on tenured and tenure track faculty, they also strive to convert their scholarship of engagement to scholarship of discovery in the form of journal articles and books. Several of the research participants also make efforts to move “beyond [their] narrow disciplinary perspectives to work with colleagues in other disciplines” and engage in “more comprehensive and holistic” research methods.

The following examples illustrate how the research participants incorporate their scholarships of engagement, discovery, and integration into their scholarship of teaching to teach intercultural competence among their students in their respective disciplines whenever they deem appropriate. These examples might provide insights and inspirations to other faculty who seek to incorporate the teaching of intercultural competence in their academic pursuits.

One research participant, who is African American, teaches intercultural competence by laying the ground work for his students. He stated that

[L]aying the ground work for me has been a very useful place to start with. The recognition of how difference has affected your life, how has your difference, whether it be your gender, your culture, the place where you come from, how has that affected your life and how people treat you? Getting students to tap into the consequence of difference, whether these are positive or negative consequences, just the recognition that difference equals positive consequences or negative consequences, also the recognition that those differences are not controllable differences [are helpful]. In another word, you did not earn your gender, you did not earn your class or your status, you did not earn where you grew up, yet they have consequences, positive or negative.

Recognizing that for oneself and recognizing that significance for others is one of the ground principles so that from there you can start talking about the importance of recognizing everyone's voice, the importance of everyone counting and everyone counting equally. I think you can start talking about equality; but I think it is laying that foundation, because very often in the U. S., it boils down to the Other. Issues of social justice have to deal with people of color. In this country there is a privileging of African Americans, so racial and social justice issues tended to be seen as a Black thing. And I do not think that has been a very useful part of the discussion. So anything that undermines that is helpful.

Another research participant teaches students intercultural competence by starting with something that they have already known. She stated that

[i]n terms of preparing them for [the courses] as a pedagogical lesson, I usually start with something that they already know, and then move toward something that they do not know. For example, stuff that is really easy to start with is stereotypes. They might not say "No" a lot about Asian people, but they have been exposed to popular culture, and they have seen the same kinds of stereotypes over and over about Asians or Asian Americans. That gives me traction to move beyond looking at how they have been represented and then what Asian-Americans say about these representations and challenge these representations, and then move to the kind of experiences that are not represented. Given the popularity of these stereotypes, perhaps it might edge out alternative experiences, stories and histories.

Martha Nussbaum (1997) asserts that narrative imagination is one of the three specific capacities that are essential to the cultivation of humanity necessary to create interculturally competent citizens in today's world; and narrative imagination refers to the ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person's story, and understand the emotions and wishes and desires that person might have. The next two examples demonstrate how some of the research participants try to cultivate their students' narrative imagination through the teaching and learning of intercultural competence. One of the research participants shared her way of teaching by stating that

[i]n my classes, when I attempt to explain concepts and provide historical backgrounds, I encourage the students to assume the identities of the people and the stakeholders and have them explore to the best of their abilities how they analyze it and how they can imagine somebody else analyzing it. From that perspective, I encourage students to think not just narrowly in terms of their personal experience, but cross over and try to imagine what it would be like for somebody else in a different context. For some students, it works really well, but not all students can do that. But with each time I run the exercise or we have a class discussion, I can see shifts in how students build their arguments that leads me to be hopeful that something has changed. Another research participant aimed at the same goal of bringing change to students' way of thinking from a different angle. She explained that

[t]he diversity in the work place class is more focused on the management side. I have the framework that if you were to create a workplace that is diversity-friendly, what

are the approaches you need to take? I use that framework to address how we enhance the awareness of diversity in the workplace. How do you hire people? How do you diversify the organization? How do you manage those people? I focus on those tools. Last year when I taught this class, the final project was that each one of the students had to be a candidate for the chief diversity officer for a public agency, higher education, or a non-profit organization. We would do a panel interview, they would give us a statement, and the rest of the class would be interviewers. That would give them an opportunity to think about what they would do if they were chief diversity officers.

The Lack of Formal Criteria

for Evaluating and Rewarding the Teaching for Intercultural Competence

The data analysis reveals that currently there is no official definition of intercultural competence at the departmental level or at the institutional level. In addition, neither the institution nor various academic units at PMU have established official criteria to evaluate or reward the teaching of intercultural competence during the promotion and tenure process. One of the research participants who is the head of an academic unit stated that “there is no official definition for intercultural competence in my organization. But if you ask every individual faculty, they will come up with one.” Another research participant who is also the head of an academic unit stated that

[w]e do not know how we define it. If we had a mission statement that talked about intercultural competence, I could talk to that question. But we currently do not. I think it is assumed and some of us are doing it, and some of us are doing it in more

implicit ways, and others are not. I would not be surprised if some of us never had thought about it and paid no attention to it.

A female research participant explained the confusing state in her academic unit regarding the concept of intercultural competence by saying that

I do not know whether we had defined it. We had the mission statement discussion. We talked about trying to be inclusive and address the social equity issue. I am not quite sure we as a unit really talked about intercultural competence as a concept. I think a lot of people still think intercultural competence basically is still race and gender.

Without official criteria to evaluate the teaching of intercultural competence, the rewarding of such an academic activity during the promotion and tenure process becomes impossible. One research participant who is in charge of an academic unit explained that the traditional ways of supporting the intercultural competence is the business model. It is how much money you can bring and how many publications you have produced, and that you do not hate the students. You rely heavily on external evaluators who use the same rubric. There are very few places where we can objectively count your inclusion of intercultural competence in your scholarly activity. Therefore, not having a systematic and standard way of knowing when and how intercultural competence is included, we have difficulty rewarding it.

Another research participant who heads a different academic unit concurred that “it is not one of the things that we evaluate. I think we’d appreciate it, but we do not have a formal way of evaluating or rewarding it.”

In summary, the data analysis of the research questions in part three of the interview protocol reveals that all research participants believe teaching intercultural competence is one of the most urgent tasks facing higher education in today's world, a conviction informed and reinforced by their personal backgrounds and life experiences. While striving to be interculturally competent individuals and scholars, all research participants acknowledge that the acquisition of intercultural competence is a continuous learning process and requires constant efforts and work. The data analysis also shows that all research participants' respective academic units are very supportive of the teaching of intercultural competence and other diversity related academic activities; and this open and supportive organizational culture has given the research participants the freedom to pursue their academic interests. However, the actual implementation of the teaching of intercultural competence is entirely left to each individual faculty to interpret and execute in his or her courses without any organized effort to promote and endorse it at the departmental or institutional level. The research participants are also strongly committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence and incorporate their scholarships of engagement, discovery, and integration into their scholarship of teaching by using different methodologies. Since no official criteria to evaluate the teaching of intercultural competence have been established at the departmental or institutional level, the rewarding of such an academic activity during the promotion and tenure processes becomes impossible.

Part Four

Questions regarding organizational climate and research participants' socialization into the academy:

- *Have you encountered any particular difficulties while being socialized into the academy as a result of being foreign born?*
- *What are some of the obstacles you have encountered in your organization while pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?*
- *What are some of the support you have received from your organization while pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?*
- *What effects do organizational culture and climate have on your pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?*
- *How do mentoring relationships contribute to your academic pursuit?*
- *Has your pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence contributed positively to your promotion and tenure? Please explain.*
- *What are your recommendations for your organization to better support faculty of color's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?*

Questions in part four of the interview protocol are designed to examine the effect of implicit and explicit implications of organizational culture on the research participants' pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and their teaching of the intercultural competence at PMU. Cress and Hart (2005) assert that "if we want to fully understand the nature of the academic environment, we must examine the entire complement of realities" (p. 113). When we attempt to understand faculty of color's professional experiences and the challenges they face in the academy, we need to put the social/psychological and behavioral/procedural dimensions of their realities into consideration, since these dimensions "are all profoundly interrelated and deeply connected, in what look like intrinsically necessary ways" (Wilber, 1998, p. 66).). Data collected for the questions in part four of the interview protocol were analyzed according to Wilber's (1998) four-dimensional organizational model; and the themes emerged are grouped and presented as follows: 1) external institutional processes and practices; 2) internal institutional beliefs, values, and attitudes (organizational cultural norms); 3) internal individual beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings; and 4) external individual behaviors; 5) in addition, socialization issues specific to the foreign born faculty are grouped and examined separately.

External Institutional Processes and Practices

When asked to name some of the obstacles they have encountered in their organizations while pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence, the research participants listed heavy teaching load, big class size, and the lack of funding for travel to attend conferences as some of the

obstacles. Yet the biggest obstacle stemming out of the institutional processes and practices appears to be the tenure process and the pressure tenure process exerts on the research participants' academic lives. One research participant explained by stating that if I am pursuing a trajectory or project on the scholarship of engagement, that might take a lot more time, because I have to form relationships in the community. It takes time to develop relationships, it takes time to develop trust to be able to start doing research within a community. That time may be two years before I can do a study because people can trust me. Two years on the tenure clock may mean not many articles even if they are setting it up. That means your third review comes up, you maybe only have one or two articles, and that is a negative third review. So the tenure clock, that timeline does not allow faculty reasonably to pursue all those four functions. It really suggests that, given the time line, arbitrary or not, it is there. If you want to be successful, you want to evaluate these four types of scholarship and determine which of them best conforms with the given timeline. You certainly can avail yourself to these four functions, but before tenure the time consideration really suggests privileging one type of scholarship over another. If you do not do that, you are taking a big gamble. I think that, by the time when I came up for tenure, if I did not have 7 or 8 publications, I would not have got tenure, even though I was doing the work of the university. I did all the assessments, I set up many of the assessment practices that we currently apply. I spent my first 6 and 7 years at the university doing that. Part of it is the scholarship of discovery. A lot of it is on service, mentoring, and assessment. I would not have got any credit for it had I not published 7 or 8 by the

time when I came up for tenure. So yes and no. You can do the work of the other [three functions], you can do the work to let knowledge serve the city in terms of developing city partnerships and projects. But if they do not translate into papers, journal articles or money, you will not get tenure, and I think that is the reality. That's what we currently have.

