ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS, DECISION MAKING AND THE CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

Marie P. Ting, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004

Dissertation directed by: Professor Jeffrey F. Milem
Education Policy, Planning and Leadership

The purpose of this study was to understand senior administrative decision-making regarding the campus racial climate within institutions of higher education. Specifically, I addressed the following questions:

1. How do senior administrators learn/develop their views about diversity?
2. What is their experience with diverse populations and how does this influence their views about diversity?
3. What organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland influenced their decisions?
4. What common factors influence senior administrators decision-making regarding policies and practices related to the campus racial climate?

To answer these questions, I engaged in an interpretive case study analysis (Merriam, 1998) of senior administrators at the University of Maryland. Data obtained from semi-structured interviews with fifteen senior administrators and documents were analyzed to create themes around how senior administrators make decisions regarding the campus racial climate.

This study has implications for expanding theory, particularly regarding decision-making in higher education. In the most general sense, the data collected in this study was consistent with existing research on decision-making within institutions of higher education. In this study, decision-making regarding the campus racial climate was influenced both by individual differences and the organizational nature of institutions of higher education (Baldridge et al. 1979, 1991). This study also reinforced the research by Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) showing that socio-historical forces, governmental policies and an institution's legacy of inclusion/exclusion, the psychological and behavioral climates affect the campus racial climate.

Implications for practice suggests five propositions for consideration regarding the factors that influence the decision-making of administrators regarding the campus racial climate: 1) Race matters in decision-making, 2) Experiences that administrators have with diverse others, diverse ideas and diverse institutions affect the decisions they make regarding the campus racial climate, 3) The institutional context in which decisions are made matters a great deal, 4) Faculty members play an important role in shaping administrative decisions and how they are engaged and involved in diversity efforts is important, 5) Given the professional nature of higher education, leaders can shape the campus racial climate through the use of symbols.

SENIOR CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS, DECISION-MAKING AND THE CAMPUS RACIAL CLIMATE

by

Marie P. Ting

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2004

Advisory Committee:

Professor Jeffrey F. Milem, Chair
Professor Sharon Fries-Britt
Professor Robert L. Hampton
Professor Marylu McEwen
Professor John Williams

Acknowledgements

God is so good!

I have the privilege of doing what I love because of a number of special people who have been mentors, advocates, champions, advisors and friends.

To my "Michigan Mentors": John Matlock, Lester Monts, Walter Harrison, Nancy Cantor and Lee Bollinger. You taught me life-changing lessons about courage, conviction and "compelling interest."

To my "Maryland Mentors": Marie Davidson, Gregory Geoffroy, William Destler, Andrea Levy and my "roommates" on the 2nd floor, if I was able to do anything for the campus, it was because of your trust and generosity. To Robert Waters, your encouragement and support made my days so much easier. And of course to Cordell Black, my Maryland "dad." You opened the door for me to be the most blessed graduate student on campus.

To some special "brothers": Jeff Vancollins, Rob Kelly, Paul Umbach and Andre Perry. I could not have asked for a more challenging and passionate community of scholars to study and struggle with. To Chris Liang, my "partner in crime" and to Tait Sye, my original "partner in crime."

To those along the road that reminded me that it's not all about the work or me, but it's about God: Nancy Cha, Patty Lee, Jinhee Lee, John Kim, Paul Kim, Andrew Kim, Steve Suh, Steve Yoo, Kathy Bahk, Bonnie Shen, Grace Meng and others. Thanks for supporting me through the heart-aches and struggles, I see Christ in each of you.

To Pastor Q: for trusting me with your "sheep," for your prayers and for helping me through the tears.

To my family, in particular my parents who came to the United States with one suitcase and yet went all the way. Thanks to Roy who suffered as my unpaid editor.

Special thanks for those who took the time to talk with me about their experiences as senior administrators on campus.

Finally, of course, to the members of my dissertation committee. To Marylu McEwen, for listening the way I needed to be listened to. To John Williams, for your gentle wisdom. To Sharon Fries-Britt, my Maryland "mom." To Robert Hampton, your support was crucial and I look forward to "building" with you. And of course to Jeff Milem, my esteemed chair…we made it huh?

"You do not delight in sacrifice, or I would bring it; you do not take pleasure in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise." (Psalm 51:16-17)

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Demographic trends in the United States show that the racial/ethnic composition of our society is changing dramatically. Between 1990 and 2050, the population of Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and African Americans will show dramatic growth (258.3 percent, 269.1 percent, 83 percent, and 69.5 respectively) (Campbell, 1996). While these changes in the population demographics will be more profound in particular parts of the country, they will be evident in every region of the United States. Between 1995 and 2050, the minority population will account for nearly 90 percent of total population growth. All minority populations are expected to grow and will surpass the non-Minority population by 2050 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1999).

These changing demographic trends are also reflected within institutions of higher education. The enrollment of students of color in college has increased by more than 62 percent between 1989 and 1998. From 1997 to 1998, all four major racial minority groups (Latino/a, Asian Pacific American, Native American and African Americans) experienced enrollment increases within institutions of higher education, and graduate students of color achieved their greatest percentage gain in enrollment (5.4 percent) (Harvey, 2001).

These population changes in the next 25 to 50 years are of significance for college administrators because institutions of higher education must prepare students to take their place in an increasingly racially diverse society. Some believe it is the mission and responsibility of institutions of higher education to develop in students the knowledge, skills, and competencies that they need to be active members of a changing society (Nussbaum, 1997; Rudenstine, 1996). Support for this belief has been evident for a long time in higher education. Former University of Michigan President James Angell believed

that institutions such as Michigan had the responsibility to educate students regardless of race or ethnicity and that campuses should be places where students gain experience interacting across differences.

> I am now aiming merely to remind you that at an expenditure which is simply ridiculous to call burdensome, this prosperous State of Michigan has, through the wisdom of her fathers, succeeded in furnishing the higher education to all her sons and daughters, without distinction of birth, race, color, or wealth…our great public universities are the essence of democratic living; we are the proving grounds for whether our very divided society can come together and engage… (Angell, 1879)

In the 21st century, Joseph White, interim president of the University of Michigan reflected beliefs similar to those of former President Angell:

> I have come to the conclusion that one mission of our university is to serve as an extraordinary gateway of opportunity to our diverse democracy and to the global economy in which we compete. A core question we face is how to do the best possible job of educating the talented young people who come to us and how to develop them so that they will be effective citizens and leaders…If you think about the environment into which we launch young people, it is clear that the only way to ensure they are prepared is to create a diverse human environment in which they can learn…. (White, 2002, p. 11A)

Angell and White believed that educating students to function effectively in a diverse democracy requires the ability to work across racial/ethnic differences. White's statement reflected the belief that a quality modern education, one that prepares students for leadership in today's society, takes place at institutions with high levels of student, faculty and staff diversity. The relationship between diversity and quality education is one of the philosophical underpinnings in the argument to preserve affirmative action in college admissions decisions (Gurin, 1999). Those who support the continued use of affirmative action argue that it is in our national interest to maintain high levels of diversity in colleges and universities (Gurin, 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000). In response

to a lawsuit filed that challenged the University of Michigan's use of affirmative action in admissions, President Lee Bollinger and Provost Nancy Cantor wrote:

> A first-class education is one that creates the opportunity for students, expecting differences, to learn instead of similarities. Likewise encountering differences rather than one's mirror image is an essential part of a good education. Race is educationally important for all students, because understanding race in America is a powerful metaphor for crossing sensibilities of all kinds. …The country cannot afford to deprive institutions of higher education of the ability to educate generations of young Americans---minority and non-minority---in an environment that enables all to flourish, and understand each other, in a truly integrated society… (Bollinger & Cantor, 1998, p. A17)

In a statement endorsed by 68 educational organizations, the American Council on Education stated that diversity is important not only because it promotes personal growth and a healthy society, but also because it "enriches the educational experience; strengthens communities and the workplace and enhances America's economic competitiveness" (Wilds & Wilson, 1998, p. 3).

The Benefits and Challenges of Diversity

Arguments made by scholars about the benefits of diversity support what administrators and educational organizations believe are advantages afforded to students who are educated on diverse campuses. Education among diverse peers enhances the learning and development of students across a range of important educational outcomes including the ability to engage in complex thinking and perspective taking, increased cultural awareness, greater commitment to promoting racial understanding and improvement of intergroup relations (Astin, 1996; Milem & Hakuta, 2000; Pascarella, Palmer, Moye, & Pierson, 2001). These are crucial skills to have if one is to function effectively as a citizen in a diverse democracy (Gurin, 1999; Milem, 2000). Students educated in diverse environments are more engaged in learning and are more likely to

persist, report greater satisfaction and seek graduate degrees (Chang, 1999b; Gurin, 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000). Campus diversity creates conditions such as unfamiliarity, disequilibrium, differing perspectives, and contradictory expectations that ultimately promote learning and complex thinking (Gurin, 1999; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

The increasing numerical and proportional representation of racial/ethnic groups on campus, also referred to as structural diversity, yields many educational opportunities but also creates challenges for institutions of higher education (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen & Allen, 1998, 1999). With increasing structural diversity, acts of racial hostility on college campuses have increased (Altbach, 1991; Chang, 2000; Hurtado, 1992). Studies of the college experience of African American, Asian American and Latino students on predominately White campuses indicate that social isolation, personal dissatisfaction and incidents of racism are common (Allen, 1987; Astin, 1993a; Chan & Wang, 1991). Previously underrepresented students on predominately White campuses experience unique hardships that create a negative social environment and ultimately hamper their academic success (Richardson & Skinner, 1991). Achieving a racially diverse student body by itself does not guarantee a welcoming environment (Colón, 1991). If institutions of higher education are not prepared to identify and address the challenges that result from enrolling students of color, intergroup tension and conflict are likely to increase and ultimately impede the educational process (Altbach, 1991; Colón, 1991; Hurtado, 1992). Educational polities and practices that fail to account for the multiple ways in which the campus climate for diversity must be addressed can, among other things, hinder student success (Chang, 1999b; Hurtado et al. 1998, 1999).

Frontline work on diversity policy and programs are most often the responsibility of administrators who must devise plans to address a changing campus population. Very few administrators are adequately prepared for the challenge of dealing with campus diversity beyond structural issues because of the prevailing belief that proportional representation is enough to ensure racial equity. Chang (2002) writes that some administrators adhere to "the discourse of preservation" which is the belief that "one particular dimension of diversity--increasing the proportional representation of underrepresented students of color--can single-handedly produce widespread educational benefits for all students" (p. 131). The danger in the discourse of preservation is that diversity is thought of in simple rather then complex terms, and the full benefits of diverse campuses are not maximized. Achieving a racially diverse student body by itself does not necessarily result in positive outcomes (Chang, 1999b; Loo & Rollison, 1986) and thus cannot be the sole ambition for institutions that seek to address diversity issues (Colón, 1991).

The focus of diversity initiatives tends to be on admissions and access (Allen, 1992; Chang 1996; Rendon & Hope, 1995), but merely enrolling a diverse study body in an institution may reap minimal educational benefits because of a failure to consider the context in which diversity is enacted (Chang, 1999b; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Administrators who once focused on achieving a diverse population for the purposes of racial equality now face issues related to the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Smith, 1995). Institutional leaders must take a well-coordinated, multi-layered approach when looking at campus diversity and pay close attention to the racial climate (Chang, 2002; Milem, 2000).

This dissertation presents an analysis of how senior administrators make decisions around a politically charged issue such as racial/ethnic diversity. Thefactors which impact decision-making behavior will be the focus of this research.

Decision-Makers and Decision-Making

The ability to make good decisions is important for successful management and is a common part of organizational life (Mintzberg, 1973). Administration has been characterized as the art of making organizational decisions (Hodginskin, 1996). Decision-making has been studied in disciplines such as economics, political science, business and organization behavior (Chaffee, 1991). Edwards (1954) believed that managers should use a logical and rational process when making decisions. Rational decision-making assumes that behaviors flow in an orderly, sequenced, linear way and are based on knowledge and/or beliefs (March & Olsen, 1976). Rational decision-making behavior is considered to be the normative ideal, but is unrealistic because most decisions are too complex to have the decision-making process flow in a logical or sequential manner (Chaffee, 1991).

Cohen and March (1991) wrote that to avoid failure as a leader, it is important to understand what may constrain the ability to make decisions. To understand decision-making in higher education, it is important to understand how the characteristics of colleges and universities (e.g. professional organizations with ambiguous goals, environment vulnerability) influence the outcome of any decision (Cohen & March, 1991). Behaviors exhibited by administrators at institutions of higher education do not always occur in a rational, logical or linear fashion (Birnbaum, 1988). Studies suggest “a

potential dichotomy between what is espoused and what is practiced in academic decision-making" (Dill, 1991, p. 380). The beliefs held by administrators do not always translate into appropriate or logical behaviors because decisions made by administrators do not occur in a context free environment. Ross (1977) found that traditions, beliefs, and values influenced by an institution's history are strong predictors of decision-making behavior. The behaviors exhibited by administrators vary depending on factors such as the organizational structure of the institution, external influences and current events (Cohen & March, 1991; Kerr & Jermier, 1978). Individual perceptions, personality and attitudes also can affect decisions made in institutions of higher education although research on the extent of their impact has been limited (Dill, 1991). In sum, decision-making is a complex process because of the many factors that can have an impact on individuals who make decisions.

Studies of decision-making in higher education range in topics from institutional fiscal priorities (Hackman, 1991; Michael, 1998; Slaughter, 1998) to hiring (Twombly, 1992) to academic program termination (Eckel, 2002). Each of these studies has increased our understanding of organizational and individual factors that moderate action. These studies found that decision-making is influenced by factors such as the world economic market (Slaughter, 1998), federal and state laws (Kaplin, 1992; Olivas, 1988), political agendas (AGB, 1984), public opinion (Layzell & Lyddon, 1993), institutional culture, current issues and history (Twombly, 1992), characteristics of the individual decision-maker such as life experiences, race, gender and political orientation (Dill, 1991; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994) and perceptions of control, power and influence (Dill, 1991; McLaughlin, Montgomery & Sullins, 1997; Eckel, 2002).

Conceptualizing the Campus Climate for Diversity

Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) provide a helpful way for campus leaders to conceptualize the complicated issue of the campus climate for diversity. Their framework consists of four dimensions of racial climate that institutions must consider as they examine climate on their campuses. The four dimensions are the structural diversity of the institution, the institution's historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion, the psychological climate, and the behavioral climate. Structural diversity refers to the patterns of representation of people from different racial/ethnic groups; that is, the numbers and proportion of people from different racial/ethnic groups on campus. The historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion refers to the legacy of limited access and exclusion that exists on many campuses and the effect that this has on current educational practice. The psychological climate involves perceptions of racial/ethnic tension and discrimination, attitudes toward those who are different, views of intergroup relations, and perceptions regarding institutional responses toward diversity. The behavioral climate consists of the nature of interactions across different racial/ethnic groups. These elements of the framework are connected and interdependent, working together to shape the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity. The framework provides information that administrators can use to ground their understanding and beliefs about the campus climate for diversity and as a result be more effective in shaping campus policies and practices.

The conditions that impact the decision-making process regarding the campus climate for diversity have not been studied. Moreover, the potential effects of personal values, institutional history, attitudes or other elements on decision-making regarding the

campus climate have yet to be explored. This study explores these and other factors that influence and explain decisions of senior administrators regarding the campus climate for diversity.

Purpose of Study

This dissertation presents a case study analysis of senior administrators at the University of Maryland. This study explores senior administrative decision-making regarding the campus racial climate within institutions of higher education. In order to investigate the processes through which senior administrators make decisions on campus climate policy and practices, this study explores the following questions:

1. How do senior administrators learn/develop their views about diversity?
    a. What is their experience with diverse populations and how does this influence their views about diversity?
2. What organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland influenced their decisions?

Informants' responses to these two questions provided information that was used to answer a third primary research question:

3. What common factors influence senior administrators decision-making regarding policies and practices related to the campus racial climate?

Overview of Methodology

This study examines how administrators make decisions regarding the campus climate for diversity. Administrative decisions are examined within the context of the University of Maryland. To answer the specific research questions, this study employs a qualitative research method known as case study.

Case studies are intensive analyses of a single unit or bounded system such as an individual, community of people or program. They describe real-life situations and may be used to understand and explore contemporary complex social phenomena where no clear set of outcomes may be available. Case studies are best used in trying to answer "how" and "why" questions in regards to specific behaviors (Yin, 1984, 1994). Case study in the field of education is used to identify and explain specific issues of institutional or organizational practice (Merriman, 1998).

This case study is primarily interpretive in that it will contain detailed, descriptive data used to prove or disprove theoretical assumptions (Merriam, 1998). Also known as "thick" data, the detailed and descriptive data can be used to analyze, interpret or theorize about a particular phenomenon. Rubin and Rubin (1995) characterize the interpretive approach to social research as "…not about categorizing and classifying, but figuring out what events mean, how people adapt, and how they view what has happened to them and around them. Interpretive social researchers emphasize the complexity of human life" (p. 33). In this interpretive study, the researcher describes and interprets in detail the complexities involved in administrative decision-making regarding campus climate issues at the University of Maryland.

Creswell (1998) suggests a number of characteristics that describe a site suitable for the use of case study methodology. Researchers must have contact that can facilitate entry, be able to convince participants to cooperate, and be able to manage the logistics in getting to the site and collecting the data (Creswell, 1998). The University of Maryland was selected because it met these criteria.

Maryland was also selected as the site for this investigation because it provides a rich context to study the phenomena of interest. Maryland is a campus that, from the 1950s to the present, went from virtually no people of color on campus to one of the most structurally diverse research universities in the country. While attaining success in terms of admissions and access for students of color, administrators are currently grappling with how to provide an environment that maximizes the educational benefits of diversity. In addition, the complex socio/political forces that shape how the institution has treated issues of racial/ethnic diversity make Maryland an interesting site for this study.

Data for this study was generated from a variety of sources including interviews and document analysis. Interviews of key senior campus administrators were the primary form of data collection. The interview protocol was designed to explore the conditions that impact decision-making by senior administrators. The protocol also considered the literature on campus climate for diversity and administrative behavior in institutions of higher education. The research questions were answered through intense interviews with senior administrators who had a significant number of decision-making responsibilities and influence on policies and practices. This study focused on senior administrators who have or have had significant responsibility and influence on racial/ethnic diversity initiatives. Informants were selected by nonprobabilty, convenience, criterion and maximum variation sampling methods (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990).

Documents examined included historical documents, mission statements, reports and research papers that served as background material to inform the interview protocol and place the interview data in context. Data gained through document analysis lent

insight into the participant's frame of reference, that is, the social, political and historical context within which policy makers at the University of Maryland operated. Data collected through documents were also used to confirm interview data.

Three different areas of research guided this study. The first body of research addresses the importance of ethnic/racial diversity within institutions of higher education and its impact on campus climate. The works of Gurin (1999), Milem (2000) and Milem and Hakuta (2000) provide information on the effects of a diverse student population on individual and institutional outcomes. Research by Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) provides a framework for conceptualizing the campus racial climate. The second body of literature focuses on decision-making theory within organizations. The research of scholars in organizational change (Hitt & Tyler, 199; Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989) guides this discussion. The third area of literature focuses on factors that influence administrative decisions within organizations, and more specifically, within higher education. The work of Birnbaum (1988), Cohen and March (1986) and Baldridge, Curtis, Eckert and Riley (1978, 1991) guide this discussion.

Values, Biases and Limitations

In qualitative studies, assumptions, values and biases can enter into the research and are important to acknowledge (Creswell, 1998). My assumptions, values and biases emerged primarily from my identity as an Asian Pacific American and my educational experiences. My professional focus throughout my educational career has been working on issues of equity on behalf of communities of color. This research reflects my interests in diversity and equity as they relate to race/ethnicity and therefore does not address

religion, sexual orientation, ability status and other ways that individuals may identify themselves.

In my work with senior administrators, I have seen them make decisions that have positively affected the campus climate. I assume, therefore, that senior administrators can play a key role in shaping policies and practices, more so then faculty and students. Through my personal interactions with senior administrators within institutions of higher education, I also believe that senior administrators are generally well-intentioned people who lack information or are under a variety of unseen constraints that limit their ability to make certain decisions. This is especially true regarding politically charged issues such as racial/ethnic diversity. These unseen constraints hinder the ability of administrators to effectively utilize the existing research that can inform their decisions about how to maximize the educational opportunities afforded by a diverse campus.

This research studies the decision-making of senior administrators about the campus climate for diversity at one large, public, mid-Atlantic research institution, the University of Maryland. It does not assume that the conclusions can be applied to other institutions of higher education because contextual factors that play a large role in this research will vary from campus to campus. In addition, the study focuses on senior administrators and therefore does not include others who have the ability to influence policy and practice, including students, faculty or mid/lower level administrators.

Contribution of Study

This study examined the behavior of senior administrators as they create and shape policy and practices regarding the campus racial climate. The findings of this study add to a considerable body of literature on decision-making within institutions of higher

education. Specifically, this research explores the complex factors which influence administrators as they attempt to create policies and programs regarding the campus racial climate.

This study may not apply broadly to all institutions of higher education but it will be useful to individuals who seek to apply or transfer the findings to their own personal experiences (Merriam, 1998). Case study research allows researchers to gain insight and understanding on aspects of educational practice that can ultimately have a direct impact on how policy, practice and further research are shaped (Merriam, 1998).

Scholars argue that campus climate is a complex issue that must be attended to, yet little is known about that which influences administrators as they think about and shape the climate. By examining the context under which administrators operate, this study will help administrators and scholars of higher education better understand the challenges that they may face in implementing policy and practices that effectively create a positive campus climate for diversity.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The literature reviewed focuses on three different areas in an effort to understand decision-making by leaders within institutions of higher education in regards to the campus climate for diversity. The first area addresses the impact of ethnic/racial diversity within institutions of higher education and its impact on campus climate. The works of Gurin (1999), Milem (2000) and Milem and Hakuta (2000) provide information on how diversity benefits individual students, institutions and society as a whole. Research by Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen and Allen (1998, 1999) provide a framework for understanding the campus racial climate. The second area of literature focuses on decision-making within organizations in general. The research of several different scholars in business (Hitt & Tyler, 1991; Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989) guides this discussion. The third area of literature provides an understanding of the various internal and external conditions which impact decision-making within institutions of higher education. The works of Birnbaum (1988) and Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker & Riley, (1978) guides this discussion.

Diversity Matters in Higher Education

In examining demographic trends regarding the population of the United States, it is apparent that the racial composition of our nation is changing dramatically. Experts predict that between 1990 and 2050, Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and African Americans will undergo dramatic growth in their populations (258.3 percent, 269.1 percent, 83 percent, and 69.5 respectively) (Campbell, 1996). Between 1990 and 2050, people of color are expected to account for nearly 90 percent of the total population

growth in the United States and by the later half of this century they will surpass the White population (Day, 1996).

In the United States, interaction with people from different racial backgrounds is unavoidable. Political theorist Benjamin Barber (1992) asserts that "diversity remains America 's most prominent virtue and its most unsettling problem...*E pluribus unum* is our brave boast, but we are neither very united nor very comfortable with our diversity" (p.42). The struggles related to racial/ethnic diversity currently faced by institutions of higher education mirror those that are also faced by American society. Chang (2000) writes

> …the dynamics of race and racism were integral to critiques of democracy made by Alexis de Tocqueville, Gunner Myrdal, W.E.B. DuBois, and Martin Luther King. For them, racial circumstances in American society exposed the contradiction between what is supposedly guaranteed by our cherished democratic principles and how these principles are systematically applied and broadly experienced (p. 169)

Campus Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity

For institutions to effectively and comprehensively address issues related to a diversifying campus, particularly in relation to racial and ethnic diversity, they must move beyond addressing issues of access and enrollment (Smith, 1997; Garcia, Hudgins, McTighe Musil, Nettles, Sedlacek, & Smith, 2001). The belief that "one particular dimension of diversity--increasing the proportional representation of underrepresented students of color--can single-handedly produce widespread educational benefits for all students" (Chang, 2002, p. 131) has resulted in policies and practices focused on admissions and access (Allen, 1992; Chang 1996; Rendon & Hope, 1995). Current research shows that increasing the proportional representation is not enough to ensure

racial equity or positive outcomes (Chang, 1999; Liu, 1998) and thus cannot be the sole ambition for institutions that seek to address diversity issues (Colón, 1991; Smith, 1997; Garcia et al, 2001). Merely enrolling a diverse student body is not enough to fully address issues of racial equality because the context in which students experience this diversity, the campus climate, matters a great deal (Chang, 1999; Hurtado et al, 1998, 1999).

Administrators who once focused policies and practices on issues related to admissions and access now must also focus on issues related to the campus climate (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Hurtado et al. (1999) write that "...campuses can no longer speak about changes in the number of diverse students without recognizing how this change affects the psychological climate or opportunities for interaction across different groups on campus--and ultimately changes in educational outcomes for students" (p. iv).

The study of the experiences of people of color within institutions of higher education is extensive but few empirical studies specifically focus on a comprehensive view of campus racial climates (Hurtado, 1992). Campus climate has typically been defined as psychological in nature as it tends to involve issues of perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members (Peterson & Spencer, 1990). Recent research by Hurtado et al. (1999) extends this definition by concluding that perceptions of the environment are “not only psychological in nature but have much to do with a wide range of experiences specific racial/ethnic groups have in society and within institutions” (p. 6) and are thus “inherently linked to a range of social phenomena that have to do with structure, history, and actual interactions across diverse communities within the environment” (p. 7). A number of studies have found that a positive campus

climate for racial/ethnic diversity benefits students, institutions of higher education and society as a whole (Astin, 1993a; Duster, 1995; Chang, 2002; Milem, 2000; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

The campus climate for diversity impacts student achievement, satisfaction and retention (Astin, 1993a, 1996; Tierney, 1997). Aspects of the campus climate affect students' feelings of marginality or belonging and their degree of physical and psychological involvement (Astin, 1996).

A positive campus racial climate can facilitate the development of qualities such as openness to diversity, the ability to dialogue across difference, and empathy and respect for those who are different (Gurin, 1999; Hurtado et al. 1998, 1999). These are skills that students need to be civic leaders (Bernstein & Cock, 1997; Boyte & Kari, 2000; Nussbaum, 1997; Rudolph, 1965). Bernstein and Cock (1997) note, "…if democracies are to flourish, universities must prepare citizens who can look beyond their own borders…" (p. B7). Effective citizens in the United States today must "have the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to compete in a global world economy" (Banks, 1997, p.11). Good citizenship not only involves voting and obeying the law, but also requires an understanding and appreciation of those of different backgrounds (Boyte & Kari, 2000). Similarly, Damon (1988) asserts that citizens must possess moral traits that include "dedication to honesty, justice, social responsibility, and the tolerance that makes democratic discourse possible" (p. B4). Effective citizenship in today's society requires an understanding of and ability to engage the diversity within the United States (Bernstein & Cock, 1997). People must learn to connect across racial, religious and economic differences. This happens when individuals are able to think in a critical and

complex manner (Gurin, 1999). Critical and complex thinking skills are evident when individuals are able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of differing positions on an issue (Bernstein & Cock, 1997).

