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ABSTRACT

THE GENDER EFFECT: A CASE STUDY IN THE CULTURE OF A RURAL NORTHERN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Toni Rae Poulsen

Master of Science in Social Science

California State University, Chico

Summer 2012

This study is about gendered culture and perceived discrimination in a rural community college. The purpose of this study is to identify if women faculty at rural community college in California, whose length of experience span over thirty years of community college history. Did these women experience similarities in hiring processes, were they placed on the tenure track, and was academic freedom part of their community college culture? Lastly, did women perceive a level of respect from male colleagues of equal education, and was there perceived equality among faculty genders, and did women feel they had to super-perform their duties in order to be considered equal to male colleagues? This study used an open-ended questionnaire and most of the female faculty members interviewed had or have worked at the college for over fifteen years. The history of community colleges, as well as females entering the community
college workforce as faculty, the glass ceiling effect, and tenure and academic freedom are explored.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The “glass ceiling effect” which is renamed gender ceiling effect, exists in private and public sectors. The community college studied here seems to pass the equity test, when examined empirically, but surprisingly, women faculty still perceive that there is inequity in a one-sided male culture that does exist on community college campuses. What implications does this have for understanding the long-term cultural consequences of decades of discrimination?

Based on historical data, women, with degrees equal to those of their male colleagues, entering the workplace in a faculty position, during the seventies and eighties were paid less than men, and the work environment could have possibly been defined as “chilly” toward women (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001). State and Federal agencies have tried to level the field. However, within the parameters of each institution women perceive inequality still exists on some level. This study is trying to describe the nature of those perceptions, and its possible effects on how women work in the workforce.

Background

The community college or two-year college has existed privately on some level since the mid-nineteenth century, but public junior colleges began at the turn of the twentieth century. These institutions served as a “middle school” between high school
and four-year universities. Since the beginning, the junior college served students who otherwise would not be able to attend a traditional university due to ill-preparation or lack of funding. California led the pack for secondary institutions through legislative initiatives supporting growth and expansion, but it was not until the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, otherwise known as the GI Bill, that gave the community college the boost it needed to cement itself as a fixture in higher educational culture. Generational decades help paint the canvas of marked events that led to the expansion of a higher educational movement (Geller, 2001). Continued state and federal monetary support ensured the survival of community colleges through passage of several legislative pieces to insure institutional growth at the two-year level. Community colleges provide many benefits to the students and communities they serve. Similarly, one can say the two-year college is not without criticism, but the future is certain that secondary institutions will continue, however, the nature of the institution is in a state of flux (Phillippe, 2000).

Limitations

This case study will serve as a basis for other rural community colleges located throughout the nation to understand how attempts at creating equal opportunity effect the target population, in this case women.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The idea behind a two-year college (junior college, or currently referred to as community college) is that students achieve an educational base in lower division studies at a lower cost than at a distant four-year institution. Two-year colleges spread across the nation after 1945, but their journey was not always smooth (Geller, 2001). Most importantly the question of whether or not a community college was more like a high school or a university led to a conclusion that the community college’s rightful place is in-between the two institutions (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Instruction is based on a highly educated faculty delivering the lower division of college work, especially general educational requirements (Phillippe, 2000) otherwise taught at more expensive four-year institutions.

As state sponsored institutions funded by taxes, the community college also had an obligation to follow legislation, executive orders, and appointed federal and state commissions, to not discriminate against gender or minorities (Myers, 2010, p.4). The civil rights movement of the fifties through the seventies, which addressed women and minorities entering the labor force in the late sixties and seventies experienced obstacles that led to governmental action through law. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is the federal agency currently charged with investigating allegations
of discrimination within the state and federal institutions. Thousands of alleged
discrimination charges are filed every year (Myers, 2010, pp. 13-14).

Women Faculty at the Community College

Tradition and stereotyping clashed and legislation paved the way for females,
which encompassed students and opportunities for women faculty hires at the Junior
College level. The belief is that, for seven decades men held teaching positions in
community colleges, while women held “service” oriented positions in fields like home
economics and physical education. But, in the mid-seventies and eighties, retirements left
vacancies in higher education and women began careers as fulltime faculty in community
colleges. Old ideals remained among community college male faculty and the “battle of
the sexes” began. As men accepted women into their labor force, stereotyping emerged
that emphasized that women taught soft subjects and female faculty perceived inequality
while struggling to survive in a man’s world emerged in response.

A result of that dual responsibility of raising a family and being competent at
their job led to women adapting to fit into the male ideology of how a women is to be in
the workforce, some had to reinvent themselves as women faculty walked on eggshells to
successfully accomplish their job (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001). Female faculty
employment as part-time instructors at community colleges were a good fit for educated
mothers, but time spent raising a family and juggling employment duties led to a belief
that women did not care about their job as much as men. Men perceived women were
there to nurture students and men were there to lead, causing women to take a backseat in
areas of leadership (Townsend, 2006). In the seventies and eighties women colleagues
carefully navigated through the maze of land mines to accomplish their tasks without
drawing attention to their gender, often quietly putting up with what they believed was disrespectful (Frye, 1995). Legislation was introduced to assist women with the task of equalizing the male female ratio in the work place, in an effort to achieve amicable working conditions between both genders. Today the community college is almost even with male-to-female hiring ratio, which is aimed at equalizing opportunity for both genders (Myers, 2010).

**Employment at the Community College**

The community college system employs thousands of employees, including classified staff for clerical service, confidential employees handling management affairs, and certificated employees for teaching. Rural and urban colleges vary in size, but the structure is the same regardless of the population or location of the institution. Statistics report most full-time faculty have a Master’s degree, with sixteen percent having a doctorate. Full time faculty is on salary, and typically teaches five classes per term, and is usually placed on the tenure track. This track provides a probationary employment period, where the instructor is evaluated yearly, and awarded permanent status if approved by their peers and the governing board at the end of the fourth year. Contingent faculty and part time faculty are hired “as needed” to fill teaching positions in excess of faculty, or specialized courses the administration desires to offer in a given semester. The part time faculty usually teach one to two classes a semester. Such employees are paid on an hourly rate, and not offered benefits. The maximum teaching assignment for a part time/contingent faculty member is 67%. The part timer is an “at will,” contracted employee, and has no hiring renewal rights (Vaughan, 1995). This is the entry point for lay women.
As women moved forward into the labor force in greater numbers in the 1960s, the government enacted legislation in an effort to change the working culture and address specific inequities based on gender differences. Women often believed they were alone in the workplace, discriminated for having children, and given service type jobs that kept women from attaining the more deserving tenure track. The “glass ceiling effect” was coined as a woman who had the same education as a man, but found herself stuck because of her gender instead of her ability. As legislation began to tackle the male dominated culture in employment, it took several major attempts to address minorities, and women in the public and private sector. Employers adapted to laws, while culture was slower to change. Through trial and error, women achieved greater success in the work place, and women began to rise to leadership positions, and obtain greater equality in pay and employment (Elacqua, Beehr, Webster, & Hansen, 2009).

As women entered the community college as full-time faculty, the numbers were fewer, the jobs were different, and women proved themselves on every front. Female faculties often taught less technical subjects, like English and humanities, and it was believed not given opportunities to lead. Legislation was geared at public institutions like community college systems through the Pregnancy Act, Affirmative Action, Title VII, Title IX, and The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Affirmative Action requires any agency that accepted federal money be in compliance with the rules and regulations pertaining to gender and minorities in the labor force (Myers, 2010). But rules were violated, and employers claimed ignorance of the laws, but through time and acceptance equality legitimized, as a result in 2012. Equal pay and job promotion are within a single digit margin, and hiring is nearly fifty percent equal of male and female.
Nevertheless, all the progress made to shatter the glass ceiling; women still perceive a
glass ceiling on almost every level within the institution (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).

Tenure is the ultimate “glass ceiling” for community college faculty, because it is considered the end of the probationary status, and the beginning of permanent employment. Tenure provides job security, and the ability to relax, and teach controversial topics associated with course content. Academic Freedom is closely tied to Tenure, and the institution develops its reputation by honoring Academic Freedom and granting Tenure to fulltime faculty meeting professional criteria. Community college faculties aspire for tenure status, and spend one to four years attaining tenure, based on board criteria and policy (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges [ASCCC], 1998).

As a result, tenure has become the battleground as community colleges hired part-time or contingent faculty to save money (American Federation of Teachers, 2009). Tenured faculty numbers decreased as administration has increased nationwide, as administration sought to streamline course delivery and balance budgets. Administrators challenged tenured faculty through “due process” because of laws, resulting in increased court cases for tenured faculty. While tenure is a valued reward for faculty, changes in economics and employment dynamics could change the way tenured is obtained, or by hiring part time and contingent faculty, thus bypassing tenure completely (Fossey & Wood, 2004). Such matters are what underlie this thesis.

For the sake of the reader, perception, culture, and discrimination are discussed at length at the end of the study. The terms and definitions are throughout the introduction, and consist of; tenure, academic freedom, glass ceiling, and gender. To aid
in discussion, I am including my definition of perception, culture, and discrimination. Perception is the way in which people relate to their environment. According to Williams (2005), once stereotypes are triggered, people’s perceptions are shaped by them. The actor takes on a role, and his role is defined by what he or she perceives his role should or should not be. Cognitive bias helps to shape and mold the way in which people are perceived. This perception becomes their reality. Culture is the traditions and rituals that define our perceptions. It is the way people react to daily life, reinforced by tradition and rituals, receiving some type of feedback to continue or discontinue a behavior. With positive feedback, the culture strengthens, with negative feedback the culture alters a bit until it receives feedback indicating the social norm. Once culture is in place, it becomes difficult to change, thus actors in the play assume the role that they perceive, based on the culture in place. Discrimination is the perception that one group receives preferential treatment, special favors, or more, than the other person or group. In the case of this study, it is the female faculty spanning thirty years of service, who perceive gender inequity.

Community College’s Inception

Community Colleges began in the 1800s, but were privately owned. Mid-eighteenth century private two-year institutions consisted of Monticello and Susquehanna University in Virginia, which served as “post-secondary schools,” and became a model for the junior colleges. Many other universities desired to follow suit and/or experienced growth by adding community colleges to existing high school campuses and eventually building stand-alone campuses in regions. The federal government responded by drafting
policy concerning the use of lands for educational expansion, in 1862, known as the “Morrill Act,” which allowed federally owned land to be purchased for the use of new or expanding universities, including post-secondary studies of higher education. This allowed the “public post secondary-schools” an opportunity to thrive (Geller, 2001).

Post-secondary schools, later referred to as “junior” and “community” colleges, resulted from the need to provide students with lower division course work to better prepare them for Bachelors’ level work. While other colleges were experimenting with the concept, Joliet Junior College was credited as the first public secondary school, founded in 1901 in Illinois, to include post secondary curriculum. The overcrowded higher institutions in Illinois in 1890 led instructors to determine that students in universities were underprepared and that bringing mediocre students up to speed was a waste of resources. William Raney Harper (the man credited to coining the term ‘junior college’), then president of the University of Chicago, and J. Stanley Brown, principal of the public high school in Joliet, saw an opportunity to prepare junior and senior high school students, by assigning lower division work to college-bound graduating seniors from high school, in effect forming a two-year “secondary school” (Geller, 2001). The secondary school (junior college) created an economical sector for less-prepared yet determined students to compete for seats in the university, and also gave financially deprived students a chance to excel in lower level college. The solution to the new secondary school was imagined by Harper and Brown, and a fifth and sixth year was added to the high school curriculum. Professors were encouraged to accept the credit of the courses taken at the Joliet high school and welcome those students into the university as transfers, entering as juniors (Phillippe, 2000).
Tillery and Deegan (1985, as cited by Geller, 2001) describe such “generations” of post-secondary school expansion. The “first generation” is from 1900-1930, which consisted mostly of expansion of existing universities, adding post-secondary schools to the institution. The second generation from 1930-1950, is the “junior college generation,” followed by the third generation, 1950-1970, known as the “community college generation,” the fourth generation, the seventies and eighties, being labeled the “comprehensive community college” (Geller, 2001).

Other junior college institutions sprang up to offer lower level general education courses to meet the demands for general education needs throughout the United States. These models served to fulfill the need to provide quality low cost education for students who would have lived at home, linked by their “common mission” of providing students with general education credits prior to entering into universities. These other colleges modeling Joliet Illinois’ model of learning include Fresno, California, Kansas City, Missouri, and Rochester, New York (Phillippe, 2000).