Another research participant also stated how the pressure to get tenured impacted the way she carried out her professional duties by saying that

[w]hen I first came as a junior faculty, I was heavily invested in working closely with students and mentoring them and giving them advice. It would be drawn to my attention that if I wanted to move up and get tenure, I had to focus more on my research and teach a little bit less. Because I had this priority to get through tenure, then I can do things differently. It was somewhat disturbing and discouraging to me, because you were so driven on your career path that the very body of people you are supposed to be in service to get slighted in the process.

Internal Institutional Beliefs, Values, and Attitudes

(Organizational Cultural Norms)

The lack of mentoring relationships with senior faculty is often cited as one of the major reasons in the attrition of women and faculty of color (Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989). Many faculty of color reveal that they have received very little or no mentoring from senior faculty colleagues while being socialized into the academy (Stanley, 2006). Contrary to these findings, all research participants in this study have contributed their academic success to the generous mentorship they have received from

their colleagues. One research participant recalled her experience of growing up as an academic at PMU by stating that

I have had a lot of great mentors. I am fortunate because I went to school here and I already knew a lot of people in the system. I have a long term relationship with a lot of people in this institution and I can capitalize on that and they have supported me in many different ways. The fact that I landed on this job is because many people encouraged and helped me to get this job.

Another research participant described her experience of being socialized into PMU by stating that

[i]n terms of support from the organization, things like courses off and the ability to get funding for research are important at the institutional level. What is more important was the mentorship I got that was informal from other colleagues, mostly females who would help me negotiate and understand the informal culture and what the expectations were that are never really fully written anywhere, but only through institutional experience you can get that. I was very fortunate to be mentored by other colleagues who could cue me in ways that I would not have known.

The third research participant who was foreign born described the support she received when she came up for tenure by stating that

[m]y mentor taught me what the American academic culture is like. She gave me models of CV or narrative for my tenure and promotion, and she would check it.

Another colleague is also very supportive. So mentoring is very important for junior faculty.

Nieto (2006) observes that, once entering the academy, faculty of color are often expected to present the “minority viewpoint” in their committee work, and are often overcommitted on service-related projects in their departments and universities; as a result, their research and academic work may suffer. Several research participants in this study also voiced their concerns about being overcommitted to committee work and being expected to teach time-consuming courses. One research participant regarded this kind of high expectations placed on faculty of color as “hidden labor” and “hidden cost” by stating that

if there is any ethnic or multicultural committee, you are on that. You are the token person for that. You are the representative for any kind of committee that remotely deals with the “Other”. You are asked to do that. You are asked to basically represent a number of different people. ... We are asked to do invisible extra work, and sometimes we are singled out because we can fulfill a number of symbolic functions. [T]here are a lot of things that come between one and the scholarship of discovery because of these invisible things such as committee work, emotional handholding [of students of color who are lost], and the cost of being the representative for people of all colors. Those things get in the way of scholarship of discovery, which at the end of the day, tenure track faculty will be judged on.

Another research participant explained why faculty of color do not want to be perceived as the representatives for all races by stating that

[h]istorically it has always been faculty of color who are seen as the representatives of their groups. That is a very heavy burden to place on someone. I think the other piece

is that that assumption is part of racism in that you think the experience of one should speak for the experience of many. One of the aspects of racism is seeing everyone in the undifferentiated fashion, they are all the same. Thirdly, Martin Luther King Jr. has a famous saying that “the oppression of any person is the oppression of us all”.

Addressing and fixing racism is not just for African-Americans, or Native Americans, or Latino Americans. It is for all of us. So we all have the responsibility to address inequalities wherever we see it. It is not a Black thing, it is not an Asian thing. It is a human thing. So that is why many faculty of color resist being labeled and being expected to do that work, because if we do that, then we prevent everyone else from doing that work, too.

Being expected to teach time-consuming courses is another factor that may jeopardize research participants’ research agenda. One of the research participants shared her experience in this regard by stating that

[w]hen I first arrived, one of the things we have to do as part of our department is to contribute to the University Studies curriculum. Certain faculty are asked to teach in University Studies, in particularly very time-consuming freshmen inquiry. You teach that course for a full year, but you co-teach and there are a lot of meetings with other team members and students you are supposed to mentor. It was recognized as a very time-consuming thing, and I was asked to teach it. I asked around, none of the other new faculty had been asked. After I taught it for a year, I took a leave of absence from here for personal reasons. The other faculty of color was asked to teach it. I do not know what kind of cultural capital was being circulated by having these two junior

faculty of color to teach these courses, while there are a lot of other young faculty who are all hired at the same time are not asked to teach these courses. The tenured faculty are not asked, either. This is an example of the kind of stuff we are asked to do.

Those are definitely obstacles, because they are so time-consuming and involving a lot of coordination. That kind of teaching and being asked to perform certain kinds of things feel like somehow are related to identity as opposed to research or scholarship, while other people do not have that kind of expectation.

One of the research participants also recognized the class system within the academia as one of the institutional cultural norms at PMU by stating that

[s]ometimes people are oblivious of the fact that there is a class system within academia. When I was a fixed term faculty [at PMU], I could feel there was very very rigid class system within academia, with the tenured professors up there, non-tenured professors, fixed terms, and the other academic professional ranks. We talk about problems of oppression, but it is here. I am concerned that we never really look into the issue. Each of us may have a different idea, but collectively I don't think we have talked about it.

Internal Individual Beliefs, Values, Attitudes, and Feelings

Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, and Han (2009) point out that feelings of "Otherness" and experiences of racial and ethnic bias are often identified as major factors that shape faculty of color's commitment to higher education. Faculty of color state that their race and ethnicity influence the reception they receive in the academy (Bower, 2002). They often feel voiceless and invisible since their ideas are often easily dismissed due to subtle

and overt discrimination (Cress & Hart, 2005). For many faculty of color, their experiences with their majority colleagues comprise either a major factor for their academic success or a deciding factor for them to leave and move on to another institution (Stanley, 2006).

While all research participants in this study have contributed their academic successes to the great mentoring relationships they have had with their colleagues, they did report that they have seen other faculty of color leave PMU for reasons related to their racial identities and the difficult working environment. One of the research participants stated that

I have mentioned earlier on that a lot of faculty of color have left. Two of them left were from X Department. These two women faculty of color basically felt, they could not stay here because of the hostility they felt. One was tenure track, the other was already tenured, and she left still. They are Asian-American women. There is something about how race is understood merely in terms of Black and White conflict. The fact that they are Asian-American and were experiencing acts of racism was not treated by the administration as acts of racism, because racism is only intelligible if it is understood in these kinds of racialized ways of African American experiences. They filed grievances and talked about how they were being discriminated against, nothing was done. So eventually they left. The conflict was animated by the fact that they were the few tenure track faculty in that department. Those two were fantastic colleagues and mentors, well-published, and they were both on the verge of nervous breakdown, and they left.

Another research participant also stated that

[h]aving been at P[M]U for fifteen years, I have seen too many faculty of color enter this institution with high hopes and good promise, and not survive it at the tenure line when they first go up for promotion and tenure. I am absolutely certain it does not have anything to do with how competent they are from an academic perspective. I think it has more to do with the fact that they do not understand the institutional culture and they do not get adequate support from the institutional culture.

External Individual Behaviors

Chang, Altbach and Lomotey (2005) report that the demands for a meaningful integration of multicultural perspectives into the curriculum to present a wide range of ideas reflecting the diverse social, cultural and economic realities in American society have been met with opposition from faculty who favor the traditional curriculum and from administrators who worry about the costs for the creation of new specializations and courses. And faculty of color who teach courses with multicultural content and perspectives often face resistance from White students (Stanley et al., 2003), as evidenced by student evaluations of courses and teachers (McGowan, 2000; Delgado-Romero et al., 2007).

While all research participants in this study have reported great openness and receptivity from their colleagues and the institution for teaching intercultural competence and other diversity related topics, some of them have indeed faced resistance from White students and received bad evaluations for teaching such courses. One of the research

participants who teaches cultural studies and ethnic studies shared her experiences by stating that

[i]f you are talking about race and you are the only person of color in the classroom, that is really incredibly draining. I personally feel sometimes I am targeted. We study writers who are of color talking about racism, and I do NOT agree with every single writer of color. I feel even if I do not agree with them, I am read as their spokesperson. I am the text in the room that gets interpreted as well. It gets draining to have to feel that you are always on the defensive. If you mention race, it is because you have a personal vendetta or bias that you can not take an intellectual position on it. I often say “Never again would I teach about race! I am only going to teach things that appear to not have anything to do with race!” It is tiring. And you never know how the conversation is going to go, and it can go South very quickly. So I just do not want to teach anything about race. Even if you teach just a part of it. I teach this course, and we teach some texts about race. My evaluations are like “Race. Race. That is ALL we talk about”. So it does not matter, it is already over determined.