The qualities needed for students to be effective civic leaders and citizens in a diverse democracy are developed better on diverse college campuses (Smith, 1997). Diverse learning environments lead to an increased commitment to improving racial understanding (Gurin, 1999; Milem, 1994). Students who are educated in a diverse learning environment are more likely to engage in a variety of activities and exercises that allow them to develop the qualities necessary for effective civic leadership (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Chang 1999; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, Dey & Trevino, 1994; Milem, 2000; Milem & Hakuta, 2000).

Colleges and universities across the country struggle with crafting polices and practices that create a diverse learning environment and improve the climate for racial/ethnic diversity (Cortes, 2000; Cress & Sax, 1998). Indeed the campus climate for diversity, although once thought to be too indefinable and vague to fully comprehend (Crosson, 1988), must be examined at multiple levels (Hurtado et al, 1998, 1999). Campus administrators have not made long range and strategic planning in regards to campus diversity a high priority (Botstein, 1991). Administrative resistance to the comprehensive examination of diversity initiatives exists in part because racial issues are seen in isolation and not a part of the central part of the institutional mission (Altbach, 1991). In addition, diversity initiatives are not given priority because of the pervading perspective that racial issues were dealt with during the Civil Rights movements of the 1960s (Altbach, 1991; Hurtado, 1996).

Relatively recently, organizations such as the American Association for Colleges and Universities have promoted and sponsored initiatives that explore issues in regards to campus climate and a diverse democracy (AAC&U, 1995; Smith, 1997; Garcia et al. 2001). National studies funded by the U.S. Department of Education such as the "Preparing Students for a Diverse Democracy" (Diverse Democracy Project) explore, among other things, how institutions of higher education are creating diverse learning environments which prepare students to take leadership roles in an increasingly diverse democracy. The study also explores the cognitive, social and democratic outcomes within students who are educated in a diverse learning environment (Diverse Democracy Project).

In an effort to provide an organized way to conceptualize this complex issue, Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) developed a framework that can help identify organizational areas that administrators and scholars can attend to as they examine the campus racial climate. Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) argue that campus climate is shaped by both external and internal (institutional) forces. The external forces impacting campus climate represent a combination of governmental policies, programs and initiatives, and socio-historic forces. The four internal forces that interact to shape the campus climate for diversity are the historical vestiges of discrimination, structural diversity, the psychological climate, and the behavioral dimension of climate.

The historical vestiges of discrimination refer to the legacy of limited access and exclusion of racial minorities that exists at most predominately White institutions of higher education (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). When segregation was a legal practice in the United States, institutions of higher education engaged in exclusionary practices that

prevented certain racial/ethnic groups from full participation in campus life. Although desegregation laws have provided increased access for certain racial/ethnic groups, historical vestiges of discrimination exist in the form of symbols, institutional policies and practices that are rooted in a long history of segregation. Moreover, these vestiges result in a set of long-standing embedded benefits that advantage particular groups on campus (Duster, 1995; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999).

Embedded benefits exist in the maintenance of campus policies that were designed to serve a homogeneous population. In other words, within historically White institutions, a variety of activities exist that were created without consideration for, and to the continued exclusion of students of color. Hurtado et al. (1998) use the Greek system as an example of one embedded benefit that exists on many campuses. At certain institutions of higher education, a great deal of support, in the form of financial and human capital, is given to the Greek system. Activities and programs generated on behalf of the Greek system were intended for a homogenous White student population to the exclusion of students of color. As such, though Greek systems now claim to be integrated, the climate has not necessarily changed to promote participation by people of color. The continued strong support of the Greek system on many campuses is an embedded benefit enjoyed by White students.

Structural diversity refers to the numerical and proportional representation of people from different racial/ethnic groups on campuses. Increasing structural diversity through policies and practices addressing admissions and access has typically been the focus of institutions of higher education when addressing racial equality (Allen, 1992; Rendon & Hope, 1996). Chang (2002) writes that the campus leaders adhere to a

"discourse of preservation" which "implies that one particular dimension of diversity--increasing the proportional representation of underrepresented students of color--can single-handedly produce widespread educational benefits for all students" (p. 131). Although increasing structural diversity is important, it cannot be the only goal for institutions that seek to improve and enhance a diverse learning environment. Achieving a racially diverse student body by itself does not guarantee equal opportunity, a welcome environment, or positive interaction across diverse backgrounds (Colón, 1991; Gurin, 1999).

Addressing the needs of a diverse student body has been a source of tension and challenge for administrators, particularly for those who are most accustomed to creating policies and practices for a homogeneous population. For example, as students of color increased in population on many campuses, they demanded representation of their cultural heritage in the curriculum (Wei, 1993). Administrators resisted a more inclusive curriculum because they lacked experience with, and an understanding of, non-Western cultures. Believing that the study of these cultures was less rigorous, some administrators within institutions of higher education hindered the inclusion of non-Western cultures within the curriculum (Botstein, 1991). At institutions where administrators were unwilling to adjust policy and practices, students rallied to demand the inclusion of diverse traditions within the curriculum (Wei, 1993). Student activism, which was a source of tension for many administrators, served as a catalyst for the creation of ethnic studies programs such as Asian American studies (Chang, 1999; Wei, 1993). Indeed, in order to provide a comprehensive education for students, the curriculum at institutions of higher education must be adjusted.

> …If one asked the question, how does one develop among contemporary undergraduates the capacity to think, inquire and debate articulately about issues such as justice or the individual in society, then proposing serious curricular solutions, the matter of race, nonWhite and non-Western cultures, as well as a reformulated construct of the Western tradition, all must come into play (Botstein, 1991, p. 101).

The increasing racial hostility on college campuses also has been a challenge facing institutional leaders (Altbach, 1991; Chang, 2000; Hurtado, 1992). Studies of the college experiences of African American, Asian American and Latino students indicate that incidents of racism, social isolation and personal dissatisfaction are common for these students (Astin, 1993; Chan & Wang, 1991). Current research demonstrates that if institutions of higher education are not prepared to identify and address hostile conditions that can result from enrolling more students of color, intergroup tension and conflict is likely to increase (Hurtado, 1994). Previously underrepresented students on predominately White campuses experience unique hardships that create a negative social environment (Skinner & Richardson, 1988). A campus that is filled with racial tension impacts teaching and learning because attention and energy are deflected from academic pursuits (Altbach, 1991). Hostile conditions can hamper the academic success of students of color and lead to student attrition (Altbach, 1991; Colón, 1991; Hurtado, 1992, 1994; Loo & Rolison, 1986).

A racially diverse student body on campus can create special challenges for institutional leaders. Simply bringing a diverse student body together does not necessarily result in positive outcomes or guarantee equal opportunity or a welcome environment (Chang, 1999; Colón, 1991; Liu, 1998). The unique challenges brought about by the increasingly diverse student populations cannot be ignored if institutions of higher

education are to equitably serve all students. On the other hand, education among diverse peers has the potential to enhance learning and development across a range of important educational outcomes, including critical thinking skills, intellectual and social self-confidence (Milem & Hakuta, 2000). Among students of color, diverse campuses facilitated the development of cultural pride, ethnic identity, and academic, social, and professional support (Duster, 1991).

The third dimension of the framework developed by Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) is the psychological climate. This dimension includes feelings of the responsiveness of the campus to diverse populations, views of group relations, attitudes toward those of different racial/ethnic backgrounds, as well as perceptions of the nature of racial/ethnic tension and discrimination. Perceptions of discrimination and an unjust campus can negatively impact student success (Hurtado, 1994; Loo & Rolison, 1986). Faculty can influence how students experience the psychological climate, directly (racial slurs, favoritism) and indirectly (pedagogy, course content). For example, students of color who perceived that they were singled out or treated differently in a classroom setting reported high levels of alienation and isolation from the institution (Cabrera & Nora, 1994). Although faculty play an important role in terms of socialization and student learning, peers are often the main source by which students learn (Astin, 1993b; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). Peer groups play a vital role in shaping students' attitudes and behaviors (Astin, 1993b). Peer group norms can affect attitudes toward cultural awareness, social activism or community service (Astin, 1993b). On more diverse campuses students are more likely to socialize across race, take ethnic studies courses and attend racial/cultural awareness workshops which result in greater retention rates and

college satisfaction (Chang, 1996). Finally, interracial friendships that develop more easily on diverse campuses can influence student's values and learning. Interracial friendship "…encourages students to venture more frequently outside their circle of best friends to socialize across race….and works to define interracial interaction as a norm for expected behavior" (Antonio, 2001, p. 83). Socializing across race and discussing racial/ethnic issues had a positive effect on student retention and overall satisfaction with college (Chang, 1999). Interaction across racial differences, as mentioned before, not only serves to improve students' overall college experience, but also prepares them to take leadership roles in an increasingly diverse democracy (Milem & Hakuta, 2000). Also included in this dimension of the campus climate is the level of support felt by students of color and perceptions of how their experiences and perspectives are valued. For example, the availability of resources for cultural heritage celebrations can influence perceptions of support and value of certain racial/ethnic groups (Steele, 1992). "…The particulars of black life and culture – art, literature, political and social perspective, music – must be presented in mainstream curriculum of American schooling, not consigned to special days, weeks, or even months of the year…." (Steele, 1992, p. 78). Steele's comments suggest that, in addition to heritage months or weeks, universities should make aspects of the experiences of these cultures more evident in all areas of the university. Students of color who perceive that the culture they bring to the university is of little value are more likely to experience poor academic performance and feelings of alienation (Cabrera & Nora, 1994; Smedley, Myers & Harrell, 1993).

The behavioral dimension of climate includes the actual interactions across race/ethnicity and the nature of such interactions in the co-curricular and curricular

realms. Involvement of students in cross-cultural activities is a part of the behavioral dimension. The absence of social interaction across race/ethnicity can impact how students view each other and also limit potential positive educational outcomes (Gurin, 1999). "…Maximizing cross-racial interaction and encouraging ongoing discussions about race are educational practices that benefit all students" (Hurtado et al., 1998, p. 287). Campuses should provide regular and structured opportunities for students to interact cross-racially and these must be "viewed as equal in status by all participants…" (Hurtado et al., 1998, p. 294). Chesler and Crowfoot (1990) write that the absence of interracial contact negatively influences students' views toward other students and the support of and participation in diversity initiatives. Gurin (1999) writes that institutions of higher education offer an opportunity to break the pattern of segregation that occurs within society. Students often come to campus from segregated high schools or neighborhoods and that pattern will likely be maintained in future living and work environments unless students have opportunities to engage diversity while they are in college. "…Students structure their lives so they also live in racially separated and insensitive domains; thus, all are protected from discomfort – and from contact that might be enriching or that might reduce systematic stereotypes and ignorance." (Chesler & Crowfoot, 1990, p. 219).

While structural diversity must be present to break patterns of segregation, the quality and type of interaction students have with difference is crucial to their growth and development (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn & Terenzini, 1996). Promoting a positive campus climate for diversity must involve quality and consistent cross-racial interaction such as structured discussions about race (Milem, 1994). Additional research

shows that among White students, those who had little social interaction with someone of a different background were less likely to hold positive attitudes toward multiculturalism on campus (Globetti, Globetti, Brown, & Smith, 1993). Conversely, White students who socialized with someone of another race, discussed racial/ethnic issues with other students, or attended racial/cultural awareness workshops were more likely to value the goal of promoting racial understanding (Milem, 1994). A commitment to improving racial understanding is a quality that is necessary for all students to develop if they are to be effective citizens in a diverse democracy (Gurin, 1999; Milem, 1994).

Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) write that to improve the campus climate for diversity, administrative leaders must address, through programs and practices, the historical, psychological and behavioral dimensions of campus racial climate. Among their more specific recommendations, Hurtado et al. (1999) suggest that institutions regularly and systematically assess the campus climate, involve faculty in diversity efforts, make a conscious effort to include those who were previously excluded due to race/ethnicity, create collaborative learning environments, increase student/faculty interaction outside of the classroom, support inter-group dialogue programs and increase staff/faculty sensitivity toward racial/ethnic diversity. In the end, an improved campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity has a direct link to teaching and learning and ultimately the mission of institutions of higher education (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999).

Senior campus administrators are often expected to create policy and practices that improve the racial climate (Kirkland & Rega, 1997). A racially diverse organization is characterized as one that has visible leaders who work toward promoting change in regards to the campus diversity policies (Foster, Jackson, Cross, Jackson & Hardiman,

1988). Current scholarship exists to inform campus leaders about best practices that will improve the climate for diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999), yet for a variety of reasons, those who have administrative authority often fail to make subsequent rational decisions (Simon, 1976).

Decision-Making

Strategic decision-making is a primary function of upper level managers within organizations (Child, 1972). Strategic decisions are defined as "nonprogrammable decisions that involved the commitment of substantial resources at the level of the total enterprise" (Wally & Baum, 1994, p. 933). They are decisions that are "important, in terms of the actions taken, the resources committed, or the precedents set" and are "those infrequent decisions made by top leaders of an organization that critically affect organizational health and survival" (Eisenhardt & Zbaracki, 1992, p. 17). Rational normative, external control and strategic choice are three primary models used to explain the strategic decision-making process (Hitt & Tyler, 1991).

Rational Choice Model

Rational models explain that decision-making is a sequential process. First, the individual defines the problem, then searches for alternative solutions, assesses the consequences, and finally selects the "right" alternative. Rational choice models assume that behavior is purposeful, conscious and consistent (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Rational decision-making occurs when options are well defined, widely accepted and made within a simple, stable and clearly defined environment (March & Simon, 1958). Organizations that are focused on the pursuit of clear and specific goals and exhibit highly formalized social structures tend to employ rational decision-making (Chaffee, 1987; Scott, 1987).

A weakness of the rational model includes a failure to recognize the impact of power, politics and context in which the decision is made (Baldridge et al., 1978). Indeed, decision-making by managers is often an open and sometimes illogical process involving many elements (Hodginskin, 1996) and is influenced by a variety of situational and psychological influences (Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989). The problem is not that "rationality is ill-conceived, but rather that the conditions under which it works best are relatively rare in organizations" (Weick, 1985, p. 109). Decision-making is more often irrational and sometimes inconsistent because individuals do not always make optimal decisions that maximize benefits and minimize losses (Simon, 1976). The strictly rational perspective of strategic decision-making is incomplete because it does not recognize the influence of personal characteristics and perceptions (Hitt & Tyler, 1991) when ultimately people and not organizations make decisions (Child, 1972).

Strategic Choice Model

The strategic choice model operates under the premise that decision-making is more complicated than the process described by the rational choice model because of the influence that a decision maker has on strategic decisions (Child, 1972; Mortimer & McConell, 1978). Individual differences among decision-makers affect strategic decision-making activities (Eisenhardt & Bourgeois, 1988; Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987; Hitt & Tyler, 1991). Personal cognitions about the world, needs, values, experiences and expectations can play a role in decision-making (Child, 1972; Simon, 1976; Weick, 1979). Hambrick and Mason's (1984) upper echelons perspective theorizes that strategic choices reflect an executive's psychological and observable characteristics such as age, level of education, background, work and other past experiences.

Just as previous experiences impact decisions, perspectives on the future also affect a decision-maker (Bateman & Zeithaml, 1989; Lewin, 1951). Thoughts and views of the future, that is, anticipated success or failure, impact decision-makers (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984). Future perspectives are influenced by the way that choices are framed. If a choice is framed in a positive light with a potential gain, then the decision-maker is more likely to look favorably on that alternative. Levels of risk taking and commitment are also influenced by the way that a choice is framed. An individual is less likely to make a risky decision if the probable outcomes are framed positively or negatively. Kahneman and Tversky (1984) found that depending on whether treatments for cancer were described in terms of mortality or survival, patients' decisions to seek treatment were different. In sum, strategic decisions are influenced by a combination of individual perspectives on past, present and future events (Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989).

Contextual and situational influences also enter into the decision-making process in the form of perceived organizational slack (Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989; Bourgeois, 1984). Organizational slack refers to actual or potential resources that support and allow for an organization to adapt, adjust or change its polices or practices. Organizational slack has been positively associated with strategic risk-taking in that the availability of resources impacts a willingness to make risky decisions (Carter, 1971). For example, if an individual perceives that an organization has enough resources to cover any losses that may result from a potentially risky decision, then he/she may be more likely to take that risk.

External control model

Advocates of the external control perspectives argue that strategic decisions are constrained by the environment rather than managerial behavior (Romanelli & Tushman, 1986). The structure of the environment, such as the complexity and hierarchical nature of the industry, affect strategic decision-making activities (Child, 1972; Hannan & Freeman, 1977; Hitt & Tyler, 1991). Centralization of authority, size and complexity of the institution are a part of the external environment which affects decision-making (Barney & Ouchi, 1986; Bourgeois, 1984). Competitor behavior, technology, customer preferences, environmental instability and uncertainty impact the organization and ultimately affect decision-making (Duncan, 1972; Wally & Baum, 1994).

Hitt and Tyler (1991) conclude that executives use a combination of the rational, external and strategic choice perspectives when making strategic decisions. Executives and managers are influenced by a combination of contextual circumstances and individual values as a result of personal experiences (Bateman & Ziethaml, 1989).

Strategic decision-making in business organizations is a complicated phenomenon and is equally complicated within institutions of higher education. College and university campuses are organizations with extremely complex environments. Because increasing numbers of administrative and educational problems confronting colleges and universities are so complex and involved, it is almost impossible for institutional leaders to make "good" decisions (Simon & March, 1993).

Influences on Decision-Making in Higher Education

The majority of recent higher education leadership theorists argue that the action of leaders is contingent on situational and organizational conditions (Birnbaum, 1988,

1992). Effective institutional leaders must be sensitive and responsive to the internal culture of the institution and also have the skills to deal with external constituencies (Birnbaum, 1988). To understand decision-making in higher education it is important to understand the distinct characteristics that comprise campuses and to recognize the ways in which the character of the college influences the outcome of any decision (Cohen & March, 1991). The environment, that is, the structure of the institution, political climate and other situational conditions under which administrators operate are important to understand to comprehensively understand higher education decision-making (Birnbaum, 1988; Chaffee, 1987; Cohen & March, 1986; Twombly, 1992).

Professionalism and Goal Ambiguity

Baldridge et al (1978) characterized institutions of higher education as organizations dominated by professionals. Institutions of higher education are comprised of expertly trained professionals (faculty members) who demand and are usually granted a great deal of autonomy regarding what they research, how they teach and the hours that they work on campus (Baldridge et al., 1991). Faculty members work relatively independently and do not consider themselves subject to administrative directives because of the infringement those directives place on professional autonomy (Mintzberg, 1991). Rather then having their work evaluated by administrators who may be superior within the bureaucratic structure, professionals demand that peers or colleagues in their fields serve as evaluators (Baldridge et al., 1991; Cohen et al., 1972).

The lack of consensus about where power and authority exist within institutions of higher education complicates the role of an administrator. Different types of authority exist depending on the organizational member. Faculty may provide “academic

authority" whereas administrative authority rests in the administration or board of trustees (Clark, 1991). Administrator's attempts to dictate policies and practices become difficult because faculty members demand input and will not necessarily comply with administrative directives. For example, although the provost may strongly encourage faculty members to attend diversity training workshops, there is no guaranteeing that all, if any, will attend. A high position in the administrative hierarchy is not seen as a source of authority because organizational members are presumed to be colleagues (Birnbaum, 1988).

To be effective leaders, administrators must embrace the fact that faculty do not consider themselves subject to administrative authority or hierarchical power structures (Swenk, 1999). Administrators within institutions of higher education must focus on balancing and coordinating the interests of organizational members so that they can work together (Baldridge et al., 1978). An administrator should be most concerned and considerate of interpersonal issues such as understanding the different personalities, needs and values of the campus constituents so that they can effectively lead (Birnbaum, 1988; Bensimon, 1989).

Goal ambiguity is another characteristic of institutions of higher education (Baldridge et al. 1991). Goals are often debated and unclear because organizational participants (e.g. students, staff and faculty) may differ in their beliefs or perspectives about institutional matters (Cohen et al., 1972; Baldridge et al., 1991). Faculty, for example, may come together as peers and have common goals that may not be the same as those of the administration or students (Birnbaum, 1988). For a student, the goal of an institution of higher education may be quality teaching. However, the goal of the

institution for the faculty member may be research. Furthermore, the goal may be fund-raising for administrators in the development office.

Defining institutional goals is complicated by the transient nature of institutional participants. It is important to understand current organizational members and their concerns because institutions of higher education are driven strongly by values and beliefs that vary depending on the participants (Kezar, 2001). Participation by members of the organization is fluid and varies in terms of the amount of time and effort they invest (Cohen & March, 1986). As institutions of higher education become more diverse, more participants with various needs, expectations, and racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds add to the complex process of decision-making by administrative leaders (Kezar, 2001).

Environmental Vulnerability

Decision-makers within institutions of higher education are extremely vulnerable to the organizational environment and are greatly affected by external forces (Baldridge et al., 1978, 1991). Institutions of higher education are not closed systems but are open and in continued interaction with their environments (Baldridge et al., 1991). The organizational environment is the model of organizational governance under which the institution operates. Such models include the collegial, bureaucratic or political system (Baldridge et al., 1978, 1991).

External environments play a crucial role in affecting internal, institutional change (Baldridge & Deal, 1983). Although colleges and universities have traditionally had a great deal of academic autonomy, it has never been absolute (Brubacher, 1990). The external environment that affects campus administrative work includes the state and

federal government and the general public. The control that the state and federal governments have over funding to colleges and universities can influence administrative behavior (Birnbaum, 1988). Institutional leaders often submit themselves to policies set forth by federal government funding programs in order to receive monetary resources (Berdahl, 1991). In addition, the lack of funds and financial resources constrains the ability of administrators to significantly influence campus policies (Birnbaum, 1988). More recently, the public has called for greater accountability and a better understanding of where their taxes go in supporting institutions of higher education. "The locus of power seems to be shifting from inside to outside the university, from the community of scholars to the public domain, from the university's historic position of privilege and immunity to one of responsibility and accountability" (Brubacher, 1990, p. 30). More so now then ever, pressure to solve social problems and to be more fiscally accountable weigh on campus leaders and their decisions (Kezar, 2001).

Slaughter (1998) found that the external environment played a large role in the formation of policy around fiscal priorities within institutions of higher education. In the 1980s, as a response to a faltering position in the world economic market, federal funding that normally was set aside for public sector/public welfare programs such as higher education was reduced (Slaughter, 1998). Congress focused on funding entrepreneurial research or other initiatives that had more profit generating potential. In an effort to obtain this funding, administrators responded by supporting and promoting entrepreneurial research efforts within academic departments. The result of this action was that departments that had great financial need, but no prospects for conducting any entrepreneurial research (e.g. arts and humanities), were under-funded. Resource rich

departments that already had generated a great deal of funding from entrepreneurial research (e.g. science and high technology) received additional funding and support. This situation exemplifies how funding decisions made within institutions of higher education can, at times, appear irrational.

Another element of the external environment that affects administrative decision-making is federal and state laws. On issues ranging from residency requirements to hate speech, federal and state laws influence administrative decision-making (Kaplin, 1992; Olivas, 1988). "As higher education becomes more reliant upon government support, and as colleges offer themselves for hire as willing participants in commercial ventures and as social change agents, legal restrictions are sure to follow" (Olivas, 1988, p. 595). Institutional leaders must consider the legal ramifications of most major decisions made within institutions of higher education (Olivas, 1988).

The political process can weaken the decision-making ability of institutional leaders, particularly in states where trustees are elected. Leaders often find themselves submitting to the whim of political agendas rather then what might be best for the institution (AGB, 1984). Trustees, who often have the power to push through or stall institutional initiatives, are often subject to the agenda of a political party or politician who may have nominated or appointed the individual to the position. The process of becoming a trustee is rarely separate from state politics (AGB, 1984). Politicians may use institutions of higher education as pawns for promoting selfish goals, particularly in regards to fiscal matters (Michael, 1998).

Similarly, public opinion can influence decision-making by administrators. Layzell and Lyddon (1993) found that there was a direct relationship between public

perception of higher education and resource allocation for institutions in the 1970s. The study found that the general attitude among people in the United States was that higher education was "a personal asset rather than a societal one" (Layzell & Lyddon, 1993, p. 319). In other words, people did not feel the need or desire to financially support institutions of higher education because a college degree only benefited individuals rather then society as a whole. Elected federal and state lawmakers reacted by cutting allocations to institutions of higher education. As state funding for institutions was reduced, institutional leaders were forced to make difficult decisions about campus funding priorities and ultimately to initiate significant budget cuts.

In a study of the selection processes of college deans, Twombly (1992) found that context (institutional culture, current issues and history) was influential in the decision-making process. Her study compared the search processes of different professional schools as they looked for new deans. In one college she found that the committee's selection was strongly related to state budget allocations. Budget cuts required that a dean with fund-raising experience be hired. The decision of the committee was greatly influenced by whether an individual had the ability to raise money. At a different college, the study found that the history with previous deans played a key role in the decision-making process. After experiencing a series of over-controlling deans, the search committee favored candidates who seemed more collaborative and open.

Normative Beliefs

Within colleges and universities individual normative beliefs can influence decision-making.. Normative beliefs are the social pressures felt by individuals to perform or not perform a behavior. Normative beliefs are a combination of the

perceived approval or disapproval of important and significant reference groups and the motivation to comply with the views of each referent (Ajzen & Madden, 1986). Significant referents may include peers, family and professional colleagues, in other words, anyone that maybe referred to when making a decision. Normative beliefs are known to influence different types of behaviors such as exercise participation (Courneya & McAuley, 1995) and smoking (Lennox & Taylor, 1994).

Research on faculty decisions to unionize found that they were most affected by the perceived normative and social pressures (Zalesny, 1985). Faculty were most likely to vote for unions if they perceived social pressure to do so. In another study on voting intentions and unionization, Montgomery (1989) found that campus clerical employees were strongly influenced by opinions of friends, family members, and coworkers. Understanding and conforming to social norms as they relate to institutional culture is important in order to be an effective administrator (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, 1991). In a study of college presidents, Bensimon (1989) found that experienced presidents, when assuming new office, recognized the importance of understanding institutional culture, norms and expectations. The behavior of administrative leaders is constrained by a campus social system which is dictated by the expectations of institutional members (Pfeffer, 1991).

By understanding and embracing community norms, leaders gain trust, loyalty and influence. Whetten and Cameron (1991) argue that an effective higher education administrator is sensitive to the political shifts that institutions undergo and is able to negotiate the varying needs and desires of different interest groups.

Normative beliefs play a large role in administrative decision-makingin regards to diversity issues in higher education (Botstein, 1991). Currently, administrators within institutions of higher education experience normative pressures regarding implementation of and support for diversity related initiatives. Institutions of higher education have come under tremendous internal and external pressures to embrace what Lawrence Levine describes as "a more eclectic, open, culturally diverse, and relevant curriculum" (Chang, 1999, P.183). Institutions of higher education are expected to provide solutions for racial tension and to be an example of racial harmony for the rest of society to imitate and have responded to this pressure, in part, through policies and curricular changes (Chang, 1999, 2000).