California passed the “Cametti Act” in 1907 “permitting high schools to offer college level work,” which was then amended by the Ballard Act in 1915, “which allowed support of junior colleges” authorizing California counties to form districts, provide state and county support for students attending junior college (Geller 2001, p. 4), and allow districts to form boards and policy and procedures, in support of growing the junior college concept. California led the movement of establishing the first American Association of Junior Colleges in 1921, after holding a meeting in Chicago, and giving direction to junior colleges and technical colleges’ focus and establishing the Community
College Journal in 1930. During this time frame, California had twenty-one public junior colleges delivering general Liberal Arts coursework to its students (Phillippe, 2000).

In 1925, according to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) timeline, “The Junior College Movement” was identified by Leonard Koos, who acknowledged the emerging culture, and studied the “development of junior colleges, by location, enrollments, and fields of study” (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. 107). Walter Crosby Eells in 1931 documented “growth and curriculum in public junior colleges, as well as its role in increasing access to higher education” (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. 107). The two author’s works gave legitimacy to the movement with documentation of the purpose for which they existed, and the ability postsecondary education had to offer socially diverse populations in the decades to come (Phillippe, 2000, p. 18).

In 1930s, the Great Depression swept the nation, but college growth continued despite economic downturn. It was suggested by Geller (2001) that “lack of jobs left people with time to think about getting an education” (p. 5). As a result, college growth continued even during this time period, increasing by somewhere between 219-259 community colleges nation-wide (Geller, 2001).

State-sponsored junior colleges became a staple among lower and middle class households as a way to educate for career and job training (Phillippe, 2000). During the thirties, the lower and middle class vocational education was represented by leadership’s “uniform promotion” of the junior college as the “two-year terminal institution,” rather than solely for transfer to four-year. The purpose “should be” to educate those who would not go on to four-year universities. Frey (1995) claimed the conservative leadership viewed education as a level of social “hierarchy,” which had
expanded into the leadership of the junior college, and touted success by having published its first issue of *The Junior College Journal* in 1945. Frey (1995) claimed university education was for “national, political, and social elite.” Since most could not “aspire” to meet the expectations of the universities, the lesser class should not burden the university system by “flooding” enrollment. The world was becoming more complex, and due to this complexity it was good to get more than twelve years of education to fully prepare for the advance workplace requirements (AACC, n.d.).

According to Frye (1995), the promotion of the junior college served the “ideological perception” of an “evolving society,” but also served to promote instruction at the junior college. Frye claimed if the two-year college were deemed “terminal” and not designed for transfer, it would bolster enrollment that otherwise would have been small. Frye further explains that a non-transferrable higher level of education could be designed for most if not all, and would target the “semi-professional” category that is somewhere in-between “artisan and professional occupation.” This concept quickly died, and the beginning of World War II replaced ideology (Frye, 1991, p. 6).

As servicemen returned from war, the *Serviceman’s Readjustment Act*, also known as the *GI Bill*, was introduced. This created a government subsidized market for military personnel to receive education upon completion of active duty. Community colleges prospered as men went to college to receive formal career training. In 1944, Congress enabled servicemen returning to civilian life with an opportunity to receive a college education by passage of the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act. The act was known as the GI Bill, and provided financial support for veterans of World War II who desired to attend college. This bill was the beginning of “socialized education” for all economic
backgrounds. Over two million Veterans, as well as sixty-thousand women and seventy-thousand blacks attended college under the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act in 1947 (Geller, 2001, p. 6).

The Truman Commission report, published in 1947 by the President’s Commission on Higher Education, called for little-to-no tuition for junior colleges with the charge that junior colleges serve their districts, act as social centers with an emphasis on “civic responsibilities,” and establish the word “community” in the names of the various colleges that were populating the regions throughout the nation. Grant money was offered by the Kellogg Foundation in 1960, to “encourage school districts to offer two-year learning centers within their own four-year degree” (AACC, n.d.). The goal of colleges was to train deans and presidents who would graduate from the Kellogg Junior College Leadership Program, to provide uniform leadership as twelve deans and presidents. This began the leadership model and twelve universities accepted the leadership concept, graduating hundreds of leadership recipients (Phillippe, 2000, p. 18).

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (a process of evolving legislation to provided financial aid to qualifying students, based on low income ranges) provided the opportunity for “practically every American to attend college” (AACC, n.d.) thus increasing the need for community colleges. Further amendments in 1972 and 1992, and the passage of the Pell Grant which permits a student free money to attend college based on grade point average standards, and allowed the opportunity for desiring students to receive the first two years of higher education with little or no cost (Phillippe, 2000).

Thus, community colleges are now a familiar institution in every part of the nation and dot the country with a unique set of inter-linking educational ideals and access
to services. Open enrollment and low tuition rates provide commonality to lower division learning, but still each college is uniquely different, often due to the influence of locally elected board of education. The mission statement of each college is locally prepared to meet a specific district’s student needs. The differences in missions are derived by population and developed by governing boards filled by elected trustees who represent their local community, in a fashion that often boards of regents do not. Large urban colleges fill the countryside, but rural colleges also exist and are essential learning centers for the farming and ranch populations located in sprawling western landscapes (Phillippe, 2000, p. 19).

Employees in a community college system include from 104,000 full-time faculty and around 190,000 part-time faculty. Most full-time faculty have a master’s degree, with sixteen percent having a doctorate degree. Most full time faculty teach five classes per term, with part-time faculty teaching one to two classes per semester (American Federation of Teachers, 2009, pp. 12-25). Comparing the full-time faculty part-time faculty, contingent faculty (temporary status, teaching a full load, but without benefits) and/or part-time faculty are an integral part of the community college campus. Part-time faculty can teach sixty-seven percent of a full load, ratio required by state law in California (Vaughan, 1995).

The benefits two-year colleges ensure for communities and students are listed in research, President Reagan referred to Community College as “a priceless treasure close to our homes and work, providing open doors for millions of our fellow citizens . . . the original higher education melting pot” (Geller, 2001, pp. 8-9). President Bush praised community colleges at a convention for the AACC for the work they do and said the
nation was grateful. Several legislative acts were passed by the federal government allowing college classes to be taken by high school students, which would transfer with the student as they enter college (Geller, 2001).

The benefits of community college are numerous, and widely acknowledged. Open Enrollment is valuable for students and attributed to the success of community colleges (Phillippe, 2000). Students who attend community college ultimately receive higher incomes, as well as an opportunity to be equipped academically if transferring to a four-year university. Immigrants receive the necessary tools to learn the English language through programs community college programs designed to bolster the underprivileged. The community college also serves the vocational student desiring a trade for blue-collar jobs. All of these examples translate into college success and higher earnings (Belfield & Bailey, 2010, pp. 57-58).

But community colleges have some negative drawbacks. Open enrollment could lead to “restricted access for disabled students due to budget cuts” (Geller 2001, p. 5). Vocational and career training brings in private money, which changes the nature of the institution. The curriculum needs to meet the demands of extensive technology-based learning, requiring continual upgrading of technological equipment and curriculum within the classroom which require large sums of money (Williams, 2005).

According to John Frye (1995), community colleges struggled to find their identity; he states that community college faculty was also “sensitive” of criticism from university faculty. The prejudice comes from the movement from high school to higher education in the form of secondary schools, as well as visions of grandeur by high school faculty desiring to be college professors, and high school principals aspiring to
administrative positions (Frye, 1995). The relevance to referring to this research explains the reverting nature of high school roots and their effect in the trend of community colleges beginning again to resemble high schools rather than secondary schools, and will be discussed in further detail in subsequent literature.

There are further problems, the geographic placement of two-year colleges on a state-by-state basis, is “not spread evenly throughout the country” (Phillippe, 2000, p. 5). Each state determines placement, and “structures,” leading to some states with many two-year schools compared to universities, and other states with fewer two-year schools compared to four-year universities (like the East Coast). The nature of diversity with placement partnered with the individuality of each school’s structure of record keeping, and governance, leads to little uniformity from state to state. Lack of records for transfer rates and various data can be linked to inaccurate data, poor technology, and lack of personnel to keep students on track for transfer can leave students feeling like the two-year process is an endless cycle (Song & Waters, 2011).

Research by Jones (2008) reports a trend called “Corporatization,” which is fueled by economic shortfalls and threatens the nature of community college. Jones focuses her research in California, and blames administrators for forming contracts with private corporations’ who are in need of a trained workforce, to dictate the curriculum to community colleges in order to adequately prepare vocational students for employment. This type of partnership is dangerous, according to Jones, and leads to “business modeling,” that is linked to “paying for a service.” The student “commodity” mentality gives students the perception that they are always right and grades are up for negotiations. The hiring of contingent faculty and part time instructors to teach
specialized classes needed for corporation training gives the student even more power over the institution, since part-time and contingent faculty are not part of the loop in matters of academic integrity and the goal of achieving specific “outcomes.” The part-time and contingent female faculty, who are primarily women, leads to disconnect and perceptions of discrimination, since the “at-will” instructor has no mentors to assist with the norms of the college. Jones stresses this partnership between corporations and institutions of higher learning can lead to inflated grades and pressure to pass inferior students in order to decrease the risk non-renewal of part-time faculty contracts the following semester (Jones, 2008).

Thus, community colleges evolved from preparatory institutions to “centers of learning” designed to prepare and guide the underprivileged and older adult returning student on a vocational career path or transfer education to universities toward a profession. The institution considered a jewel by American past presidents, like Ronald Reagan, and enhances communities with uniqueness based on each district’s own mission statement. Community colleges dot the land, providing easy access for all. Open enrollment, opportunities of employment in rural areas, and community enhancement are all credited to two-year institutions. The disadvantages community colleges bring is that open enrollment can restrict access, and poor advising can keep a student from progressing. Future trends can bring private money into community colleges which dictate a business model, leading to inflated grades and pressure on faculty to comply with the “commodity” student gives students assumed rights to dictate demands that are not part of the college experience. Faculty members and administration need shared governance to maintain the community college’s earned place in higher education. Male
and female faculty are expected to participate in governance roles in community colleges, and women have become an active voice in governance, as well as many other leadership roles on campus, but this wasn’t always the case.

Community College as a Profession

“Looking to the Future Profession in Community Colleges” concluded that teaching in community colleges is a legitimate profession (Townsend, 2007). The community college instructor does not rely on the university professors for ideas. With the exception of curriculum, little else resembled the university model. The author felt that in spite of the unique differences and lack of university similarities community college instructors still lacked integrity as “not distinct” as a profession.

With the birth of community colleges and the increased need for higher education during the 1960s, and with education made available through the G. I. Bill, the definition of community college continued to change with varying needs. No longer considered part of a high school, yet clearly not part of a university, it is safe to say community colleges may be categorized as a unique type of facility which offers people a second chance at an education (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).

In Community College Faculty: Overlooked and Undervalued Townsend and Twombly (2007) asks the question: “Is community college teaching a profession?” (p. 107). The author concluded community college teaching is a unique profession which is set apart from both ends of the spectrum (high school to university).

One of the factors measured was, What level of education is required to teach? Community college instruction traditionally requires a master’s degree, and high school
teaching requires a bachelor’s degree, and a university professor usually requires a
degree, Ph.D. (Townsend, 2007, p. 108). In the sense of education, the community
college boards set their own unique educational requirements. Faculty govern the
educational requirements by having Academic Senate groups which are faculty specific
and are influenced by labor unions with faculty membership, and by educational codes
that require college administrators to seek collegial consultation or shared governance
from the faculty. While community colleges have their own unique set of criteria for
governance, and teaching faculty requires higher degrees, Townsend is bothered because
the community college instructor is not taught to formally teach. In this internal struggle
Townsend (2007) is debating, she asks, “Is community college teaching beneficial as a
structure of higher education?” (p. 117). Townsend reluctantly conclude that, indeed,
teaching at a community college is a profession, and based their conclusions on higher
degrees required to teach at the community college.

Gender

Continuing with Townsend’s research, a two-year college hiring boom in the
eighties caused by retiring faculty, led to the hiring of female faculty members to fill
vacant positions. Family demands and economic changes led to pressure in society to
begin hiring women as community college instructors. According to Susan Twombly
(1995), the eighties was a “revitalization period” (p. 71). She focuses on leadership styles
and problems women faced in leadership at community colleges, and concludes with
facts that are representative of an independent female trying to navigate her way in a
man’s world. Twombly uses language to describe differences between men and women’s
leadership styles. Male leaders are as “stoic ship navigators and strong athletic coaches or military commanders,” while describing women as “teachers, weavers, collaborators and empower-ers” (p. 70). Twombly’s essay concludes that when it comes to leadership styles, “men conquer and women nurture” (pp. 72-77).