Stanley (2006) states that research and scholarship focused on ethnic and multicultural issues by faculty of color are often considered non-mainstream and are not always rewarded in the academy; this practice has put faculty of color at a disadvantage in the tenure and promotion process wherein mainstream research is often most valued and rewarded.

Although all research participants in this study have stated that their academic work related with the teaching of intercultural competence and other diversity topics has not

had any negative effect on their promotion and tenure, some of them do feel that ethnic and diversity related scholarship is not as valued as other types of scholarship by their mainstream colleagues. One research participant pointed out that

[t]here is a subtle sense that diversity and intercultural competence are the sort of things minority faculties do and it is not very important. I think that needs to be looked at and addressed and to see how we can make the intercultural competence into a mainstream agenda. It feels it is just a lip service now and needs to be taken seriously. For example, there is a person doing tons of sustainability work, and there is a person doing tons of diversity work. And there is a subtle sense that the person who is doing sustainability work is a better scholar than the person doing the intercultural competence, because intercultural competence is about touchy-feely, and not a real science, but sustainability is real science.

Socialization Issues Specific to Foreign-born Research Participants

Besides sharing the challenges faced by faculty of color in higher education, foreign born faculty of color also encounter some specific obstacles due to cultural and language barriers while being socialized into the academy. The three foreign born research participants in this study have identified the following areas as specific challenges to their socialization into the academy: a) the transition to American teaching style; b) the adjustment to writing academic papers the American way; c) difficulty of socializing with mainstream faculty because of cultural barriers; and d) difficulty of writing academic papers because of language barriers. The above identified specific challenges are not common problems among all three foreign born faculty members. Two of them each

identified one of the four challenges with the third foreign born faculty identifying the other two. While the transition to American teaching style and the adjustment to writing academic papers the American way can be accomplished in a fairly short period of time, to overcome both cultural and language barriers will take not only tenacity but also longer period of time.

The Transition to American Teaching Style

One of the foreign born research participants described her early teaching experiences at American higher education setting and her struggle to transition to American teaching style by getting students more involved in the teaching and learning process. She recalled that

[w]hen I first started teaching as a TA, I was much more concise with the fact that I am Japanese. That made it harder psychologically. In Japanese higher education, the instructor will lecture and the students listen. When I was teaching communication class, the expectation was to be more interactive. I could not really figure out how to do it, so I would do a lecture. That did not go very well. There is also this fear factor. When you are lecturing, you can prepare what you are going to lecture, you do not have to be spontaneous. My biggest fear factor was that I would not understand what the students were asking [in an interactive classroom setting].

The Adjustment to Writing Academic Papers the American Way

Another foreign born research participant recalled her experiences of adjusting to writing and presenting academic papers the American way by stating that

[i]t was a cultural difference. The system I came from was a British [academic] system and I had been trained to always acknowledge the work the others have done before me, and be humbled by it in terms of how I write and how I present my work. In the introductory part of the paper, you would talk about all the contributions that had been made before, and then you put a remark that this is my small contribution. It took me quite a bit of effort. In the institution where I went in the U. S., I was told I had to start by saying what a brilliant person I am and how this would be cutting edge and nobody has done it before, and that is why I am important. It was a shifting of my sense of self that the way papers are written and the way you present your work does not come from a humble position, rather it comes from a position of authority. That was a serious adjustment that I had to make and it took me some time in graduate school to figure it out.

Difficulty of Socializing with Mainstream Faculty Because of Cultural Barriers

The third foreign born research participant revealed that her lack of American cultural references often hinders her communication and interaction with her mainstream colleagues by stating that

[t]he regular small talk is difficult for me because of my limitation in English comprehension and speaking ability. I don't know so many things going on in the media and in my neighborhood, or what's going on with the football games and college football games, a lot of regular daily stuff that American people talk about. I can see two American faculty members sitting at some school event and they may be talking casually. When I sit down next to them, they stop talking, probably they do

not know what topic they can share with me. I feel the same way, I do not know what to talk about with them. Those small things are tough challenges for me.

Difficulty of Writing Academic Papers Because of Language Barriers

This same third foreign born research participant also revealed her difficulty of writing academic papers in English by stating that

[w]riting a paper is really tough and it takes rigorous editing. Finding someone who can do the rigorous editing is really difficult. And I am a slow writer. I am fortunate because my colleague Pat is really a mentor. She is always willing to help me with English editing, no matter when I need it. English is definitely an obstacle for me.

In summary, the data analysis of the research questions in part four of the interview protocol, grouped according to Wilber's (1998) four-dimensional organizational model, reveals that the biggest obstacle stemming out of the institutional processes and practices appears to be the tenure process and the pressure tenure process exerts on the research participants' academic lives. Regarding organizational cultural norms, contrary to the findings in the literature, all research participants in this study have contributed their academic success to the generous mentorship they have received from their colleagues. However, several research participants voiced their concerns about being overcommitted to committee work and being expected to teach time-consuming courses that may jeopardize their research agenda. One of the research participants also recognized the class system within the academia as one of the institutional cultural norms at PMU. Regarding internal individual beliefs and feelings associated with their professional lives, some research participants reported that they have seen other faculty of color leave PMU

for reasons related with their racial identities and feelings of voicelessness when confronted with difficult working environment. Regarding external individual professional behaviors, some research participants reported they have indeed faced resistance from White students and received bad evaluations for teaching courses about race and race related issues. Some of them also feel that ethnic and diversity related scholarship is not as valued as other types of scholarship.

The three foreign born research participants in this study have identified the transition to American teaching style, the adjustment to writing academic papers the American way, difficulty of socializing with mainstream faculty because of cultural barriers, and difficulty of writing academic papers because of language barriers as specific challenges to their socialization into the academy.

Overall Summary of Key Findings

Data collected from the research interviews are organized in a four-part interview protocol with the purpose to address the two research questions that have guided this study: (a) What are the experiences of faculty of color in their pursuit of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching in American higher education institutions? (b) How do faculty of color purposefully incorporate the teaching and learning of intercultural competence into their scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching? All interview questions are developed by using Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship and Wilber's (1998) model as a

framework for organizational change with the purpose to examine the effect of implicit and explicit implications of organizational culture on the roles of professoriate.

In answering the questions in part one of the interview protocol, the research participants shared information about their personal and professional backgrounds, stated their belief and value systems as academics, and voiced their expectations for this research study. All research participants asserted that their personal backgrounds and life experiences have greatly informed their belief and value systems as academics; and they believe their academic work has relevance to the larger world and can bring about social change and social justice in society. They also believe that qualitative research studies such as this one need to be done because PMU as an institution still has challenges about working with under represented students as well as retaining faculty of color. Besides their desires to have their experiences highlighted and heard, the research participants expressed their wishes and expectations for structural and procedural changes at both departmental and institutional levels regarding the pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence at PMU.

Based on the data collected from questions in part two of the interview protocol regarding the research participants' experiences of pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching, the following themes emerged: 1) the lack of familiarity with Boyer's (1990) definitions of the four functions of scholarship among most of the research participants; 2) the research participants' strong commitment to the scholarship of engagement and students' moral and affective development; and 3) the privileging of the scholarship of

discovery and its effect on the research participants' practice of the four functions of scholarship.

Data analysis reveals that, despite the fact that all research participants are carrying out the four functions of scholarship diligently, most of them had confusion over the definitions of the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of teaching because these two functions of the scholarship are less valued and thus less emphasized at the institutional level. The data analysis also reveals that all six research participants are strongly committed to the scholarship of engagement by partnering with the communities outside of the campus and to students' moral, civic, and affective development by emphasizing the importance of good citizenry in their teaching. The data analysis also indicates that the culture of privileging the scholarship of discovery over the other three functions of scholarship is strongly present at PMU; and this institutional culture has influenced all research participants' practice of the four functions of scholarship and forced them to invest their time and energy heavily on the scholarship of discovery in order to receive promotion and tenure.

Based on the data collected from questions in part three of the interview protocol regarding the research participants' experiences of teaching for intercultural competence, the following themes emerged: 1) research participants striving to be interculturally competent individuals and scholars; 2) supportive organizational culture for the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; 3) research participants strongly committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence; and 4) the lack of formal criteria of evaluating and rewarding the teaching for intercultural competence.

The data analysis reveals that all research participants believe teaching for intercultural competence is one of the most urgent tasks facing higher education in today's world, a conviction informed and reinforced by their personal backgrounds and life experiences. While striving to be interculturally competent individuals and scholars, all research participants acknowledge that the acquisition of intercultural competence is a continuous learning process and requires constant efforts and work. The data analysis also shows that all research participants' respective academic units are very supportive of the teaching for intercultural competence and other diversity related academic activities; and this open and supportive organizational culture has given the research participants the freedom to pursue their academic interests. However, the actual implementation of the teaching for intercultural competence is entirely left to each individual faculty to interpret and execute in his or her courses without any organized effort to promote and endorse it at the departmental or institutional level. The research participants are also strongly committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence and incorporate their scholarships of engagement, discovery, and integration into their scholarship of teaching by using different methodologies. Since no official criteria to evaluate the teaching of intercultural competence have been established at the departmental or institutional level, the rewarding of such an academic activity during the promotion and tenure processes becomes impossible.