Individual Characteristics

Characteristics of the individual decision-maker are influential in decision-making (Dill, 1991). Administrators' personal values that result from different backgrounds and life experiences affect attitudes and values that ultimately influence policy decisions (Meier, 1993). Walker and Lawler (1982) found that the political orientation of an administrator was a factor in his or her decision to support collective bargaining. In regard to administrative personnel decisions related to hiring and firing, common life experiences with respect to race and gender were important sources of influence (Johnsrud et al., 1994). In another study regarding hiring and promotions within industry, Kanter (1977a, 1977b) found that decisions were based upon perceptions of "trustworthiness." Those who were perceived by the decision-maker to be more trustworthy were those with whom they shared similar life experiences which were measured by visible differences such as race and gender.

Racial attitudes are also individual characteristics that can impact decision-making. For example, White's perceptions that their social/economic status is at risk will influence their attitudes toward programs like affirmative action or race-based scholarships (Bobo & Kluegel, 1993). Indeed programs such as affirmative action that provide economic assistance to underrepresented groups have not historically seen a great deal of support from Whites (Schuman et al., 1998). Bobo & Kluegel (1993) explain that although Whites may generally have positive attitudes about people of color, once they see potential threats to their social or economic status, then their attitude will turn negative.

Negative attitudes toward those of differing race/ethnicities are acquired through socialization processes (Young & Takeuchi, 1998). School, family, peers and the media are common mediums by which individuals are socialized (Katz, 1976). In other words what people learn from school, family, peers and media about different race and ethnicities will affect their attitudes toward those groups.

Studies of White racial attitudes show that educational attainment and demographic variables play a role in attitude formation (Bobo & Licari, 1989). For example, those who are highly educated and younger tend to hold more tolerant racial attitudes (Bobo & Kluegel, 1997). Cognitive complexity resulting from higher levels of education is positively linked to racial tolerance (Bobo & Licari, 1989).

Childhood experiences with those of differing racial/ethnic groups also impact attitude formation. Braddock (1980) found that the experiences White children had with people of color shaped their racial attitudes and beliefs about desegregation as adults. Indeed Whites who attended desegregated schools and had greater contact with those of

different racial/ethnic backgrounds tended to have fewer racial stereotypes, were less fearful of hostile reactions in interracial settings, and were more accepting of desegregation as adults (Braddock, 1980). Lack of contact with people from different racial/ethnic groups can negatively affect racial attitudes. Conversely, intimate, pleasant, rewarding and equal status contact plays a role in reduction of prejudicial attitudes (Amir, 1969).

Among college students, research shows that attitudes toward different racial groups are related a college student's field of study (Guimond & Palmer, 1989; Sidanius, Pratto, Martin, & Stallworth, 1991). Students who expressed less favorable attitudes toward those of different backgrounds were more likely to be in fields such as business, engineering and the natural sciences.

Participation in racial or cultural awareness workshops are also found to influence racial attitudes. Springer, Palmer, Terenzini, Pascarella and Nora (1996) found that among college students, participation in forms of multicultural education served to decrease levels of prejudice.

Perceptions of Power

Within institutions of higher education, perceived power is influenced by a number of conditions ranging from personal characteristics such as gender and race to external influences such as increased demands for accountability by voters (Layzell & Lyddon, 1993). There is an overall perception of declining power by the administrators due to conditions such as the centralization of power and increasing influence in decision-making from external sources (Harten & Boyer, 1985). Several studies demonstrated that an individual’s perception of his or her own power and influence was a

criterion for decisions on internal resource allocations (Dill, 1991). Hackman (1991) found that the centrality of a unit and its bureaucratic power within the institution influenced decision-makers, particularly in the area of resource allocation. The chairperson's perceived power and control played a role in how he or she allocated work time (McLaughlin et al., 1977). Department chairs that perceived they had a great deal of control or power in departmental matters spent more time on their chair-related duties. In contrast, chairs who perceived that they had little individual control or power typically spent more time with students and in other activities that were related to faculty life (McLaughlin et al, 1977).

Decisions about academic program termination were also influenced by the amount of perceived power and influence that a department or an individual had (Eckel, 2002). Instead of basing closure decisions on costs or academic quality, Eckel found that they were often based on perceived departmental power and political clout. Programs that were perceived to be weak and unsupported and that lacked influential champions were closed while those that had strong advocates remained open. Administrators were also influenced by perceptions of whether their decisions could be successfully executed. In other words, administrators decided against program closure if they thought that there would be significant protest or barriers that could interfere with their decision (Eckel, 2002). Perceived power in the form of administrative title or position can be influential in the decision-making process (McLaughlin et al, 1977). The title held by an individual within an institution (i.e. faculty member, dean, or department head) can affect perceptions of his or her own power and influence and will influence decision-making behavior (Dill, 1991).

The many internal and external environmental factors that have been mentioned all influence administrative decision-making. Decision-making within institutions of higher education is a complex process and made even more so with calls for more accountability, declining resources and the changing needs of an increasingly diverse student body (Wolverton, Gemlech, Wolverton & Sorros, 1999). In modern times, one such complicated and challenging issue facing higher education decision-makers is preparing students to live and work in an increasingly racially/ethnically diverse democracy (Milem, 2000).

Summary

Research illustrates the relevance of the campus climate for diversity as an area of study and concern for institutions of higher education. A diverse learning environment yields significant positive outcomes for individual students, the institution and society as a whole. While existing research on campus climate provides information for institutional leaders on how they might go about creating policy and practices in this area, the process by which decisions are made or not made in this area is unclear.

Research on decision-making in higher education indicates that there are a number of constraints that may hinder administrators from making rational decisions. There are a number of complex environmental, situational and personal elements that affect the decision-making process of senior administrators. Informed by existing research, this study examines the factors that influence senior administrators as they make decisions regarding the campus climate for diversity.

CHAPTER 3

Research Design and Methodology

This study explores senior administrative decision-making regarding the campus racial climate within institutions of higher education. In order to investigate the processes through which senior administrators make decisions on campus climate policy and practices, this study asked three research questions:

The following research questions framed this study of the decision-making behavior of senior administrators at the University of Maryland:

1. How do senior administrators learn/develop their views about diversity?
    a. What is their experience with diverse populations and how does this influence their views about diversity?
2. What organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland influenced their decisions?

Informants' responses to these two questions provided information that was used to answer a third primary research question:

3. What common factors influence senior administrators decision-making regarding policies and practices related to the campus racial climate?

This chapter discusses the research methodology, sample selection, data collection methods, data analysis strategy, validity and reliability issues, limitations and ethical considerations.

Design of the Study

In qualitative research, reality is subjective and constructed by the participants in the study. The researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding rather than outcomes or products (Creswell, 1994; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1984). Qualitative research describes in detail people's words and actions with the goal of accurately representing the situation as experienced by the informants (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Qualitative research has a concern for context, understanding the unique perspective of the informants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992) and happens in a natural setting where the researcher observes what is occurring (Merriam, 1998).

This study examined the process by which senior administrators made decisions on policies and practices related to the campus racial climate. This study focused on the factors that influence the decision-making process rather than on the quality of the decisions themselves. To answer the specific research questions, this study employed a qualitative method known as case study. Case studies are especially useful in psychological, sociological and organizational studies when trying to answer "how" and "why" questions (Yin, 1989). A case study requires the use of multiple sources of evidence including interviews, documents and observations to analyze "a phenomenon within its real-life context" (Yin, 1989, p. 23).

Three underlying reasons guided the selection of the case study method for this research. First, case study is an appropriate method to investigate a contemporary phenomenon when the context of the study is important to understand (Yin, 1989). The campus racial climate is a contemporary phenomenon that has only recently been an area of concern at many institutions of higher education. In addition, decision-making within

institutions of higher education, particularly regarding a complex issue such as racial/ethnic diversity, is a complex process greatly impacted by contextual conditions (e.g. the political climate and current events).

A second reason to use the case study approach was because of the topic of this study, decision-making by senior administrators related to racial/ethnic diversity. Case study has commonly been used as a methodology to study how and why decisions occur and the subsequent results (Yin, 1989). The case approach also has been used to facilitate the analysis of public policy issues (Macpherson, Brooker & Ainsworth, 2000) such as those related to racial/ethnic diversity.

A third reason to use the case approach is because it captures the thick, descriptive narrative that is necessary for a rigorous study of complex human behavior (Yin, 1984). This case study relies on rich, descriptive data gathered primarily from interviews and documents to understand the phenomena of decision-making in a complex organization. Detailed descriptive data allows a researcher to develop conceptual categories that better facilitate data analysis (Merriam, 1998).

Definition of Terms

Senior Administrators: Include the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans (academic and student services), or Directors. An administrator is a person in charge of planning, organizing, coordinating, controlling, and managing the administrative functions of one department, unit or educational organization.

Senior Central Administrators: Includes only the senior administrators who are not directly connected with or oversee the day to day administrative functions of one specific academic unit or college.

Campus Racial Climate: The environment for learning and socializing across racial/ethnic differences. The elements of the campus climate for diversity include structural diversity, historical vestiges of discrimination, and the psychological and behavioral climates.

Campus Racial Climate related Programs/Policies/Practices: Initiatives designed or administered by institutional members that address an issue or program related to the campus racial climate. In this study, this termis used interchangeably with "Diversity Programs/Policies/Practices."

Unit of Analysis - The Sample

To begin a case study, it is necessary to identify a unit of analysis, which may be an individual, a group, program or event. Prior to any data collection, a decision must be made as to whether a single or multiple-case is going to be used (Yin, 1989). When a study contains more than one case, a multiple case study design must be used (Yin, 1989). Multi-site case studies allow the richness and detail of individual cases to emerge and at the same time identify general elements that can be compared and contrasted eventually allowing conclusions to emerge (Merriam, 1998, Miles & Huberman, 1994). This study employed a multiple case study design because it sought not only to understand individual decision-making process, but also to compare the process across a number of senior administrators in order to generate theory (Patton, 1990).

This dissertation involved the study of multiple cases within a single context, the University of Maryland. The University of Maryland is a large, public, four-year institution of higher education located in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Key senior administrators, specifically those who had worked within the institution for

the past five years, served as individual cases and the specific units of analysis. The institution and the five-year timeframe were appropriate for this investigation because while Maryland has been characterized as one of the most structurally diverse institutions in the United States, there was evidence that administrators still struggled with how to provide a positive campus racial climate. For example, within the past five years there have been a number of hate incidents targeting students of color. These incidents have forced institutional leaders to re-think and re-examine the campus climate for diversity. Recent hate incidents have also served as the impetus for the creation of committees, commissions and special programs to address issues related to the campus climate. The timeframe was selected because not only was it experiencing significant transformation in terms of structural diversity but there were significant national issues which added an interesting dimension to the discussion. The time frame was also selected to increase the likelihood that participants would be readily available and easily contacted and that their recollection would be fairly fresh in their mind.

The struggle to create a positive campus climate for diversity was also evident in the number of institutional self-studies on issues related to equity and diversity for staff, faculty and students that have been commissioned in the past decade. The past decade has also been a time where students of color have been active in challenging the administration and campus as a whole regarding the level of institutional support for diversity initiatives. For example, due in part to students' push for curricular change, the institution now supports an Asian American Studies program.

Maryland provided a rich context to conduct this study because it is an institution that continues to struggle with how diversity is best addressed in policy and practice~~s~~.

Maryland was an institution undergoing significant transition and transformation as a result of structural diversity. In addition, the complex socio/political forces that shape how the institution has treated issues of racial/ethnic diversity added to the rich context under which administrators at Maryland operate. (See chapter 4 for a more detailed description of Maryland).

Maryland also was an ideal context to conduct this study because of my role within the institution which allowed me to assume the role of participant-observer in the research setting. Participant observers are "fully engaged in experiencing the setting under study while at the same time trying to understand that setting through personal experience, observations, and talking with other participants about what is happening" (Patton, 1990, P.207). As a participant-observer, my familiarity with the setting was an advantage in structuring interviews because it allowed me to have a more complete knowledge of the informants and context of the study (Hunter, 1993, Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

As someone who already had a good relationship with many of the informants, a certain level of trust and openness existed that improved my access to informants (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). In order to have fruitful and honest discussion about issues of race, ethnicity, diversity and equity, a degree of trust must exist (Patton, 1990). My prior relationship and knowledge of the informants was also be helpful because we shared some common understandings of specific issues, people and topics that reduced the amount of time spent doing background research.

My proximity and knowledge of the setting, allowed me to gain a better understanding of the informants' experiences (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Guba and Lincoln (1994) write that

> …in situations where motives, attitudes, beliefs, and values direct much, if not most human activity, the most sophisticated instrumentation we possess is still the careful observer - the human being who can watch, see, listen…question, probe and finally analyze and organize his direct experience (p. 213).

Close, consistent contact with the institution was integral to this study because it provided opportunities to learn things that informants may be unwilling to talk about in the interview (Patton, 1990). Close contact also allowed for an understanding of the context under which administrators operated (Patton, 1990). The understanding of context was important in this study because of the important role it plays in decision-making (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker & Riley, 1978). Proximity also allowed me to observe activities that informants may not mention because such activities are so much a part of everyday routines of administrative life (Patton, 1990).

Data Collection

Data for this study were generated primarily from interviews and document analysis. The principle source of data for this research was interviews with senior administrators who had a significant number of decision-making responsibilities regarding policy and practices that affect the campus racial climate. These data provided insight regarding how administrators at the University of Maryland made decisions regarding the campus racial climate.

Interviews

Qualitative interviewing allows for a deeper understanding of the phenomena of study (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Interviews provide insight into how people interpret and understand complex relationships, and how current behavior may have been influenced by past decisions or incidents. The central goal of an interview is to understand how the informant thinks (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), and in this case, how he/she thinks as he/she makes decisions related to the campus racial climate.

Informants were selected by purposeful sampling which generated information-rich cases and allowed the researcher to focus in-depth on investigating and understanding a small group of subjects. In this type of study, the size of the sample was not as crucial as having information-rich cases (Patton, 1990). Purposeful sampling is frequently used by qualitative researchers and allows for the discovery and understanding of complex phenomena (Merriam, 1998). The specific forms of purposeful sampling used in this study were snowball, criterion and convenience sampling (Patton, 1990).

Snowball or chain sampling, which eventually resulted in a list of information-rich informants, began by asking "well-situated people" (Patton, 1990, p. 176) for names of individuals who they felt had significant decision-making responsibilities regarding the campus racial climate. The initial group of informants was selected by referrals from knowledgeable faculty and other institutional members who were centrally involved with and highly informed about programs and policies related to Maryland's campus climate for diversity. As more people were consulted, the list of information-rich informants grew because key names were mentioned repeatedly. The study began with an initial informant list, to which during the course of data gathering, other informants were added.

Criterion sampling uses predetermined standards that were of importance to the study to select the informants. Criterion sampling results in a list of "elites" or "the influential, the prominent, the well-informed people in an organization or community who are selected for interviews on the basis of their expertise in areas relevant to the research" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 83). For this study, the criterion for informants was that they were senior administrators with significant decision-making responsibility and influence on campus diversity issues. Although decisions are made on a daily basis by administrators at all levels and on a multitude of topics, the informants selected for this study were senior administrators who had significant decision-making responsibility and influence regarding racial/ethnic diversity initiatives. This study focused on senior administrators because of an assumption that they were in the position to have a great deal of influence on campus policies and practices.

Convenience sampling was also used in this study. Convenience sampling usually takes less time, money, and effort because it is based on availability and accessibility (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990). The selected informants were those who were accessible in terms of location, wilingness and availability to me.

After identifying a potential list of informants, I e-mailed each of them and explained the purpose of my study, the requirements for participation, and asked for their participation (Appendix A). Attempts were made to ensure that the pool was diverse in terms of race and gender and represented a broad spectrum of major units within the institution. In total, twenty-one individuals were asked to participate in this study and fifteen agreed to be interviewed. Among the fifteen informants, eleven were people of color and four were White. The six individuals who were invited to participate but chose

not to participate were White. Seven informants had begun their careers as faculty members. In regard to the length of service at the University of Maryland, tenures ranged from thirty plus years to two years, with the majority having worked more then ten years. In addition, three people were interviewed because they could provide more information regarding the institutional context and could help to clarify information discovered during my analysis of historical documents. These three individuals were selected because of their knowledge of University of Maryland and its history regarding diversity initiatives. In addition these individuals had first hand information regarding policies and practices that had been implemented that shaped Maryland's campus racial climate.

After confirming the list of those who agreed to participate, I obtained the appropriate consent from each informant. The consent form (Appendix B) was based on the requirements detailed by the University of Maryland Human Subjects Review Committee. Interview sessions occurred at a mutually agreed upon time and in the offices of the informants where their privacy was assured. Informants were asked for consent to have the interview audio taped. Prior to each interview session, participants were assured of anonymity in regards to all data gathered. Interviews varied in duration, ranging from forty-five minutes to one and a half hours. Any significant variations or changes in tone and body language were also noted and recorded in notes taken during the interview. Immediately after each interview the tape and the notes taken during the interview were reviewed to identify any emerging themes. All interviews were transcribed verbatim within 24 hours of the interview. Transcription was done manually in order to insure that the richness and detail of the data were maintained (Merriam, 1998). Audiotapes were kept in a secure location and accessed only by the researcher.

Merriam (1998) describes interview formats that range from highly structured to open ended and conversational. Highly structured interviews rely upon predetermined wording and specific ordering of questions. A semi-structured interview involves a mix of structured and open-ended questions. An unstructured interview is more like a conversation where questions are flexible and open-ended. Unstructured interviews are used when the goal is to understand the informant's perspectives on a particular topic (Merriam, 1998). A semi-structured interview format was used in this study because it facilitated exploration of the specific decision-making influences in a way that allowed the informants to share perspectives in their own words.

The interview protocol was developed using guidelines suggested by Patton (1990). The questions were designed to provide information on experience and behavior, opinions and values, feelings, knowledge, sensations, backgrounds and demographics of the informants. The interview protocol provided a framework to guide the interview while permitting me the freedom to purse topics more in-depth (Appendix C). Two members of the dissertation committee reviewed the questions on the interview protocol to help assure that the questions were clearly phrased and appropriate to the questions that I wished to explore. Questions were open-ended so as to not result in dichotomous responses and in addition, I used a frame of reference familiar to the informant, the University of Maryland.

The interviews for this study revealed the informants beliefs, knowledge, experience and background. Specifically, the interviews explored administrator's perspectives on racial/ethnic diversity, and thoughts on related beliefs about diversity and views about campus climate policy and practices. The interviews also revealed

information about conditions that informants considered influential in their decision-making regarding the campus racial climate.

Before and during the interview biographical data was gathered to provide relevant background information on the informants (questions 1 and 9). Biographical data included information such as gender, race/ethnicity, years at the institution, and areas of current and past responsibilities at the institution. Biographical information was important for this study because individual differences such as ethnicity, gender and social economic status can influence decision-making (Dill, 1991).

Question 2, 3, 4 and 5 asked the informants to identify particular programs or initiatives that they feel were significant in contributing to campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity and provided a point or reference for questions 3 and 5 which explored in more depth their decision-making process. Questions 6, 6.5, 7 and 8 provided more insight into the general decision-making process and behavior of the informants. It is important to note is that when the informants were contacted and the interviews began, I explained that I was examining decisions related to the campus racial climate. As the interviews progressed, informants inevitably used terms such as "diversity initiatives" or "diversity related programs" interchangeably with the term "campus racial climate."

Research questions were explored to the "saturation point," that is, until no new information was forthcoming (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). In a qualitative study, some interviews will yield more data than others because some informants may not be as forthcoming or cooperative as others. Every interview may not yield rich data but all

interviews are valuable because they are cumulative; they build on and inform each other and are not meant to stand alone (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

In addition to the interviews with study participants, including three interviews with individuals who served as historical informants, additional informal discussions occurred with individuals who provided information for my exploration of the institutional context. These individuals were those who had the knowledge to confirm or disconfirm information discovered in document analysis related to the history of the formation of policy and programs related to Maryland's campus racial climate.

Documents

Documents are a stable and objective source of information and a good way to understand attitudes, perspectives and beliefs of the informants (Merriam, 1998). In this study, documents were primarily used to assist in constructing and understanding the institutional context with regard to the campus racial climate. Although documents were valuable in helping to verify some interview data, they were primarily used to understand the history of the institution in regard to policies and practices as they affected the campus climate. Documents analyzed in this study included published books, articles, reports, letters and memoranda, institutional or departmental mission statements, policy implementation notices regarding diversity issues, speeches, interviews, feature news articles related to campus diversity, and minutes of formal and informal administrative meetings on diversity issues. Other documents examined included institutional self-studies and reports on diversity issues. Historical documents that dealt specifically with the design, development, and implementation of diversity initiatives at Maryland were also reviewed. Of particular interest to this study were documents related to Maryland's

history of segregation and desegregation, which were important in understanding the context of this study. Documents accounted for historical events that led up to the formation of policy and practices and also provided background information on informants in regards to their history with institutional diversity initiatives and efforts. Documents provided information about the cultural norms, values and traditions at Maryland.

During the interviews informants were invited to and subsequently shared documents that they felt supplemented the information provided in interviews. For example, there were additional unpublished reports or department specific information related to specific policies and programs that were not uncovered in the initial collection and review of documents.

Data Analysis

The research questions and literature on decision-making in higher education guided the analysis of these data because in case study methodology the researcher may begin constructing a theory about the case before any data are collected (Yin, 1994). In this study, I sought to expand on current research derived from the literature on decision-making in the context of higher education with the goal of developing categories, patterns and themes that eventually led me to my interpretations and findings. Analysis of data was done manually to preserve the richness and detail of the data.

Analysis of data was based on themes related to decision-making regarding the campus climate for diversity at Maryland. The analysis began with an in-depth study of each transcript to sort and reduce the volume of the data. Each case was summarized in written form, including biographical information on the informants and an initial

overview of what played a role in decision-making in regard to the campus racial climate. Eisenhardt (1989) refers to this initial step as "within-case analysis." During this stage data was transcribed, sorted, reduced and coded to facilitate analysis (Murphy, 1980). I then used the research on decision-making in higher education outlined in Chapter II to code and group the interview data into themes regarding decision-making in higher education. I also coded data that informants cited as influential in their decision-making but were not reflected in the literature review in Chapter II. Once the data were coded, data that related to the same themes were grouped together in "provisional categories" or provisional themes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Examples of provisionalthemes included perceptions of power, priorities, subjective norms and leadership. The initial "definition" of themes were either based on prior literature and research or, if not mentioned in prior research, a definition was created.

As each case was analyzed and coded, data in the form of interview excerpts illustrating the provisional theme were inserted in a grid. A linenumber indicating where the quote was located within each transcript was added so that it was easy to refer back to the context of the quote within each transcript. This first chart assisted in a more in-depth examination of each provisional theme. This occurred in order to assure that coding was accurate and also to facilitate a more in-depth exploration of the elements of each provisional theme. Data within theprovisional theme was examined because I was aware that certain themes may be sub-categories of others. As the provisional themes were examined, sub-themes emerged and a new set of grids focusing on the sub-themes were developed.

Interview data from each informant was then inserted into this new set of grids comprised of the sub-themes in order to facilitate cross-case analysis. I then examined all of the data within each sub-theme to confirm a set of final themes. Analysis of data across cases involved a search for consistent patterns in decision-making between informants. Good cross-case comparison allows data to be looked at in divergent ways (Eisenhardt, 1989). In this study the cross-site search for patterns occurred by an examination of the previously mentioned data grids to identify similarities and differences between the cases. These forced comparisons lead to a more complex understanding and discovery of unexpected themes or concepts. Initial themes and patterns emerged as a result of the within-site and cross-site analyses. Emerging themes were compared to the research presented in chapter two and then examined for consistency across cases (Murphy, 1980). The data analysis methods employed in this study ensured that the conclusions reached were an accurate representation of the data. What emerged from the examination of the data analysis was a series of themes, the majority of which were present in the initial literature review. These themes are explored in chapter 5.

Validity and Reliability

Qualitative researchers must ensure that the study meets validity and reliability requirements (Yin, 1989). Qualitative research allows significant room for interpretation and thus must have measures to ensure that it is rigorous (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Internal validity in qualitative research reflects the degree to which the data matches reality (Merriman, 1998). Triangulation, peer examination, and identification of any

researcher bias are common strategies that are used to assure internal validity (Merriman, 1998), each of these strategies were used in this study.

Triangulation involves the use of multiple methods or sources of data collection for the purpose of verifying the findings. Triangulation strengthens the overall design of the study because it allows the researcher to overcome the weakness of one particular data gathering method or source through the strength of another (Patton, 1990). For example, documents may be used to verify a comment made by an informant. In this study, data from interviews and a wide range of documents were used to cross-validate and confirm the content, accuracy and interpretation of the data gathered.

Peer examination involves meeting with someone uninvolved with the study who asks questions about the methodology, conclusions, and biases of the study. Peer examination is meant to ensure that the interpretation of the data is as unbiased as possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I was in regular contact with a peer unrelated to the study who challenged my results and analysis and offered alternative explanations for my conclusions. This individual examined my initial data grids and emerging provisional themes and suggested alternate ways to interpret and organize the data. My peer examiner also challenged some of my initial my conclusions that I drew from the data. I was also in constant contact with my dissertation advisor during the data gathering and analysis phases to discuss my experiences and findings.

Because qualitative studies allow significant room for researcher biases to influence the results of the study, it is important that I explain and clearly state my perspectives, judgments and values (Creswell, 1998). At the time of this study I was a graduate assistant in the Office of the Associate Provost for Equity and Diversity; a

position that I held for two years. I had intimate knowledge of the issue at hand due to my contact with senior administrators who made decisions regarding the campus racial climate. While at the University of Maryland, I worked on a number of initiatives and served on various committees that directly or indirectly addressed issues related to the campus climate for diversity. My work and position in the institution caused me to develop some biases about some administrators who I felt had not done an adequate job of serving the interest of students of color.

As a result, I was extremely sensitive about how my own biases and subjectivity could affect my study and its findings (Creswell, 1994; Yin, 1989). In addition, I was aware of how my history with the institution, my previous experiences with the informants, and my own life experiences influenced how I interpreted the data. By adhering to the standards of validity and reliability described by Yin (1994), I strove to counteract potential researcher bias.

External validity involves the degree to which the conclusions drawn are applicable to other situations at other periods of time, in other words the extent to which the results are generalizable or transferable (Merriam, 1998). Generalizability is the extent to which research findings and conclusions can be applied to the population at large. Transferability is the applicability of the results of research in one context to another similar context and occurs when the researcher allows readers to make connections between parts of the study and their own experiences (Merriam, 1998).

Generalizability and transferability were facilitated by providing "thick description" or as much detail as possible about the context, setting and the individuals involved in the setting in which the study occurs (Merriam, 1998; Whitt, 1991). An

outside reader should be able to gather enough details from the written investigation to determine if the results were applicable to his/her context, thus a detailed description of the context of this study was provided. Although this study may not apply broadly to all institutions of higher education, it can be useful to individuals who want to apply or transfer the findings to their own experiences (Merriam, 1998).