LaPaglia (1994) studied women in fictional genre and compared journal writings of reality among women in community college settings. LaPaglia begins her study with a quote from Noble (1994) stating that, “One occupational hazard of doing scholarly research on women is the possibility of failing to be taken seriously.” While this study is older, it makes points of how working women are portrayed through fictional genre. It is unclear if the genre casts the negative light or the genre masks the negative connotations, but the result produced the same effect. LaPalgia, asked women faculty at community colleges to keep journals to produce another side of “life at the community college,” other than the fictional life being portrayed in the media (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 47).

The study’s focus on fictional portrayal of women faculty in community college, according to LaPaglia (1995), claims the “community college and junior college, are ‘low status markers’ and [in her opinion] tell the viewer to not take this person seriously” (p. 48). Examples included a comment made by Donald Barthelme, who claimed “armadillo’s grow five to six feet in length and are allowed to teach at the junior college level” (as cited by LaPaglia, 1995, p. 48). Another example was a novel written by Walter Walker in 1989, which referred to junior colleges as “full of draft-dodgers, re-entry women and the very dumb” (as cited by LaPaglia, 1995, p. 48). The author further elaborates that societies’ opinion of the community college is that it is a place for white women, usually “powerless and uneducated, or recently divorced” (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 49)
The sir-names given in fictional genre paint a socio-economic picture as well. Names like “Bobbie Ray, Dean of LaMar Tech and Jolene Synder of Milwaukee Community College” (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 49) Women who taught at community colleges were portrayed in fictional genre (e.g., The Women’s Room as cited by LaPalia, 1994) as being female outcasts, over indulging alcoholics, and individuals who roamed the beaches in search of self, indicating the career caused the loss of control in their behavior (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 49).

LaPaglia (1995) takes the study to harsher fictional film portrayals depicting outspoken and “strong” women “should be dead women,” sending a male attitudinal message through fiction, that strong women would not be tolerated. Fictional women who “asserted power” were entering community colleges, and, in reality, they were entering community colleges as part of the women’s movement (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 50).

LaPaglia (1994) asked two dozen women students and fourteen female faculties in community colleges to journal their experiences for three weeks. The women shared commonalities, referenced by LaPaglia as follows: “Agency,” which meant the women, were making their own choices to further their goals. “Joy of Learning,” in which the women took time to build confidence and ended up with enlightenment. “Marginality,” the women experienced the feelings of being undervalued, and unappreciated, and joined in the cause to champion women. Lastly, “juggling,” as the studied women took on new responsibility as students and faculty as well as family duties, which was especially difficult if the woman was a single parent (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 51). And women were acutely aware that the sacrifices they were making to learn or teach came with ridicule from the larger culture.
Faculty shared some of the “problems they encountered and battles they had to fight” (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 52) but mostly the faculty commonalities were about the important work they were providing for their students, the sense of accomplishment they received by helping their students achieve success, and their struggles with ways to present material to a diversified audience. Female faculty had written discontent with male administrators, but understood praise for an accomplishment would never come, and believed if “he, the administrator, got the credit” things would go more smoothly (LaPaglia, 1995, p. 52).

Through research focusing on gender and teaching in community colleges, we may ask the question: do women find success as community college faculty? We are unable to find a variety of research about female faculty in community colleges until the 1980s, although there is some mention of female deans, long before the feminist movement who advised women in non-traditional ways. For example, in a 1945 issue of the Junior College Journal, Stuelke, a forward thinking female dean at Fullerton Women’s College had a unique opportunity to “change the course” of women’s educational goals. She promoted the idea of female students getting a “real education” by taking advantage of “sound consciousness” (determining one’s own mind) happening in the nation during this time (as cited by Frye, 1995, p. 11). Frye (1995) concluded that, before 1970, local and national management in community colleges was almost entirely male-dominated and also that community colleges had flawed missions and misguided goals regarding female issues, as interpreted by male leadership (pp. 17-18).

At the conclusion of Frye’s article, one is left to consider several questions such as: Were women steered away from master’s degrees due to influence from male
leadership? Did female staff end up at two-year colleges because men used two-year colleges as a platform to launch a higher career at universities? Why would women settle for two-year careers in 1970? And also, what has been the impact of women at the two-year educational level?

Gender and Community College Culture

The abstract from “Feeling a Bit Chilly: Exploring the Climate for Female Community College Faculty,” states that around the year 1981, Hall and Sander coined the phrase “Chilly Climate” to describe a negative experience for female students, faculty, and administrators (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001, p. 1). This study consisted of 740 female faculty responding to issues concerning their work environment, salary, and several other issues. The study was conducted in 1974, where 28% of the faculties in junior colleges were female, compared to 10% in other institutions. Data from 1997-1998 reveals that 38% of community college faculties were female compared to 19% at other institutions, indicating that community college system was favorable to increasing the hiring of female faculty at a greater rate than other institutions (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).

The study quotes an author of research named Barnard from 1964, who publicized a myth that women preferred teaching and service to research and scholarship, and that women were non-competitive and did not desire climbing the status ladder. The article continues with the idea that women had to “super-perform” to be considered equal to male colleagues. Along with working harder at work, women have to juggle family responsibilities of rearing children (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).
Such studies are biased in two ways according to Hagedorn and Laden (2001). The first tainting being that previous studies were only of white men in the western region. Through studies expanding Carol Gilligan’s work, the conclusion is made that women’s ways of “knowing” are a mystery since women had been ignored by psychological studies, which women work in “webs and nets,” and that women’s learning styles were different than men’s learning styles. Gilligan discusses female learning as “women’s way of knowing” (as cited by DiCroce, 1995, p. 81). This is described as the process, silently taking it all in, without needing to say a word “in the quest for self.” DiCroce (1995) describes female “ethos” as being loving, kind-hearted and incapable of leadership due to instinct (p. 81) as compared to “pyramids and hierarchal ladders like men” (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001, pp. 5-6).

Women spend more time teaching than men. The percentage of community college faculty is fifty eight percent female compared to forty six percent male, and only sixteen percent female faculty are involved in research compared to twenty seven percent male faculty. The author does point out that the purpose of community colleges is teaching and not research. There is a clear “distinction” of gender bias when it comes to faculty service areas and disciplines. The author states that women tend to be teaching in the areas of humanities and social sciences and men tend to be teaching “hard sciences” or law, along with mathematics. The difficulty for women teaching in community colleges, particularly in male-dominated disciplines is assumed to be a lack of mentoring, or “professional recognition,” by male colleagues and administrators. In an effort to research complaints by female faculty on gender discrimination the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), found female faculty “came up short.” As a result, several
“like” institutions have conducted their own studies with similar findings (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001, p. 8).

Hagedorn and Laden’s (2001) research lists two promotions: 1) from faculty to administrator and 2) division chair to a dean, other than occasional stipends for special assignments deemed by the institution there is no other advancement for faculty desiring to promote at a community college. Noted in the article, women found their career move (promotion from faculty to administrator, or faculty to division chair) blocked by male leaders in “power structure positions, which repress women and don’t allow for promotion or upward mobility” (p. 12).

However, it is better in two-year colleges than in four-year colleges, and females generally are active in their career advancements due to so many women being hired in the 1970s, as well as large amounts of female students influencing the hire of even more female faculty (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001, p. 12).

The study concluded that women make up half the workforce at community colleges and the number of females serving in administrative positions has been increasing, especially after 1995. The “chilly climate” does still exist, but not nearly as severe as it was once reported and is much better when compared to problems experienced by university female faculty.

Powers given to administration, the rise in student enrollment and budget cuts have resulted in overreaching administrators flexing their muscles and testing the foundations of tenure. Justified or not, the academic freedom and tenure process is under threat, uprooting long-time faculty for things that were once deemed acceptable practice. Part-time faculty is replacing the tenured track faculty member, which sends
mixed messages to the tenured faculty. David Wilson (2010) quotes the U.S. Department of Education 2007 report,

In 1987, fifty-four percent of community college faculty worked part time. Twenty years later, sixty-nine percent worked part time . . . only seventeen percent of community college faculty is in tenure-track positions, with fourteen percent in full time non-tenure track positions. (p. 2)

As females continued to fit into the workforce, national trends showed laws governing upward mobility for females were not enough to keep women from being placed at mid-level positions, and small percentages were present in top wage earning positions, and women felt they could not break through the invisible barrier (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001). Such studies were of course widely read, presumably shaping the perceptions of women teaching at the community college.

Glass Ceiling Effect

The glass ceiling is a term defining the entry of women or minorities into the work force, “a gender bias” encountered that is a unique type of discrimination. Four criterion are present when a true glass ceiling is present:

[as a] unique and identifiable form of discrimination, the criteria are (a) a gender or racial difference that is not explained by other job-relevant characteristics of the employee; (b) a gender or racial difference that is greater at higher levels of an outcome than at lower levels of an outcome; (c) a gender or racial inequality in the changes of advancement into higher levels, not merely the proportion of each gender or race currently at those higher levels; (d) a gender or racial inequality that increases over the course of a career. (Myers, 2010, p. 16)

Historically, President Kennedy was the leader who sought to change this culture, and through governmental process and policy, he set a course to equal the women’s entry into the labor force. Efforts were made and policies and commissions were formed. Barriers
remain, and this section will work to identify the barriers, and describe through literature, where America stands today in relation to the glass ceiling (Elacqua et al., 2009).

According to a study called *Perceptions of the Glass Ceiling Effect in Community Colleges*, a dissertation by Cheryl E. Myers, the history of gender equity legislation began in 1961, when President John F Kennedy sanctioned a committee to oversee gender equity with Executive Order 10925. The charge of the committee was directed toward federal contractors to “take affirmative action in employment to ensure individuals are not discriminated against on the basis of race, creed, color or natural origin” (p. 4). The committee was called the *Equal Employment Opportunity Committee* and, at the same time, President Kennedy established the *President’s Commission on the Status of Women*. At this time in history, the fate of women and discrimination was in its early stages, and it was clear that discrimination was occurring. The charge of the commission and committee was to examine gender discrimination by law, in education and in the workplace (p. 12).

Legislation was as passed to deal with gender inequity in pay. This included the *Equal Pay Act* in 1963, which began as an amendment to increase minimum wage and other salary imbalances. The Equal Pay Act calls for equal pay for equal work for all. Merit pay and other “pay differentials” were permitted as long as the subject was not gendered (Myers, 2010).

In the beginning of the Civil Rights upheaval, legislation was enacted to forbid gender or minority discrimination in the workplace. In 1964, *The Civil Rights Act, Title VII*, created written law to prevent discrimination against “women and minorities in hiring, firing, and compensation” (p. 12). The legislation investigates claims of
discrimination based on race, religion and origin under the jurisdiction of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The commission launches full investigations to prove or disprove allegations, bringing charges against violators, or dismissing accusations based on insufficient evidence (Myers, 2010).

Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 were the beginning of a progressive wave toward affirmative action legislation. This established criteria for federal contractors to hire without prejudice to race and gender. Contractors had to submit a hiring plan to the Department of Labor, which complied with the orders and affirmative action criteria (Myers, 2010).

With discrimination laws in place, the time came to move affirmative action from private corporations receiving federal money to institutions of higher education, both public and private. The Executive Order in 1972, which extended affirmative action to institutions receiving federal money, led to Title IX of the education code and became an avenue of equal opportunity for educational institutions. Title IX was followed by the Pregnancy Act in 1978, which gave women the right to have children without loss of employment status and benefits, treating pregnancy as a disability rather than something that should be penalized (Myers, 2010).

Since the 1980s, the federal government is an active supporter in leveling discrimination and recognizing the “Glass Ceiling Effect” which presumably was thought to exist only in “corporate America.” During this time, the government, through agencies like the Department of Labor and the Glass Ceiling Commission created in 1991, brought legitimacy to the discrimination practices in this country, and discriminated individuals began to feel the implementation of equal opportunity employment as the American
workforce was heavily scrutinized through studies and findings that revealed “advancements” and “barriers” to women and minorities in corporations and institutions of higher learning. This article continues with findings, which all four publications confirmed with documentation that “the glass ceiling as an invisible barrier that confronts women and people of color as they approach the top of the corporate hierarchy” (Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009, p. 462).