The data analysis of the research questions in part four of the interview protocol, grouped according to Wilber's (1998) four-dimensional organizational model with the purpose to examine the effect of implicit and explicit implications of organizational

culture on the research participants' pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and their teaching for intercultural competence, reveals that the biggest obstacle stemming out of the institutional processes and practices appears to be the tenure process and the pressure tenure process exerts on the research participants' academic lives. Regarding organizational cultural norms, contrary to the findings in the literature, all research participants in this study have contributed their academic success to the generous mentorship they have received from their colleagues. However, several research participants voiced their concerns about being overcommitted to committee work and being expected to teach time-consuming courses that may jeopardize their research agenda. One of the research participants also recognized the class system within the academia as one of the institutional cultural norms at PMU. Regarding internal individual beliefs and feelings associated with their professional lives, some research participants reported that they have seen other faculty of color leave PMU for reasons related with their racial identities and feelings of voiceless when confronted with difficult working environment. Regarding external individual professional behaviors, some research participants reported they have indeed faced resistance from White students and received bad evaluations for teaching courses about race and race related issues. Some of them also feel that ethnic and diversity related scholarship is not as valued as other types of scholarship by their mainstream colleagues.

In addition, the three foreign born research participants in this study have identified the transition to American teaching style, the adjustment to writing academic papers the American way, difficulty of socializing with mainstream faculty because of cultural

barriers, and difficulty of writing academic papers because of language barriers as specific challenges to their socialization into the academy.

CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS
AND SUGGESTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

All six faculty members who participated in this research study are successful stories at Pacific Metro University. They joined the institution as tenure track faculty members, survived the institutional culture and the promotion and tenure processes. Five of them have already got tenure, three of them have been promoted to full professors, and four of them are serving as leaders in their academic units or on campus wide committees. Their successes are partly due to their own hard work, and partly due to the generous mentorship they have received from their colleagues and the institution's supportive atmosphere. The institutional openness and receptivity towards diversity related academic activities afford them the freedom to pursue their academic interests that bear no negative consequences on their promotion or tenure. The institutional tradition of community engagement only strengthens their commitment to the scholarship of engagement and students' moral, affective, and civic development. Their success stories demonstrate that Pacific Metro University and its faculty body have the good will and generous spirit to nurture their new faculty members and see to it that they reach their full potentials as productive academics.

During the interviews, all research participants expressed their deep devotion to the institution, their gratitude to their colleagues who have helped them succeed, their love for their chosen profession, and their desire to educate students to become capable and caring citizens of the world. At the same time, they also expressed their deep concern for

those faculty of color who were unable to survive the institutional culture and had to opt to move to other institutions. They also offered many sound suggestions on how to improve the institutional culture and practices so that the institution itself, its faculty, staff, and students together as a teaching and learning community, can go from strength to strength.

Wilber (1998) believes that both individuals' and organizations' existence and success fundamentally depend on their extensive networks of relationships; these extensive networks of relationships are both internal as well as external with social/psychological and behavioral/procedural aspects. While external behaviors, processes, and practices are observable; internal beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings can be known yet unobservable. Thus, by utilizing Wilber's model as the framework for organizational change, this qualitative research study was carried out in order to examine and understand both the observable and unobservable aspects of the institutional culture and the effect of their implicit and explicit implications on the research participants' pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence at PMU.

In this chapter, suggestions for institutional change based on the findings presented in the previous chapter are grouped under the four dimensions of Wilber's (1998) model as the framework for organizational change: 1) suggestions to improve external institutional processes and practices; 2) suggestions to improve institutional cultural norms (internal institutional beliefs, values, and attitudes); 3) suggestions to improve work climate

(internal individual beliefs, values, attitudes, and feelings); and 4) suggestions to improve campus teaching and learning climate (external individual behaviors).

Suggestions to Improve External Institutional Processes and Practices

“One of the great challenges faced by U.S. institutions of higher learning . . . , is the engagement and full utilization of the population’s talent” (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010, p.1). A campus with a diverse student body and diverse faculty promotes positive social and intellectual interactions among people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, broadens the range of students’ viewpoints, and creates a learning environment that is essential to the quality of higher education. As one research participant pointed out

it is really important to have greater diversity of ideas, opinions, cultural representations on campus. I think numbers matter. It is really important that you have adequate number of faculty of different cultures, different racial and ethnic backgrounds. I think the students’ diversity also needs to increase because it is very hard to teach the significances of difference. You try to get people to tap into their own difference but also the difference of others around them. So if the others around them are not sufficiently diverse in experience and ideas and upbringing, it will not be a powerful experience. I think the numbers for faculty, students, and staff really need to improve.

In his message to the campus community and the larger community beyond the campus regarding diversity at PMU, the university president writes that

diversity is central to the educational experience at P[M]U.... [O]ur students tell us that the diversity in our classrooms enriches their educational experience. We are committed, too, to build the diversity of our faculty and staff. Our faculty and staff offer experiences both inside and outside of the classroom that give our students the knowledge and skills they need to serve a diverse society. The diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and points of view represented within our campus community enlivens and deepens classroom discussions and creates a campus climate where everyone feels welcome.

Because of the significant role diversity plays in students' educational experience, higher education institutions should continue their commitment in diversifying their faculty, staff, and student bodies as one of the ways to improve their external institutional processes and practices. They should also continue to find ways to attract more under-represented students to campuses and make continuous efforts to recruit and retain faculty of color by enhancing the working climate of mutual respect and actively nurturing the academic development of faculty of color.

Data analysis of this research study reveals that the biggest obstacle stemming from the institutional processes and practices appears to be the tenure process and the pressure tenure process exerts on the research participants' academic lives. One of the research participants suggested radical reform of tenure process to relieve its pressure on faculty's academic lives by stating that

I think we are using the tenure system that was developed a hundred years ago and we have not kept up with the times and the realities. And the six-year clock is a stupid

rule. We should be able to say to people that you can take twice the time, you can choose to take half the time, but you can also choose to have your family and a happy life [by taking twice the time]. Happy faculty teaches better and does better research without feeling guilty to his family, yet remains loyal to the institution. You can have bench marks [to measure the] progress.

Tenure system reform is a complex issue and the pressure of the six-year clock has been keenly felt by all research participants in this study. Yet the area of tenure practice that they most wish to reform is the privileging of the scholarship of discovery during the promotion and tenure process. At PMU, Boyer's (1990) four functions of scholarship have been incorporated into the university's promotion and tenure guidelines, which declare that faculty's scholarly accomplishments can be demonstrated through activities of research, teaching, and community outreach. But in practice, faculty's scholarly activities of teaching and community outreach have not been valued very much, and it is still the scholarship of discovery that plays a deciding factor in their being rewarded with promotions and tenure.

For higher education institutions to truly and equally value all four functions of scholarship, it requires a fundamental paradigm shift by having the courage to break with the norm and status quo and by having the genuine desire to truly reward the scholarship of engagement, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching during the promotion and tenure process. As one research participant stated

I think tenure as a practice can be a positive inducement towards faculty building. But we have defined it in a way to primarily emphasize the scholarship of discovery. So I

think that is the thing that we really need to look at, but not just look at on paper, because if that were the case, we would be done. Most of our tenure and promotion guidelines recognize those four functions. But what needs to happen is a shift of the norms, the norms that govern a place, and that goes beyond what is written on the paper. It is people's beliefs, attitudes, biases, prejudices. That is the place where we need to do some work if we want those other elements to be recognized.

The third area of institutional processes and practices that can be improved particularly at PMU is to find ways to continue to strengthen its well established tradition of the scholarship of engagement. Since the 1990's, PMU faculty, students, staff, and administrators have been working "with over four hundred community partners on projects that promote equality and social justice" (PMU president's message to the community, p. 1, 2011). PMU has also developed senior capstone courses by "taking students out of the classroom and into the field" to "understand and find solutions for issues that are important to them as literate and engaged citizens" (PMU University Studies, P.1, 2011). Capstone courses can also be extended to graduate students at PMU to help them understand real issues in the community and engage in the scholarships of engagement and discovery with their professors at a more intimate and deeper scholarly level. And the skills and knowledge gained from this experience can serve as a spring board once they are launched into society after graduation either as community leaders or as future academics.

One of the research participants shared his vision of a graduate capstone program by stating that

[w]e should have opportunities for faculty and students to engage with the community at more sophisticated level like a graduate capstone. You have a faculty to teach the graduate capstone class. These capstones have to have four more disciplines represented, and you have to partner with a community organization and identify a problem. Now you have a faculty who has the knowledge, skills and ability to solve that problem, graduate students from different disciplines, partnership with the community, and a whole year to solve the problem. The more we do these kinds of things, the more we improve our scholarships of engagement, integration, and discovery.

Suggestions to Improve Institutional Cultural Norms

(Internal Institutional Beliefs, Values, and Attitudes)

Susan Hockfield (2010) asserts that “[c]reating a culture of inclusion is not an optional exercise; it is the indispensable precondition that enables us to capitalize on our diverse skills, perspectives and experiences” (p. III). Many faculty of color have reported that mentoring relationships not only help to foster their professional development, but also help to facilitate their emotional and social adjustment within the institutional culture where they often face social alienation and professional isolation (Tillman, 2001). Stanley (2006) also reports that mentoring has strong impact on faculty of color’s professional lives, and it helps faculty of color with their teaching and research and enables them to develop a presence of leadership in their fields.