The extent to which the research and the results could be replicated added to the reliability of the study (Merriman, 1998). Similar to validity, reliability was facilitated by triangulation and consideration of investigator biases. Reliability was also ensured through providing an audit trail. An audit trail, also referred to as establishing a chain of evidence, provided a detailed description of how the data were collected and analyzed. Thus I have provided a detailed description of my data collection and analysis procedures.

Limitations

The lack of generalizability may be a limitation of case study methodology, meaning that the results may not be applicable to other institutions of higher education (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1989). On the other hand, it was not the goal of this research to generalize to any or all institutions of higher education. Another potential limitation of case study methodology is that it relies heavily on the integrity and unbiased reporting of the researcher. In addition, my status as an Asian Pacific American may be a potential limitation. The ethnic background of a researcher can create perceptions on the part of the informants that may cause them to make assumptions and feel more or less comfortable with the researcher and ultimately affect their honesty and forthrightness (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). I believe thatthe unwillingness of Whites to participate in

this study was due in part to my ethnicity. Whites may have been less comfortable talking about race with a person of color for fear that I may render some sort of judgment on their actions or words. Compared with people of color, Whites also may have been less comfortable talking about issues of race because it is not an issue that they are forced to examine on a daily basis. The lack of White informants was ultimately a limitation of this study. Had more White informants agreed to participate, the data and conclusions may have been richer.

Ethical Considerations

The nature of qualitative research places special ethical demands on the researcher because of the close contact and relationship that she/he develops with informants (Whitt, 1991). Confidentiality, honesty and responsibility are ethical criteria that must be addressed in a qualitative study (Dobbert, 1982).

In this study, the informants and their responses were described in a way that ensured their anonymity. Informants were assigned pseudonyms and anonymity was extended in the reporting of all information learned through interviews, observations and data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

Honesty required that the informants had full knowledge of the purpose of the research and how the information they provided would be used. Informants had full knowledge of the interview agenda and the time required for their participation. An informed consent form was used to insure that informants understood the purpose of the research and their role as informants (Bodgan & Biklen, 1992).

Finally, responsibility required that I understand the ramifications of the research on the informant and the institution. Some information gathered included critical

remarks about units or individuals that had the potential to damage professional reputations. My responsibility as a researcher required that I understand the data I collected could not be used for personal gain but only to contribute to knowledge. To this end I did not discuss or share the interview data with others for the purpose of gossip or unnecessary conversation.

CHAPTER 4

Institutional Context: The University of Maryland, College Park

This chapter describes the institutional context in which this study was conducted, specifically highlighting initiatives related to the campus racial climate at the University of Maryland, College Park. Current initiatives sponsored by the institution focus on issues such as recruitment and retention programs, inter-group dialogues, and various classroom initiatives. Educational opportunities for students, staff and faculty on diversity issues have not always been present and have been implemented over time. Diversity related activities ranging from campus offices to programs to committees have emerged for a variety of reasons including responses to legal challenges, compliance with federal civil rights legislation and progressive campus leadership. These legal challenges have forced Maryland to become more vigilant in serving communities of color, particularly Blacks, and have caused Maryland to change and shape old and new policies and programs to better serve communities of color.

This section provides a brief overview of the emergence of campus policy and practices regarding the racial climate at the University of Maryland. Highlighted in particular are significant socio-historical forces and events that the informants in this study mentioned as significant in influencing their decision-making regarding the campus racial climate.

The University of Maryland – A Brief Overview

The University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), is a large, public, four-year research university located in Prince George's County, Maryland, a majority African-American suburban county adjacent to Washington, D.C. UMCP currently offers

baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral programs in the liberal arts and sciences, social sciences, the arts, and selected professional fields. UMCP is a Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution under the Carnegie classification system, and is part of the University System of Maryland (USM), which includes thirteen four-year public colleges and universities. The current organization of higher education in Maryland was implemented in 1988 following major education reform legislation that combined five institutions that originally comprised the University of Maryland with the state's six comprehensive universities into one system governed by a Board of Regents with a Chancellor serving as the chief executive officer of the system. This legislation granted these institutions greater autonomy than they previously had, and among other things, designated the UMCP as the "flagship" campus. Designation of the campus as the flagship institution "mandated an elevation of [the] university to the top echelon of the nation's public universities" (Maryland, 1997, P. 5).

From De Jure to De Facto Segregation

Originally established in 1859 as the Maryland Agricultural College to produce "liberally educated gentlemen," (Callcott, 1966, P.147) the institution became one of the nation's first land-grant colleges in 1867 and by the early 20th century had expanded its offerings to include programs in engineering, business and the liberal arts. The college added graduate programs shortly before World War I and in 1920 merged with professional schools in Baltimore and changed its name to the University of Maryland.

Located in a state where education was segregated by race, little or no provisions were made by the State of Maryland for the post-secondary education of the Black population until the Morrill Act of 1890. The Morrill Act of 1980 appropriated federal

funding to public institutions of higher education "without distinction of race or color" (Callcott, 1966, P. 161) and as a result the state of Maryland contributed money to Princess Anne Academy. Princess Anne Academy was an institution where Blacks could receive training in skills such as farming, home economics, brick-laying and other such trade skills. But despite the added funding under the Morrill Act of 1890, it was widely acknowledged within the state that the Princess Anne Academy was a neglected institution that lacked sufficient funding and support from the regents. The institution received only the minimum financial support necessary under the Morrill Act of 1890 and as a result quickly deteriorated. Recognizing the poor state of the institution and the substandard education that was provided there, in 1932 the regents "somewhat guiltily established a fund totaling $600" (Callcott, 1966, P. 306) so that Blacks could apply to out of state schools. This was the beginning of a pattern set by the institution regarding how it dealt with any Black citizens who wished to pursue a higher education. In order to prevent integration on the University of Maryland campus, institutional leaders provided money for Black students to attend out of state schools. This practice went unchallenged until 1934 when Donald Murray, a Black student, refused to apply for a scholarship to study law out of state and took legal action to gain entrance to the University of Maryland law school (*Pearson v. Murray, 1936*). Murray was admitted to the Law School on court order in 1935 and graduated in 1938. Although this case technically opened the way for the enrollment of other Black graduate students, institutional leaders continued to fight integration and in order "to avoid indiscriminate mixing" (Callcott, 1966, P. 307), increased funding for scholarships to out of state schools to $30,000.

Murray's successful battle to attend law school was followed in the late 1940s when a Black student sued and was granted admission to Baltimore's nursing school (*McCready v. Byrd, 1950*). As a result of the Maryland Court of Appeals ruling in favor of the Black student, in 1951 the Board of Regents declared that all applications from Maryland residents for admission to professional schools in Baltimore were to be "considered on an equal basis without regard to race, color or creed" (as cited in Maryland, 1969, P.1). Also in 1951, the first legal battle over desegregation at the undergraduate level came to an end when Hiram Whittle was admitted through a vote from the Board of Regents and became the first Black undergraduate at the University of Maryland.

After admitting Whittle, the University of Maryland did not admit additional Black undergraduate students until after the 1954 Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* which struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine (*Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896*) and ruled that institutions of public education must be integrated. The Board of Regents declared in 1954 that

> the same policy heretofore governing admission of students, residents of Maryland, to the Graduate Schools of the University shall hereafter apply to the undergraduate schools at all braches of the University, that is, that all qualified students, resident of Maryland, may apply for admission to the University in any of its schools. (Board of Regents, 1954)

As a result of this ruling, acting UM President Thomas Symons authorized the director of admissions to admit Black Maryland residents beginning that same year and as a result two Black students were admitted to UM. A year later the Board of Regents moved to extend this policy to Black applicants from out of state.

Dismantling De Facto Segregation

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. (42 U.S.C. §2000d)

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a significant moment in the history of the United States in regard to equality for persons of color. As the civil rights movement gained momentum in the United States, UMCP experienced a relatively large amount of activity on campus related to equity for Blacks.

The 1960s emerged as a significant time on the UMCP campus for student activism and social change. Students, to the dismay of administrators, began to support and increase their activism around civil rights issues. For example, when noted segregationist George Wallace came to speak on campus in his 1964 campaign for the presidency, he was jeered by a large majority of the 8000 students in his audience (Callcott, 1966). During that same time, when the Dean of Student Life discouraged staff from participating in civil rights rallies, he was widely criticized and was eventually forced to resign from his position (Callcott, 1966). Social activism by groups such as the Campus Coalition Against Racism (CCAR) served to encourage administrators to pay more attention to communities of color. CCAR was formed in the fall of 1968 as a group of concerned students, student organizations, faculty and administrators. Student organizations that held membership in CCAR included groups such as the Black Student Union, the New Democratic Party, Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Council, Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Government Association. The stated goal of

CCAR was "to eliminate institutional wide racism in the University community" (Maryland, 1969, P. 100).

Although students were vocal in their displeasure regarding discrimination, relative to forces external to the institution, they were somewhat less a factor in changing policy or programs related to the campus racial climate. The primary impetus in the 1960's and 70's for the creation of policy and programs to enhance the campus racial climate was pressure exerted from entities external to the campus. Callcott (2001) attributed the increased interest in civil rights issues on the UMCP campus in the late 60's for the disadvantaged and Blacks in part to progressive leadership at the state level. The governor at the time, J. Millard Tawes, was "conservative by instinct, but masterful at embracing change and playing the role of reformer that the times required" and "like Lyndon Johnson, was ready to take the logical step from civil rights to a frontal war on poverty" (¶ 33).

Another force external to the institution that added to the pressure to provide a better climate for Blacks was criticism by members of the state board of higher education. The University of Maryland was routinely "blasted" in the newspapers by vocal state board of education members for its poor treatment of Blacks. Later on, certain members of the state legislature would join members of the state board of education in publicly criticizing the University of Maryland. The bad publicity received by the institution added to the pressure it was feeling from state officials.

Finally, during this time period, perhaps the greatest pressure pushing the institution to create policy and programs to better serve Blacks was the need to comply with federally ordered desegregation laws. Among the programs that were developed

during this time in an effort to comply with these laws and also to demonstrate to the public that the UMCP campus was attempting to address the needs of Blacks included the Intensive Education Development (IED) program. IED was first developed in the 1967-68 academic year to address the educationalneeds of Black undergraduate students. More specifically, the program was created to provide academic, financial and counseling support to disadvantaged graduates enrolled in college. The Office of Human Relations Programs was created in 1968 to respond to issues of discrimination and inequities facing Blacks. In the 1990's the office expanded its services to focus on gender, sexual orientation, religious and other racial/ethnic differences. Both the IED programs and OHRP were mentioned specifically in Maryland's first desegregation plan submitted in response to litigation initiated by the United States Office of Civil Rights (OCR) in 1969.

In 1969, the State of Maryland and nine other states were notified by the United States Office of Civil Rights (OCR) that they were operating segregated higher education systems in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. OCR alleged that the State of Maryland had yet to address the current effects of past discrimination and required the submission of a desegregation plan that outlined ways in which Maryland would change to comply with Title VI. OCR required that the plan have as its objective, among other things, increased educational opportunities for Blacks and other persons of color regarding access to higher education. This event began almost twenty years of negotiations between OCR and the Maryland higher education system regarding the creation of an acceptable desegregation plan.

In September 1969 President Elkins proposed a desegregation plan for UMCP which included not only enhancing the functions of the previously mentioned IED and

Office of Human Relations, but also included the creation of programs such as Afro-American Studies and the Cultural Study Center. The Cultural Study Center was designed to provide the institution with research on the needs of Black students. The Elkins plan also included an increase in staff within the office of undergraduate admissions and the counseling center devoted to recruiting and retaining Black students. The new staff in the counseling center were hired to help Black students with reading and study skills and also to cope with emotional problems.

But despite efforts by the University of Maryland to address the needs of the Black population, Maryland's system of higher education still operated under de facto desegregation. In other words, even through segregation did not exist by law (de jure) it existed by fact (de facto) and as a result, in 1970, the Legal Defense and Education Fund (LDF) of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) initiated a lawsuit asserting that OCR was not fulfilling its obligation to sanction states and their universities for noncompliance of Title VI. This case, known as *Adams v. Richardson* (1973a/1973b) was initiated by the LDF to compel OCR to enforce Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Under the provisions of Title VI, any states in violation stood to lose all federal funding for primary, secondary and postsecondary institutions of education. Specifically, the suit argued that a number of southern states, including Maryland had failed to adopt measures necessary to overcome the present effects of past discrimination and that OCR was not enforcing Title VI. In 1973, OCR was directed to proceed with enforcement action and remove federal funding from states found in violation of Title VI. Upon appeal by OCR the courts ruled that instead of engaging in enforcement proceedings, OCR could first attempt to secure acceptable desegregation

plans from the states in question. As a result, OCR requested that Maryland submit a desegregation plan that complied with Title VI. Maryland's desegregation plan included, among other things, a goal of 16 percent enrollment of Black freshmen at the UMCP campus. After the plan was reviewed, OCR determined that the state of Maryland was still not in compliance with Title VI and required the state to submit a new desegregation plan.

As the state of Maryland continued to negotiate with OCR, new entities were developed on the UMCP campus in attempts to comply with desegregation laws and to counter continuing publiccriticism by state officials. Among these entities were the Nyumburu Cultural Center and the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Education. The Nyumburu Cultural Center emerged in the 1971 to be a central location for Black social, cultural and intellectual interaction on the UMCP campus. Nyumburu's activities included lectures, seminars, art exhibits and workshops. Pressure from outspoken faculty who felt that the campus had to better address the campus racial climate for Blacks by providing students with a 'safe space' to socialize was an additionalimpetus for the creation of Nyumburu. Black students felt that they were not welcome in places like the student union and expressed a need for a place of their own on campus. In 1972 the Office of Multi- Ethnic Student Education (OMSE), originally called the Office of Minority Student Education, was created. OMSE was created as an attempt to centralize and consolidate minority academic student services on campus.

A number of policies were also created to ensure that staff and faculty of color were equitably treated in regard to hiring practices. In the 1971-1972 academic year, the *University of Maryland Affirmative Action Plan* was developed and stated "…the College

Park campus administration is committed to the elimination or revision of any policy or practice which in effect is discriminatory. It considers this commitment a part of its intrinsic obligation to fairness and justice." (Maryland, 1972, P. 2) Because the affirmative action plan was created to comply with federal mandates, the plan's design provided a detailed description of steps that were being taken at the time of its writing to guarantee equal education and employment opportunities for people of color and women in compliance with the spirit of Title VI.

In 1975, after Maryland had submitted its *First Mid-Year Desegregation Status Report* to OCR, the state was informed that it was again in violation of Title VI. In other words, the desegregation efforts made by Maryland were unacceptable to OCR subsequently informed the state that unless some action was taken within 30-60 days, enforcement actions would be initiated. After a series of unsuccessful negotiations, the state was informed by OCR that enforcement proceedings were going to begin. At this point, the State of Maryland counter sued OCR to stop enforcement proceedings *(Mandel v. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare,* 1976*).* This began nearly ten years of litigation between OCR and the state of Maryland. Over the next several years, Maryland worked to develop a plan for dismantling its dual system of higher education and for eliminating the vestiges of segregation. Although the ruling in *Adams v. Califano* (1977) resulted in the "Califano Guidelines" which gave states a framework under which they could base their desegregation plans, Maryland still was unable to develop an acceptable plan**.** From the mid-1970's until 1985, OCR and Maryland were in constant negotiations concerning the development and implementation of an acceptable desegregation plan.

During the mid-1970's, as the post-secondary education system of Maryland waited for a resolution to *Adams v. Richardson*, UMCP continued to increase services geared toward improving the campus racial climate for persons of color. With the appointment of Gluckstern as chancellor of the UMCP campus, the institution experienced a significant increase in programs and policies created to enhance the campus racial climate. Gluckstern, according to a faculty member who was on campus during the time "really had an interest in trying to do some things around diversity he realized this was an important issue and did some significant things when prodded….he had to be pushed a little bit." Among those things prodding Gluckstern was not only compliance with federal desegregation orders but also an active Black Faculty and Staff Association (BSFA).

The Banneker program, a merit and race based scholarship, was established in 1979 to target and attract Black students to UMCP. This program was part of Maryland's plan to comply with the recruitment and retention goals in the desegregation plan it submitted to OCR. The program was also the result of the efforts of vocal members of the BSFA who felt that if the institution was serious about serving Blacks then it could afford to invest in that program. The Banneker program was created to be a recruitment tool for high-achieving Black undergraduates. In addition to possessing a high level of academic achievement to qualify for the scholarship, recipients had to demonstrate leadership and community involvement. Banneker scholars received four years of full support for tuition and fees as well as additional privileges such as priority housing and mentorship opportunities. This program was at the center of a significant legal battle in the 1990s which is described later in this chapter.

Along with the efforts to recruit Black students in the 1970's, attempts were also made to improve the environment in which people of color and women worked and studied. In 1976, the Human Relations Code, recommended by the University Senate, was established by the Chancellor as a standard by which members of the Maryland community should operate in regard to the treatment of people of color and women. The code was created to:

1. Prohibit discrimination as defined in this document within the Campus community both by educational programs and, to the extent specified herein, by a formal grievance procedure;
2. Establish the responsibilities of the Office of Human Relations Programs in connection with this Code;
3. Establish mediation and grievance vehicles within the units and colleges of the campus, in conformity with the Campus Affirmative Action Plan;
4. Establish the responsibilities of Equal Education and Employment Opportunity (EEEO) Officers (Maryland, 1976, P.1)

The Campus Compliance Officer, placed within the Office of Human Relations was given responsibility for investigating complaints of discrimination in accordance with the Human Relations Code. This position was established in response to a federal law that required a formal means for processing complaints of discrimination on all university campuses.

The President's Commission on Ethnic Minority Issues (PCEMI), originally established as the Chancellor's Commission on Minority and Ethnic Issues, was created in 1979 to advise the President on issues of concern to minority students, faculty, and staff. President Gluckstern created this group in response to a request made by faculty and staff. The PCEMI was created to serve as an advocate for the minority community, reviewed existing campus policies that affected ethnic minorities, and made recommendations for change or improvement.

In 1980 a memo to PCEMI summarizing the status of people of color on campus, Chancellor Robert Gluckstern reported that UMCP had made significant progress in the recruitment of minority faculty and students. He cited the existence of a large number of programs dedicated to improving the status of minorities on campus including support units such as the Center for Minorities in Science and Engineering and a variety of minority faculty and staff recruitment programs. It was during this time, specifically in 1982 that the UMCP made one of its boldest statements regarding equal opportunity for minorities when the campus appointed its first Black chancellor, John Slaughter.

Moving Toward Compliance

From the onset of his presidency, John Slaughter expressed his concern and interest in assuring access and success of people of color. In his 1983 inaugural address, Slaughter stated:

> The University of Maryland, College Park must be the campus to which the most talented graduate and undergraduate students from this state come. We want to appeal to the 18 year old woman with a National Merit Scholarship, the Black student who is looking for a quality educational environment…To stress this diversity does not mean that we abandon our commitment to excellence…Too often we equate the notions of affirmative action…with mediocrity. We must open our doors to create educational opportunities for a wide variety of students and we must recognize the potential for excellence in a diverse student body…Now is our opportunity…to make this a model multi-racial, multicultural and multi-generational academic community (OHRP, 1998, P. 2.4).

In 1985, two years into the tenure of President Slaughter, OCR and the State of Maryland finally agreed on a statewide desegregation plan that met the requirements of Title VI. OCR accepted Maryland's plan conditionally for the period of 1985-1989, but did not acknowledge that the state was in full compliance with Title VI. The principal objectives of the plan included efforts to increase recruitment and retention programs for

Black students, and to desegregate faculties, staffs and governing boards of each campus. Included in the 1985 plan was the continued use of race-targeted scholarships, like the Banneker. From 1985 to 1991, Maryland submitted yearly progress reports to OCR, with the final report submitted in 1991.

While the institution was monitored by OCR, between 1985 and 1991, additional policies and programs were established to attend to aspects of the campus racial climate above and beyond recruitment efforts. Many of these efforts were credited to the leadership of President Slaughter who placed high priority on diversity efforts. In addition, faculty members continued to play an important role in advocating for policies and programs that enhanced the campus racial climate. For example, a major institutional report issued in 1987 entitled *Promises to Keep: The College Park Plan for Undergraduate Education* was initiated through the efforts of John Pease, a prominent faculty member known to care a great deal about the status of undergraduate students. A part of the report suggested the following proposal:

> As of the Fall of 1990, all undergraduates should be required to take one 3 credit course that focuses primarily on either: a) the history, status, treatment, or accomplishments of women or minority groups and subcultures, or b) cultural areas outside North America and Western Europe…Since we live in a steadily shrinking and interdependent world, a 'global village' increasingly aware of the dangers of chauvinism or parochialism of any kinds, it is essential that University of Maryland graduates leave having taken at least one course that will alert them to areas and energies other than those dominant in the traditional Western culture (OHRP, 1998, P. 6.3).

This proposal became known as the "Human Cultural Diversity" requirement within the undergraduate curriculum. The Human Cultural Diversity requirement was designed to give students an opportunity to learn from and about people outside of "those dominant in the traditional western culture" (Maryland, 1989b, Distributive studies section, para. 12).

The report also included a statement about the needs of communities of color and expectations of how they should be treated within the UMCP community.

> Campus policy requires that all students, regardless of sex or race, must be treated equitably and with equally high expectations. High standards for academic performance and classroom decorum must be enforced. The committee also acknowledges the need in many areas on campus for more role models for women and minorities among faculty, administration, and staff (Maryland, 1989b, Women and minorities section, para. 2).

In 1988 the institution created the Office of Graduate Minority Education, now known as the Office of Graduate Recruitment, Retention, and Diversity (OGRRD). This office was created to provide administrative and fiscal support that would identify, recruit, retain, and graduate a diverse graduate student body. The office assists the University's colleges and departments in creating an environment supportive of the academic success of women and graduate students of color. This office was created due to an emerging awareness that although there were services to address the needs of Black undergraduate students, the graduate student population went largely ignored.

Chancellor Slaughter's concern about the status of people of color on campus extended beyond students to include faculty and staff. Slaughter felt that the measures put in place by previous administrations to assist with the recruitment of minority faculty and staff were inadequate. In particular, recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, especially Blacks, continued to be a problem so Slaughter created a special position to coordinate affirmative action programs and reporting efforts and oversee the newly created Equity Council. The Equity Council was created by President Slaughter to assure that affirmative action procedures were followed in every college and division. The Equity Council also served as an advisory group to the President and President's

Cabinet to improve recruitment and retention of a diverse community and was charged with reviewing and recommending search and selection policies and procedures for the university and its colleges and departments. (Maryland, 1986)

During the tenure of Chancellor Slaughter, UMCP moved toward compliance with OCR desegregation standards with the submission of an acceptable desegregation plan. The structural diversity of students and faculty was steadily increasing and new policies and programs were created to address needs and concerns of communities of color. The number of services devoted to people of color increased significantly during the tenure of Chancellor Slaughter and additional services were added under the tenure of President William E. Kirwan.

Excellence Through Diversity

In his 1989 inaugural address, President William Kirwan described his vision of the institution in regard to diversity. He believed that the University of Maryland should be known as "a place where excellence is achieved through diversity; a place that reflects the diversity of our state and the cultural richness of the world …a place where diversity is not only tolerated, but celebrated" (OHRP, 1998, P. 2.7). Kirwan led UMCP through arguably one of its most defining periods regarding the campus racial climate. In *Podberesky v. Kirwan* (1991), UMCP was sued over its use of the Banneker scholarship program initiated in 1979. The plaintiff argued that the only reason he did not receive a Banneker scholarship was because he was not Black. He alleged that the practice of reserving a portion of institutional financial aid funds for a single-race exclusive scholarship program was discriminatory. As part of the defense strategy, the university presented findings of past investigations by OCR to the Court of Appeals to assert that

vestiges of segregation still existed and thus, the race-based scholarship was necessary and legal. In a statement defending the existence of the scholarship, former President Kirwan wrote:

> To defend our stance on the need for race-specific scholarships, the university was forced to document candidly and thoroughly our belief that the particular segregationist history of the University of Maryland had residual effects that continue to distance Blacks from the university. File boxes of testimony, documents and records were assembled – effectively, a highly public baring of our institutional soul. Our attorneys argued passionately that the Banneker scholarship were not an anachronism, unnecessary in the environment of the 1990s, but rather an essential device in increasing our acceptability to all (OHRP, 1998, P. 2.5)

In the end, the appeals court did not agree with Maryland and Podberesky was awarded the scholarship. After the United States Supreme Court refused the university's request to hear the case, the race exclusive scholarship program was dismantled in 1995. The Banneker program was combined with the Francis Scott Key Scholarship program and became solely a merit based scholarship.

The Podberesky decision had wide ranging effects on the institution in that all race-based affirmative action programs underwent a review and institutional leaders made necessary adjustments to ensure compliance with the standards set forth in that case. In reference to the impact of the *Podberesky* decision, President Kirwan said "…the Banneker decision has caused us to modify a lot of programs, but as long as we can operate under the *Bakke* principle, taking diversity into account, we will be all right" (OHRP, 1998, P.2.14). The *Bakke* principle that Kirwan referred to was outlined in the case of the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978). In this case a White student who was denied admission to a medical school at the University of California, Davis filed suit claiming that he was the victim of reverse discrimination and that

minority students were given preferential treatment through the use of a special admissions program. Bakke argued that the special admissions program violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The compromise ruling by the Supreme Court determined that the University of California could not make decisions based solely on race but that it was in the state's interest to, according to Justice Lewis Powell, obtain "the educational benefits that flow from an ethnically diverse student body" (University of California Regents v. Bakke, 1978, sect. IV). Powell's opinion was a compromise opinion in a split court (four Supreme Court justices agreed that Bakke had been the victim of reverse discrimination while four believed that California's affirmative action plan complied with the 1964 Civil Rights Act). This decision provided a guiding principle for the use of affirmative action in higher education.

Although there were fewer Black recipients of the Banneker scholarship after the lawsuit, UMCP experienced an increase in the enrollment of Black students immediately after the lawsuit which many have attributed to the institution's defense of this program. Kirwan's visible and vigorous defense of the Banneker program also sent a signal to the UMCP campus that diversity initiatives were important to campus leadership. As a result, while diversity enhancement programs like *Banneker* were being challenged, new programs still emerged.

The diversity programs that emerged during the Kirwan era focused not only on recruitment efforts, but also on providing a positive campus racial climate for students and employees. In agreeing with a statement in a 1992 institutional report, Kirwan wrote that "UMCP does much better at bringing in undergraduate African American

students than in graduating them, and far better at hiring African American faculty than in retaining them" (Maryland, 1992, P. 4). The new programs that emerged for during Kirwan's tenure included the Curriculum Transformation Project that was created in 1989 to assist faculty in including more diverse materials into their courses. The goal of the program was to help faculty achieve a diversified curriculum by offering workshops and resources on initiating curricular change. The program was designed to help faculty members integrate scholarship on race, gender and other forms of diversity into their courses. The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) was founded in 1990 as another effort to ensure that the classroom climate is conducive to learning for all students regardless of race. The CTE was created in response to recommendations made in several campus reports that called for renewed emphasis on undergraduate education at UMCP. CTE initiatives were designed to improve a range of faculty teaching skills, including teaching in diverse classrooms.