As the governmental agencies continued to investigate the “glass ceiling effect,” barriers were identified through a study conducted in 1991 by the Department of Labor using the nine Fortune 500 companies (Meyers, 2010, p. 17). The study included a wide variety of companies with varying numbers of employees. The companies reviewed consisted of seven industries and five “geographic regions.” The study found “common threads” and reported that women and minorities were stuck in “low levels of management, and did not promote” (Meyers, 2010, p. 17). The EEOC concluded that principles were not being followed at corporate levels. Tracking and monitoring systems were not in place to report on progress being made within the company. Discrimination in regards to salary discrepancies was not monitored. Women and minorities held positions that did not lead to promotion, while promoted employees were given preference to hold positions that trained for advancement. Lastly, “records to record ‘recruitment, employment, and developmental activities,’ were nonexistent, even though they were required to by the EEOC” (Myers, 2010, p. 18).

Myer’s research is important to community colleges because the same structure exists in governmental agencies, including colleges. The EEOC has a charge to
protect all agencies that employ women and minorities, and community college faculty and students fit the EEOC’s oversight charge.

This study concluded that barriers pertaining to organization and institution prevented minorities from entry to employment from areas of basic employment job announcements to search firms being unaware of EEOC requirements to offer minorities the opportunity to advance to higher positions within the company. A study was initiated in 1992 by the Merit System Protection Board which surveyed 13,000 employees in the federal government (Myers, 2010, p. 18). This study concluded “education and experience” to be the two factors of most importance, and the ability to move around being the third factor to advance in a federal career. Promotion was based on enthusiasm, performance, and time spent at the workplace, which led to reward and rank increase. Women with children were unable to meet this criterion, and were often passed up for promotion due to time constraints created by the need to care for family, which appeared to reflect “less commitment” to the job (Myers, 2010).

This particular study quoted the Department of Labor as positively reporting that women’s success was increased by twenty seven percent from 1979 to 2002 in management or “professional specialty occupations,” but the growth was in “traditional positions,” which consist of non-masculine roles including service-oriented and nurturing positions. The “barriers” keeping women from “top management positions” were identified and categorized to include “Societal, Internal Structures, and Governmental Barriers” (Myers, 2010, p. 20). As described by the study, “societal barriers” were limits to the applicant possessing enough education and the lack of qualified women to assume roles of higher management positions. “Internal Structures” blamed businesses for their
lack of mentoring, recruiting, and trend of corporations to be mindful of promotion and
advancement within their own organization, while denying opportunities of promotion to
minorities as a result of ignorance or negligence of management to include or reach out to
the under-represented. Lastly, the “governmental barriers” included inefficient record
keeping, inaccurate monitoring of promotion and improper enforcement of laws
pertaining to the glass ceiling.

The barriers tended to mask how policies were enforced, and continued a
culture of discrimination “by default,” sending a message to reporting agencies that
companies and governmental agencies were complying, even though discrimination was
continuing. The research concluded that there is little research to draw upon that
“identifies and investigates the glass ceiling effect,” which led to “factors” to study the
glass ceilings that were equal in measurement (Myers, 2010, pp. 29-30). The studies had
a wide variety of study-methods which were believed to misrepresent the findings, and
offered no help to minorities or gender to identify what method of study best measured
the effects of the glass ceiling (Myers, 2010, pp. 28-29).

While it is evident that a glass ceiling did exist in the corporate world, the
government turned the study onto their own agency by investigating a glass ceiling effect
within government agencies. In 1992, the Merit Stems report was released called “A
Question of Equity: Women and the Glass Ceiling in the Federal Government.” “Thirteen
thousand employees were surveyed, with a sixty-six percent return rate, and found one in
four supervisors and one in ten executives were women” (Myers, 2010, pp. 19-20). Three
areas for advancement in the federal government were listed in the study that led to
promotion: education, experience, and the ability to relocate. Oddly, the ability to
relocate was the highest marker for promotion, since employees who relocated received more promotions. This study revealed that women who performed a satisfactory job, but were not in the office as long as male colleagues, were perceived as not having as much commitment to the job and were therefore passed up for promotion. The expectation of a woman to transfer for promotion was also problematic, due to the uprooting of the family (Myers, 2010).

Examining a glass ceiling effect has resulted in little research. However, Myers (2010) does address a study done by Parsad and Glover, where the glass ceiling is examined in gender differences in tenure at community colleges. Women have not had the same opportunities in their educational pursuits. “Biases and stereotyping toward the roles of women in the workplace and gender, led to differences in educational opportunity” (Myers, 2010, p. 22). A study by Parsad and Glover stated that without educational opportunities, the entire career selection leads to lack of promotion (as cited by Myers, 2010, p. 24). The census quoted in the study from the nineties concluded men earned higher wages than women at all educational levels, and the higher the level of education the more the pay discrepancy equaled out. Stereotyping of gendered roles from academic leaders led to advising women to follow in home and family oriented educational paths. Teachers’ attentions would follow suit, and women venturing into science and lab type courses would not receive the same opportunities as men already placed in the traditional “male” educational career path (Myers, 2010, p. 24).

Continuing with Myer’s (2010) research, women’s work in the labor force consisted of “clerical positions, public relations, education, nursing, and healthcare, and the women who did get into a man’s profession and taught, were hired into lower ranking
staff positions” (p. 24). In conclusion, according to the societal barriers Myer’s found in literature, women in college were advised to take “softer” subjects more suited to women’s traditional roles in society, which would limit her educational choices and give her less education which would lead to less experience which would lead to lesser income.

Women faculty were often left out of social groups that would alert and prepare them for promotion within the institutions.

Inadequate recruitment practices (often by word of mouth); as men hold most upper management positions, cause the women to be unaware of upcoming promotions. A lack of opportunities to participate in professional development can lead to less education and opportunity and a lack of understanding were interpreted by male colleague as non-commitment. (Meyers, 2010, p. 24)

Meyers (2010) also said that women did not frequent men’s venues, such as bars, and golf courses, missing opportunities to rub elbows with decision makers, further limiting their chances of promotion, including presumably that for entry into tenure track positions.

In the glass ceiling effect in academia, women tend to “adopt an approved feminine subtype in order to succeed.” In an article entitled “The Glass Ceiling and the Maternal Wall in Academia” Williams (2005) asserted, “the women who succeed are the ones who know their place” (p. 97). Their place was described as downplaying competence and being nice, friendly, and helpful with members of the “dominant group.” The problem stated by Williams was, in academia, the “brilliant woman may fail to meet the unarticulated expectation that women be sociable and reassuring” (p. 97). A male colleague who is competitive could become threatened by a competent woman, and set a course to derail her as a competitor, using any method, even sexual harassment (p. 97).
The community college’s teaching structure includes full-time faculty, and part-time or contingent faculty. Faculty’s goals are unique for desiring to teach at a community college, but in rural communities, the pay is usually higher than the local high school teaching positions, and a relaxed atmosphere with flexible hours. Once the decision was made to continue with a career at a community college, tenure becomes crucial.

Tenure

Tenure is awarded to faculty at the end of probationary employment and the offering of permanent employment status. This process according to collective bargaining rights typically takes “no more than six years.” Once a faculty member is granted tenure status, they can only be dismissed from employment on the basis of “just cause,” or other “permissible cause” and not before the faculty member has a “hearing before a body of his or her academic peers” (Fossey & Wood, 2004, p. 52).

In contrast, a non-tenured faculty member (part-time or contingent) receives a semester contract and, at the end of the period of time agreed upon, has no guarantee of continued employment. A part-time faculty member usually teaches one or two classes per semester, and contingent faculty is full-time non-tenured faculty, hired as “temporary.” Contingent and part-time faculties are used in community colleges to compliment tenured full-time faculty member’s teaching loads (American Federation of Teachers, 2009).

In 1925, the first statement regarding tenure and academic freedom came forth in a conference which set forth a set of principles introducing tenure. Several associations
quickly jumped on board and by 1934 a “Series of Joint Conferences” included the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges were involved. In 1940, a set of principles were drafted and approved by the same associations. In 1966, an ethics code was adopted, followed by a ‘revised interpretations’ of the principles. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopted a resolution on tenure and academic freedom. That same year, the National Education Association (NEA) adopted the statements to apply to higher education. As of 1995, the Association of University Professors has 156 organizations that have also adopted the Statement of Principles” (ASCCC, 1998, p. 4).

Tenure is the ultimate ‘glass ceiling’ for full time faculty teaching in a community college. Scholars claimed, in an article by the California Academic Senate report, that tenure is about protecting the “university’s integrity” by giving the instructor the right to engage in academic freedom without consequence from his or her peers. Tenure involves meeting board-initiated criteria, approved through peer evaluations over a period of four to no longer than six years which then enables a faculty member to earn a permanent position within the institution. In the event tenure is not awarded, faculty is typically dismissed. Once a faculty member is tenured, he or she cannot be “let go” for any reason other than just cause, and is free to teach as he or she interprets the curriculum. The institution’s integrity is at stake because the student is taught the philosophies of the curriculum as presented through the lens of the instructor, who should deliver a passionate presentation of the material. Tenure is the prize sought after by faculty who desire to teach as a “way of life” giving them the ease of exercising academic freedom without fear of sanction from administration (Kussrow, 2000, p. 10).
The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in an article entitled “Academic Freedom and Tenure; A Faculty Perspective,” gave criteria on academic freedom as the

freedom to inquire, which includes all aspects of a topic, be it controversial or a viewpoint with the idea that the critical thinking process is crucial to the learning process. The same right extends to the student, who has similar rights as the instructor, with the privilege of a classroom free of judgments, prejudices and intimidation. (1998, p. 12)

The instructor has the right to “due process and peer review,” which gives the instructor and the administration a set of guidelines to explore “inquiry and accountability.”

Equally, students have rights to grades free from “political influence.” The student can challenge his /her grades based on criteria within a due process system set in place through state education code within the institution (ASCCC, 1998, p. 12).

Due process protections enable the faculty member to assist with the governance of their college. Tenure tolerates freedom without retaliation to ‘criticize and question’ the operations of the institution without retribution or harassment for doing so. This right includes criticism of the elected board, the administration, and also fellow colleagues. The article claims that without the freedom to criticize, the entire college is polluted (ASCCC, 1998, p. 12).

The ability to give instructors license to “teach and model ethical reasoning” by teaching similar content of some controversy, models the way in which the private and public sector are intertwined. As private industry comes to the institution for needs and it may become mixed with financial outcomes within the institutions, thus affecting the integrity of education. Tenure helps students be independent in the world around them,
while gaining the education to live within a democratic society as a contributing member (ASCCC, 1998, p. 13).

Tenure and academic freedom are mingled at the higher level of education. Non-tenured faculty has few rights. If dismissed “for cause,” the institution must offer training or devise a plan of improvement for non-tenured faculty, but in fact most administrators choose to not renew non-tenured faculty without stating a cause. Tenured faculties do have rights under the tenure process, but cases can be made for specific reasons (insubordination, immoral conduct not pertaining to content of classroom lectures) and eventually lead to termination if the process has been followed. However, these cases often end up in court with a panel of peers and administrative judge’s ruling on the conduct in question. The faculty member gets paid leave during the proceedings, but the process can lead to termination and possible “payback” should the faculty member lose the case. Tenure and academic freedom are protection for the faculty, but not a guaranteed protection.

Historically, institutions have not dismissed tenured faculty except for “serious” misconduct, but several court cases demonstrate how tenure is upheld for both tenured and non-tenured faculty. Non-tenured faculties have no rights. The court case quoted in “Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective” (ASCCC, 1998) was Board of Regents v. Roth (1972). The court ruled that failure to renew a non-tenured faculty contract was the right of the board and did not require “due process.” Unless the faculty member is not renewed based on misconduct of some type, the institution may simply decide not to renew. A firing for misconduct, where the conduct is identified and
given as a “cause” and does require some level of due process, and is often informal (Fossey & Wood, 2004).

In the case of Academic Freedom, the courts ask, if “public speech” is in question, is the speech of “a marketplace of ideas,” or “is it a matter of public concern?” If the speech is a matter of public concern, a second question is asked about the content of speech being balanced regarding a negative impact against the institution’s operations, which includes “impact on employee morale, workplace harmony, or employee’s relationship with a superior” (Fossey & Wood, 2004, p. 55). In regards to academic freedom, free speech may protect an employee of the district or may work against the employee, depending on how it is used (Fossey & Wood, 2004).

But, academic freedom inside the classroom is limited to course content, grades, and faculty evaluations. Outside the classroom, the faculty member can speak or write without worry of reprisal. Few cases have brought charges against academic freedom regarding outside writings. If students are offended, historically the institutions have given students a right to take a different section of the course with a different instructor (Fossey & Wood, 2004, p. 61).

The component of academic freedom provides job security combined with the culture of “learning” causes faculty members to aspire to achieve tenure status. Thus, tenure is the “glass ceiling.” The freedom to teach without reprisal on controversial topic matters is the sought after prize, but are tough economic times threatening the tenure process and keeping certain genders from even getting a shot at hitting a “glass ceiling?”