One of the constant themes throughout this research study is the research participants’ strong emphasis on the importance of mentorship that has not only helped them succeed

academically, but also helped them to navigate, survive, and eventually become professionally integrated into the institutional culture with the acquired knowledge of institutional rules, regulations, and expectations for academic success. One of the research participants stated passionately that

[m]entoring relationships are a key for me and particularly for junior faculty to be able to have the ability to understand the larger institutional culture, to get guidance about what is important and to get feedback on what they are passionate about and how they can work into their careers, the things no documents written by any administrator or any institution can give you guidance on. It is through mentoring, personal relationship, people with more experience linking up with people with less experience, that becomes the glue that moves one generation and one cohort of faculty into another cohort that gives the institution stability. I do not know whether we have recognized the importance of mentorship, but I think to a large degree, our success as a faculty body, our success in terms of how we train our students has to do with these mentoring relationships, either faculty to faculty or faculty to students.

Because mentorship plays such a fundamental role in shaping not only faculty's academic development but also in helping them to adjust to the institutional culture, all academic units and departments at higher education institutions should have plans in place to help newly arrived faculty members pair up with senior faculty members in the same department who will help them to become familiarized with their new jobs and the institutional culture that surrounds them. Senior faculty mentoring within the department is especially important since the organizational culture of the academic department is

most responsible for faculty development (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000). Department chairs or senior faculty appointed by department chairs should help to facilitate the pairing between new faculty and established faculty. After they are paired up, new faculty members should take the initiative to make self-assessments to determine the areas that they need mentoring the most so senior faculty can provide mentoring more effectively to ensure their smooth transition into the institution and future success in their academic endeavors. This close involvement in new faculty's mentoring relationships at the departmental level will not only help the institutions to retain faculty of color, but will also help to facilitate the success of faculty of color's professional development from the moment when they enter academia.

The success of a mentor-protégé relationship, like any human relationships, depends on many factors. Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (2004), a Black female associate professor and a White male professor who have entered into a successful mentoring relationship, identify six common issues facing faculty involved in mentoring relationships: (1) trust between mentor and protégé; (2) acknowledged and unacknowledged racism; (3) visibility and risks pertinent to faculty of color; (4) power and paternalism; (5) benefits to mentor and protégé; and (6) the double-edged sword of "otherness" in the academy. These six identified common issues can offer guidance to faculty who wish to enter mentor-protégé relationships.

One of the research participants in this study also recommended personalized mentoring in great detail; and her suggestions can provide more insights on how to provide mentoring to new faculty of color at higher education institutions. She stated that

I think the personalized mentoring is very important. This goes against what the Diversity Council and diversity initiative are doing. I do not think we should be presumptuous about the fact that faculty of color need to be mentored by faculty of color. Some people feel more comfortable working with people who look like them. But not everyone may function that way. If a Japanese mentor is in Japanese literature, he can not help me at all. I would rather have a very wise White man mentoring me so I can be successful in my own discipline, as long as I feel comfortable. I hate to think that just because you are Japanese, so you need an Asian mentor. Not really. I do not endorse fully the institutional wide yet not individualized mentoring system for minority faculty. Non-minority faculty also need mentoring, too. But we should not give special treatment to minority faculty. We need to think individually who needs what and what is the best mentoring system for that individual faculty, because there is a tendency to think we need to create a special mentoring system for minority faculty by minority faculty. [For personalized mentorship], we need to do an assessment on what kind of mentorship this particular faculty needs. For example, I came in from a very different background. In my case, I had a lot of teaching experience, and I had quite a bit research experience, I had a lot of funding and revenue generating experience. So I do not necessarily need a lot of mentoring in these areas, but I need good mentoring on how to publish articles, how to find the journal outlets, how to get to know people in the field. The idea for mentoring is often oversimplified. You really need to assess what this person really needs. Let's find a way to support this person where this person needs to be supported.

Another way to improve the institutional cultural norms is to create an inclusive culture by inviting more mainstream faculty to sit on diversity related committees and councils on campuses. As one research participant pointed out that

[a]ddressing and fixing racism is not just for African-Americans, or Native Americans, or Latino Americans. It is for all of us. So we all have the responsibility to address inequality wherever we see it. It is not a Black thing, it is not an Asian thing. It is a human thing.

The inclusion of more mainstream faculty on these committees will help to alleviate faculty of color from being over burdened by committee work. More importantly, the presence and involvement of mainstream faculty will demonstrate that higher education institutional culture is created by all members who value the same principles and ideals that are essential to the success of the institutions' educational missions, as opposed to a fragment of the institutional culture that is created by only a selected few based on their racial and ethnic identities.

Suggestions to Improve Institutional Climate

(Internal Individual Beliefs, Values, Attitudes, and Feelings)

Persistent negative and chilly work environment is often regarded as the major factor for the failure of recruitment, retention and development of faculty of color in American higher education. Faculty of color often feel voiceless and invisible since their ideas are often easily dismissed due to subtle and overt discrimination (Cress & Hart, 2005).

Several research participants in this study reported that a large number of faculty of color

had left the institution because they felt voiceless when faced with hostile work environment.

Susan Hockfield (2010) asserts that “a community reaps the benefits of diversity only when it looks beyond the numbers alone and actively creates a culture where everyone feels valued and included – an environment in which everyone can do their very best work.” Intercultural competence among all institutional employees is the key to create an inclusive and supportive working environment where all members of the institution, regardless of their cultural and ethnic backgrounds and their positions and ranks within the institution, can treat each other with mutual respect, compassion and dignity. As one research participant emphasized that we need to have “respect for different ideas, respect for different methods, respect for different interpretations, respect for how we achieve different conclusions by using the same data, respect for how people internalize and externalize what they understand.”

One way to raise the awareness of the importance of intercultural competence on campus is to add intercultural competence as one of the values in the institution’s mission statement. Currently, PMU’s mission statement includes five core values that the institution holds. One of the core values is “A Climate of Mutual Respect” that states PMU “values diversity and fosters a climate of mutual respect and reflection that supports different beliefs and points of view and the open exchange of ideas” (PMU Mission Statement, p.1, 2011). It will be very helpful if the institution can include intercultural competence as part of this core value by identifying explicitly what constitutes intercultural competence and by declaring intercultural competence as an

ability that all members of the institution should strive to acquire in order to create a climate of mutual respect on campus.

The inclusion of intercultural competence as one of the core values that higher education institutions hold will also boost the teaching and learning of intercultural competence on campuses. Since currently PMU does not have formal criteria to evaluate and reward the teaching of intercultural competence and other diversity related courses and activities, the inclusion of intercultural competence as part of the institutional core values will certainly give more legitimacy to these kinds of academic activities. One research participant wished that

[i]t might also be nice if in our mission statement we talk about intercultural competence so everybody who is reading about P[M]U or work for P[M]U know that is a value we hold. For those of us who want to respond to it, we have something to hold on to. For those who are not responding to it yet, it might trigger some thoughts about the significance [of intercultural competence] and get a conversation going about what it means to be an institution of the 21st century in terms of how we train our students.

Another way to enhance the awareness of the importance of intercultural competence is to explicitly identify the study of a foreign language as a means to gain intercultural competence. One research participant pointed out that

it is important to be able to speak more than one language. It gives you an access to a different way of understanding the world. And it also makes you more empathetic to

people who are learning a new language and who are not dumb. There is this assumption that if you can not speak proper English, you are slightly stupid.

Another research participant also stated that

[t]here is a particular benefit and value of speaking more than one language because language gives us insight into a different culture about how people think and how they structure their thoughts. Once you have at least one other culture, you become more open to the idea that not everyone thinks in the same way and processes in the same way. Even though you may not know the other culture, you become sensitive to that fact.

Currently at many higher education institutions, only students who are working on their Bachelors of Arts and Masters of Arts degrees are required to take two years of foreign language study, while students who are working on their Bachelors of Sciences and Masters of Sciences degrees do not have to meet such a requirement. Given how much the world has been transformed and integrated by sciences and technology in the last several decades, it could only be beneficial for students of sciences to also pick up a second language that will enhance not only their understanding of the world but also their problem-solving skills when undertaking scientific experiments and technology innovations at the global level or working with their future colleagues from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds at home.

The study of a second language can also be inherently linked with the institutional goal of internationalization and the institution's desire to educate its students to become

interculturally competent world citizens. As the PMU's president (2005) points out in his fall symposium speech that

[i]f we are to continue to be true to our mission, then we must focus on the global community. As the world has become more interconnected, as our nation's economic stability increasingly depends on global partners, and as peace has always been an elusive goal, our nation's future depends on each of us being culturally competent from a global perspective. (p. 2)

One research participant also suggested more emphasis be placed on the connection between the institutional goal of internationalization and the study of a second language by stating that

[t]here could be more coordination among Intercultural Communication Department, the Department of World Languages and Literatures, and International Studies. There is frequent communication between the Department of World Languages and Literature and International Studies. But in terms of students' awareness of intercultural communication, I do not see raised awareness very much, which is indicated by their attitudes toward language study. I think more emphasis can be put on language study. If they want to become diplomats and work at the State Department, they should be fluent in at least one other language. If they regard language study requirement as a hurdle, attitude wise, they are not interculturally competent. I think more emphasis should be put on language study in these three departments in a more coordinated way. At the university level, [there should be] stronger and more explicit commitment to the language study. It is not just two year

foreign language study requirement. Why not explicitly connecting internationalization and the two year language requirement? I think the university could do a little more to implement the internationalization.