Beginning in 1995, the Asian American Student Union (AASU) took a number of steps to encourage campus administrators to support an AAST program. AASU met with administrators and secured seed money from the Provost at the time to hire a graduate assistant and coordinator to establish the Asian American Studies Project. Almost a year and a half later, AASU led a series of public demonstrations demanding that the institution establish an Asian American Studies certificate-granting program. This resulted in the creation of an Asian American Studies task force by the Provost to explore the development and implementation of an Asian American Studies Program on the UMCP campus. The report included suggestions on topics ranging from curricular changes to faculty hiring issues. The provost endorsed the report in 1998 and granted

seed money to the Asian American Studies Project which included a faculty coordinator, graduate assistant and office space.

Along with supporting programs such as Asian American Studies and CTE, during this time the concern of campus leadership regarding issues of campus diversity was evident in the number of internal reports and studies that were commissioned by President Kirwan since the 1980s. The studies and reports were commissioned to investigate the extent to which the offices and programs were effective in achieving the institutional diversity goals that were set to combat the historical legacy of segregation. These reports were for the most part the imitative of faculty members who were concerned about the state of Blacks on campus. One of these first reports commissioned in 1989 was entitled *Access is Not Enough: A Report to the President Concerning Opportunities for Blacks at the University of Maryland at College Park.* This report addressed the ongoing needs of the UMCP Black faculty, students and staff. The conclusions of the report were meant to assist UMCP to think of diversity beyond recruitment, but to examine the entire campus climate for diversity.

In 1992, *The Report of the Committee on Excellence Though Diversity: Providing Opportunities for Black Americans at College Park* again reviewed the status of Blacks at College Park. The genesis of the report began in January 1990 when the Campus Senate passed a resolution calling for a committee charged with the task of following up on *Access is Not Enough* and with making recommendations for further action. The goal of the report was

> to assess the effectiveness of programs aimed at achieving the full participation of Blacks in all aspects of campus life; recommend changes in programs that are determined to be deficient; and suggest new strategies that are needed in order for

> the campus to achieve the objectives on Black participation. (Maryland, 1992, P.2)

President Kirwan issued a memo entitled *An Action Plan in Response to Studies of Progress toward Diversity Goals for Black Faculty, Staff, and Students* which responded to recommendations made in both the 1989 and 1992 reports. His memorandum included plans for improvement in the recruitment, retention and graduation of Black students; the appointment, retention, and promotion of Black faculty, and the campus climate for Black employees and students.

In response to pressure received from non-Black communities, particularly faculty and staff, President Kirwan and the chair of the President's Commission on Ethnic Minority Issues (PCEMI) appointed the Asian, Hispanic and Native American Task Force in November 1993 to investigate the needs of other people of color on campus. The Task Force was asked to determine the extent to which opportunities for access, participation, and success of Asian, Hispanic and Native American faculty, students, and staff existed at UMCP. In 1995 the *Asian, Hispanic, and Native American Task Force Report* was completed. The report showed that within the Asian, Hispanic and Native American groups, there was considerable variation within each community based on factors such as national origin, religion, and immigration patterns into the United States. The report recognized that there were some similarities in needs for support and services on campus among Asians, Hispanics and Native Americans, yet important differences existed as well.

The Diversity Accountability and Implementation Plan (DAIP) began in 1993 as a process to keep units accountable for their progress in their efforts to increase structural diversity. Originally created as the Diversity Incentive Fund (DIF Proposal), the DAIP

was established as a mechanism for campus units to determine how effective they were in meeting institutional diversity goals. Under the DAIP, individual campus units were given primary responsibility for achieving campus diversity goals, with central campus offices responsible for helping to establish the campus-wide goals. Central campus offices also provided departments and units with technical and financial assistance for achieving diversity goals. An assumption underlying the DAIP was the belief that individual campus units could most easily discern their diversity needs and establish practices to address them.

The many diversity related activities at UMCP during the administration of President Kirwan were noted in the 1991 Periodic Review to the Middle States Association. The report stated that there existed

> No less than twenty-five commissions, committees, and campus offices directly or indirectly involved with improving the campus climate and equity…and approximately seventy registered campus organizations reflecting the various cultural, national, religious, racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual differences among the student body (Maryland, 1997a, Sec. II, para. 7).

Given the large number of diversity related activities during this time period, in 1993, OHRP established the "Diversity Initiative" which was designed to coordinate and support diversity efforts around campus. The Diversity Initiative received two grants from the Ford Foundation totaling $1.4 million and in partnership with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), UMCP created the DiversityWeb, an internet resource directory of the diversity efforts of 300 campuses; the Diversity Digest, a quarterly newsletter; and the Diversity Database, an on-line resource which contains campus, local, national and international information related to various forms of diversity (OHRP, 1998).

As a result of the large number and range of activities in which the campus was engaged Maryland began to receive a national reputation for its diversity activities. In 1997, President Clinton's Initiative on Race recognized UMCP for its leadership in diversity programming. Specifically, the White House recognized the Diversity Initiative as a model program in terms of strategic institutional diversity programs. Similarly, in 1998 the Ford Foundation and AAC&U proclaimed the University of Maryland to be "a national leader in diversity learning and good campus practices" (OHRP, 1998, P.iv).

Between the period marking the end of Brit Kirwan's tenure as president and the beginning of the tenure of current President C.D. Mote, two additional initiatives emerged. The Multicultural Involvement and Community Advocacy (MICA) unit was created Within the Office of Campus Programs in the division of Student Affairs. MICA consists of a group of five full-time and part time staff who serve students and student groups from the African American, Latino, Asian Pacific American, Native American and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered undergraduate communities. The MICA staff "has a dual role of empowering and advocating on behalf of minority students and educating majority students to the value and benefits of multiculturalism and diversity." (Maryland, 2003a, para. 2) The MICA staff also support the "culturally specific student organizations and promotes cross cultural involvement opportunities for all students." (Maryland, 2003a, para. 2)

As part of a continuing effort by the institution to unify and coordinate a variety of academic diversity initiatives, the Consortium on Race, Gender and Ethnicity was created in 1998. This program was created and push to institutionalization by prominent

faculty members who were also able to obtain significant external funding. The Consortium on Race, Gender and Ethnicity

> Is an association of academic units and individual faculty on the University of Maryland Campus whose mission is to promote, advance, and conduct, research, scholarship, and faculty development that examines the intersections of race, gender, and ethnicity with other dimensions of difference (Maryland, 2000c, para. 1).

The Consortium was designed to help faculty members from across the campus to collaborate and earn grants to support their research on issues of race, gender and ethnicity.

Relative to other time periods, the programs and policies developed during the tenure of President Kirwan were less a result of compliance with desegregation laws then they were out a desire by campus members to create a more positive campus racial climate. In particular, the campus racial climate was most affected by the leadership provided by President Kirwan. His willingness to invest institutional resources into the defense of the Banneker scholarship and also commission the major campus reports investigating the status of people of color were important in signaling the institution that diversity was essential in the institution's excellence.

The Current Situation

Demographics

In order to understand the current status of the campus climate for diversity at the University of Maryland, it is helpful to examine the changes in structural diversity that have occurred at the institution. This section examines the changes in the structural diversity of the UMCP since 1975, the first year in which the institution began to systematically keep data on students of color to 2002, the time which this study

commenced. The data for this section was obtained from unpublished data provided in 2002 from the University of Maryland, Office of Institutional Studies.

The structural diversity of undergraduates has changed dramatically in the past 27 years. While students of color made up 10 percent of the undergraduate student body in 1975, they were approximately 32 percent of the undergraduate student body in 2002. Black students represented 6.6 percent of all undergraduates enrolled at Maryland in 1975 but had increased in representation to approximately 12.4 percent of the undergraduate population by the fall of 2002. Increases in the representation of Latinos and Asian Pacific American (APA) students on campus are also evident during this time period. While only 1.2 percent of all undergraduates were APA in 1975, 13.8 percent of all undergraduates were APAs in 2002. Latinos were only .9 percent of all undergraduates in 1975 but had increased to 5.1 percent of all undergraduates in 2002. Native Americans are the only group to have experienced a decrease in representation during this time period. While Native Americans were 1.2 percent of the undergraduate population in 1975, they represented just .3 percent of all undergraduates in the fall of 2002.

In regard to the 1998-2002 timeframe, the representative number of students of color reached its highest level in the institution's history in 1998 at 38.2 percent. Since 1998, there has been a slow decrease in the proportional representation of undergraduate students of color. Nearly all of this change can be explained by decreases in the Black student population which went from 14.2 percent in 1998 to 12.4 percent in 2002. The representation of APA, Latino and Native American students has remained relatively stable during this time period.

In regard to graduate students, students of color comprised only 6.8 percent of all graduate students in 1975 while that proportion had grown to 15.6 percent in 2002. Black graduate students increased in proportion from 4.6 percent in 1975 to 7.2 percent in 2002 and peaked at 8.1 percent in 1995 and 2000 while APAs were less then 1 percent of the graduate student population in 1975, they were 5 percent in 2002. Very small gains can be seen in Latino and Native American graduate student numbers between 1975 and 2002. However, the representation of Native American students decreased between 2000 and 2002.

The population of tenured/tenure-track faculty of color has more than tripled between 1975 to 2002 growing from 5.1 percent to 16.8 percent. Among faculty of color, APAs represented approximately 8 percent of the faculty in 2002, up from 2.2 percent in 1975. Blacks currently comprised just make over 6 percent of the faculty in 2002, up from 2.8 percent in 1975. In 1975, there were no Latinos in the faculty ranks and Native Americans represented only 0.1 percent. In 2002, the Latino population grew to 2.4 percent and the Native American population remained at 0.1 percent. In 2002, the proportion of faculty of color reached a record high in 2002 at almost 17 percent.

In sum, the data suggest that structural diversity at UMCP has increased over the last 27 years. The number and proportional representation of people of color, undergraduate and graduate students, staff and faculty have all increased with the greatest increases occurring between 1990 and 1995. Although increases continue between 1995 and 2002, between 1998 and 2002 it appears as if the institution may have reached a plateau in its representation of people of color. The proportional increase in

representation of people of color between 1998 and 2002 slowed significantly compared to the 1975-1998 timeframe.

Recent Events

With the departure of President Kirwan and the arrival of the current president, C.D. Mote, Jr., UMCP entered into an era of significant transition and transformation in regard to its campus racial climate. Not only was there been an increase in structural diversity, but additional policy and programs designed to shape a positive campus climate for diversity also were created. A number of significant and complex socio-historic forces emerged during this time period that affected how the institution addressed issues of racial/ethnic diversity on campus. This section gives a brief overview of the status of diversity initiatives during the tenure of President Mote with a focus on programs, policies and practices that have been designed to enhance the campus racial climate.

When President Mote began his tenure in September of 1998, UMCP had received national attention for its institutional diversity efforts. This national reputation was due, in part, to some of the high-profile initiatives that were described earlier in this chapter. Maryland's reputation as a leader in campus diversity initiatives continued with the creation of new programs such as the Intergroup Dialogue Program (IDP) launched in 1999 by the Office of Human Relations Programs. Modeled after similar programs on other campuses, IDP brought together individuals from diverse groups to engage in discussion related to their differences across ethnic, racial and religious lines. One goal of these dialogues was to facilitate positive, meaningful, and sustained cross-group relationships. The creation of the IDP program was timely given a series of campus hate crimes that occurred during that year. These incidents forced institutional leaders to

address the campus climate for diversity once again and provided the impetus for the creation of a series of new campus programs and policies.

In response to the hate crimes, President Mote appointed a panel in January of 2000 to "consider any or all opportunities for enhancement of our experience as a diverse community [and] promote a campus-wide vision that seeks to bring together people with diverse views and experiences." (Maryland, 2000a, para. 3) The panel concluded its work in the spring of 2000 and made recommendations addressing issues such as physical safety, recruitment/retention of persons of color, restructuring the equity system and enhancing scholarship around issues of diversity. The committee recommended that the institution do more to encourage positive interactions across cultural differences and to coordinate the many diversity related activities on campus more effectively. Finally, the panel concluded that the institution must move beyond a focus on structural diversity and should work to improve all aspects of the campus racial climate.

In his response to the Diversity Panel Recommendations, President Mote wrote:

> Working with the vice-presidents, I have identified initiatives for immediate implementation in three areas: 1) development of a University response protocol to deal with hate-crime incidents and other emergencies; 2) improved coordination and communication of diversity-related activities; and 3) increased efforts to strengthen our recruitment and retention of minority faculty, administration and students and to highlight diversity research. I have asked appropriate members of my administration to begin implementation of the activities listed in this document. (Mote, 2000b, para. 3)

The President charged the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs with undertaking a review of UMCP's response to incidents of hate. This review identified a set of priorities which included “tending to the needs of victims and the campus community, finding and punishing perpetrators and providing sufficient avenues for

reporting hate bias incidents." (Maryland, 2003b, Hate crimes sect.). Based on the findings of the review, the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and OHRP worked to develop and implement a campus-wide information and education campaign on the prevention of Race, Religious, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, and Disability (RRESD) related harassment and intimidation.

Student activism in reaction to the hate crimes was the impetus for efforts such as Racism Awareness Day, which occurred to educate the campus on issues facing communities of color. Racism Awareness Day was a one time student driven initiative created to educate the campus about both the persistence of racism and other forms of discrimination. It was also during this time that, student activism again played a role in pushing for the creation of the Asian American Studies Program. In 2000 the Campus Senate passed a curriculum proposal for the Asian American Studies Program and made it a full certificate-granting program.

Along with the creation and establishment of various initiatives, during this time a series of statements linking the concepts of diversity and excellence were made within institutional documents. The *2000 Maryland Strategic Plan* included the following statement:

> The University enjoys diversity in its student body that is unequaled among most public research universities and that has greatly enriched the University and added to its excellence. At present, 33% of our undergraduates are students of color, and among all non-Historically Black Institutions, we rank among the top five in the number of baccalaureate and doctoral degrees awarded to Blacks (Maryland, 2000b, University and its environment section, para. 1).

In addition, the *2000 Maryland Strategic Plan* stated:

> Through numerous campus-wide activities to achieve greater diversity and inclusiveness, the University has built a solid foundation from which to create a

> campus that thrives on diversity. This success is a major strength, which provides a foundation for an energetic new campus-wide push to achieve community with diversity (Maryland, 2000b, Vision and strategy section, para. 11).

During this same time period, the importance of diversity was also stressed in UMCP's mission statement:

> The University counts among its greatest strengths and a major component of its excellence the diversity of its faculty, students, and staff. It is committed to equal educational opportunity. It strives to hire a diverse faculty and staff of exceptional achievement through affirmative action, to celebrate diversity in all of its programs and activities, and to recruit and retain qualified graduate and undergraduate minority students (Maryland, 2000a, Institutional Identity section, para. 4).

In addition, the mission statement asserted that, in accordance with the *2000 Strategic Plan* the institution would:

> Ensure a university environment that is inclusive as well as diverse and that fosters a spirit of community among faculty, staff, and students by increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff; by recruiting outstanding and diverse graduate and undergraduate students; by improving the graduation rate of ethnic minority students; and by building a greater sense of community among faculty, staff, students, and alumni… (Maryland, 2000b, Institutional outcomes and objectives section, para. 2).

In fall 2001, in response to the Diversity Panel's recommendations, the Vice President for Student Affairs sponsored Building Community Day. This event was created to encourage members of the campus community to "celebrate the richness of Maryland's campus diversity" (Maryland, 2003b, Campus partnerships section, para. 4) The events that occurred were meant to engage the campus community in dialogue and interaction across communities. The day was "aimed at engaging all members of the campus community in meaningful dialogue, interaction and action toward the building of

an educational consortium around diversity" (Maryland, 2003b, Campus partnerships section, para. 4)

Also in 2001, an *ad hoc* committee chaired by Dean Irv Goldstein was commissioned by President Mote to review the coordination of diversity programs on campus in response to the recommendations issued by the President's Diversity Panel. Specifically, the commission's charge was "to examine the effectiveness of the current system of administering the human relations code, to recommend changes where appropriate, and to review the relative roles of the Office of Human Relations, the Equity Council, and the Department of Personnel Services regarding the effectiveness of the equity system" (D. Mote, personal communication, June 28, 2001). The committee was given the responsibility to suggest how the number of diversity related activities on campus could be coordinated more efficiently. The committee subsequently recommended that a new position in the President's office be established and the person in that position be charged with providing leadership and advocacy for issues of diversity and equity.

Among the most high profile programs created by President Mote to address the needs of underrepresented populations was the Baltimore Incentive Awards Program, initiated in 2002. Modeled after a similar program at the University of California-Berkeley, the program targeted disadvantaged students who demonstrated academic ability, "uncommon persistence and maturity despite adverse life situations." (Maryland, n.d., para. 2) This program, focused on Baltimore City, identifies up to nine candidates each year who receive full four-year scholarships to attend UMCP. While the award is directed toward financially needy students, the scholarship component is only a small

part of the program. “The development of individual character, critical thinking skills and leadership within a small community of peers, advisors and faculty mentors” is a large part of the program (Maryland, n.d., para. 2).

In his fall 2002 State of the Campus address, President Mote said that maintaining the commitment to a fully diverse campus was a primary goal.

> We cherish our broadly based diversity and the warm and welcoming character of our campus. We have benefited immeasurably by our pursuit of these qualities; they are right; and our commitment to them does not falter. (Mote, 2002, Diversity section, para. 1)

This statement were made when *Black Issues in Higher Education’s* issued its annual rankings of institutions that have the most diverse graduates. According to the 2002 rankings, UMCP was 14th among all colleges and universities in the total number of bachelor degrees awarded to Blacks and 3rd in doctoral degrees. UMCP ranked 11th in the number of bachelors degrees awarded in engineering to Blacks and first in the number of doctorates awarded in mathematics and 3rd in the number of doctorates in engineering, social science and history. For APAs, UMCP was 18th in the country in bachelor's degrees awarded; 10th in biology degrees; 9th in degrees in Education and English; 13th in computer sciences; 14th in social sciences and history; and 18th in engineering.

Clearly, the institution was a different place in 2002 than it was in the early days of desegregation and UMCP’s campus racial climate has continued to change and evolve. At the time of this study, the campus was anticipating the impact of lawsuits challenging the University of Michigan and responding to the budget deficit facing the state of Maryland. These two events were significant socio-historic forces that were affecting administrators as they made decisions about policies and programs regarding the campus racial climate.

The University of Michigan Cases

The Michigan admissions lawsuits began in 1997 when two lawsuits, *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* were filed which challenged the University's use of race in its undergraduate admissions and law school admissions. In *Gratz* (the undergraduate case) and *Grutter* (the law school case) the plaintiffs argued that the University's use of race-based affirmative action in its admissions practices unlawfully discriminated against Whites. Specifically, the plaintiffs felt that the University's use of race as a "plus" factor in admissions was unlawful in a public institution of higher education because it discriminated against Whites.

The University's position on the other hand was that the law, outlined by Justice Powell in the 1978 *Bakke* decision, permitted the consideration of race and ethnicity in admissions in order to achieve the educational benefits of a diverse student body. The institution argued that these benefits constituted a "compelling governmental interest" which justified the consideration of race and ethnicity in the university's admissions processes. Beginning in 1998 the case was in and out of lower courts until 2002 when attorneys representing Grutter and Gratz asked the U.S. Supreme Court to review their cases and the Court subsequently agreed to do so.

Oral arguments for both cases were heard before the U.S. Supreme Court in the Spring of 2003. In its decisions issued the following June, the Supreme Court held that in the *Grutter* case, diversity was a compelling interest in higher education, and that race was one of a number of factors that could be taken into account to achieve the educational benefits that flow from a diverse student body. In sum they found that the Law School's admissions policy was constitutional. In the *Gratz* case, the Court held that

while race could be considered in admissions, the process used by Michigan was unconstitutional because it violated equal protection provisions of the United States Constitution.

The outcomes of both cases were generally welcomed at the University of Maryland because it signaled to institutional leaders that their current admissions and diversity related policies were legal. In other words, the institution could continue to operate as it had prior to the Michigan lawsuits and that it's policies would not have to be drastically changed.

State Funding: Leading to a Budget Crisis

Governor Paris Glendening, a former UMCP faculty member, was key in assuring that the UMCP campus was well funded by state allocations during his tenure as governor from 1994 to 2002. In fact Glendening was a driving force behind the 1988 flagship initiative described earlier in this chapter. In fiscal year 1995, a report conducted by the state to determine how much funding UMCP would need to attain the goals set forth in the 1988 flagship initiative legislation determined that the state would have to contribute "$50 million of additional state support [in FY 1995] for the University of Maryland to attain the average of its aspirational peers" (The Flagship Initiative, Background section, para. 3). As a result Governor Parris Glendening announced a four-year funding plan for higher education to insure, among other things, that UMCP achieved flagship status. Between 1995 and 2000, UMCP benefited from relatively high levels of state funding. Toward the end of Governor Glendening's administration, and two years into President Mote's tenure, state support for higher education began to wane due to an impending recession.

At the time of this study, in the sixth year of Dr. Mote's presidency, extra state funding for the UMCP flagship initiative was no longer a consideration; in fact, the institution was facing an $81 million budget deficit in FY 2004 (starting July 1, 2003). This was the most severe budget deficit the University had experienced since its designation as the flagship campus in 1988. This shortfall was anticipated as early as 2002 when state lawmakers saw evidence of a recession that had not occurred since the early 1990s. Maryland was not alone in this struggle, as public universities in several states had already been forced to cut their budgets during FY 2002. For FY 2003, the funding situation was equally poor across the country as state revenues dipped and budget surpluses from previous years were exhausted. Many states had already cut higher education appropriations or planned to do so. This was a time of great uncertainty in terms of state support for higher education in Maryland. This uncertainty was heightened by the election of a new governor in the fall of 2002.

Robert Ehrlich, the first Republican governor of Maryland since Spiro Agnew, pledged during his campaign to exclude higher education from his plan to pare down state expenditures. But as he took office, higher education was at the center of many reductions in the governor's effort to balance the state budget. The state was facing a projected $1.3-billion deficit in its $11-billion budget for the coming fiscal year as Governor Ehrlich's inauguration drew near..

Mid-way through the 2002-2003 academic year, the University of Maryland experienced a significant amount of turmoil as a series of deep budget cuts were handed down by Governor Ehrlich. At the time of this study, the budget cuts for the 13 campus system of the university totaled $67 million or nearly 8 percent of its budget and

institutional leaders were in the midst of deciding how the cuts would impact programs and policies. This far, the cuts forced institutions within the University System of Maryland to compensate for funding cuts by a variety of methods that included employee layoffs and the imposition of mid-year tuition increases.

Summary

The University of Maryland, College Park was a campus that, from the 1950s to the present, went from virtually no people of color to one of the most structurally diverse research universities in the country. Along with an increase in structural diversity, UMCP became home to a variety of campus climate related policies and programs.

Early in the institution's history, many of these programs emerged due to external pressures such as lawsuits, federal laws and desegregation orders, and focused primarily on increasing the structural diversity and the legacy of these and complex socio-historic forces continues to impact the campus today. In the institution's more recent history, new complex socio-historic forces emerged that affect the campus racial climate including state budget cuts and the University of Michigan admissions lawsuits.

Forces internal to the institution such as faculty demands and to a lesser extent, student activism have, and continue to impact the campus racial climate. A more recent internal force that has affected the formation of policy and programs regarding the campus racial climate was a demonstrated commitment by institutional leaders to diversity issues. From the late 1970's to today, a series of top institutional leaders, who have articulated a commitment toward diversity at UMCP, were instrumental in transforming the campus racial climate.

UMCP was an institution affected by a variety of external and internal forces that have shaped the campus racial climate. Today, these and newforces continue to shape and affect decision-makingby administrators on policy and programs which impact the campus racial climate.

CHAPTER 5

To understand factors that influence the decision-making behavior of senior administrators with respect to the campus racial climate, I interviewed fifteen senior administrators at the University of Maryland, College Park; all of whom had significant responsibility for decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. By conducting intensive interviews with these administrators, reviewing related documents and talking with other key informants, I gathered information in an effort to understand factors that influence and explain decisions of senior administrators regarding policy and practices that address the campus racial climate. The analyses and findings presented in this chapter do not elaborate on the quality of decisions, but instead focus on the factors that were identified as being influential in shaping decisions that impact the campus racial climate.

The following research questions framed this study of the decision-making behavior of senior administrators at the University of Maryland:

1. How do senior administrators learn/develop their views about diversity?
    a. What is their experience with diverse populations and how does this influence their views about diversity?
2. What organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland influenced their decisions?

Informants' responses to these two questions provided information that was used to answer a third primary research question:

3. What common factors influence senior administrators decision-making regarding policies and practices related to the campus racial climate?

This chapter presents the findings from my data collection. The data reported in this chapter are themes most prominently mentioned by informants as they make decisions regarding the campus racial climate. While I have indicated that these administrators work at the University of Maryland, College Park, I use pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. In addition, I have not included any information that could be used to identify those who were interviewed.

Summary of Themes

Analysis of the data in this study indicated that senior administrators at the University of Maryland were influenced by a variety of forces when making decisions regarding policy and programs related to the campus racial climate. Fourmajor themes characterize the factors that influence administrator's decision-makingregarding the campus racial climate. These include: the race of the decision-maker, characteristics of higher education organizations, finances, and socio-historical forces.

Developing views about diversity: The impact of race

Although all informants in this study indicated that previous life and work experiences with racial diversity influenced their decisions regarding the campus racial climate, these experiences varied significantlyby race. For informants of co lor, the experiences they had interacting across racial difference, particularly when the interactions were discriminatory, were important influences on their decision-making. While Whites reported that they were influenced by the presence of diverse others, they never described specific interactions that they had across race.

White Informants

White informants described the impact that living and learning in integrated environments had on their decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. Mark said "I was born and raised in Chicago, which is a very diverse town, and I learned diversity early on as a youth" John described a similar experience.

> I grew up with this [diversity]. It was one of those things where I worked for my father for four summers and the factory was highly integrated and I learned... how blacks and Whites interacted…I've seen a whole lot of other things, other places where I worked…where [integration] did not happen.

Some of the White respondents described how they learned to appreciate diversity though attending integrated institutions of higher education.

> I went to Loyola of Chicago. In 1963 we won the NCAA Championship in basketball and it was the first time in NCAA history that the tip off of that championship basketball had more blacks then Whites on the court. So I grew up with diversity. I lived with diversity in college, in graduate school, and then I went out to Los Angeles, which is just a wonderfully diverse environment. (Mark)

Similar to Mark, John's experiences in an integrated educational environment were influential in shaping his philosophy on race and society.

> I was in a fraternity at Loyola in Chicago and we were integrated, we had blacks and Jews and others… and everyone got along well and it was no problem, I learned that this was a key part of life and you learned to live like that.