A new trend that has emerged in the downturn of the economy is the need to hire part-time or contingent faculty. American Federation of Teachers (2009) reported
that tenured faculty declined to eighteen percent, down to one quarter the amount reported in 1997, and contingent faculty hiring is up eighty-two percent in all areas of higher education. While community college administrators are allowed to have fluctuating numbers of non-tenured faculty (it also varies from state-to-state), the trend is not to replace with tenure track faculty, but to replace with contingent or part-time faculty. Administrative hiring grew by forty-one percent, and “other professionals” grew by 50%. In relation to growth and gender, women grew at a faster rate than men and accounted for 48% of tenured college faculty, while men grew at 21%. However, the areas of female growth in faculty positions were mostly in contingent faculty hired during the reported ten-year period (American Federation of Teachers, 2009, pp. 3-4).

Simply put, the community college student is being served by less-tenured faculty and more part-time and contingent female faculty, with more administrators and non-instructional personnel to service the school and the student. American Federation of Teachers (2009) primarily focused on “higher education” (lumping both two and four-year levels together) in general, the study claims the trend is “system wide” and not specific to community colleges.

An article by Kussrow (2000), “The Myth of Tenure,” quotes President Brand as saying “Being a faculty member is not a job, it’s a life” (p. 8). This gives credence to faculty being excited about learning and viewing their job as a privilege to serve and influence students (p. 9). The premise of this work suggests that collective bargaining through union representatives erodes the rights of tenure, to the point that today “tenure is a myth.” Kussrow suggests steps that tenured faculty need to give to their bargaining unit’s representative to include proper language which safeguards tenure. He outlines
steps for contracts to include a written process for dismissal, should the need arise, “making it fair for the employee who may be at the end of an administrative witch-hunt” (2000, p. 7).

If tenure is the ultimate goal for faculty, then the trend of administrative hiring practices is headed in the opposite direction. An article by David Wilson (2010) begins with a journalism instructor being under the scope of administrative disapproval for exposing alleged removal of powers for faculty, fiscal mismanagement, and student mistreatment. The faculty member in question was warned to “back off,” and told he was “headed down the wrong path.” When the instructor, refused to comply he was reassigned by administration, and was removed from the paid position of “journalism advisor.” (The “extra-curricular” activities also give faculty rewards either monetarily or by allowing personal growth by serving students). Wilson explained, this type of reprisal represents ways in which tenure and academic freedom can be eroded until it becomes culturally non-existent (2010).

These examples are cases where a faculty member could perceive a culture of the glass ceiling effect. Tenure is the glass ceiling, but monetary advancements were mentioned by Myers (2010) in her dissertation and being an activities advisor would be considered a stipend. If taken away a faculty member could perceive a demotion, and the glass ceiling effect would apply.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

After careful review of the literature, it is apparent that regardless of legislative efforts to lessen the “glass ceiling” by hiring equal numbers of faculty, women faculty that still believe that inequality in hiring exists on community college campuses. This was particularly the case with both hiring for tenure track positions, and eventual promotion to tenured states. This seems to be the case not only in the faculty of community colleges of the rural areas that I am interested in, but also more generally.

To answer the question of why these perceptions exist, I propose to use qualitative research in order to understand how women perceived their career trajectories at a rural community college in northern California. Such methods are advantageous because they are designed to illuminate how actors give meaning to both their social world, and their own actions in ways that quantitative methods do not. To do this selected twelve participants to take part in the case study (Thomas & Nelson, 2001, p. 32).

In order to frame the problem, I looked at available yearbooks located in the college library, which exist from 1951-present. I did this in order to identify the historical trajectory of the gender mix within the faculty. The yearbooks continue sporadically from 1951 until the early seventies, when course catalogs (published every other year until 2009) replace Yearbooks in listing faculty and assigned disciplines. Charts depict
female-to-male ratios in hiring for full-time faculty as determined from the yearbooks and
course catalogs, but these do not depict if men or women were full-time or part-time
faculty, since it is not listed in either source.

In collecting such data, the interview is the most common instrument for
qualitative research (Thomas & Nelson, 2001, p. 263). “Qualitative interviews gives the
essence of being present by observation” (Thomas & Nelson, 2001, p. 351). The
framework of my research questions were open-ended, and began with socio-
demographic information (p. 336), seeking the length of time the employee has or had
been employed with the community college district, the person’s name, age, and length of
service with the district, and then begins the nature of the hiring process questions begin;
were you employed by processes (Myers, 2010). The second phase of the interview
framework inquires about tenure track and academic freedom. The third framework
structure is about “perceptions” (Elacqua et al., 2009; Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).

A formal interview schedule for the qualitative research was developed to
elicit how participants gave meaning to the roles in which they play. Questions for the
interview schedule were developed about the employment process because it established
a level of equality if the process was followed. Thus, participants were asked if they felt
they were given academic freedom before and after tenure (Kussrow, 2000). The study
set out to determine if the college’s female faculty were given different job descriptions
after they were hired (Geller, 2007) and if during the time of their employment, did the
female faculty desire promotion, and if affirmative, did receive promotion (Myers, 2010).
Lastly, questions regarding female perceptions of equality including if the female faculty
member “perceived” a lack of respect from male colleagues, inequality of treatment
compared to male colleagues, and if the women felt they had to “super-perform” their job to gain the respect of their male colleagues (Hagedorn & Laden, 2001).

In the interview/selection process, in order to have a valid sample for addressing the question about how women understood the hiring process, it was important to create a wide sample of full-time female faculty members including those who have or were previously employed, currently employed, and retired from the community college. Participants were selected from available disciplines currently offered at the institution. Disciplines represented, but not listed on the questionnaire include, basic skills, English, reading, physical education, criminal justice, and political science. Holders of administrative positions including former Instructional Deans and former athletic director, child development, workability II coordinator including DSPS, and journalism were also included.

Participants were selected by longevity (trying to capture participants with fifteen years or longer with the district). A conscious effort was made to select participants from each discipline. Because the rural college is small, with approximately fifteen female faculties, it was difficult to find participants who were willing, and who trusted my motives in doing the research. Four participants had retired within the year, and two of the four retired participants had been retired over ten years. I purposely did not select new tenured female faculty, for fear their answers would not represent their true feelings, since fear of retaliation could be present (junior faculty risk lay-offs as the economic downturn intensifies for community college districts like ours).

An interview schedule was developed to structure the interviews consistently. They were given the option to respond in person, by phone, or through email, thus
creating an environment most comfortable to the participant. During the one live interview, the participant handed me her pre-written questions, which we then discussed over lunch. The one phone conversation was an effort to “capture” the interview due to computer literacy issues, the participant had her questions with her and we went through each question without explanation, she dictated and I typed her answers. Such interview schedules are typically designed to capture structured commentary without discouraging extemporaneous comment. No participants were allowed to see other faculties’ responses, discuss other participants, and were never told names of participants in the study, in an effort to narrow the focus on the individual participant’s experience.
CHAPTER IV

DATA RESULTS

Disciplines taught at the rural community college in northern California were listed in the yearbooks in the college’s library and spanned the years listing “faculty” in 1940, and began listing faculty “disciplines” in 1951. After 1974, course catalogs replaced Yearbooks, and were published every other year (Table 1).

Questions for the interview schedule were developed about the employment process, if job descriptions after they were hired changed, and did the female faculty desire promotion, and if affirmative, did in-fact receive the desired promotion. The structure also set out to measure if the female faculty member “perceived” a lack of respect from male colleagues, inequality of treatment compared to male colleagues, and if the women felt they had to “super-perform” their job to gain the respect of their male colleagues. This information is contained in Table 2.

Research from the Library

Hiring patterns were viewed from yearbooks and course catalogs housed in the rural community college’s library. In the first ten years, disciplines were not identified for male/female faculty. The title stated “Faculty and staff.” The data went from 1940 to 2009. Prior to 1972, several yearbooks were missing. The data collected is based on yearbooks available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction trades</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunsmithing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworking</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Drawing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Life)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Biology</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library studies</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking</td>
<td>F (1952)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Lab</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In a 1945 issue of the *Junior College Journal*, Stuelke, a forward thinking female dean at Fullerton Women’s College, had a unique opportunity to “change the course” of women’s educational goals. She promoted women get a “real education” by taking advantage of “sound consciousness” happening in the nation during this time (as cited by Frye, 1995). Frye concluded that before 1970, local and national management in community colleges was almost “entirely male dominated.”

During the forties and early fifties, the Yearbooks do not identify disciplines or gendered faculty, it was uncertain if women were in management roles as suggested by Frye, or if the females were full-time faculty members. There was a clear pattern of women being present in the yearbooks during the forties, which suggested that the rural community college had male and female faculty that were fairly even, with four of the
Table 2

Results of 12 Questions Asked of Female Faculty at a Rural Northern California Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Response Categories (Counts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How long have you worked at the college?</td>
<td>1-5yrs (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-15yrs (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15+yrs (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has your job title changed since you were hired?</td>
<td>Yes (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you apply through a traditional process?</td>
<td>Yes (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were there other applicants?</td>
<td>Yes (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you work at another community college prior to this college?</td>
<td>Yes (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once employed at the college were you placed on the tenure track?</td>
<td>Yes (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prior to tenure, did you feel you had academic freedom?</td>
<td>Yes (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Once tenured, how did you view academic freedom?</td>
<td>Same (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With reserve (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you feel you were treated equally to male colleagues?</td>
<td>Yes (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus?</td>
<td>Yes (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer?</td>
<td>Yes (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Did you feel you had to do a “super performance” to be considered to your male colleagues?</td>
<td>Yes (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
women continuing on for several years, two of the four women went on to become faculty emeriti. These two women faculty members held Master’s degrees and a doctorate degree from prestigious universities. The rural college was ahead of their time in hiring trends for that era, and there was a time when the male-to-female female ratio appeared to be even, but unclear what positions the women held as “faculty.”

Tillery and Deegan (1985, as cited by Geller, 2001) refer to “generations” of post-secondary school expansion. The “first generation” is from 1900-1930, which consisted mostly of expansion of existing universities, adding post-secondary schools to the institution. The second generation, 1930-1950, is the “junior college generation,” followed by the third generation, 1950-1970, known as the “community college generation,” the fourth generation being labeled the “comprehensive community college,” and a fifth and sixth generation were not named because the author of the book Geller is quoting was writing during the fifth generation, but Terry O’Banion is quoted by Geller as an ad hoc name for the missing generations, suggested the sixth generation to current day be called, “the learning community college” (Geller, 2001, p. 2).

It is evident that this rural community college began during the “second generation” and continued to progress throughout Geller’s quote of “generations” ending with the “learning community college.” The evolving community college does flex and bend with needs and trends, and the rural college is no exception. It began small, and as part of a high school campus, and during the GI Bill boom, separated from the high school and moved up on the hill outside of town, distinguishing themselves as a post-high school, the next level in higher education (Townsend, 2006).
The disciplines taught at the rural community college were listed in the yearbooks in the college’s library and spanned the years listing “faculty” in 1940, and began listing faculty “disciplines” in 1951. The disciplines included gunsmith, forestry, math, history, architecture, auto, woodworking, chemistry, physics, art, music, business and physical education. These subjects were taught by men, and women’s subjects included, English, foreign language, psychology, library, and physical education (overlapped with male instruction). Homemaking was added in 1952. In 1956, physical education and mechanical drawing added two male instructors, and Accounting was added with a female instructor. The male art instructor was replaced with a female instructor. In 1958, the college added a male instructor to teach English, music, and social science. Reading lab was added with a female instructor.

The seventies and eighties show a pattern of male faculty domination at the rural college. In 1972, the college had two female instructors, one in physical education and the other female in social science. Male instructors in 1972 taught a variety of courses including, journalism, art, criminal justice (2 instructors), social science (4 instructors), math (2 instructors), business, English (3 instructors), sciences including life and biology (2 instructors), forestry (5 instructors), engineering, gunsmith, physics, and agriculture. In 1975, the rural college added male instructional positions in construction trades, welding, philosophy, political science, and work experience and library science.

In 1976-1977, four female faculty remained teaching in educational testing, health, psychology, and reading; 29 male instructors taught subjects listed above, but they added a male counselor and a male geology instructor, and further assigned men to teach English and business. In 1979, an anthropology and Native American coordinator
were added to the male instructional side, while the female faculty continued in basic skills learning, nursing, psychology, reading, and special education, and added two female instructors in physical education and English.