To create a climate of mutual respect and enhance intercultural competence among faculty, staff, and students at higher education institutions, administrators at all levels also need to become closely involved with diversity initiatives and issues in order to demonstrate higher education institutions' unwavering commitment to diversity. Their involvement and commitment to diversity set the tone for the whole campus communities, thus helping to create a positive and encouraging working environment within higher education institutions. All faculty of color need to be encouraged to have meaningful involvement and professional interactions with their majority colleagues and become closely involved with departmental matters as well as issues at the institutional level so that they will no longer feel isolated, marginalized, invisible and voiceless. These approaches will help to alleviate the feelings of isolation and rejection felt by faculty of color, give them a sense of belonging, solidarity and community, and further strengthen their devotion and commitment to their institutions.

Suggestions to Improve Campus Teaching and Learning Climate

(External Individual Behaviors)

The difficulties and challenges faculty of color experience in the academy are also reflected in their academic behaviors and their pursuit of the four functions of scholarship. Some research participants in this study felt disheartened and discouraged when their teaching of race and diversity met with resistance from their students, and

their scholarship on intercultural competence and multicultural issues was not considered as valid scholarship by their mainstream colleagues. The lack of a formal system to evaluate and reward the teaching and research focused on intercultural competence and diversity issues has sometimes caused some of the research participants feeling uncertain about their academic work. As one research participant pointed out that

the institution gives us indications of what is important and what is valued and what is not. The institution gives us cues, and sometimes they say they value certain things, but they do not translate into formal recognition or formal rewards, and I think that is disappointing. Many faculty think intercultural competence is very valuable and they do it, but it is not necessarily an indication we get from a higher level institutional culture. In these cases when it is not a policy of the institution, its implementation depends on individuals rather than institutional culture.

At a multicultural university, inquiry, teaching and learning flourish by virtue of an interactive and interdependent diversity of cultural differences (Antonio, 2003).

Therefore, teaching and learning and scholarship with multicultural content and focus need to be supported at both the departmental and the institutional levels. Scholarship on diversity and multicultural issues needs to be recognized as true and worthy scholarship and receive support and recognition from mainstream faculty and people in the position of decision-making. The best way to achieve such a goal is to adjust the reward system to value teaching and research focused on diversity and multicultural issues (Cress & Hart, 2005) during promotion and tenure processes. Since PMU holds diversity as one of its core values and “supports different beliefs and points of view and the open exchange

of ideas” (PMU Mission Statement, 2011, P. 1), this value and the beliefs of PMU should be reflected in its promotion and tenure guidelines. It should be explicitly written in the promotion and tenure guidelines that the teaching of intercultural competence and research on diversity and other multicultural issues will be recognized and rewarded during promotion and tenure processes. When faculty of color realize that their scholarly work is validated and their contributions are valued, they will choose to commit themselves to their chosen profession and their institution.

Faculty of color who teach race and diversity issues inside classrooms also need support from the institution when their teaching is faced with resistance from students. One research participant who had met this kind of difficulties while teaching Ethnic Studies courses offered her suggestion for institutional support by stating that for the bigger institution at a structural level, people who are in these offices like Affirmative Action, the Ombudsman, and the Dean of Student Affairs, there needs to be more workshops, discussions about these issues for those kinds of organizations. It needs to be more specific and well directed to the structural organizations that facilitate the movement of ideas and relationships between faculty and students. If some faculty of color were to have a hostile student who is acting out because of the topic of race or something that challenges his ideas about the Whiteness or his understanding of American history, these kinds of things that have the power to completely derail a class, there needs to be understanding and support for faculty so when scenarios like that arise, they have their administrators’ support. Sometimes when you are in the classroom, you are all by yourself.

Adequate institutional support facilitated by the home departments, the Office of Affirmative Action, and the Office of Student Affairs should be given to faculty of color who teach race and diversity topics inside classrooms so that they can have the peace of mind to do their best work without having to feel alone and targeted and without having to worry when the next “bomb” is going to go off. Institutional support from these offices should also be given to those students who feel uncomfortable and challenged by race related subject matters. If our faculty, staff, and students can seize all of those teachable moments and engage each other with genuine heart to heart conversations about race and diversity, then we are truly on our way towards a better future of mutual respect made possible by our intercultural competence.

Suggestions for Future Research

A few possible directions for future research have emerged during the course of this research study. First of all, there is the need for more qualitative research studies on faculty of color’s experiences of pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in American higher education. More qualitative research studies will offer more insights in helping us better understand faculty of color’s professional lives and scholarly experiences with more opportunities to improve the educational practices in higher education.

Secondly, only six tenured and tenure track faculty of color at PMU were interviewed for this research study. Their accounts of their professional and scholarly experiences have only provided a snapshot of the issues that this researcher has attempted to investigate. A large scale research study involving faculty of color at multiple

institutions across the nation will reveal a fuller picture of the current state in which faculty of color pursue the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence.

Thirdly, because of faculty of color population issues in the academy, faculty of color from different racial and ethnic backgrounds were grouped together as a subgroup for this research study. As such, the sample for this research study lack diversity in representing different racial and ethnic groups in the academy; and the nuanced cultural traits of the racially and ethnically different groups may have been overlooked. Therefore, a qualitative research study of faculty of color from one single racial or ethnic group can be conducted to see whether issues specific to that individual racial or ethnic group will emerge regarding their experiences of pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in American higher education.

Implications and Conclusion

Horace Kallen (1949), the first adult educator to argue for cultural pluralism in American higher education, envisioned a diverse America as an orchestra, the different instruments, each with its own characteristic timbre and theme, contribute distinct and recognizable parts to the composition, so in the life and culture of a nation, the different regional, ethnic, occupational, religious, and other communities compound their different activities to make up the national spirit. (p. 117)

Sixty years after Kallen (1949) uttered his beautiful sentiment of building the national spirit through diversity and unity, America is rapidly becoming “an orchestra” of

different people, each group with its own characteristic culture and tradition. Such a racially, ethnically and culturally diverse population and student body will no doubt present enormous challenges and new opportunities for American higher education to make efforts to meet the educational needs of all citizens. The changing demographics of the nation's general population and student body make it clear and necessary that a more open, culturally diverse and relevant curriculum will become an even more prevalent feature of American higher education (Chang, Altbach, & Lomotey, 2005), with its epistemological premise built around the notions of human experience, narrative, voice, intercultural competence and democratic agency (Torres, 1998).

To be able to support and sustain an open, culturally diverse and relevant curriculum, faculty of higher education need to have the courage to challenge the traditional notion of scholarship as merely research and publication devoid of social responsibilities and visions for the future. Instead, scholarship should be understood as a moral and political practice that always presupposes particular renditions of what constitutes legitimate knowledge, values, citizenship, modes of understanding and views of the future (Giroux & Giroux, 2004). As one of the research participants pointed out, what "we are doing in the ivory tower has relevance beyond the ivory tower", and we are "not simply working in a vacuum, and that there is an ultimate goal of social change and social justice." Through their strong commitment to the scholarship of engagement and their strong commitment to students' moral, civic, and affective development in their teaching, the research participants in this study have redefined the meaning of scholarship by demonstrating how the scholarships of engagement and teaching can help the academy

“become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems” (Boyer, 1996, p. 18).

The research participants in this study are also equally committed to the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in their pursuit of the four functions of scholarship. With their heavy investment in the scholarship of engagement, they strive to convert their scholarship of engagement to scholarship of discovery in the form of journal articles and books. Several of the research participants also make efforts to move “beyond [their] narrow disciplinary perspectives to work with colleagues in other disciplines” and engage in “more comprehensive and holistic” research methods. The research participants are also able to incorporate their scholarships of engagement, discovery, and integration into their scholarship of teaching to teach intercultural competence among their students in their respective disciplines whenever they deem appropriate. Their integrated application of the four functions of scholarship signals that the time has come “to build bridges across the disciplines” since “[s]ociety itself has a great stake in how scholarship is defined” (Boyer, 1990, p. 77).

As such, this research study contributes to the body of knowledge examining the experiences of faculty of color in American higher education, especially in an area where the study of the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching for intercultural competence has been severely lacking. This research study also brings higher education stakeholders’ attention to the enormous impact of diversity and globalization on American higher education, and the importance of the redefinition of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence on

American college and university campuses. But most importantly, this research study provides useful information about the experiences of faculty of color's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence so that policy-makers and administrators in higher education can offer appropriate support to the scholarly endeavors of faculty of color, understand the tremendous value they bring to higher education, and better utilize their intellectual diversity in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in today's world that is being reshaped tremendously by diversity and globalization.