The decision-making regarding the campus racial climate for White informants was also affected by lessons they learned from their parents. For example, Jenna said "I grew up in a household, in a family where there was a lot of openness and we actually had lots of discussions about discrimination." Jenna credited her family's openness to

issues of race and discrimination as fundamental in helping her to become more open-minded and educated on such issues.

James said that his father played a significant role in shaping his belief regarding the importance of racial diversity and social justice in society and on campus. His father was a history professor in the 1930s at a southern university who along with five other professors, advocated for the admission of Blacks to the university where he taught. All five were eventually fired for their actions. Through his father's example James said that he learned an important lesson about the importance of equal opportunity for everyone regardless of race. His father's "willingness to take a stand" was an example of how he too needed to take a stand when it came to creating a positive campus racial climate. John recalled "my father was...in charge of production so he hired people and fired people and…My father broke the color line in that factory…He was the first one to hire Blacks." His father's commitment to integration was something that John credited as having an important role in shaping his commitment as an administrator to working to create a positive campus racial climate.

Informants of Color

Informants of color reported that specific incidents of discrimination that involved negative experiences with Whites had a significant impact on their decision-making regarding the campus climate. Bobby, for example, attended a college where people of color could take courses but were not allowed to live on campus. Having grown up in a predominately Black environment, he recalled his first interaction with a White student at that college.

> I remember sitting under a tree…we had to read a book over the summer and talk about it before school started…and there was this kid sitting next to me…White woman from a county and I don't know where…and she said if my father knew that I was sitting under this tree and there was a black boy under this tree…he would yank me out of this school so fast…but I think it was good for her to be sitting under the tree with the black boy to learn that the black boy was pretty much like the White boys…except that he didn't happen to live on campus.

Although this was not a pleasant experience for him, he believed that it was ultimately a good opportunity for this young woman's stereotypes and misconceptions of Blacks to be addressed. In addition, Bobby felt that the interactions he had across race at that school were good for him as well. He said "in that environment I learned lots of stuff that I didn't learn in the environment where I grew up because I grew up in an environment which was primarily African American." Though this experience, Bobby came to believe that a diverse learning environment afforded important educational opportunities for Whites and students of color. He acknowledged that some of the decisions he has made as an administrator were shaped, in part, by his desire to provide students with opportunities to interact across differences. He recognized the added value of an education that occurs in a diverse environment and has worked to promote that at Maryland.

An inability to find aspects of his experience represented in the curriculum helped to influence Mitch's decisions to support campus climate initiatives. Mitch described being upset by the fact at he could not find the experiences of Blacks reflected during his formal education process.

> I essentially had been airbrushed out of history. I knew nothing of myself or the people of the Diaspora. Let's face it, my curriculum simply avoided discussion of the contributions and achievement of people of color to civilization. But I knew from the few readings that I had done that there were people all over the world of color (who) had a lot to say and a lot to offer… I was determined to have that

> curriculum reflect more of me and I was determined to have the faculty reflect more of me. This has driven me all of my life.

Like Mitch, other informants of color described experiences that they had with racism and discrimination during their academic careers. In reflecting on her experience in graduate school, Donna recalled how, as a Black woman, she was sent a clear message by a professor that she was not expected to achieve in statistics. When she defied these expectations and excelled in statistics, Donna said "I became this different person" in the eyes of faculty members. As a result of this experience, she developed the view that "everybody could be a different person if you gave [them] the opportunity to learn." The fact that she was able to defy the expectations of others guided her own work with students at Maryland. Donna said that she made special efforts to assure that students of color were given opportunities to learn and excel.

Similarly, Sue's interest in assisting communities of color through her work was related to her past experiences with discrimination. As a senior in a majority White high school, when it came time for her to apply for college, counselors gave her White classmates one set of applications while she was given another set. The applications she was given were for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. At that time, she said that she did not understand the significance of what the counselors had done because she was the first in her family to attend college. However, she realized later that because of her skin color, her counselors had made decisions that limited her choices about which institutions of higher education she could attend. From this experience, Sue developed a belief that was to become a central part of her philosophy as an educator. Namely, "if we don't give full access to everybody, then we are guilty and responsible for what they

become." In other words, Sue felt that the success of students of color depended in large part on the choices that they are given and that she felt personal responsibility in working to insure that students of color were given as much access and as many choices as White students.

In sum, although early experiences in diverse environments were cited as influential in decision-making regarding the campus racial climate, the specific experience varied by the informants' race. Unlike informants of color who cited the influence of individual, up-close and personal interactions across racial differences, White informants were more likely to describe observing diversity from a distance. In addition, White informants were influenced by the examples set for them by their parents regarding issues of racial diversity and social justice. Also when people of color described difficult interactions across race, their tone suggested that these types of interactions were typical and that they accepted themas a normal occurrence. On the other hand, when Whites described their interactions with diverse others, their tone suggested that these were special, unusual occurrences and they were something that they were proud to have experienced.

Organizational characteristics of that influenced decision-making

There were a number of organizational characteristics that influenced the decision-making of informants regarding the campus racial climate. The organizational characteristics that were identified by informants in this study as having an influence on their decision-making included the power of faculty, decentralization of authority, and ambiguous goals. For the most part, informants identified these organizational

characteristics as inhibiting their ability to enact policies and programs that positively affected the campus racial climate.

Faculty Power

The professional nature of institutions of higher education is such that faculty members see themselves as equal to if not superior to administrators in importance, value and expertise. Clayton, a former faculty member, said "…for those of us [who] came up through [the] faculty we realize that a university is a university because of the faculty." Faculty members believe that they are of prime importance, central to the mission of institutions of higher education, and expect to be treated as such. Informants in this study agreed that faculty participation and support were needed if the implementation of any policy or program was to be successful. John's statement illustrates this point. "If faculty aren't happy, you don't last long…You really can't go running down some path trying to lead the faculty if they don't want to go."

The autonomy that faculty have makes it difficult for senior administrators to exercise any command or control over faculty behavior. John said that he could not give orders and expect that they would be always obeyed, particularly by faculty members. Cliff added that, "faculty often don't want to be involved in anything if they can't tie it to their particular [unit]. Unless they can see where it's going to directly benefit them, you can't get them on board." For Mitch, faculty resistance to campus diversity initiatives was often the most difficult form of resistance he faced on campus. Regarding his efforts to create a positive campus racial climate, Mitch said "…the most prominent and persistent resistance to initiatives comes too frequently from the faculty itself."

On the other hand, faculty support could encourage and push administrators to pursue diversity initiatives. Jenna said that faculty encouragement meant a great deal to her office in that "…there are enough committed faculty…on this campus who influence what it is we do here in (this office)…that keeps us going." Similarly, John said that whenever he considered supporting a new initiative, "it's not just the number of students at either the undergraduate or graduate levels but the number of faculty who are interested [in a particular initiative]. I think that drives a lot of what a college does." In sum, informants reported that faculty played a critical role in influencing administrators' decision-making. Informants were more likely to support campus climate initiatives when they believed that faculty were supportive of their efforts. On the other hand, it was unlikely that informants would decide to support any initiatives if they anticipated faculty resistance to their efforts.

Decentralization

The informants in this study indicated that the decentralization of power and authority at the University of Maryland limited their ability make decisions designed to improve the campus racial climate. In other words, they ability to dictate and control policies and programs does not automatically come from holding a position of authority in the administrative hierarchy. Cliff said that the president, provost or other senior administrators did not "really bring a lot of order to things around here…there's not a real strong command and control structure." He added,

> "the frustrating thing is that it's not like a company where you can just order somebody (to do something)…If it were up to me, if I were president, I would order folks to hire more faculty [of color]…but I'm not sure if…even the president could do it."

The inability of central administrators to exercise authority and control was a constant source of frustration for Cliff. Cliff said that one reason why recruiting faculty of color was difficult was because he could not simply tell deans and department chairs "right now we are going to hire 100 more faculty of color, I order you to [do] it." Although he said that the Provost strongly encouraged deans to hire faculty of color, deans ultimately made their own decisions. Cliff argued that the best "we can do is try to be moral leaders, philosophical leaders in terms of content and also leaders in terms of philosophy, morality, things like that."

The limited ability to exercise authority and control also presented a significant challenge for Pam in her efforts to set up a variety of campus-wide committees to coordinate diversity activities. Sheadmitted that her success with these initiatives was limited. Pam attributed her inability to coordinate campus diversity activities to the fact that "it's difficult to really expect that they would do the work …because they aren't working for us and they aren't accountable to us…but (rather) to the units that they represent." The decentralization of units is so pervasive that those who work within a college or department, for example, feel more accountable to their dean or department chair rather then to the president or provost. Although she saw the need for collaboration, Pam indicated that the process was frustrating and difficult.

> If we can help in pushing that part of the mission of the university in a concerted way…in a collaborative way…I think that would be something that would be very helpful for us here but…it's not easy to do that…because there are so many factors you have to deal with, personalities, time, money. All sorts of stuff.

James indicated that, as a central administrator, it is difficult for him to affect the campus racial climate within departments and units. "I think you are always going to affect your local situation and when you are in a department you can actually affect the local

situation in a particular department in a very real way. From here, I really can't do that very easily." Despite his desire to influence a department's campus racial climate, James believed that, because of the decentralized nature of the University of Maryland, his decision-making power and authority were limited.

Although informants felt that decentralization limited their ability to make decisions, they were able to exercise influence on the campus racial climate through other means. In particular, the expectations and values articulated by campus leaders through symbolic actions influenced the decision-making of informants in this study. Bobby and Pam recalled a statement by a past president that articulated his expectations and priorities in regard to campus diversity. Bobby said the president "used to talk about I want a multi- ethnic, multi-generational, multi this, multi that, campus and I think he was sincere about it [and] worked toward it." The fact that the president was so vocal about his support of diversity goals encouraged Bobby to work toward improving the campus racial climate. Jack also credited past institutional leadership for clearly communicating expectations and values regarding diversity on campus.

> I have to give the campus leadership credit. You know, I think…they weren't fair weather liberals. They weren't liberal just because it was the flavor of the month but that [it] was something that was part of who they were. And so I think that tone at the top and even that uncompromising tone at the top didn't let the fair-weather liberals off the hook

Donna said that recently she found a sense of "renewal" in her work because "I hear the president saying things now that I think there is a real belief in diversity." She said that she saw "much more commitment [from the leadership] and it has been what drives me." Jenna believed that she was able to make progress on diversity issues because of "the support of the campus leadership" and there is "just a lot of moral support from the

leadership." James stated "I think what has really helped have been that our last two presidents…have been totally committed to increasing the diversity of the institution and seeing diversity as the hallmark of the institution."

Not only was the top institutional leadership important in encouraging diversity related work, but encouragement from immediate supervisors was important as well. Sue said "I'm very fortunate in that I do work with a supervisor who understands the importance of diversity." Bobby said that he was able to pay particular attention to diversity issues because "I report to a guy for whom it's an end… [there is] just no concern about [if] this is in keeping with the philosophy of the office…it's at the heart of the philosophy of this particular guy."

Informants reported they were greatly encouraged when financial resources were provided by campus leaders to help them implement their ideas. John spoke of what he felt was strong support given by the "upper administration" for campus diversity efforts. Ray said "the fact that you have [high level administrators] who [are] supporting…diversity" and "who put resources behind their rhetoric" made a difference. Sue said that "[Institutional leaders] have been very supportive of me" and she added that the support she received came from financial resources and flextime to participate in diversity related activities. Similarly, Ellie acknowledged the impact that support from her supervisors' had on her efforts to support campus diversity initiatives. Regarding the work she did with diverse populations, she commented that "this dean is encouraging" and in reference to her previous dean she said he "was very supportive [of] whatever I needed to do for students…he and [another campus leader] were very happy to do whatever I needed to do for students."

In the way that financial resources provided by their superiors were a key incentive in influencing informants to pay attention to diversity issues, informants indicated that they used financial incentives to influence the behavior of their subordinates. Jack stated, "it helps being a (senior administrator). And it helps having a large portfolio and I can sometimes give people medicine and they don't realize it." Because Jack controlled a sum of money that departments could access to develop courses, he would "sometimes encourage people to do the right thing" by funding courses that addressed issues of racial diversity. Similarly, other institutional leaders used financial resources as leverage to encourage people to pay more attention to the campus racial climate. An informant said

> The way that this campus operates, the provost fiscally controls the budget of colleges at some level so that can be an important factor in motivating people to do the right thing in terms of building diversity programs.

Similarly, Afton used financial resources to assure that "departments that are making good faith efforts at diversity are those that will profit financially...We are really anchored to make it financially advantageous for departments to do the right thing." Making funding available to support climate initiatives was an important symbol that institutional leaders used to encourage people in their diversity related efforts.

Despite the constraints that administrators face as a result of the decentralized structure of Maryland, leaders were able to have influence through indirect means. For example, rather then making demands or exercising the same authority that a CEO might have in a corporation, Cliff said that central administrators could "call people together and encourage them to do the right thing" as a symbol or sign that creating a positive campus racial climate was important. Although they did not exercise the same kind of

authority that they would in a comparable position in a private company, they could bring together various units for a specific effort. Cliff said

> I'm probably the one person best situated to bring together groups like that in the same room around an issue. So I think my biggest value is really just bringing people together in ways that they would not have come together and I think that is good.

Ultimately, rather then issuing mandates and orders, leaders used indirect means to influence the decision-making of campus constituents. These indirect means included public statements about the value of diversity to the campus, the provision of financial incentives and coordinating activities around diversity issues.

Goal Ambiguity

The fact that different constituents at the institution held different perspectives about fundamental institutional goals was something that complicated the decision-making of administrators as they considered policies and practices related to the campus racial climate. Dusty explained that there were differing perspectives on what role diversity plays in the mission of the university. These perspectives range from diversity as being a "core" or central aspect of students' education to "fringe" or simply an add-on to student's education at Maryland. When he tried to promote efforts to improve the campus racial climate, the response he would get from some members of the Maryland community was "well that's fine, but the core, you gotta make sure you teach about biochemistry and learn about the moon." Similarly, Cliff expressed a belief that diversity related activities were viewed as "fringe" and not central to the mission of the institution. Cliff believed that diversity activities were not something that faculty would become involved in without incentives or rewards. He asserted that for faculty "diversity really

seems like a fringe. Fringe, or either what they [faculty] do when they get rewarded. Diversity can be seen as being even more fringe then other fringe things." Jack believed that while diversity initiatives were in place across the campus, diversity had not been integrated into the core mission of the institution. "The challenge is to make sure that people see [diversity] as a core value and not just an add-on [or] a nice thing to do." He added that the University of Maryland had not institutionalized diversity to the point where it "is important to us through and through."

Some informants indicated thattheir involvement in campus diversity initiatives was motivated by the recognition that the university had received for its campus diversity efforts. Ray said that it was important for him to work on diversity issues because the university had "made a name…in the national scene" in regard to diversity efforts. Similarly, Cliff said that he paid attention to diversity issues because "Maryland has a reputation for at least being a leader in areas of diversity and inclusion and I'm interested personally and professionally in making sure we actually do that." Dusty said that the reputation that Maryland had developed around diversity issues was key in helping the institution to continue to make progress in providing a positive climate for racial diversity. He said Maryland "wants to believe that it is reacting helpfully to communities of people and that we are pushing the envelope in progress socially."

Regardless of their personal beliefs, informants in this study indicated that, because diversity was not a wildly held institutional priority, their ability to make decisions that improved the campus racial climate was difficult. Jenna commented that because her unit has a large number of priorities, her ability to focus on diversity initiatives is hindered despite her own personal desires to do so.

> There are probably 8 or 10 things that the campus relies on us to do that are very very important and I wish we could narrow that down to 4 or 5 so we could spend more time [on a smaller set of issues]…I don't think anybody has put up a barrier and said no you can't do [programs related to increasing the structural diversity] but the question is, can you recommend to do this and still be able to accomplish everything else you need to accomplish in difficult budget times.

One informant mentioned the impact of recent changes in the admissions criteria of the institution which involved enrolling students with higher standardized test scores and grade point averages in order to improve the academic reputation of the institution. This informant said that in terms of improving Maryland's academic reputation that "we can [now] talk great about how bright our students are. We've done that extremely well in the last 5 years." However, the informant believed that the quest to improve Maryland's academic reputation had a negative consequence for improving the structural diversity of the institution.

> [It] has scared away applicants, and it is scaring away applicants in certain communities; especially PG country and Baltimore City and those are two cities where there are large numbers of African Americans and smaller numbers but still significant numbers of Latinos.

For this informant, the institutional goal of recruiting students with "amazingly high test scores" conflicted with the institution's ability to increase its structural diversity. This was an example of a time when other institutional goals were in conflict with climate and diversity related goals and the latter goals were sacrificed.

The lack of clarity and agreement about the role of diversity in the institution's mission inhibited the ability of informants to make decisions on policy and programs that would improve the campus racial climate. Programs and policies which met widely accepted institutional goals (i.e. academic excellence) were those that tended to gain

support without debate. Achieving a positive campus racial climate was not acknowledged by informants as being a widely held institutional goal.

Pace of Change

Informants indicated that they were frustrated with the pace at which the University of Maryland as a whole and individuals within the institution seemed to change and hence were discouraged from investing time and energy into improving the campus racial climate. They attributed the slow pace of change to the reluctance of institutional members to change their attitudes about diversity and also to the bureaucratic nature of a large and complex institution of higher education such as Maryland. Jack reflected this point of view when he said that "in higher education, if it's the best idea since sliced bread, it's gonna take 3 years to get through the system [and] through all of the darn committees…" Cliff believed that Maryland's slow pace of change was inherent to higher education organizations.

> It's a very conservative institution and things are slow to change. People are not just politically conservative [but] people in higher education just don't change. The fundamental business of higher education has not changed in 400 years…the fundamentals of this thing haven't changed in a long time...a lot of what we know maybe has changed but the way we do it hasn't changed in a really long time…I always want to do more but these are real conservative institutions.

Along with the slow rate at which the institution changed, the slow pace at which individual attitudes changed was also frustrating for informants as they sought to create and implement diversity policy and practices. Jack noted "all of the Doubting Thomases and those who are just resistant to change" made institutional change a slow process. Similarly, Sue said that she felt constrained and frustrated by the slow pace at which people at Maryland embraced diversity.

> As much as you want to believe that diversity is accepted at this university; there are still groups of people who are tired of the word, who never really accepted it in the first place. So one of the constraints [in creating a positive campus racial climate] is really continuing to open up the minds of people.

Pam indicated that "sometimes [at] Maryland it's harder because there are a lot of us who like to believe [we] are doing the right thing already; so we can become so apathetic." Jack added that creating a positive campus racial climate was hard at Maryland because people believed that because the institution had achieved a certain level of structural diversity, this was enough.

> I think it's also hard in Maryland because we look at the structural diversity [and] 37% of our students are from diverse backgrounds and they just presume that it's magic, [we] got all the people here, good things are going to happen. They don't realize that you have got to work on programming; you've got to work on quite frankly some of the faculty attitudes

According to Jack, improving the campus racial climate was difficult because people had become complacent and satisfied with the progress that had already been made and were less inclined to continue to make an effort to work on these initiatives. According the Pam and Jack, some institutional members were inclined to rest on the reputation the university had achieved it its diversity efforts and, as a result, were willing to stop or slow their work in this area.

Financial Resources

Amount of Resources

In this study, informants indicated that a lack of financial resources constrained their ability to implement policies and programs designed to improving the campus racial climate. John said that finances were always a consideration whenever departments or colleges wanted to create anything new. This challenge was evident in one informant's

reflections regarding the creation of the Asian American Studies Program. In regard to the Asian American students who lobbied for the Asian American Studies Program he said "…when Asian American students came in I was certainly alert to what they were doing…I (was) very much in favor of what they wanted but…didn't have any money" so he subsequently was unable to provide financial support to the program. Several other informants in this study shared examples of how a lack of funding affected their ability to create campus climate related programs. Ellie and Mitch noted situations when a lack of financial support from their superiors hindered their ability to implement programmatic initiatives related to the campus racial climate.

At the time of this study, the University of Maryland was experiencing great financial strains as state funding allocations were being cut (see chapter 4). Informants in this study cited the budget situation as having a significant influence on their ability to implement policies and programs regarding the campus racial climate. In regard to his efforts to increase the structural diversity of faculty, Ray said "financial issues are always very important, [the] deciding factor. Obviously today, because of all of the budget problems that we have, this is much more difficult." Similarly, James said that there is "no question that the current budgetary problems put a big clamp on our ability to more forward as aggressively as I would like for us."

Although some informants talked about how hard it was to support diversity programs during an era of budget reductions, others said that, despite the budgetary situation, resources were still available to support these programs. Mitch said that he was encouraged because he had "not seen a shrinking of resources [for diversity initiatives] even under these fiscally challenging times in the past 3 years." Several other informants

also mentioned the availability of financial resources to engage in diversity efforts. Cliff said that in regard to efforts to improve the campus racial climate "we literally have spent millions of dollars between recruiting and programming." Sue added "I believe that the University, for me at least has been very supportive…in giving funds for different programs."

According to Dusty, the contradicting ideas among informants regarding the availability of funding for diversity initiatives exist because people have different priorities. While Dusty believed that the budget crisis was significant in hindering the progress of diversity efforts, he pointed out, "in my mind funding is driven by priorities… You make choices, you know…in the end, the money will go to what institutions and people value most." From his perspective, diversity issues were not always valued. Instead, they were frequently lost among other institutional priorities and, as a result, were less likely to be funded.

External funding

During lean budget times, some informants felt the need to be especially entrepreneurial in securing external funding to support diversity initiatives. They recognized that resources given to campus climate initiatives were not likely to be increased during a time of budgetary shortfalls. Ellie said that, because of the financial crisis facing the institution, she was devoting a significant amount of time to fund-raising in order to expand and continue her climate related programs. "Well, this period of recession that we are in…I've got to now do another 10% cut and…I'm going to be writing a bunch of proposals." The importance of external grants or "soft money" to fund diversity initiatives was not only significant during the time of this study, but has been so

historically. John spoke of the important role that external funding and grants played in supporting diversity initiatives within his unit; not just during times of financial hardship. He added that if any new initiative is "going to be successful, no matter how nice the idea is, [it] has to have the wherewithal to operate. Now, either someone gives them the wherewithal, saying go operate, which in the real world doesn't happen, or else you go out and earn it. It doesn't matter who you go to [for external funding] but you have to go to somebody." He believed that people must be entrepreneurial in getting sources of external funding and that units must "go out and earn it [money]" if they are to gain institutional support. The ability of any new initiative to generate external funding was influential in encouraging John to contribute any of his funds to support the initiative.

External support played a very important role in funding programs in Pam's office. Programs designed to improve the campus racial climate in Pam's office were funded largely by soft money though grants awarded by corporations and foundations. The ability of her office to generate these grants played a critical role in helping her office gain subsequent institutional support.

> I think that the fact we got [grants] made a lot of difference in terms of how we are able to do the job that we are doing now and how they [central administration] have to grudgingly look at us because we are able to attract funding from these foundations… [in that] there must be something right in what we are doing [for these foundations] to give us the money

In this study, financial resources were described as playing various roles in influencing informant's decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. At times, financial resources could be an incentive that encouraged institutional members to engage in activities that created a positive campus racial climate. During times of diminishing state funding, some informants indicated that diversity initiatives were more difficult to

support. Other informants said that there was still a great deal of financial support available from campus leadership during these times. Finally, most informants agreed that external sources of funding were important for the continuation and support of campus diversity initiatives at the University of Maryland.

Socio-historical forces

Maryland's history of segregation

As described in Chapter 4, the University of Maryland had a long history of segregation and, until recently, was in regular negotiation with the Office of Civil Rights to demonstrate that it had complied with desegregation agreements. As a result, many decisions by administrators regarding diversity policy or programs were made as they tried to comply with OCR regulations. Jenna said that when she first began working at Maryland, "we were still considered a segregated institution and so there was an awful lot of reporting that needed to be done." In order to comply with state and federal desegregation regulations, staff in her office devoted a great deal of time to writing reports that documented Maryland's progress in desegregating the institution.

Also due to Maryland's history of segregation and discrimination against Blacks, the needs of the Latino, Asian American and Native American populations were overlooked when it came to diversity programs or policies. Historically, any specific programs or policies aimed at communities of color, until recently, were geared toward the Black population. John said that UMCP's and the State of Maryland's history of discrimination against Blacks spurred his interest in addressing the needs of Blacks.

> One of my strong agenda items was pursing those things I saw as being important not just to the university but to the society we live in and one of the keys to that was supporting minorities, [specifically] those minorities that resonated most strongly here on campus and in the state, and that started with African Americans

In the 1960's, when Christopher first arrived at the institution, Maryland had a bad reputation in the Black community. Christopher said that the institution's legacy of exclusion and mistreatment of Blacks continued to have a negative impact on the university's ability to recruit diverse faculty and undergraduate students. "This place was avoided like the plague when I first came here… students did not consider coming to Maryland pretty much at all…and it's still a problem in my opinion." Christopher believed that the poor reputation Maryland developed in the 1960's continued to negatively impact the recruitment of Blacks in the present.

Changing Demographics

The changing demographics of students in regard to race in recent years caused informants to broaden their ideas about diversity and to look at the issue as more then just Black and White. Specifically, the significant increases in the Latino and Asian American populations at UMCP have forced some informants to recognize that they must consider how the campus climate affects these populations of students. Sue said, "the students we are dealing with now are very different than students we were dealing with just five or ten years ago and so I need to figure out what that difference is…" Similarly, Bobby acknowledged that when he first began working with students of color, his sole focus was on African Americans. However, an interaction he had with a colleague helped him to open his mind to the needs of Latino students. Bobby said that this colleague "helped me to be more sensitive to the fact that there is another underrepresented ethnic minority group that was growing very, very slowly that was

going without any institutional support." He said that this experience caused him "not to be as narrow with my definition of diversity…and to be more inclusive."

The shifting demographics are cited by some informants as key in the efforts that they make to improve the campus racial climate. The relatively recent increase in the number of people of color in the state of Maryland has caused some informants to consider how UMCP is prepared to address the needs of these potential future students.

> Some people have accepted diversity only because of the demographic reality. If you look at who is graduating from Montgomery County high school for example or PG County high school they are very different than the high school graduates 25 years ago…that is the reality (Jack).

James said that he supported diversity initiatives "for very fundamental reasons [that] are related to the future of this country."

> The fact of the matter is…the diverse population of this country [is increasing]. The citizens of the country who come from minority backgrounds, individuals of color in particular tend to be more economically disadvantaged and less educated, not in every case, but in many cases that's true and if the United States is to maintain a position of leadership both economically in terms of it's national defense, in terms of its standard of living, you can imagine that we are going to need to be more effective in providing an education and opportunities for these populations. And in many ways education is the key to that.

Reactions to campus and national issues

There were three significant incidents that were mentioned by informants as having influenced their decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. The first incident was the *Podberesky v. Kirwan* lawsuit described in chapter 4. In response to the court decision in Podberesky, the undergraduate admissions process was completely reshaped.