In Barbara Townsend’s research, a two-year college hiring boom in the 1980s which resulted from retiring faculty, led to the hiring of female faculties to fill vacant positions. Family demands and economic changes led to pressure in society to begin hiring women as community college instructors. The eighties were referred to as a “revitalization period” (Townsend, 2006).

During the 1980s, women continued to teach at a lower ratio than men at the rural college. Women taught in educational testing, nursing, psychology, reading, English and physical education, and two retired faculty Emirati returned to teach a second English class and fulfill psychology/counseling duties. The college added male faculty in new subjects including, humanities, media, speech, and business economics, as well as having multiple instructors in life and physical sciences, counseling, and forestry. In 1982, the college added another female English instructor, a female librarian, and business instructor, and its first female counselor.

In 1992-1993, the rural college added a female to teach biology, which was an unprecedented move toward modern trends. The Hagedorn and Laden (2001) study indicates that there is gender bias when it comes to faculty service areas and disciplines. Hagedorn and Laden state that women tend to be teaching in the areas of humanities and social sciences and men tend to be teaching “hard sciences” or law, along with mathematics.
Currently, the rural college is fairly even and consistent with national averages with male/female ratios, with one female instructor teaching biology, a female instructor teaching math (the same two females hired in 1992 and 1996) and several women teaching in English, counseling, health and human services, humanities, social science, criminal justice, career guidance, health, basic skills, disabled learning, physical education, and one female part-time coach. Male instruction includes chemistry, forestry, health, math, business, media, psychology, health and human services, English, math, physical education, and journalism. There is one part-time female coach, along with five part-time male coaches and one full-time male coach who coaches two of the four female sports. Rodeo was recently listed as a sport at the college and their staff has one full-time male coach and one part-time female. The athletic director was removed as a faculty position and currently considered a management position; the athletic director is a male. The former athletic female respondent felt she had to work harder than any athletic director, she also felt she had to “bend over backwards to meet her department’s needs.”

The “glass ceiling effect” for the community colleges began around the same time as the emergence of female faculty hiring in higher institutions. The employment equality level was so bad across the public and private sector that legislators had to act to create a more equitable work environment. The Equal Pay Act, Civil Rights Act, Title VII, Title IX, The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Affirmative Action and the extension of affirmative action to include any agency who accepted federal money required compliance with equitable laws (Myers, 2010).

It is interesting to see a pattern emerge from the chart in Appendix B and C, the rural college did fall well below hiring trends in the seventies and eighties in regard to
gender. It is not clear why for two decades, and during the establishment of federal laws to correct the equitable work environment, that rural college was able to escape scrutiny of affirmative action activists. Theories suggested by one casual conversation from a retired faculty member, who suggested the college president at the time had a pattern of hiring men, and did not care to employ women for unknown reasons (Appendix J). There is still a trend of men coaching male and female sports, along with the Athletic Director, since having the one and only female athletic director over a decade ago, who served in that role for a short two years.

Limitations

It is not stated in the rural community college yearbooks if the faculty listed were full or part-time instructors, or if the listed females were a total of faculty and management personnel, including office assistants. Only two of the four female faculty members who consistently appear in the 1940-1950s Yearbooks became faculty emeriti, indicating that they had retired from the college. With further inquiry of long time residents, only the two retired faculty emeriti are remembered as being employed full-time at the institution.

Interview Results

☐ Question 1. How many years have you worked or currently are working for the rural northern California community college?

Selection was based on seasoned faculty who had devoted most of their lives or who will be devoting most of their lives to the rural college. One faculty member is no longer with the district, and one is currently employed with Lassen College, but
below the fifteen-year mark. Ten women have worked at the college over fifteen years, and five of the females interviewed have retired from the district.

☐ **Question 2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process?**

This question is important to establish if proper processes were in place and being used in hiring faculty, to ensure equal employment opportunity, pursuant to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s Charge.

☐ **Questions 3. Has your job title changed once you were hired?**

The “glass ceiling” is an invisible barrier, according to research (Elacqua et al., 2009). The Department of Labor quoted by the authors, discussed “advancements and barriers” confronting women from 1979 to 2002. The study considered “professional specialty occupations” and found growth primarily within “traditional positions.” Four barriers were listed that keep women from meeting their career goals. The one that applies to this study was “Internal Structures,” which blames the lack of mentoring, recruiting, and corporations, and their lack of consideration for gender advancements.

Interestingly, eleven of the twelve female faculty interviewed had some type of job change within the institution. While none of the women have complained about the many moves, it seems suspicious as to why so many would be working in so many different positions. Without mentoring, the faculty member might not understand their new position, and be interpreted as poor performance. Two faculty members obtained more education in order to promote, one from classified to a faculty position, the other to leave a particular discipline and begin instruction in a different discipline.
The rural college has moved women faculty within the college for various reasons. It is unclear if mentoring or recruitment was the reason for the changes in job placement, but it is clear it happened frequently.

This question establishes a pattern of whether a hiring process was in place and followed, and also help with questions to determine if women applicants were immediately placed on the tenure track, or had to wait for various reasons. Ten of the women were hired by a traditional hiring practice. The females submitted an application, were part of an interview process, and were selected by a committee or by the president, in accordance with the hiring practices in place at that time. One of the twelve female faculties was promoted within, however she believed she still applied and was interviewed for the promotion, and her initial hiring was held in accordance to the current policy when she applied. The second of the twelve female faculties was hired outright, being recommended for the position from a visiting dean, and was offered the job immediately.

The rural community college appears to have a history of developing and implementing a hiring process, and placing faculty on the tenure track. Only two exceptions, and both were situations beyond the scope of a traditional hire, yet both instructors received promotion without question of offering tenure.

- **Question 5. Did you work at another community college prior to employment at this college?**

Nine of the women faculties began their careers at the rural college, and three women had previously been employed at other community colleges. The three that have worked at other colleges seemed to have more critical views of certain aspects of
management. The remaining nine could be disadvantaged, based on a lack of knowledge as to how other institutions operate.

Question 6. Once employed at the rural community college in northern California were you placed on the tenure track?

Tenure track hiring is under threat of extinction according to Fossey and Wood (2004). Tenure is the “end of probation,” and is the highest level a faculty member can aspire to at a community college. With economic hardships, institutions are reluctant to hire full-time faculty and place them on the tenure track. It is important to establish the process of hiring female faculty, and determining if the rural college placed women on the tenure track.

According to the research, the rural community college has a good track record of placing women on the tenure track when the instructor is hired full-time. Ten of the twelve women were hired and placed on the tenure track, and granted tenure at the end of the probationary period. Two of the women’s positions did not include tenure with their initial contract. One of the two women applied to promote to a faculty position, and she was granted a tenure track contract. The second woman was hired on a grant which did not offer a tenured position, however the second year she applied and was offered a tenured track faculty position.

The rural community college in northern California does offer tenure to female instructors. Women seem to be given full rights and privileges when hired as faculty at the institution. This is a forward thinking move on the institution’s part. Wilson (2010) quotes from the U.S. Department of Education 2007 report, “In 1987, fifty-four percent of community college faculty worked part-time. Twenty years later, sixty-nine percent
worked part time . . . only seventeen percent of community college faculty as a whole is in tenure-track positions” (p. 1).

Our college appears to be well above average in granting tenure to female faculty. Trends could change quickly given the economic hardships facing California community colleges, but today it does not seem to be an issue.

Questions 7 and 8. Prior to Tenure, did you feel you had academic freedom? The following question asks, “Once tenured, how do you view academic freedom?”

These two questions work together to establish “perceptions” on how this rural community college has historically viewed and continues to view academic freedom.

All the female faculties’ responses in this interview seemed overwhelmingly positive toward the institution’s attitude regarding academic freedom before and after being granted tenure. Nine spoke favorably in the way in which the administration has allowed a culture that embraces academic freedom by full-time faculty. For the past thirty years, the remarks of the faculties interviewed praise the rural college for allowing academic freedom to breed and foster a learning environment, most comments were either “yes we had complete academic freedom before and after tenure,” or “academic freedom was never questioned.” One faculty member stated her first president told her, “Don’t tell me how to do my job and I won’t tell you how to do yours,” she elaborated that his job was money and her job was teaching (Appendix O). It was easy to conclude that administration and the rural college’s board honor the right for a faculty member to teach without fear of discipline.
One instructor viewed academic freedom as a right granted by the institution, however some trust issues based on past experiences led her to feel that her job was not one hundred percent safe, due to being a junior in her department; however there had never been an incident to verify her perception. Two of the females are non-teaching faculty so the question is not applicable (Appendix L).

As Wilson (2010) stated in the U.S. Department of Education 2007 report, the threat of having academic freedom taken away by administrators does not appear to be the case at the rural community college. Given the comments in the faculty questionnaire, our community college in northern California is above the fray in giving their students a faculty member who is free to teach without fear of discipline, or the risk of administrative confrontation.

Question 9. Do you feel you are treated equally to male colleagues?

This question arose from a study by Hagedorn and Laden (2001), who states “there is a clear gender bias in faculty service areas and disciplines” (p. 4). A 1974 study of 740 women at community colleges found that perceptions of inequality did frequently occur. The study quoted by Hagedorn and Laden included work environment, and salary discrepancies. This behavior was viewed as “discrimination.” Hagedorn and Laden go on to state that in 1997 the stated discrimination problem seemed resolved by hiring more female full-time faculty to the community college institutions.

Townsend wrote regarding equality of gendered faculty now in community colleges, “the ratio of male to female faculty is about equal” (1995, p. 43). Jackson and O’Callahan (2009) claimed that women perceive a glass ceiling on every level within
the institution. This study wanted to measure the rural college’s female faculty patterns of “perceived” equity treatment compared to Hagedorn and Laden’s (2001) study.

Two faculty members felt they were treated fairly, except under certain college president’s leadership. Two felt they were equal in pay, but did not elaborate, while another faculty member had the perception based on comments, that she had not “negotiated a very good deal for herself” (Appendix M). Two females felt initially the treatment was fair, but toward the end of their career, they were not treated equally to male colleagues. One faculty member said she was treated fairly, “but there were a number of male colleagues who acted out of line.” She went on to elaborate that she was involved in a case against them and won (Appendix I). Another faculty member stated, “Fairly enough,” but continued with concerns over female students and inequities in athletics in regards to budgets. In the same answer, she expressed concerns over a male administrator who she felt targeted her for gender and religious reasons (Appendix L). A female faculty member answered no, she felt she was given extra workloads, and sometimes the workload of male colleagues, and she felt her work was more scrutinized than her male colleagues (Appendix M). Another complaint of a female instructor was that males were given overloads that were considered illegal according to the education code, but ignored by administration when alerted to the error. On the positive side, some men did respect her (Appendix N).

The comments in this section were interesting and varied. Some answers were simply “Yes” with no explanation, while others shared experiences of tolerance and pain from the question.
Question 10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college?

According to research by Hagedorn and Laden (2001), who quoted Barnard from 1964, Barnard publicized a myth that women prefer teaching and service to research and scholarship, and women are non-competitive and did not desire climbing the status ladder. The research lists two promotions from faculty to administrator or division chair, or deans, yet women found their career move blocked by male leaders in “power structure positions, which repress women and don’t allow for promotion or upward mobility” (p. 12). The authors explained the desire for women to teach and not lead was based on, “women having to juggle responsibilities of rearing children” (p. 12).

Five of the seven female faculty studied at the rural college did desired paid leadership positions, and went on to obtain those roles at the institution. It was not without controversy. “One faculty member described a position equal to a division chair when it was held by a male, but she was denied equal pay by the all male executive board, and administration had to intervene to get the union to finally grant her equal pay” (Appendix H). Another faculty member explained “how she had been in leadership positions at the college, but the pay was not worth the hours of work she invested” (Appendix M). The last female faculty member described after serving in leadership positions at the institution said she did desire to apply for a dean position, but never did. (Appendix O).

Seven of the faculty members did not desire leadership, while one of the faculty members did desire a leadership position but felt she did not qualify (Appendix N). One
female served in paid coordinator assignment (Appendix L). Other female faculties did not expound as to why they did not desire paid leadership during their career.

Question 11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer?

This question is to determine if the respect of male colleagues toward female faculty of equal education and hire, lead to the “perception” problem facing the women today in faculty positions at community colleges. Satisfaction, suggests female faculty, given almost equal hiring by gender, should provide a sense of happiness in the work place (Jackson & O’Callahan, 2009).