References

- Abrahamson, C. (2009). Infusing cross-cultural experiences into the classroom. In R. A. R. Gurung, & L. R. Prieto (Eds.), *Getting culture: Incorporating diversity across the curriculum* (pp. 91-99). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Anderson, J. A. (2008). *Driving change through diversity and globalization: Transformative leadership in the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 582-602.
- Antonio, A. L. (2003). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe*, 89 (6), 5-19.
- Antonio, A. L. (2010, May 1). Faculty of color and scholarship transformed: New arguments for diversifying faculty [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.diversityweb.org/digest/w99/diversifying.html>
- Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23, 373-398.
- Aquirre, A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007). *College learning for the new global century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., Cress, C. M., & Astin, A. W. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professoriate, 1995-96*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

- Baez, B. (1998). Negotiating and resisting racism: How faculty of color construct promotion and tenure. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED430420).
- Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22 (5), 4-14.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, (2nd ed., pp. 3-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society* (2nd, ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research*, 71 (2), 171-217.
- Berberet, J. (1999). The professoriate and institutional citizenship. *Liberal Education*, 85 (4), 33-39.
- Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the “legitimate” knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35 (2), 160-180.
- Blackburn, R., Wenzel, S., & Bieber, J. P. (1994). Minority vs. majority faculty publication performance: A research note. *Review of Higher Education*, 17, 217-282.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1988). Faculty issues: The impact on minorities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11, 417-434.

- Bochner, A. P. (2001). Narrative's virtues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7 (2), 131-157.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Boileau, D. M. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: A challenge to use teaching portfolios to document the scholarship of teaching. *JACA*, 3, 19-23.
- Bowen, H. R. (1977). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The John's Hopkins University Press.
- Bower, B. L. (2002). Campus life for faculty of color: Still strangers after all these years? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 79-87.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49 (7), 18-33.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 221-239.
- Chang, M. J., Altbach, P. G., & Lomotey, K. (2005). Race in higher education: Making meaning of an elusive moving target. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 517-556). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 651-

- 679). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. Ontario, Canada: Althouse.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, C. M., & Yinger, R. J. (1977). Research on teacher thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7, 279-304.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (2), 2-14.
- Cress, C. M., & Hart, J. L. (2005). The hue and cry of campus climate: Faculty strategies for creating equitable work environments. *To Improve the Academy*, 23, 110-129.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Cunsolo, J., Elrick, M. F., Middleton, A., & Roy, D. (1996). The scholarship of teaching: A Canadian perspective with examples. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 26 (1), 35-56.
- De la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcon, J. J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano academics. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Deardorff, D. (2004). Internationalization: In search of intercultural competence.

International Educator, 8 (2), 13-15.

Delgado-Romero, E. A., Manlove, A. N., Manlove, J. D., & Hernandez, C. A. (2007).

Controversial issues in the recruitment and retention of Latino/a faculty. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6, 34.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of

qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp.1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (1993). *Recognizing faculty work: Reward*

systems for the year 2000. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diggs, G. A., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and

colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review*, 41, 312-333.

Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory

in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8 (1), 7-27.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the*

scholarship of teaching. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Elmore, C., & Blackburn, R. (1983). Black and White faculty in White research

universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54, 1-15.

Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

- Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux, H. A. (2006). Academic freedom under fire: The case for critical pedagogy. *College Literature*, 33 (4), 1-42.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Green, M. (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. (2000). *Toward comprehensive internationalization: An ACE initiative for undergraduate education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Gurin, P. (1999). The compelling need for diversity in education. *Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, 5, 363-425.
- Gurung, R. A. R. (2009). Got culture? Incorporating culture into the curriculum. In R. A. R. Gurung & L. R. Prieto (Eds.), *Getting culture: Incorporating diversity across the curriculum* (pp. 11-22). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harvey, W., & Scott-James, D. (1985). We can't find any: The elusiveness of black faculty in American higher education. *Issues in Education*, 3, 68-76.
- Hockfield, S. (2010, January 14). Report on the initiative for faculty race and diversity [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/provost/raceinitiative/report.pdf>
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2004). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the*

- mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*, 267-285.
- Hurtado, S., Ponjuan, L., & Smith, G. (2007, October 27). Campus diversity and civic engagement initiatives [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/Final%20Women%20and%20Faculty%20of%20Colo_2.pdf
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*, 538-563.
- Johnson-Bailey, J., & Cervero, R. M. (2004). Mentoring in black and white: The intricacies of cross-cultural mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, *12* (1), 7-21.
- Kallen, H. N. (1949). *The education of free men*. New York: Farrar & Straus.
- Kim, A. (2006). The “intercultural space” where worlds collide. In T. R. Berry & N. D. Mizelle (Eds.), *From oppression to grace: Women of color and their dilemmas within the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*, 571-592.
- Kramp, M. K. (2004). Exploring life and experience through narrative inquiry. In K. deMarrais, & S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences* (pp. 103-121). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kreber, C. (1999). A course-based approach to the development of teaching-scholarship:

- A case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 4, 309-325.
- Kreber, C. (2000). How teaching award winners conceptualize academic work: Further thoughts on the meaning of scholarship. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5 (1), 61-78.
- Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. A. (1997). Teaching as scholarship: A model for instructional development. *Issues and Inquiry in College Learning and Teaching*, 19 (2), 4-13.
- Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. A. (2000). Exploring the scholarship of teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 476-495.
- Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 57-66.
- Lincoln, Y. (1993). I and thou: Method, voice, and roles in research with the silenced. In D. McLaughlin & W. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silenced lives* (pp. 29-47). Boston: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Lynn, M., Yosso, T. J., Solorzano, D. G., & Parker, L. (2002). Critical race theory and education: Qualitative research in the new millennium. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8 (3), 3-6.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2010, January 14). Report on the initiative for faculty race and diversity [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/provost/raceinitiative/report.pdf>
- Matsuda, C. (1991). Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal*, 100, 1329-1407.
- McGowan, J. M. (2000). Multicultural teaching: African-American faculty classroom teaching experiences in predominantly white colleges and universities. *Multicultural*

- Education*, 8 (2), 19-22.
- Menges, R. J., & Weimer, M. (1996). *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1998). On critical reflection. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48 (3), 185-198.
- Mickelson, M. L., & Oliver, M. L. (1991). Making the short list: Black candidates and faculty recruitment process. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Morehead, J. W., & Shedd, P. J. (1996). Student interviews: A vital role in the scholarship of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 20, 261-269.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization* (updated ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nieto, S. (2006). A Nuyorican in the academy: Lessons learned. In T. R. Berry & N. D. Mizelle (Eds.), *From oppression to grace: Women of color and their dilemmas within the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 496-510.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oliver, D. G., Serovich, J. M., & Mason, T. L. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, 84, 1273-1289.

- Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5* (2), 116-137.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education, 26* (1), 57-80.
- Ortiz, A. M. (2000). Expressing cultural identity in the learning community: Opportunities and challenges. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 82*, 67-79.
- Pai, Y. (1990). Cultural pluralism, democracy and multicultural education. In B. B. Cassara (Ed.), *Adult education in a multicultural society* (pp. 11-27). London: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd, ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paulsen, M. B., & Feldman, K. A. (1995). Toward a reconceptualization of scholarship: A human action system with functional imperatives. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*, 615-641.
- Phillion, J. (1999). Narrative and formalistic approaches to the study of multiculturalism. *Curriculum Inquiry, 29* (1), 129-140.
- University Communications (2010). Profile: Snapshot of Portland State. Retrieved from <http://www.pdx.edu/profile/Snapshot-of-Portland-State>
- Portland State University Studies (2010). University Studies Goals. Retrieved from <http://www.pdx.edu/unst/university-studies-goals>
- President's fall symposium speech, (2005). Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Rausch, D. K., Ortiz, B. P., Douthitt, R. A., & Reed, L. L. (1989). The academic

- revolving door: Why do women get caught? *CUPA Journal*, 40 (1), 1-16.
- Reif, L. R. (2010, January 14). Report on the initiative for faculty race and diversity [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/provost/raceinitiative/report.pdf>
- Rendon, L. (1992). From the barrio to the academy: Revelations of a Mexican American “scholarship girl”. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 80, 55-64.
- Rice, R. E. (1991). The new American scholar: Scholarship and the purposes of the university. *Metropolitan Universities*, 1, 7-18.
- Richlin, L. (1993). Preparing faculty for the new conceptions of scholarship. In L. Richlin (Ed.), *Preparing faculty for the new conceptions of scholarship* (pp. 2-5). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ronkowski, S. A. (1993). Scholarly teaching: Developmental stages of pedagogical scholarship. In L. Richlin (Ed.), *Preparing faculty for the new conceptions of scholarship* (pp. 79-91). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sadao, K. C. (2003). Living in two worlds: Success and the bicultural faculty of color. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26, 397-418.
- Schuerholz-Lehr, S. (2007). Teaching for global literacy in higher education: How prepared are the educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (2), 180-204.
- Smith, D. G. (1989). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual:

- Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75 (2), 133-160.
- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8 (23), 23-44.
- Spring, J. (1995). *The intersection of cultures: Multicultural education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Stanley, C. A., Porter, M. E., Simpson, N. J., & Ouellett, M. L. (2003). A case study of the teaching experiences of African American faculty at two predominantly White research universities. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 14, 151-178.
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 701-736.
- Sue, D. W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29, 790-821.
- Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. B., Durran, M., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E., & Vasquez-Nuttall, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 10, 45-52.
- Tate, W. (1994). From inner city to ivory tower: Does my voice matter in the academy? *Urban Education*, 29 (3), 245-269.
- Taylor, K. L. (1993). The role of scholarship in university teaching. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 23 (3), 64-79.
- Tesconi, C. A. (1990). Multiculturalism in education: The importance of meaning. In B.