> Back in the time when race was used as a part of admissions and we didn't think twice about it, I don't think we ever talked about it…it wasn't until after we were challenged that we said that it's important for us to [be] upfront so people

> understood [our admissions process]…and…we created an admissions philosophy…that talks about diversity as being important, educational pluralism and so on and all of that was created after the scholarship court case.

The graduate school also changed its admissions policy in response to this case and ended its policy of awarding race-based scholarships. In response to the decision in this case, the university was also forced to re-examine many other campus programs that served students of color.

A second incident that influenced informants at the time of this study was the affirmative action lawsuit filed against the University of Michigan (see chapter 4). Although at the time of these interviews the Supreme Court had not yet issued its ruling, informants anticipated the impact thatdifferent outcomes of the case might have on campus policies and practices. Ellie decided to change the name of her office out of a fear that the Michigan case would precipitate more challenges to minority focused programs across the country. To protect her office and its resources, Ellie felt that it was necessary to eliminate the word "minority" from the title of her office. Pam said that the ruling in the Michigan case was "essential to the work we do [in her office]" because it would send a signal about how race sensitive programs, such as the ones presented by her office, would be supported and shaped. Regardless of the outcome of the case, Donna believed that it would be difficult to maintain a diverse population "because [of] all the challenges that are coming down nationally and the changing [views] of where diversity should fit in American life." Similarly, Mitch was troubled by the lawsuit because of what it signaled in terms of attitudes nationally regarding equity for people of color.

> With the national climate being as it is, there is this retrenchment, there is this withdrawal of resources that are designed to help students of color and faculty of

> color. This whole attack upon Affirmative Action is disconcerting and… troublesome.

A third incident which informants cited as having an important influence on their decision-making was a series of hate crimes directed against Black students on campus in the Fall of 1999. Cliff said that major changes in polices and practices regarding the campus racial climate "started with the hate crimes…on campus." As a result of the hate crimes, the president assembled a panel to make recommendations on issues ranging from physical safety for people of color to enhancing scholarship around issues of diversity. At the time of these incidents, the University of Maryland did not have a formal protocol for addressing campus hate crimes. While having a protocol for addressing hate crimes was dictated by state law in Maryland, this did not happen until after the hate crimes. Dusty said that the hate crimes "showered public attention on the issue that the campus really doesn't have a coherent way to look at these incidents," so a protocol was developed. In addition to the development of the hate crimes protocol, the hate crimes proved to be an impetuous for other changes in diversity policy and practices. The panel convened by the president made recommendations that were subsequently implemented by the president including the creation of a cabinet level position to assist in the coordination of the variety of campus diversity initiatives and providing more support for diversity related research and programs to encourage positive interactions across cultural differences.

A number of socio-historic forces played a major role in affecting the decision-making of informants regarding the campus racial climate. Specifically, a combination of Maryland's history of segregation, the changing demographics of the state of Maryland,

and a series of critical campus and national issues have shaped a context in which informants made their decisions about the campus racial climate.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of my data collection and the main themes that emerged from the data. The major themes that influenced administrator decision-making regarding the campus racial climate fell within four board categories that were characterized by the race of the decision-maker, the organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland, finances and socio-historical forces.

The impact of race on the decision-makingof informants was different for White informants and informants of color. Where White informants experienced diversity in a more distant, indirect manner, informants of color were affected by direct interactions across racial differences. In regard to the organizational characteristics of the University of Maryland that influenced decision-making, the primary influences included faculty power, institutional decentralization, goal ambiguity, and the slow pace of change. Financial resources could be important incentives in encouraging people to work toward enhancing the campus racial climate. External funding also played an important role in that initiatives that were able to gain external grants were also more likely to receive internal support. Finally, the influence of socio-historic forces had a profound influence on administrative decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. Specifically, the university's historical legacy of exclusion and its reaction to significant national and campus issues such as the University of Michigan lawsuits and state budget cuts influenced decision-making.

In the next chapter, the context for these findings will be discussed. Specifically, the findings will be connected to existing scholarship to understand the decision-making of senior administrators regarding the campus racial climate.

CHAPTER 6

This study explored factors that influenced the decision-making of senior administrators regarding the campus racial climate. The previous chapter described the major findings of the study that emerged from interviews with the sixteen subjects as well as an analysis of relevant documents. In this chapter I connect these findings to the existing scholarship in order to provide a context for understanding my data and findings. I describe how the findings of this study can be used to inform and improve education theory and practice. Finally, I use these themes to describe a set of propositions for understanding the decision-making of senior administrators regarding the campus racial climate.

The Major Findings

Race Matters

This study's findings are consistent with earlier research showing that individual characteristics such as background, work and other past experiences impact decision-making (Eisenhardt & Bourgeois, 1988; Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Weick, 1979). A decision-maker brings "his or her own set of 'givens' to an administrative situation" which "reflect the decision maker's cognitive base…and his or her values" (Hambrick and Mason, 1984, P. 195). Consistent with Meier (1993), the personal values that result from different life experiences of informants in this study affected attitudes and values that ultimately influenced their policy decisions. A key life experience that was critical in influencing the decision-making of informants regarding the campus racial climate was a function of the individual's race. More specifically, informants of color and White

informants differed in what they reported as being influential in shaping their perspectives on diversity and subsequent decision-making.

Informants of color referred to incidents of discrimination that resulted from their interactions with Whites as being influential in shaping the decisions they made about the campus racial climate. Many of the informants of color in this study reported that their decisions were motivated by a desire to ensure that students did not experience the discrimination that they had experienced. Donna, Sue and Mitch described experiences that they had with discrimination during their educational careers and how these experiences influenced their commitment to working with communities of color at Maryland. Donna and Sue described how they worked to assure that students of color were presented with the same opportunities as White students. The interactions they had across racial differences, although discriminatory in nature, were instrumental in shaping the developing personal values of informants of color that later influenced their decisions.

Unlike the informants of color in this study, White informants did not mention specific interactions they had across racial differences as being influential in shaping their decision-making. Whites tended to be influenced by observing diversity around them rather then having had personal interactions across racial differences. John and Mark spoke with *animation and excitement* about the significance of attending integrated institutions of higher education and the impact of seeing people interact across racial differences. Mark spoke of the significance of watching an NCAA basketball game where "it was the first time in the NCAA history that the tip off of that championship basketball game that there were more blacks then Whites on the court." In addition, White informants reported the lasting impression made by parents who were advocates

for people of color. James and John described the important things they learned from watching their parents engage in activities promoting equal employment opportunities for Blacks. In sum, White informants tended to experience diversity at a distance; unlike informants of color who had first hand experience with interactions across racial differences. Whites also tended to describe their experiences with diversity as being more distant or "away" from them and they described these distant experiences as being quite significant. On the other hand, people of color, although having often had extremely intense experiences across racial differences, were less likely to feel that these instances were significant but more a normal part of their lives.

The fact that Whites in this study did not report the same type of difficult interactions across racial differences as experienced by informants of color, was likely to be, according to McIntosh (1988) a function of "White privilege." In other words, on a daily basis Whites have certain privileges such as freedom from hostility, alienation and powerlessness that people of color routinely face in the United States. In this study, feelings of hostility and powerlessness that resulted from interactions across race were not experienced by Whites but were experienced by informants of color. In addition, whereas people of color were likely to report negative interactions across racial differences, Whites did not describe any significant interactions they had across racial groups.

In this study race played a critical role in shaping the early experiences informants had with diverse others that subsequently influenced their decision-making. Specifically, the informant's race influenced their life experiences which ultimately influenced policy decisions (Meier, 1993). There were clear differences between White

informants and informants of color in terms of their life experiences and the specific factors that influenced decision-making. Informants of color tended to cite specific interactions they had with Whites that were discriminatory in nature whereas Whites were influenced in a more external manner through their observations of diversity.

Faculty Demands

The findings of this study were consistent with research describing institutions of higher education as highly professionalized organizations dominated by faculty members who have a great deal of autonomy regarding what they research, how they teach and the hours that they work on campus (Birnbaum, 1988; Baldridge et al., 1991). Swenk (1999) wrote that effective administrators must embrace the fact that faculty do not believe that they are subject to administrative authority or hierarchical power structures. John said that the interests of faculty "drive a lot of what a college does" and "if faculty aren't happy, you don't last long." James echoed similar remarks when he said "you really can't go running down some path trying to lead the faculty if they don't want to go."

Informants in this study stated that faculty were an important group whose support was needed but could not be demanded. Cliff said that he was not even sure if the president of the university could tell faculty what to do. He added that senior administrative leaders could not "just order [the faculty] to do something." Regardless of how important central administrators think campus climate initiatives were, faculty do not have to lend their support to these initiatives nor could administrators demand it. Cliff said that unless faculty could link an initiative to their specific area of research they were less likely to lend their support or time, particularly if they saw it threatening their funding or what they thought was the "core" of the institution.

Informants recognized that changes in policies were unlikely to last or have significant impact unless faculty support and accept them (Birnbaum, 1992). In an effort to garner faculty support, rather then making demands on faculty, informants were likely to rely on acts of symbolic leadership. Cliff illustrated this point when he commented that "I...can't just order someone to do something. All we [administrators] can do is try to be moral leaders, philosophical leaders in terms of content and also leaders in terms of philosophy, morality, things like that." As informants made decisions on policies and programs related to the campus racial climate, they were mindful that faculty support was crucial and, as a result, they had to consider the method by which they could best garner that support.

Symbolic leadership matters

Informants frequently stated that the support of "institutional leadership" (the provost or president) was important in influencing their decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. The support by key institutional leaders was frequently conveyed through acts of symbolic leadership. Birnbaum (1988) asserted that the most effective way that institutional leaders can influence policy and practice is through the use of symbolic gestures in lieu of attempts at more direct, authoritative control.

"A college president who reinforces and dramatizes the importance of access, for example, by symbolic acts…may have a greater influence on faculty behavior than one who pressures faculty to start a new program" (Birnbaum, 1988, P. 208). Indirect, symbolic actions rather then direct pressure were more likely to be effective given the professional nature of institutions of higher education.

Similarly, symbolic leadership was employed by informants as they sought to influence the decisions of their own subordinates. Tierney (2000) wrote that leaders use symbolic acts to express "a vision of the institution that other individuals are incapable of communicating" (P.224). Tierney (2000) asserted that "physical symbols," "communicative symbols" and "structural symbols" can influence decision-making and in this study influenced decision-making regarding the campus racial climate.

Physical symbols

Physical symbols are "tangible examples of a particular message" (Tierney, 2000, P. 226). In this study, physical symbols used to convey the importance of diversity were financial incentives provided to programs devoted to improving the campus racial climate. Ray and John said that the financial incentives provided by the provost to hire faculty of color, for example, symbolized the importance of diversity to the campus leadership. Ray and John both asserted that the availability of these resources demonstrated the Provost's commitment to improving campus diversity and, thus, influenced their decision to support campus diversity initiatives. James said that money "can be an important factor in motivating people to do the right thing in terms of building diversity programs." Money was also significant because the ability of a unit or initiative to attract external grants was influential in causing institutional leaders to allocate institutional resources to the initiative. To some degree, the extent to which external entities funded campus initiatives symbolized the value of that initiative in the eyes of campus decision-makers. John stated that his decisions about what programs to fund were based both on student and faculty interest as well as the ability to attract external grants. Baldridge et al. (1971) and Bolman and Deal (1992) argued that

decisions on which units and initiatives received or lost institutional resources were based in part on power; which was defined by Dill (1991) as combination of many factors including the amount of external grants. At the University of Maryland, if proposed diversity initiatives or programs attracted external grants, then administrators were more likely to decide to support them through the allocation of additional institutional resources.

Informants said that they tried to "encourage people to do the right thing" in regard to supporting diversity initiatives through their decisions about the allocation of funds. In other words, informants indicated thatth ey rewarded units that made efforts to improve the campus racial climate with additional financial resources. In addition, some informants earmarked a proportion of their financial resources for diversity related activities, such as faculty or student of color recruitment, to send a signal to their units about the priority they placed on these efforts.

Structural Symbols

Structural symbols "refer to institutional structures and processes that signify more than who reports to whom" (Tierney, 2000, P. 226). Examples of structural symbols evident in this study included *ad hoc* committees and commissions that were created by institutional leaders to study the campus racial climate. President Mote's creation of a "Diversity Panel" and former President Kirwan's creation of committees and commissions to examine the status of people of color, women and LGBT people on campus were examples of structural symbols employed by campus leaders. Informants in this study felt that the creation of these committees and commissions communicated the value that institutional leaders place on campus diversity issues.

Communicative Symbols

A communicative symbol "entails not only symbolic acts of oral discourse but also written communicative acts and nonverbal activities that convey particular meaning…to a constituency" (Tierney, 2000, P. 226-227). Informants in this study indicated that public statements by institutional leaders about the importance of diversity to the institution factored greatly into their decision-making. For example, Pam and Bobby recalled the significance of public statements by previous President John Slaughter about his desire to make Maryland a "multi ethnic, multi generational" institution. Pam and Bobby felt that Slaughter's statements indicated that the campus needed to increase and intensify its diversity efforts. Public statements by leaders at the University of Maryland influenced informants' decision-making by encouraging them to pursue initiatives that contributed to a positive campus racial climate. Perhaps one of the most significant communicative symbols which signaled the importance of diversity at Maryland was President Kirwan's vigorous defense of the Banneker scholarship program. His public defense of the Banneker program through his statements about the importance of diversity at Maryland signaled to the entire nation that diversity was a value of campus leadership.

In this study, decisions regarding the campus racial climate were influenced by symbolic gestures. Symbolic leadership was used in lieu of more traditional, direct authoritative control in large part due to the professional nature of institutions of higher education (Birnbaum, 1988, Baldridge at al., 1991). Consistent with the work by Montez et al. (2002), informants were influenced to work toward changing the campus

racial climate through symbolic gestures that sent clear signals about diversity as an institutional priority.

Multiple institutional priorities and goals impact support

Informants acknowledged the fact that at an institution of higher education like Maryland, goals and priorities are debated and unclear because organizational participants (e.g. students, staff and faculty) differ in their beliefs or perspectives about institutional matters (Cohen et al., 1972; Baldridge et al., 1991). Faculty goals, for example, may not be the same as those of administrators or students. At the University of Maryland, not only were there differences in opinion about institutional goals between faculty and administrators, but even within the administrative ranks, there was evidence of differing goals and priorities. The problem created by the existence of multiple goals echoed Rhoades' (2000) assertion that "from the perspective of managers, the managerial dilemma is how to establish a common direction and coordinate common activity in the face of extraordinary academic diversity and among extremely independent, even isolated academic units and faculty members" (P. 48). At an institution as large and diverse as the University of Maryland, coordinating any activities around campus diversity could be extremely difficult because there was not clear consensus about the role of diversity at the institution and as a result, there was disagreement about how to address diversity issues.

Chang (2001) wrote that part of the difficulty in gaining institutional consensus regarding diversity issues was because some believe that diversity-related efforts have no academic value. Clearly, there were differing perspectives at the University of Maryland as to whether diversity was at the "fringe" or "core." Cliff argued that anything related

to diversity is likely to seem "fringe" for faculty members. Dusty added that when people talk about diversity efforts "people say, well that's fine, but the core, you gotta make sure you teach about biochemistry and learn about the moon." The debate about the value of campus diversity reflects a national debate about "what knowledge is deemed legitimate, valuable and worthy of respect" within a higher education curriculum (Chang, 2002, P. 133). In addition, "the educational imperative of diversity-related efforts is highly contested. Some nationally recognized scholars see no academic value in those initiatives and commonly view them as part of higher education's ideological project in sensitivity training" (Chang, 2001, P. 93).

The doubt some have about the value of diversity initiatives within institutions of higher education reflects a national debate about diversity as a compelling interest in the mission and purpose of higher education. The lack of consensus on the role of diversity as a national and institutional priority pressured informants in this study to pay attention to other matters that they felt were more widely acknowledged and agreed upon priorities. Jenna said that although she felt that promoting diversity at Maryland was a "moral imperative…the question is can you recommend to do this and still be able to accomplish everything else you need to accomplish in difficult budget times?" Chang (2000) wrote that "when the notion of race…becomes an integral aspect of institutional life, it has multiple effects, both exposing competition among institutional interests and aggravating the tension between them" (Chang, 2000, P. 162). One of the competing interests evident in this study was the tension between "self-interest" and the "public good." For example one informant believed that Maryland's desire to raise its profile by recruiting students with "amazing test scores" often overshadowed its "land-grant

mission." This informant felt that Maryland was sacrificing service to students, particularly students of color in the state by devoting resources to recruiting out of state students who had higher grade point averages or test scores. Ultimately, although this informant felt that fulfilling Maryland's land-grant mission was more important, the decisions on resource allocation was often based not on personal beliefs, but institutional priorities.

Although many informants said that diversity was a priority or expressed a desire to improve the campus racial climate, they said that it was hard to allocate resources to those activities when there were so many other things they had to fund. In addition, informants indicated that it was difficult to allocate resources to support campus climate initiatives because Maryland faced tremendous financial pressures at the time of this study. Ray's remarks reflected this belief. "Obviously today because of all of the budget problems that we have this [supporting diversity efforts] is much more difficult." However, even in better budget times, informants cited insufficient financial resources as a reason why they were unable to support diversity initiatives. Dusty believed that the real issue in supporting diversity initiatives was *not* insufficient financial resources but more a matter of priorities. He said "funding is a hindrance but in my mind funding is driven by priorities. You make choices [and] in the end, the money will go to what institutions and people value most."

Socio-historic forces influence the campus racial climate

Consistent with the tenants of the climate framework of Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999), socio-historic forces, represented by a combination of governmental policies,

programs and initiatives, affected the campus racial climate at the University of Maryland. Informants in this study indicated that they were influenced by a variety of external factors when making decisions regarding the campus racial climate. This finding was consistent with research indicating that decision-makers within institutions of higher education are extremely vulnerable to external forces (Baldridge et al., 1978, 1991). Desegregation mandates were the impetus for the earliest initiatives to create a racially diverse campus at many campuses across the country (Tierney, 1997). Administrative decisions may also be influenced by external forces such as laws and governmental policies (Baldridge & Deal, 1983). In this study, the impact of state funding allocations, laws and governmental policies were influential as informants considered policy and practices related to the campus climate.

With regard to the impact of laws and governmental policies on campus climate, an examination of Maryland's history showed that many diversity related programs were created as part of campus efforts to comply with federal desegregation policies and laws. More recently, the affirmative action lawsuits facing the University of Michigan had tremendous impact on informants in the study. Informants indicated that if Michigan lost the case, Maryland would have to re-examine its diversity related policies and programs. As a result, many were making plans in anticipation of different possible outcomes in these lawsuits. Pam spoke of the impending court decisions and said that they would be "essential to the work that we do here" in terms of campus diversity programs. She felt that a decision against the University of Michigan would cause Maryland to reconsider its own affirmative action policies which might lead to a decrease in its structural diversity.

With regard to finances, the control that the state and federal governments had over funding to the University of Maryland significantly influenced decision-making behavior. Institutional leaders often submit themselves to policies set forth by federal government in order to receive monetary resources (Berdahl, 1991, Birnbaum, 1989). For example, at the University of Maryland, the time and effort devoted to early institutional desegregation efforts was due to a fear of loss of state and/or federal funding. The quest for compliance with federal desegregation laws on the part of Maryland had a great impact on policies and practices within the institution. More recently, administrators felt severely constrained by state budget cuts and indicated that their ability to attend to the campus racial climate was much more difficult as a result. Consistent with research showing the impact that the external environment can have in the formation of policy around fiscal priorities (Slaughter, 1998), informants felt that the lack of funding from the state impacted resources for diversity programs. Mitch noted that "funding is certainly a challenge in these difficult financial times for the kinds of programs that we'd like to put on." Informants felt that in difficult budget times, when employees were losing their jobs and departments were losing faculty lines, that programs related to the campus racial climate were also susceptible to these cuts.

Finally, in regard to the influence of external pressures, informants in this study indicated that one reason that they devoted attention to the campus racial climate was because of the national reputation that Maryland had developed around issues of diversity and the need to meet those expectations. Many informants discussed the fact that Maryland had made a name for itself regarding campus diversity and that it was important to maintain this reputation given the history of segregation at the institution.

Some informants recognized that Maryland needed to go to extra lengths to rid itself of the poor reputation that it had developed among Blacks and to address its historical legacy of exclusion (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). This interpretation was consistent with Kezar's (2001) and Chang's (1999) assertions that the pressure to solve social problems and to be examples of racial harmony for the rest of society play a large role in administrative decision-making regarding diversity issues. Institutions of higher education face tremendous internal and external pressures to embrace what Lawrence Levine has described as "a more eclectic, open, culturally diverse, and relevant curriculum" (as cited by Chang, 1999, P.183).

Implications for Theory and Practice

This study has implications for expanding theory, particularly regarding decision-making in higher education. The findings of this study also have implications for senior administrators in institutions of higher education who work to create a positive campus racial climate. In particular the findings of this study offer suggestions to current and future senior administrators regarding factors that they should be aware of that can affect their ability to make decisions about the campus racial climate.

Implications for Theory

This study is one of many studies that focused on decision-making in higher education. While this study did not test any theories about how decisions are made within institutions of higher education, the data were analyzed in the context of previous research on decision-making in higher education. Previous studies examined decision-making on issues such as program discontinuation (Eckel, 2002) and academic program reduction (Gumport, 1993), but no studies explored decision-making regarding the

campus racial climate. In the most general sense, the data collected in this study were consistent with existing research on decision-making by leaders within institutions of higher education. Existing research indicates that rational decision-making in institutions of higher education is the exception rather then the rule (Eckel, 2002; Gumport, 1993). In other words, decision-making is not a process with clear goals that occurs in a simple and clearly defined environment (March & Simon, 1958). In this study decision-making regarding the campus racial climate was influenced both by individual differences and the organizational nature of institutions of higher education (Baldridge et al. 1979, Bolman & Deal, 1992).

While prior studies demonstrate the influence of individual differences among decision-makers in decision-making activities (Eisenhardt & Bourgeois, 1988; Hambrick & Finkelstein, 1987; Hitt & Tyler, 1991) and the role that values, experiences and expectations can play a role in decision-making (Child, 1972; Simon, 1976; Weick, 1979), these individual differences were quite prominent in this study of decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. Individual differences that occur as a function of race emerged as the most prominent influence on decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. Informants of color were influenced by direct contact thatthey had early in their life experiences across racial differences. Whites, on the other hand, did not report direct contact across racial differences and instead were influenced by indirect experiences across racial differences such as observing the diversity around them.

Goal ambiguity is another characteristic of institutions of higher education that affects decision-making (Baldridge et al. 1991). Goals are often debated and unclear because organizational participants (e.g. students, staff and faculty) may differ in their

beliefs or perspectives about institutional matters (Cohen et al., 1972; Baldridge et al., 1991). The importance of the influence of goal ambiguity emerged as very significant in decision-making regarding the campus racial climate. With the continuing debate about the importance of campus diversity programs like Affirmative Action in college admissions, the goal of achieving a positive campus racial climate is not agreed upon.

In regard to implications for theory regarding the campus racial climate, this study reinforced the research by Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) showing that socio-historical forces, governmental policies and an institution's legacy of inclusion/exclusion affect the campus racial climate. In this study, socio-historical, governmental policies and the institution's legacy of inclusion/exclusion formed a context that played a key role in shaping the decision-making of administrators. Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) also discuss that structural diversity, the psychological and the behavioral climate play a role in shaping the campus racial climate. In this study the increased structural diversity of the campus in particular has required informants to pay attention and make efforts to change the climate in which students live and learn. The increase in structural diversity subsequently caused administrators to work toward addressing the behavioral climate by creating more programs that encourage positive interaction across racial differences. The increase in the number of programs such as intergroup dialogues occurred because of an increase in racial conflict that coincided with the arrival of a greater number of students of color. Similarly, the psychological climate plays a role in decision-making because administrators of color in particular are motivated by a desire to provide an environment where students of color are not subjected to the same feelings of exclusion that they had experienced in their educational careers.

The findings of this study suggest that there are areas that warrant future research. As stated in chapter 3, this study focused on administrators at one institution, the University of Maryland, and the findings are not intended to be generalized to other colleges or universities. Given the influence of socio-historic forces on Maryland's campus racial climate, replicating this study at other institutions with different histories, and subject to different socio-historic forces would be interesting. This would help to determine how different contextual forces thatvary in different institutions influence the decision-making of administrators regarding the campus climate.

The nature of the interaction informants had across communities of difference were influential in shaping their decision-making. Moreover, there were important differences between Whites and people of color in the way that they described these interactions and in the impact that these interactions had on the informants. People of color described how they were affected by their experiences with racism and discrimination. In describing their experiences, Whites did not talk about specific contacts or relationships that they had across race, rather they described the observations that they had of the "diverse" environments in which they had been. Given the small number of White informants in this study, an additional study focusing more in depth on how race influences decision-making regarding issues related to diversity would be interesting. In fact, had more Whites participated in this study, the conclusions reached about the differences in decision-making due to race may have been further strengthened or different.

Implications for Current and Future Administrators

Campus leaders can "either help their colleges take advantage of diversity or allow them to cower in its presence" (Montez et al., 2002, P.255). A racially diverse organization has visible leaders who work toward promoting change in regard to polices which create and support a positive campus racial climate (Foster, Jackson, Cross, Jackson & Hardiman, 1988). Work toward promoting change can begin with administrators who have a personal commitment toward improving the campus racial climate, but that alone often is not enough to change an institution. The findings of this study suggests five propositions for consideration regarding the factors that influence the decision-making of administrators regarding the campus racial climate.

1) Race matters in decision-making regarding issues of racial diversity.

Racism has, and continues to be a reality in the United States. Racial oppression is frequently the cause of everything from segregated neighborhoods to employment discrimination to unequal educational opportunities. McCarthy (1990) writes that for Blacks, their perspectives on the world are shaped by their experiences as oppressed people while Whites are influenced by their experiences as the dominate racial group in the United States. Perspectives of administrators are shaped by past experiences which are a function of experiences as Whites or people of color in the United States.

2) Experiences that administrators have with diverse others, diverse ideas and diverse institutions affect the decisions they make regarding the campus racial climate.

The nature of interactions that individuals have across communities of difference affects perspectives on diversity and decision-making about these issues. It is important to recognize is that these interactions can and will vary by race since individuals in the United States are socialized in distinct contexts that are shaped by race (Hurtado et al, 1998, 1999). Moreover, the experiences that the groups have within group and across racial differences will affect their perspectives on diversity.

3) The institutional context in which decisions are made matters a great deal. Decision-makers do not make context free decisions.

The environment, specifically the structure of the institution, political climate and other situational conditions under which administrators operate will impact decision-making (Birnbaum, 1988; Chaffee, 1987; Cohen & March, 1986; Twombly, 1992). Specifically, in regard to the campus racial climate, factors such as institutional history and socio-political forces influence the decisions administrators make (Hurtado et al, 1998, 1999). Leaders need to think complexly about the institutional context so that they can make "better" decisions about the campus racial climate (Hurtado et al, 1998, 1999; Montez at al, 2002).