The seven negative responses toward feeling respected by male colleagues are as follows; “I felt belittled and treated in a condescending manner by male instructors at times” (Appendix D). “Some respect, but not all” (Appendix E). “I still believe most male faculty members at the rural college have a problem with strong women.” Another female answered, “There is a negative element anywhere you go, and I believe it comes from a lack of self-esteem on their part. If they (male colleagues) put you down they feel they look better and have more value” (Appendix F). This response begins as a yes, but could also be interpreted as a no, “Yes initially, I felt I had to bend over backward to meet needs in my department” (Appendix G). One faculty member recounts, “In previous administrations at least one male harassed me . . . currently there are at least two male colleagues who have tried to undermine the work that I do with students” (Appendix J). Another explains, she is respected, but continues, “There have been snide comments made about me, about my program or my student athletes by male coaches; in the public or professional arena they were always respectful” (Appendix L). This female faculty member answered “No” without explanation (Appendix M). A female faculty comment
was, “some did, some didn’t” (Appendix K). Lastly, a female faculty member answered, “In the beginning yes, in the end no, total disrespect” (Appendix O).

It is interesting to note three female faculty who answered yes, and felt respected by male peers, currently work in areas where female staff are dominate. If one considers the negative answers were given with male and female faculty members present, the answer would be eighty percent, concluding those female faculties “perceive” male colleagues do not respect them as peers on many levels (Jackson & O’Callahan, 2009).

Question 12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues?

Seven women answered “yes” they felt they had to super-perform to be considered equal to male colleagues. The explanations were especially interesting in areas of equality and female perceptions. Faculty member “D” felt she always did more, but never got the pay or recognition she deserved. “E” answered “it was a constant struggle trying to ‘super-perform’ everyday and in every meeting and the men who did give respect usually had strong women in their lives.” “F” felt “in her position,” she had to “super-perform.” “H” was hired during the time when women were minorities, especially during that era; she had to “super-perform. “L” expressed that she gained respect of male colleagues by “deserving it, through competency, and snide remarks behind her back never bothered her.” “M” had to “super-perform,” along with picking up male colleague’s work that they refused to do. “M’s” work was more closely scrutinized and criticized regardless of “augmented” workload. “N” replied, “yes, I had to do a super job, and I did, it was detrimental to my health.” “O” felt she had to “super-perform,” she lived
at the college constantly, along with volunteering because no one was willing to help serve the students, and male colleagues did not attend committee meetings.

For the faculty members who did not feel they had to “super-perform,” two (F & I) felt they had to super-perform for any colleague. “J” explained her position called upon her defending herself regardless of gender. “K” replied “No,” with no explanation.

Hagedorn and Laden’s (2001) study seems to apply at our rural northern California community college, two-thirds of the rural college female faculties perceived they had to “super-perform” to be considered equal to their male colleagues.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The national trends mentioned by Barbara Townsend (1995), of male dominated institutions of higher learning and an increase in female faculty hiring, given vacancies by retiring male faculty, did lead to an increase in women entering the vocation of teaching within the community college. Appendix B clearly shows a period of two decades where women were obsolete at the rural community college. During the eighties, the college began hiring women faculty, and even hired two women to teach in non-traditional roles or “hard sciences” as mentioned by Hagedorn and Laden (2001).

The rural college was sluggish in hiring female faculty during the seventies when federal laws to correct the inequity of gender hires in higher education were being enacted, but caught up in hiring females in the eighties. Trends of community college faculty employment to date suggest faculty hires being on or around fifty percent. This rural college again follows this trend, with female faculty ratios being reported at forty five percent in 2005-2009 (Myers, 2010).

The female faculty studied at the rural community college described a hiring process that was in place and being followed when they were applying for faculty positions. Tenure was granted to all applicants, unless the position’s hiring was grant funded, or not applicable. The two exceptions were offered tenure track positions as soon as they were qualified to promote to tenure. The rural community college portrayed an
excellent rating in hiring the female faculty and placing the women on the tenure track applicable to state and board policy.

The final measurement came from Cheryl Meyer’s study, *Perceptions of the Glass Ceiling Effect in Community Colleges*. Meyer’s details the history of legislation pertaining to governmental legislative advancements made toward leveling the gender equality in the work force. By passing The Civil Rights Act, Title VII, Affirmative Action, Title IX, the Pregnancy Act, the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity committee who is charged to investigate any valid claim it receives regarding gender or minority discrimination, and the further creation of the Department of Labor and the Glass Ceiling Commission, led to equality in numbers in the community college and other governmental agencies. The Glass Ceiling Commission discovered Societal, Internal Structures, and Governmental Barriers, that revealed a lack of “acceptance” of women in all aspects of employment, which gives validity to female dissatisfaction in the work force, when equally educated to male colleagues (Elacqua et al., 2009).

The rural community college case study revealed female faculty, on some level, describe the same trends discussed in the Meyer’s (2010) and Elacqua et al.’s (2009) studies. Women “perceive” male colleagues are treated differently than women, and male colleagues have a lack of respect for female colleagues. Women faculty members interviewed also felt they had to “super-perform” to gain the respect and acceptance of male colleagues in equal positions. The added interview elaboration of several female faculty members have shed light on some of the reasons for the perceptions, and are listed in “Recommendations for Further Studies” in this chapter.
The important part of this study is it started out to examine the “glass ceiling” and ended up becoming a gender study about culture and perceptions. A culture that is slow to change, as Frey (1995) suggested, is also steeped in “perceptions” which is reality. Actors take on the role of the perceptions, fostered by the culture and the problem cannot change until the culture changes, and culture is slow to change, so changing the perceptions will also move slowly. The important part is that culture is the repressor, not male or female colleagues, but the culture that is allowed to continue through management and the way the actors play on the playground.

Academic freedom is a concept of the “freedom to inquire” without fear of retaliation and is granted to faculty as well as students. Due to unions and collective bargaining units, academic freedom, nationally is considered a myth (Kussrow, 2000). The data are backed by David Wilson, who cites clear administrative retaliation for calling foul on an institution’s management practices, which erodes academic freedom, and leads to threats and hostile working conditions.

This rural community college did a good job in valuing academic freedom with revolving administration, and continues to be an honored tradition, lending integrity to the institution’s value and respect toward maintaining a culture of learning (Frye, 1995). The questionnaires’ portrayed the rural college as getting an excellent evaluation in honoring academic freedom.

Tenure is the ultimate “glass ceiling.” As mentioned in Fossey and Wood (2004), tenure is under threat during economic hardship by over reaching administrators who hire contingent or part-time faculty. Tenure, along with academic freedom at this rural community college, seems to be well above national statistics. The American
Federation of Teachers (2009) reported that tenured faculty declined to eighteen percent, down to one quarter the amount reported in 1997, and contingent faculty hiring is up eighty-two percent in all areas of higher education. The small rural college has recently hired an “almost” equal number of faculty and placed them on the tenure track, while this study has focused on full-time hiring, it will be suggested in Recommendations for Further Studies, the hiring of contingent and part-time faculty (American Federation of Teachers, 2009).

The rural college in northern California values tenure, and shows no discrimination in placing women on the tenure track when hired as full-time faculty. It is good to know, tenure is still honored in this particular rural community college located in northern California.

Recommendations for Further Study

- **Studies to represent the un-represented**
  - A study of part-time female or contingent faculty study would reveal if the trend David Wilson used is valid at community colleges (fourteen percent in tenure positions, and sixty nine percent in part-time or contingent faculty).
  - Part-time female faculties should be studied to determine if academic freedom is honored by the administration.
  - Based on the questions used to interview the female staff at our rural community college, all faculty members should be given the same questions, to determine discrepancies in thoughts and perceptions of equality compared to female colleagues of equal positions.
Demographic studies to determine equality (perception and culture)

- Rural community colleges should be compared to urban community college national trends of tenure, academic freedom, and perceptions to determine differences in culture based on geographic location.

- Female administrators should be studied to determine if women in administrative positions perceive “barriers” discussed in Elacqua et al.’s (2009) study.

- Based on the “perceptions” of the rural community college’s female faculty, actual data from the college should be studied (budgets, office space, workloads, and promotion) to determine if data supports the “perception” in inequality.

Advice to women working in a perceived discriminatory work environment

- The culture must be changed, by educating yourself on the differences between men and women, and applying the principles of “differences,” it will be easier to not mistake the normal behavior of men as personal threats.

- A cross-culture consultant, focusing on the institution would be a good plan. Education is the only way to change perceptions, and a consultant would have the necessary tools to assist the college in making a plan, and implementing the plan to improve gender and minority relations.

- Lastly, befriend the women in your workplace. Everyone has something going on, and by being supportive to one another, you support yourself. Women
helping women is the best way to change culture, just ask the men, they have experience in this area.
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APPENDIX B
Lassen College Female Faculty 1940 to 2009

* Percent Female, percentages do not indicate if faculty member was full or part-time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Female Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940-44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-54</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-59</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-64</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-69</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-84</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-89</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-94</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-99</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-04</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-09</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX D
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how long you have worked or currently work for the college?  
   +15 years currently retired
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process?  Yes
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? Yes, to include being a director
4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. Yes, interviewed by a committee and there were other applicants, 3-4.
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? No
6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? Yes
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Yes
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? The same
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? If not, why? No, I was placed on step 4 of the pay scale when I was hired as a full time teacher at the college based on my years of experience. Later on I was talking to fellow faculty members who were union negotiators about that and they indicated that I didn't negotiate a very good deal. I had the impression that other male faculty members were started at hire steps based on deals that they made with the administration. I was paid less than other male managers in similar positions who responsibility pay as well as release time and 12 month contracts to do similar jobs
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. I was in a mid level management position for my department for 12 years.
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? Please explain. I felt belittled and treated in a condescending manner by other male instructors at times.
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. I believe that I always did more than I got paid for and never received the recognition that I deserved.
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? **+15 years, currently retired**
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? **Yes**
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **Yes, at least 6 times.**
4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. **There were other applicants for most of the positions I held at the college, but in some cases I simply “moved” to another position for which I was qualified, either because of education or experience. The process always included a letter of application, screening, interview with a committee, and interview with an administrator.**
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **No**
6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? **Yes**
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? **Yes. At that time the college was very small and I never had any concerns about what I said. I participated in major committees right away and was never concerned that my job would be in jeopardy because of something I said or did. Please Explain?**
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **Not any differently.**
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **No. If not, why? In the 70’s at the rural community college, it was a very male dominated institution. There were only 3 other female faculty members when I was hired and one of them was the school nurse! The guys were always the ones who made the decisions and in fact they about had apoplexy when I decided to join their lunch group! The only way I was equal was in pay! In the 90’s we had a very conservative male president. He wanted to reinstate a leadership position I had previously held and I was told by members of the campus community, both faculty and administration, that I shouldn’t apply because he was creating the position for another male employee. I went ahead and applied and he was quite condescending and nasty to me in the interview. It probably didn’t help that I pointed out to him several times, politely, that his assumptions about the Title V regulations were incorrect. (My perception about his treatment of me in this interview was confirmed to me by faculty members in the room at the time.)**
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at this college? *After many years I was able to become more of a leader, but it was still a struggle. I was a Division Chair and the Lead Counselor and served on the Union Executive Board. Toward the end of my career I was made Lead Counselor, a position that had previously been considered equal to a Division Chair when it was held by a male, but I was denied the equal pay by members of the union (all men on the exec board at that time). It took administrative intervention to get the union to agree to grant me equal pay.*

11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? *Some, not all. I still believe most male faculty members at LCC have a problem with strong women.*

12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. *Even doing a super job wasn’t enough many times. It felt as if I had to prove myself every day and in every meeting I attended. The men who gave me respect were mostly men who also had very strong women in their personal lives.*
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the college? **+15 years**
2. When you became employed at Lassen College did you apply through a traditional application process? **yes**
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **yes**
4. Were there other applicants? **yes** Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. **It was a panel with representation from all constituencies. I had an interview and a final interview.**
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **no**
6. Once employed at LCC, were you placed on the tenure track? **after I became a faculty member**
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? **yes** Please Explain? **I have never been questioned about anything I teach or do.**
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **As the opportunity to voice my approach to life.**
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **yes** If not, why? **As a faculty member I received the same pay as other faculty members.**
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at LCC? **NO** Please explain either answer. **I had enough to do keeping up with my classes as I taught 4-6 different classes every semester.**
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? **Some** Please explain. **There is always a negative element anywhere you go. I believe it comes from a lack of self-esteem on their part. If they put you down they feel they look better and have more value.**
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. **I felt that way about my male and female colleagues. I guess I cared more about what the female colleagues thought as I respected them more in most instances.**
APPENDIX G
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the college? + 15 years, currently retired
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? Yes, hired at 50% every semester it changed, took 3 semesters for full load.
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? yes administrator
4. Were there other applicants? Initially no, not sure Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. Applied, interviewed by vice president and hired
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? no
6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? yes
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Yes Please Explain?
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? yes
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? Initially yes If not, why? Athletics became male dominated and I was discriminated, males are aggressive in desire to get their own budgets etc. Not wanting to teach PE but focus on sports only, when I came there were no women’s sports (your perception)
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Yes, at the end of my career I became Athletic Director.
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? Yes, initially, I bent over backward to meet needs in my department.
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Yes, especially in this position
APPENDIX H
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college?
   