- B. Cassara (Ed.), *Adult education in a multicultural society* (pp. 28-44). London: Routledge.
- Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68 (1), 1-16.
- Tierney, W. G., & Dilley, P. (2002). Interviewing in education. In J. F. Gubrium, & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context & method* (pp. 453-471). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tillman, L. C. (2001). Mentoring African-American faculty in predominantly white institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 42, 295-325.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review*, 42, 421-447.
- Trueba, H. T. (2002). Multiple ethnic, racial, and cultural identities in action: From marginality to a new cultural capital in modern society. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1 (1), 7-28.
- Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1 (3), 139-168.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (1999). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Turner, C. S. V., Myers, S. L., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation:

- The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70 (1), 27-59.
- Turner, C. S. (2003). Incorporation and marginalization in the academy: From border toward center for faculty of color? *Journal of Black Studies*, 34 (1), 112-125.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2008). U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.
- U. S. Office of Management and Budget (1997). *Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President.
- U. S. Department of Education, (2008). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Umbach, P. D. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 317-345.
- Valdez, E., Balderrama, M. V., Texeira, M. (2006). Una lucha de fronteras (A struggle of borders). In T. R. Berry, & N. D. Mizelle (Eds.), *From oppression to grace: Women of color and their dilemmas in the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Villalpando, O. (2002). The impact of diversity and multiculturalism on all students: Findings from a national study. *NASPA Journal*, 40 (1), 124-144.
- Vincenti, V. B. (2001). Exploration of the relationship between international experiences and the interdisciplinary work of university faculty. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5 (1), 42-63.
- Walsh, C. E. (1991). *Pedagogy and the struggle for voice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-

- American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white institutions. Report No. 2.
Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George
Washington University.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Weimer, M. (1992). Scholarship of teaching. *Journal of the Freshmen-Year Experience*,
4 (1) 41-58.
- Wilber, K. (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*.
New York: Random House.

Appendix A:

Introductory Letter Requesting Participation

Dear Dr. _____:

I am a doctoral student at the Graduate School of Education at Portland State University. I will soon begin my dissertation research study on the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in American higher education. Ernest Boyer, the former president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, defines the four functions of scholarship as the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching (for further information, please see attached Statement of Background Information on Boyer's Scholarship Redefinition). I am writing this letter to formally invite you to participate in this research study.

The purpose of this research study is to provide useful information about the experiences of faculty of color's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence so that policy-makers and administrators in higher education can offer appropriate support to the scholarly endeavors of faculty of color, understand the tremendous values they bring to higher education, and better utilize their intellectual diversity in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in a world that is being drastically reshaped by domestic diversity and international globalization.

If you agree to participate in this research study, you will participate in one session of a two-hour one-on-one audio-taped interview with the researcher and a brief follow-up meeting for fact-checking with the researcher. Your identity will be concealed by a pseudonym; and the names of your unit, department, and discipline will also be concealed so that data can not be linked back to you. The content of your interview will be completely confidential; and all documents will be kept at a secure place by the researcher. The audio tape will be destroyed after being kept on file for three years in accordance with federal regulations. Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary, and you may choose to withdraw at any time without penalty.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in this study or your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact PSU's Human Subjects Research Review Committee at 503-725-4288.

If you have questions about the research study itself, please feel free to contact me via e-mail at fu@pdx.edu or call me at 503-682-1438.

Thank you very much for your consideration. And please inform me of your decision as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Peng Fu

Appendix B:

Statement of Background Information on Boyer's Scholarship Redefinition

Ernest L. Boyer (1990), the former president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, argues in his seminal report *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* that, as we enter the 21st century, the role of the scholar must be defined in ways that not only affirm the past, but also reflect the present and adequately anticipate the future. He states that diversity brings with it new obligations, and faculty need to extend beyond the classrooms to embrace the civic dimensions of collegiate life to serve new constituencies. He points out that our world has undergone immense transformations, the human community is increasingly interdependent, and the time has come to connect campuses to the larger world. He reminds us that if the nation's higher education institutions fail to help students see beyond themselves and better understand the interdependent nature of the world, each new generation's capacity to live responsibly will be dangerously diminished.

As such, Boyer (1990) asserts that the meaning of scholarship must be redefined if American higher education institutions are to remain vital and relevant to the realities of contemporary life. He proposes that the meaning of scholarship should be expanded to a set of four functions: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching.

The scholarship of discovery refers to the vigorous investigative research and the pursuit of knowledge and intellectual discovery in the form of scholarly publications. It is the scholarship of discovery that is largely valued and rewarded in most American higher education institutions.

The scholarship of integration means "making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way" by "giving meaning to isolated facts" and "putting them in perspective" (Boyer, 1990, p. 18), for "it is through 'connectedness' that research ultimately is made authentic" (p. 19).

The scholarship of engagement means service and engagement to the larger community that is directly linked with faculty's "special field of knowledge" (Boyer, 1990, p. 22) so that "theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other" (p. 23). In a separate speech he made several years later, Boyer (1996) further states that "the academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems – and must reaffirm its historic commitment to the *scholarship of engagement*" (p. 18).

Last, but not least, Boyer elevates teaching as the fourth function of scholarship, since teaching ensures the continuity, expansion and transformation of human knowledge.

My proposed research study seeks to examine faculty of color's experiences pursuing these four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in American higher education.

Appendix C:

Statement of Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Peng Fu, a doctoral student at the Graduate School of Education at Portland State University. This study is in partial fulfillment of the Doctor of Education degree and is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Christine Cress, professor and chairwoman of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education, Portland State University.

This study examines the experiences of faculty of color pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching so that policy-makers and administrators in higher education can offer appropriate support to the scholarly endeavors of faculty of color, understand the tremendous values they bring to higher education, and better utilize their intellectual diversity in the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in a world that is being reshaped rapidly by diversity and globalization.

If you agree to participate in this research study, you will be asked to participate in one session of a two-hour one-on-one audio-taped interview with the researcher and a brief follow-up meeting for fact-checking with the researcher.

Your identity will be concealed by a pseudonym; and the names of your unit, department, and discipline will also be concealed so that data can not be linked back to you. The content of your interview will be completely confidential; and all documents will be kept at a secure place by the researcher. The audio tape will be destroyed after being kept on file for three years in accordance with federal regulations. Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary, and you may choose to withdraw at any time without penalty.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding your participation in this study or your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact PSU's Human Subjects Research Review Committee at 503-725-4288.

If you have questions about the research study itself, please feel free to contact Peng Fu via e-mail at fu@pdx.edu or call her at 503-682-1438.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understood the above information and agree to participate in this research study. Please understand that you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty, and that, by signing this consent form, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights, or remedies.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Appendix D:
Interview Protocol

Time:

Date:

Location:

Interviewee:

Interviewer:

Before the interview begins, interviewees will be asked to read and sign the informed consent form.

Part One

General Questions regarding research participants' personal and professional backgrounds:

- What are the areas of your expertise?
- What is your academic rank?
- How long have you been teaching in higher education?
- What is your racial and ethnic background?
- Where do you come from? Please share some information about your personal background and life experience as a person of color.
- What influenced your decision to pursue an academic career?

- How have your personal background and life experience informed your belief and value systems as an academic?
- Why did you decide to participate in this research study?
- What aspects of this research study interest you the most?

Part Two

Questions regarding research participants' experiences of pursuing the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching:

- What are your definitions of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and the scholarship of teaching?
- Do you think these four functions of scholarship are important?
- If yes, how have your personal background and life experience informed your conviction?
- What do you do to apply the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuits? Would you please give me specific examples?
- How have your personal background and life experience informed your practice of the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuits?
- Are the four functions of scholarship valued equally in your organization?
- What are some of the existing policies and practices that either hinder or facilitate faculty's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship in your organization?

- How has the organizational culture influenced your practice of the four functions of scholarship in your academic pursuit?

Part Three

Questions regarding the research participants' experiences of teaching for intercultural competence:

- What is your definition of intercultural competence?
- In your opinion, what skills, knowledge, and abilities an interculturally competent individual should possess?
- Do you think you are an interculturally competent individual and scholar? Please explain.
- Do you believe that teaching intercultural competence is one of the most urgent tasks facing higher education in today's world?
- If you do, how have your personal background and life experience informed your conviction?
- How do you teach and prepare your students for intercultural competence?
Would you please give me an example of your best practice in teaching intercultural competence?
- How have your beliefs and values informed your teaching of intercultural competence?
- Does the teaching and learning of intercultural competence feature prominently in your organization?

- If it does, how does your organization define intercultural competence?
- How does the organizational culture influence the teaching and learning of intercultural competence in your organization?
- Is the teaching of intercultural competence rewarded during the tenure and promotion process in your organization?

Part Four

Questions regarding organizational climate and research participants' socialization into the academy:

- What are some of the obstacles you have encountered in your organization while pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?
- What are some of the support you have received from your organization while pursuing the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?
- What effects do organizational culture and climate have on your pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?
- How do mentoring relationships contribute to your academic pursuit?
- Has your pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence contributed positively to your promotion and tenure? Please explain.

- What are your recommendations for your organization to better support faculty of color's pursuit of the four functions of scholarship and the teaching and learning of intercultural competence?

Thank you very much for your participation!!!