   15+ years, currently retired.

2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? Has your job title changed since you were hired?

   I was hired by a traditional process with a panel interview. I was first hired as a Media Consultant, then Public Information Officer, then Journalism Instructor, the Vice President of Instruction, then as instructor for English, History, Film History, Administration of Justice, Business, Political Science.

3. Were you qualified, according to the application criteria? Yes

4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. There were other applicants. I submitted an application letter, application, resume and portfolio.

5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at this college? No

6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? Not for the first couple of years. I was placed on tenure track in 1981.

7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Please Explain?

   Yes. I was never questioned about what or how I was teaching.

8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? The same as I did before gaining tenure.

9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? If not, why? Not always. If the administration was progressive, I was treated equal. Some administrations were more difficult to work with as a female.

10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. Yes, I was promoted to Vice President of Instruction during an emergency hiring process.

11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? Please explain. I believe so.

12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. During the beginning years, females were gaining more positions the workforce. I believe during that time period I was very concerned about doing an excellent job.
APPENDIX I
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? **+15 years**
2. When you became employed at Lassen College did you apply through a traditional application process? **Yes**
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **No**
4. Were there other applicants? **Yes.** Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. **Typical interview, response to questions from a group of employees and faculty and a teaching demonstration.**
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **Yes, 11 years at Sierra College in Rocklin.**
6. Once employed at college, were you placed on the tenure track? **After my probationary period, yes.**
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? **Yes. Please Explain? I felt regarded by and supported by the faculty group.**
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **I felt that it was handled well here.**
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **I feel I was treated well; the colleagues did not respect that behavior, but I felt that I was treated fairly. If not, why? There were a number of male teachers who I felt acted out of line. I was involved in a case against them, and we won.**
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? **Yes. Please explain either answer. I was found qualified to be Accreditation Chair and was in that position along with my teaching responsibilities for a number of years.**
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? **Yes. Please explain. Maybe because they were going to shut our school down if we did not pass accreditation that time, but I was treated with great respect, although I had to sit for hours alone with some members of the faculty, explaining to them why their input was so valuable.**
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? **I felt I had to do a “super” job to gain the respect of any colleague! Please explain. This was a make it or break it endeavor, and I spent long hours attempting to get all the balls in order and made a very careful attempt to get everyone to play nicely together to do this.**
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me your name, age, and years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? 15+ years.

2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? There was a minimal interview process as adjunct. When I was shown to have the FSA required I was offered a course to teach.

3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? As adjunct taught in Child Development and later Psychology. Was then hired part time to coordinate the newly developed Human Service program (from getting the courses through local curriculum and the Chancellors Office, then finding qualified instructors). In 1996 worked as an independent contractor through a Reno agency to do job development for the WorkAbility III grant at LCC. Hired as WorkAbility III Coordinator, non tenured position (through standard District interview process) in 1997. Became TANF/LD coordinator (again had to compete for the position through standard interview process) as a tenured faculty. Funding changed and my title changed to CalWORKs Coordinator. CalWORKS funding was cut by 50%. The then EOPS/DSPS director was leaving so I stepped into his position through assignment by the District. The EOPS counselor at the time petitioned then President 2003-2008 to remove me from the EOPS Director arguing I should not have been appointed to the position but rather should have gone through an interview process. I had been appointed to the position by President 1999-2003, because the district had right of assignment. Certain administrator 2003-2008 listened to EOPS Counselor and gave me a March 15th notice terminating me from the position of Educational Administrator, EOPS. (she got the job back after it had been removed from her with a previous administration. Pretty sure she never interviewed for it). I moved into a 100% assignment in DSPS.

4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. I interviewed competitively for my first position (WorkAbility III Coordinator) and second position (LD/TANF Coordinator). Subsequent positions were obtained based on District assigning me to positions in which I was MQd.

5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? No

6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? In my second year. My first position was advertised as grant funded non tenure track. When
7. **I switched to the second position which was tenure track the district granted me a second year contract.**

8. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Please Explain? **NA. Prior to tenure I was not involved in instruction except as an adjunct before full time hire. As an adjunct there was one board member who attempted to have prior approval for guest speakers in lectures. Fortunately he was not supported by the rest of the board.**

9. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **NA**

10. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? If not, why? **Yes, until a certain administrator 2003-2008 years......**

11. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. **I would consider a Dean position on campus if the pay were comparable to the work required. As it is right now Deans earn less per month than a full time faculty member who teaches a few overloads. I have served as Division Chair and Lead Counselor ......the pay is not commensurate with the responsibilities.**

12. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? Please explain. **In previous administrations at least 1 male colleague harassed me. When I reported this to the District I was not supported by a certain president from 2003-2008. In the current and previous couple of academic years there have been at least two male colleagues who have tried to undermine the work that I do with students.**

13. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. **It’s not my problem, it’s theirs. I know that I am doing a good job. Because my position as a faculty in counseling is different than the majority of faculty positions on campus I believe I am constantly called upon to defend the position in general and not anything to do with the gender of staff involved.**
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? **+15 years**
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? **Yes.**
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **Yes**
4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. 4 – WorkAbility II, 2 – LD Instructor, went through the standard college hiring process each time.  
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **Yes**  
6. Once employed at the, were you placed on the tenure track? LD Instructor - **Yes**  
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Please Explain? **Yes**  
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **The same**  
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **Yes.**  
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? **No.** Please explain either answer. **But I did receive pay for special assignments in coordination positions**  
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? **Yes.**  
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. **No.**
1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? 5+ years
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? YES
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? Still faculty, but assignment has changed.
4. Were there other applicants? I believe so. Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. Applied after seeing job posted on CCC Registry. Invited for an interview w/ a full committee, then invited back to a second interview w/ President and VP/Dean of Instruction.
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? No, only universities.
6. Once employed at LCC, were you placed on the tenure track? YES
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? YES Please Explain? I was never very concerned about how what I said or did impacted my tenure because I always felt that I conducted myself as expected within a college or university environment.
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? The same, although I could breathe a sigh of relief, or so I thought, with regards to the threat of annual pink slips due to budget threats and my status as the junior full-time employee in my discipline. Continued budget threats and a large number of FT faculty in my discipline led to continued threats of annual pink slips because of budget concerns. I never did receive one though.
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? If not, why? I felt I was treated fairly enough, although I had concerns that my female student-athletes weren’t being funded at the same level for travel and supply budgets as male student-athletes were (a budget that required 3-4 to a room versus 2 in male sports, a fraction of supply budget). I more recently was targeted by a male administrator for what I believe were reasons I perceive to be related to my gender in contrast to the subservient role of women in his religion.
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. I have never aspired for nor been promoted to a Dean position, but I have served in paid faculty leadership positions including Division Chair and Academic Senate President.
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? *I feel that I have always been respected as a peer because of my knowledge, experience, and level of professionalism. While I do know that snide comments may have been made about me, my program or my student-athletes by male coaches, in a public or professional arena they were always respectful.*

12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? *I have always worried more about taking care of my students and serving the institution than worrying about gaining respect of male colleagues. I expected the respect because I deserved it, and was always shown respect within the professional setting. Immature comments made by male colleagues behind my back were never a concern for me and were best ignored.*
APPENDIX M
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? **1-5 years**
2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? **No**
3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **Yes, no longer have the job.**
4. Were there other applicants? Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. **I was not informed as to whether there were other applicants. Please explain the process by which you were interviewed and offered the job. Someone at the college encouraged me to apply and provided the college application form for me to file. I was selected for an interview with the selection committee and an interview with the college president on campus.**
5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **Yes, I worked at another CC in California prior to my work at the college.**
6. Once employed at LCC, were you placed on the tenure track? **N/A**
7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? Please Explain? **N/A**
8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **N/A**
9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? If not, why? **No, my workload was not equal to my male colleagues, as the college had a backlog of work that had not been done by previous administrators, and that work was assigned to me. I was instructed to complete that work at the same time I pursued a timeline of work activities that represented the “normal” load. Clearing the backlog of work involved preparation of several large reports of a hundred pages of data and analysis. In addition, some male employees at the college refused to provide me with information necessary for me to do my job; also, on several occasions a male colleague refused to prepare his data analysis, so it was reassigned to me.**
10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. **N/A**
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? Please explain. **No**
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. Yes, I was given extra work not just to “assist” male colleagues, but also to do their work when they refused to do it. My work was more closely scrutinized and criticized, despite the augmented workload.
APPENDIX N
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the community college? **+15, currently retired**

2. When you became employed at the rural community college did you apply through a traditional application process? **Yes, I applied for a position in student services; I was interviewed by the Dean during the second interview.**

3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **Yes, I took classes from Lassen College, and through Chico State televised courses and UC Berkley extension classes. I received a credential in Office and Service and Technology. I was asked to teach Career Guidance classes when the instructor had knee surgery. I continued to teach in that course as well as assist in Work Experience, the coordinator had a heavy load and I was asked to help him with his load. When he retired I applied for his position and got it. I received an eleven month contract.**

4. Were there other applicants? **I was interviewed by a group of faculty members. It was in accordance to the hiring policy at that time.**

5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the? **No**

6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? **No, not initially, but once I became a faculty member I began the tenure process, and it worked out.**

7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? **Yes I had academic freedom to coordinate Work Experience, but the administration was always pushing me for increased numbers. A load in this department was 125 students, but I had twice that many, as well as outlying areas in Bieber, Alturas, Herlong and Downyville.**

8. **Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom?**

9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **No, some vocational male colleagues were very rude and I believe were jealous of my budget, which was very good. A few of them had approved overload classes that were, according to Ed. Code, illegal. The administrator was informed, but did not seem to care. Some of the men did respect me.**

10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? Please explain either answer. **No, I did not qualify for a paid leadership position.**
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? *Some did and some didn’t.*
12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? Please explain. *Yes, I did feel I had to do a “super job” and I did. It was detrimental to my health. As a member of the curriculum committee, I felt stressed.*
APPENDIX O
Faculty Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how many years you have worked or currently work for the rural community college? **+15, currently retired**

2. When you became employed at the college did you apply through a traditional application process? **Yes, paper application, and interviewed by a hiring committee. Final interview was with the president of the college.**

3. Has your job title changed since you were hired? **No, I was hired to teach a subject and I stuck with that subject.**

4. Were there other applicants? **Yes.**

5. Did you work at another community college prior to coming to work at the college? **Yes at contra Costa and Chico State.**

6. Once employed at the college, were you placed on the tenure track? **Yes, it was three years and I was granted Tenure.**

7. Prior to tenure, did you feel that you had Academic Freedom? **Yes, administration encouraged Academic Freedom. The president at the time had a philosophy about it, he said “you stay out of my job and I’ll stay out of yours.” He made it clear I was in charge of the classroom, and he was in charge of the money to run the school.**

8. Once tenured, how did you view Academic Freedom? **The same, it was good at Lassen.**

9. Do you feel you were treated equal to male colleagues? **In the beginning it was wonderful. I was given mentors, and encouraged to participate on committees, and was given preference to head committees. In my second year I was the vice-president of the faculty association. It depended on administration, and their interpretation, in the beginning it was great, at the end I was told what book to order, and how to do simple things. It was rough at the end. The hiring process was all emergency hires; finances were based on administration’s picks. At the end it wasn’t equal.**

10. Did you desire paid leadership positions on campus, or ever promoted to a Dean during your career at the college? **Yes, I was division chair, Union President, it was hard to desire paid leadership, and it wasn’t handled like other colleges. No release time would be given, for other colleges, many on campus positions like Academic Senate is paid. I would have liked to have been a Dean, but never tried for the position. I was the activities chairmen and was paid $100.00 here and there, later the same position was advertised for $60,000 and the position went to a male colleague’s wife.**
11. Did male colleagues respect you as a peer? *In the beginning yes, at the end, no, total disrespect.*

12. Did you feel you had to do a “super” job, to be considered equal to your male colleagues? *Yes! I lived at the college, seven days a week. At the end of my career I was always volunteering because there was no one willing to serve the students. Male colleagues didn’t show up for committee assignments.*