4) Faculty members play an important role in shaping administrative decisions. Engaging and involving faculty in diversity efforts is important.

Given the important role that faculty have in shaping campus life, administrators must both involve faculty in diversity initiatives and also invest in initiatives that educate faculty about how a diverse learning environment is essential to the mission of the

institution. Administrators must invest time and effort in educating and promoting diversity efforts among the faculty if campus diversity initiatives are to be implemented and sustained. "Helping faculty to become aware of the assumptions they make about how learning occurs and how these assumptions can disfranchise a growing number of students is a beginning" (Montez et al, 2002, P. 256).

5) Given the professional nature of higher education, leaders can shape the campus racial climate through the use of symbols.

Senior administrators can give orders, but they cannot expect that they will be followed. On the other hand, senior administrators can influence constituent behavior through symbolic acts. Administrators must realize that while they are not able to mandate changes, they can be effective when they do things that convey the symbolic importance of diversity on campus. "A college president who reinforces and dramatizes the importance of access, for example, by symbolic acts…may have a greater influence on faculty behavior than one who pressures faculty to start a new program" (Birnbaum, 1988, P. 208). Birnbaum (1988) asserts that the most effective way in which institutional leaders can influence policy and practice is through the use of symbolic gestures in lieu of using the more traditional direct, authoritative control. One of the most effective symbols that administrators may use to influence policy and programs around the campus racial climate is through the distribution of financial resources.

Conclusion

The challenges facing administrators at the University of Maryland as they attempt to engage in institutional transformation around campus diversity are numerous and some are addressed in this study. Challenges such as faculty resistance, competing interests institutional interests, individual beliefs and socio-historic forces can play roles in derailing progress toward creating a campus where the full benefits of diversity are maximized. These are challenges that the University of Maryland faces in guiding the process of institutional transformation that must occur if the benefits of diversity that it espouses in its mission are to be successfully achieved.

Chang (2002) argues that institutions of higher education currently engage in a "discourse of preservation" regarding campus diversity which is aimed at "preserving the consideration of race in admissions" (P. 128) but "overlooks the importance of accounting for the evolution of diversity, thinking beyond admissions, recognizing transformative aims, and viewing learning more broadly" (P. 136). If we are to move beyond a discourse of preservation and toward a discourse of transformation on our campuses, then "meaningful and lasting democratic changes in higher education" (P. 136) must occur. Decision-makers within institutions of higher education will play an important role in this process by creating policies and programs which improve the campus racial climate so that the full benefits of diversity are engaged. The challenges that administrators face in doing this are complex and numerous, but not insurmountable. The fact that the University of Maryland has undergone so much change from its long history of segregation and exclusion that persisted into the 1960s to where it is today shows that change is possible.

APPENDIX A
Sample Informant e-mail

Dear

As you may know, I am currently a Ph.D. candidate in higher education and I am working on collecting data for my dissertation. The focus of my dissertation is exploring the internal and external elements that impact decision-making by senior administrators, particularly on policy and practices which effect the campus climate for diversity.

I was hoping that you would consider being interviewed for my study. I know that this is a busy time of year for you, but I did want to at least try to get on your calendar.

If you are willing to be interviewed, would you please let me know some dates and times where you are available and I can meet you wherever is most convenient for you. The interview will take no longer then 1 hour.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about being interviewed. Prof. Jeffrey Milem from the College of Education is the chair of my dissertation and you should also feel free to contact him with any questions.

Thanks in advance for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon!

Marie P. Ting

APPENDIX B
Administrator Consent Form

Consent for Participation

Project Title:
Senior Administrators, Decision-making and the Campus Climate for Diversity

Statement of Age of Subject:
I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Marie P. Ting ("the researcher") at the Graduate School, University of Maryland, College Park, Department of Education Policy, Planning and Leadership. The purpose of the research is to understand administrators, decision-making and the campus climate for diversity at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to explore selected senior administrators' decision-making behavior in regard to the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity. Specifically, your experiences, beliefs and perceptions are valuable for helping me understand your thought process as you consider policy and practices that address campus climate issues.

Procedures:
I understand that my participation involves being interviewed by the researcher. The interview will last approximately one hour. Notes will be written during the interview. An audiotape of the interview and subsequent dialogue will be made. If I do not want to be taped, I will not be able to participate in the study. These tapes will be destroyed fifteen years after the interviews have been conducted. I understand that if necessary, one additional interview may be conducted.

Confidentiality:
I understand that neither the University of Maryland-College Park nor my name will be identified at any time. The information I provide to the researcher will remain anonymous. In addition, the researcher will disguise any personally identifying characteristics that might put that anonymity at risk. Excerpts from interviews and observations may be used in the written report of this study only if my anonymity is not compromised.

Risks:
I understand that there are no known risks for me if I participate in this study.

Freedom to withdraw and ability to ask questions:
I understand that I am free to ask questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty. If I chose to withdraw from participation, I will notify the researcher immediately. I can contact the researcher at 240-472-2136 or "daisy@wam.umd.edu."

I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects, the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland can be contacted via the IRB Coordinator, Roxanne Freedman, at 301-405-4212 or at IRB@deans.umd.edu. I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

The faculty advisor supervising this research is: Dr. Jeffrey Milem, 301-405-2875, 2205 Benjamin Bldg., University of Maryland.

I agree to participate in this study according to the preceding terms.

Name (please print) _____
Signature of Respondent _____ Date _____

I agree to conduct this study according to the preceding terms.

Signature of Researcher _____ Date _____

Appendix C
Administrator Interview Guide

Introduction:

Thank administrator for agreeing to participate

Discuss confidentiality issues, especially since naming UMCP

Get permission to tape record

Review purpose of study (see above)

Interview Questions:

Q1. Please begin by describing your area of responsibility so that I can get a sense of the scope of your work and work conducted by your staff (this is an "as needed" question).

Q2. When you think about UMD's history in terms of enacting diversity practices, what are the highpoints and low points that make up this history?

Q3. The 2000 UMD strategic plan included a statement about diversity. The plan states that one of the goals of the UMD is to "...ensure a university environment that is inclusive as well as diverse and that fosters a spirit of community among faculty, staff, and students." What are the things that you have done as (position) to help achieve this institutional goal?

Q4. What do you believe are critical incidents/programs/policies in your tenure (and during the Mote era, they can be the same or different) that have impacted the climate for racial/ethnic diversity and what has been your role in any of these?

Q5. What are some diversity related initiatives that your office is currently working on and what are they designed to do?

Q6. For any of the initiatives/policies/practices that you mention in the previous questions where you had a direct role, please talk to me about how you went about/go around making any decisions related to the initiatives/ policies/practices (i.e. how and why did you decide to fund/create/support it?)

Clarification of they need it: What I mean by direct role is you made the actual decision.

Probe: What internal/external forces did you/do you consider when making these types of decisions.

Probe: Can you walk me through a particular decision , that is, the moment you thought about it and how it was developed and it's conclusion?

Q6.5. You just talked to me about a policy related to diversity. I'm also interested in how you make other decisions within your division, on other issues. Tell me your story

Q7. What are the major challenges you have faced in implementing diversity initiatives on campus? What factors or circumstances enabled you to support diversity initiatives? What factors or circumstances made it difficult or impossible for you to support diversity initiatives?

Q8. Describe a time when you really wanted to implement a policy/initiative/practice but couldn't and why? Vice versa.

Q9 What role has diversity played in your educational and professional experience?

(probe: Experiences with racial/ethnic diversity within your neighborhood and high school, undergraduate and graduate school. Work/career related experiences with diversity?

Q10 Please tell me about specific documents or reports that I should read that address the issues we discussed today. Are there any other individuals that you think I should speak with who will provide information relevant to this study?

References

Adams v. Califano, 430 F. Supp. 118 (D.D.C. 1977).

Adams v. Richardson, 356 F. Supp. 92 (D.D.C. 1973a).

Adams v. Richardson, 480 F.2d 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1973b).

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits, and actions: Dispositional prediction of behavior in personality and social psychology. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality, and behavior.* Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.

Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 27–58.

Ajzen, I & Driver, B. (1992). Application of the theory of planned behavior to leisure choice. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24 (3), 207-225.

Ajzen, I & Fishbein, M. (1972). Attitudes and normative beliefs as factors influencing behavioral intentions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 21(1), 1-9.

Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the attitude-behavior relation: Reasoned and automatic processes. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology.* Chichester, England: Wiley.

Ajzen, I. & Madden, T. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 453-474.

Allen,W. (1987). Black colleges vs. White colleges: The fork in the road for Black students. *Change*, 19, 28-31.

Allen, W. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*(1), 26-44.

Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56 (3), 241-281.

Altbach, P. (1991). The racial dilemma in American higher education. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

American Council on Education [ACE] (1998, February 19). *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 14 (26), 32-33.

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71(5), 319-342.

Angell, J. (May 1879). *Higher education: A plea for making it accessible to all*. Commencement Address of University of Michigan.

Antonio, A. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *Review of Higher Education*, 25(1), 63-89.

Association of American Colleges and University [AAC&U] (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy.* Washington, DC.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges [AGB] (1984). *Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities.* The Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. Washington, DC.

Astin, A. (1993a). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change*, 25(2), 44-49.

Astin, A. (1993b). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 123-134.

Attinasi, L. (1989). Getting in: Mexican Americans' perceptions of university attendance and implications for freshmen year persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 60(3), 247-267.

Baldridge, J. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university*. New York: Wiley.

Baldridge, J., & Deal, T. (1983). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Baldridge, J., Curtis, D., Ecker, G. & Riley, L. (1978). *Policymaking and effective leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baldridge, J., Curtis, D., Ecker, G., & Riley, L. (1991). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *The American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147.

Banks, J. (1995). The historical reconstruction of knowledge about race: Implications for transformative teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(2), 15-25.

Barber, B. (1992). *An aristocracy of everyone: The politics of education and the future of America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barney, J. & Ouchi, W. (1986). *Organizational Economics* San Francisco, CA: Jossey -Bass.

Bateman, T. & Zeithaml, C. (1989). The psychological context of strategic decisions: A model and convergent experimental findings. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 59-74.

Bean, J. and Kuh, G.D. (1984). A typology of planning problems. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55(1), 35-55.

Bensimon, E. (1989). The meaning of 'good presidential leadership': A frame analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12(2), 107-123.

Bensimon, E. (April, 1993). *Creating an institutional identity out of "differences": A case study of multicultural organizational change.* Paper presented at the meeting of the College Reading and Learning Association, Kansas City, MO.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1991). Higher Education and Leadership Theory. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Berdahl, R. (1991). Shared governance and external constraints. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster

Bernstein, A. & Cock, J. (1997, Nov. 14). Educating citizens for democracies young and old. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B6.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work. The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1989). The Implicit Leadership Theories of College and University Presidents. *Review of Higher Education*, 12, 125-136.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Board of Regents of the University of Maryland (1954, June 25). *Meeting Minutes*.

Bobo, L. & Kluegel, J. (1993). Opposition to race targeting: Self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes? *American Sociological Review*, 58, 443-464.

Bobo, L. & Licari, F. (1989). Education and political tolerance: Testing the effects of cognitive sophistication and target group affect. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 53, 285-308.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bolman, L. and Deal, T. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of culture, context and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 314-329.

Bollinger, L. & Cantor, N. (1998, April 28). The educational importance of race. *The Washington Post*, p. A17.

Botstein, L. (1991). The undergraduate curriculum and the issue of race: Opportunities and obligations. In Altbach & Lomotey (Eds.), *The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Bourgeois, L. (1984). Strategic management and determinism. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 586-596.

Bowen, W. & Bok, D. (1998). The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyte, H & Kari, N. (2000). Renewing the democratic spirit in American colleges and universities: Higher education as publicw ork. In Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Braddock, J. (1980). The perpetuation of segregation across levels of education: A behavioral assessment of the contact hypothesis. *Sociolgy of Education* , 53, 178-186.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Brown, K. (1999). Theory of reasoned action/theory of planned behavior. Retrieved November 30, 2002 from the University of Southern Florida, http://hsc.usf.edu/~kmbrown/TRA_TPB.htm

Brubacher, J. (1990). *On the philosophy of higher education, 3rd Ed.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cabrera, A. & Nora, A. (1994). College students' perceptions of prejudice and discrimination and their feelings of alienation: A construct validation approach. *Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies,* 16(3-4), 387-409.

Callcott, G. H. (1966). *A history of the University of Maryland.* Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society.

Callcott, G.H. (2001), The Twentieth Century. Retrieved October 15, 2003, from The Maryland History and Culture Biography, Maryland Humanities Council Web site:http://www.mdhc.org/bibliotest/essays.php?essay=32

Campbell, P. (1996). *Population Projections for States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 202*5. Retrieved November 29, 2002 from U.S. Bureau of the Census website: http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/stproj.html.

Carter, E. (1971). The behavioral theory of the firm and top-level corporate decisions, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 413-428.

Chaffee, E. (1987). Organizational concepts underlying governance and administration. In M. Peterson & L. Mets (Eds.), *Key resources on higher education governance, management, and leadership: A guide to the literature*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chaffee, E. (1991). The role of rationality in university budgeting. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader.* Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Chan, S. & Wang, L. (1991). Racism and the model minority: Asian-Americans in higher education. In Altbach, P. & Lomotey, K. (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.

Chang, M. (1996). *Racial diversity in higher education: Does a racially mixed student population affect educational outcomes?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Chang, M. (1999a). Expansion and its discontents: The formation of Asian American studies programs in the 1990s. *Journal of Asian American Studies,* 2(2), 181-206.

Chang, M. (1999b). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(4), 377-395.

Chang, M. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. *Review of Higher Educatio*, 23(2), 153 -175.

Chang, M. (2001). Is it more then about getting along? The broader educational relevance of reducing students' racial biases. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(2), 93-105.

Chang, M. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity? *Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 125-140.

Chesler, M. & Crowfoot, J. (1990). Racism on campus. Ethics and higher education. William W. May (Ed.), *Ethics and higher education*. Washington DC: McMillan Publishing Co.

Child, J. (1972). Organization structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6, 1-22.

Cohen, M. & March, J. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president (2nd ed.).* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, M. & March, J. (1991). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In M. Peterson, E. Chaffee, & T. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Cohen, M., March, J., & Olsen, J. (1972). Garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.

Colón, A. (1991). Race relations on campus: An administrative perspective. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Conner, M., & Heywood-Everett, S. (1998). Addressing mental health problems with the theory of planned behaviour. Psychology, Heatlh & Medicine, 3(1), 87-95.

Conner, M., & Sparks, P. (1996). The theory of planned behavior and health behaviors. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting health behavior*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Cook, C. & Sorcinelli, M. (1999). Building multiculturalism into teaching development programs. *AAHE Bulletin*, 51(7), 3-6.

Cooke, R. & Rousseau, D. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group & Organization Studies*, 13, 245-273.

Corson, J. (1960). *Governance for colleges and universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cortes, C. (2000). The diversity within: Intermarriage, identity, and campus community. *About Campus*. March-April.

Courneya, K. & McAuley, E. (1995). Cognitive mediators of the social influence - exercise adherence relationship: A test of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 18, 499-515.

Cox Jr., T. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Craven, E. (1975). Information decision systems in higher education: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Higher Education*, 46 (2), 125-139.

Cress, C. & Sax, L. (1998). Campus climate issues to consider for the next decade. In K. Bauer (Ed.) *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's college and university*. No. 98, Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crosson, P. H. (1988). Four-year college and university environments for minority degree achievement. *Review of Higher Education*, 11(4), 365-382.

Damon (1988, October 16). The path to a civil society goes through the university. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B4.

Dawes, R. (1988). *Rational choice in an uncertain world*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Day, J. (1996). *Population projections of the United States by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1995 to 2050, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, P25-1130*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Dewey, J. (1926). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dill, D. (1991). The nature of administrative behavior in higher education. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Diverse Democracy Project. (n.d.). http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/

Dobbert, M. (1982). *Ethnographic research*. New York: Praeger.

Duncan, R. (1972). Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 313-327.

Duster, T. (1991). *The diversity project: Final report*. Institute for the Study of Social Change, University of California, Berkeley.

Duster, T. (1995). They're taking over! and other myths about race on campus. In M. Berube & C. Nelson (Eds.), *Higher education under fire: Politics, economics, and the crisis of the humanities*. New York: Routledge.

Eckel, P. (2002). Decision rules used in academic program closure: Where the rubber meets the road. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (2).

Eckel, P. (2000). The Role of Shared Governance in Institutional Hard Decisions: Enabler or Antagonist? *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1),15-39.

Edgert, P. (1994). Assessing campus climate: Implications for diversity. In Daryl G. Smith, Lisa E. Wolf, Thomas Levitan (Eds.), *Studying diversity in higher education: New Directions for Institutional Research*, 81, 51-62.

Edwards, W. (1954). The theory of decision-making. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 380-417.

Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4).

Eisenhardt, K. & Bourgeois, L. (1988). Politics of strategic decision-making in high-velocity environments: Toward a midrange theory. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 31(4), 737-770.

Eisenhardt, K. & Zbaracki, M. (1992). Strategic decision-making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 17-37.

Feldman, K. & Newcomb, T. (1969). *Thei mpact of college on students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fisher, S., & Nelson, D. (1996). Feeling at the top: An underutilized resource in top management teams. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 11(5).

Foster, B., Jackson, G., Cross, W., Jackson, B., & Hardiman, R. (1988). Workforce diversity and business. *Training and Development Journal*, 4(42), 28-41.

Garcia, M., Hudgins, C., McTighe Musil, C., Nettles, M., Sedlacek, W. & Smith, D. (2001). *Assessing campus diversity initiatives: A guide for campus practitioners*. Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Gardenswartz, L. & Rowe, A. (1993). *Managing diversity: A complete desk reference and planning guide*. New York: Irwin/Pfeiffer.

Giles, M. & Rae, A. (1999). Career self-efficacy: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 72(3).

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Globetti, E., Globetti, G., Brown, C., & Smith, R. (1993). Social interaction and multiculturalism, *NASPA Journal*, 30 (3), 209-18.

Godin, G., & Kok, G. (1996). The theory of planned behavior: A review of its applications in health-related behaviors. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 11*, 87-98.

Goetz, J. & LeCompte, M. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Gratz v. Bollinger, No. 97-75231 (E.D. MI. filed Oct. 14, 1997)

Green, M.F. & Hayward, F.M. (1997). Forces for change. In Green, M.F. (Ed.), *Transforming Higher Education: Views from Leaders Around the World*. Phoenix: the Oryx Press.

Grutter v. Bollinger, No. 97-75928 (E.D. MI. filed Dec. 3, 1997).

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Guimond, S., & Palmer, D. (1989). Education, academic program and intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 26*(2),193-216.

Gumport, P. (1993). The contested terrain of academic program reduction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(3), 283-311.

Gurin, P. (1999). *The compelling need for diversity in higher education*. The University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, MI.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hackman, J. (1985). Power and centrality in the allocation of resources in colleges and universities. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Hambrick, D. & Finkelstein, S. (1987). Managerial discretion: Bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 369-406.

Hambrick, D. & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 193-206.

Hammond, K, McClelland, G. & Mumpower, J. (1980). *Human judgment and decision-making*. New York: Praeger.

Hamrick, F. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*. 39(5), 449-460.

Hannan, M. & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology,* 82, 929-963.

Harten, C. & Boyer, R. (1985). Administrators' receptivity to nontraditional goals. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56(2), 206-219.

Harvey, W. (2001). *Minorities in higher education 2000-2001: 18th annual status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hausenblas, H. & Carron, A. (1997). Application of the theories of reasoned action and planned behavior to exercise behavior. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19(1).

Hitt, M. & Tyler, B. (1991). Strategic decision models: Integrating different perspectives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(5), 327-351.

Hodgkinson, C. (1996). *Administrative philosophy: Values and motivations in administrative life.* New York: Pergamon.

Hrubes, D. & Ajzen, I. (2001). Predicting hunting intentions and behavior: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Leisure Sciences*, 23, 165-178.

Hsia, J & Hirano-Nakanishi, M. (1989). The demographics of diversity: Asian Americans in higher education. *Change,* Nov./Dec., 20-27.

Hunter, A. (1993). Local knowledge and local power: Notes on the ethnography of local community elites. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(1).

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.

Hurtado, S. (1994). The institutional climate for talented Latino students. *Research in Higher Education*. 35(1), 21-41.

Hurtado, S. (1996). How diversity affects teaching and learning: A climate of inclusion has a positive effect on learning outcomes. *Educational Record*, 77(4), 27-29.

Hurtado, S. & Carter, D. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of campus racial climate on Latinos' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, 70 (4), 324-345.

Hurtado, S., Dey, E. & Trevino, J. (1994). *Exclusion of self-segregation? Interaction across racial/ethnic groups on college campuses.* Paper presented at a conference on the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*. 21(3).

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 26(8). Washington DC: The George Washington University.

Ihde, D. (1977). *Experimental phenomenology*. New York: G. P. Puttman.

Ingram, K., Cope, J., Harju, B. & Wuensch, K. (2000). Applying to graduate school: A test of the theory of planned behavior (15) 2, 215-226.

Johnsrud, L & Heck, R. (1994). Administrative promotion within a university: The cumulative impact of gender. *Journal of Higher Education*, 65(1), 23-44.

Justiz, M. (1994). Demographic trends and challenges to American higher education. *Minorities in Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: ACE/ORYX Press.

Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values and frames. *American Psychologist*, 39, 341-350.

Kanter, R. (1977a). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex rations and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 965-89.

Kanter, R. (1977b). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Kaplin, W. (1992). A proposed process for managing the first amendment aspects of campus hate speech. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(1), 517-538.

Kaplan, M. & Schwartz, S. (1975). *Human judgment and decision processes.* New York: Academic Press.

Katz, P. (1976). *Towards the elimination of racism*. Pergammon Press: New York.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kerchner, C. (1993). The strategy of teaching strategy. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood & J Murphy (Eds.), *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.

Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating change in higher education in the 21st century*. ERIC-HE Digest Series, Washington DC: The George Washington University.

Kida, T. (1982). An attitudinal basis for decisions in a business context. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 116, 235-244.

Kirkland, S., & Regan, A. (1997). Organizational racial diversity training. In C. E. Thompson and R. T. Carter (Eds.), *Racial identity theory: Applications to individual, group, and organizational interventions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Kirwan, W.E. (1996, November 7). *Action plan in response to the Asian, Hispanic, and Native American task force report.* Unpublished report, University of Maryland, College Park.

Kotler, P., & Andersen, A. (1987). *Strategic marketing for nonprofit organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (2000). Culture in American colleges and universities. In M.C. Brown (Ed.), *Organizational & Governance in Higher Education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing, 160-169.

Lapiere, R. (1934). Attitudes and actions. *Social Forces*, 13, 230-237.

Layzell, D., & Lyddon, J. (1993). Budgeting for higher education at the state level: Enigma, paradox, and ritual. In D. W. Breneman, L. L. Leslie, & R. E. Anderson (Eds.), *ASHE reader on finance in higher education*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Lennox, A. & Taylor, R. (1994). Factors associated with outcome in unaided smoking cessation, and a comparison of those who have never tried to stop smoking with those who have. *British Journal of General Practice*, 44, 245-250.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper & Row.

Limbert, C. & Lamb, R. (2002). Doctors' use of clinical guidelines: Two applications of the theory of planned behavior. *Psychology, Health & Medicine,* 7(3), 301-310.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipshitz, R. (1994). Decision making in three modes. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior*, 24(1).

Liu, G. (1998). Affirmative action in higher education: The diversity rationale and the compelling interest test. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 33, 381-442.

Loo, C., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominately White university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(1), 58-77.

Lumpe, A., Czerniak, C. & Jodi, J. (1998). Science teacher beliefs and intentions regarding the use of cooperative learning. *School Science & Mathematics*, 98 (3), 133-136.

Lutz, F. (1982). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 27(4), 653-669.

March, J., & Olsen, J. (1976). *Ambiguity and choice in organizations*. Bergen, Norway: University Forlaget.

McCarthy, C. (1991). Multicultural approaches to racial inequality in the United States. *Oxford Review of Education,* 17(3), 301-316.

McCauley, C., Wright, M., Harris, M. (2000). Diversity workshops on campus: A survey of current practice at U.S. colleges and universities. *College Student Journal,* 34 (1).

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in Women's studies. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McLaughlin, G., Montgomery, J. & Sullins, W. (1977). Roles and characteristics of department chairmen in state universities as related to level of decision-making. *Research in Higher Education.* 6, 327-341.

Mackenzie, K. (1979). Group norms: Importance and measurement. *International Journal of Group Psychology,* 29, 471-480.

Macpherson, I., Brooker, R. & Ainsworth, P. (2000). Case study in the contemporary world of research: Using notions of purpose, place, process and product to develop some principles for practice. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 3(1), 49-61.

Magunnson, D. (1988). *Individual development from an interactional perspective: A longitudinal study.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mandel v. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 411 F. Supp. 542 (D. Md. 1976).

March, J., & Olsen, J. (1976). *Ambiguity and choice in organizations*. Bergen, Norway: University Forlaget.

March, J. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Marshal, C., & Rossman, G. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Martin, J., Feldman, M., Hatch, M., & Sitkin, S. (1983). The uniqueness paradox in organizational stories. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 438-453.

Maryland, Univeristy of. (n.d.). *Hate crime response protocols and prevention programming*. Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/OHRP/campus/campuspships.html#hatecrime

Maryland, University of. (n.d). *Baltimore incentives award program*. Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/biap/program/

Maryland, University of. (n.d.). UM Newsdesk. Retrieved November 5, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.urhome.umd.edu/newsdesk/facts/2003rank.cfm

Maryland, University of. (1969). *A study in intergration by the committee on intergration.* Unpublished report.

Maryland, University of. (1972). *University of Maryland, College Park Affirmative Action Plan*. Unpublished Report

Maryland, University of. (1976). *The Human Relations Code*. Unpublished Report

Maryland, University of. (1986). Minutes of the Equity Council

Maryland, University of. (1989a). *Enhancing the College Park campus: An action plan.* Unpublished Report.

Maryland, University of (1989b) *Promises to Keep: The College Park plan for undergraduate education*. http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Reports/pease

Maryland, University of (1989c) *Access is not enough: A report to the president concerning opportunities for Blacks at the University of Maryland at College Park.* Unpublished report: University of Maryland, College Park.

Maryland, University of (1992). *The report of the committee on excellence though diversity: Providing opportunities for Black Americans at College Park.* Unpublished report: University of Maryland, College Park.

Maryland, University of (1993). *Asian, Hispanic and Native American Task Force Report*. Unpublished report: University of Maryland, College Park.

Maryland, University of (1997a). *The educational mission of a public research university: The middle states self-study*. Unpublished report.

Maryland, University of. (1997b). The Value of Diversity in the University: A Statement by a Faculty-Staff Committee at the University of Maryland. Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/Topic/Diversity/Response/UM/valuediv.html

Maryland, University of (1998). The Flagship Initiative. Accessed October 15, 2003 http://www.inform.umd.edu/pres/flagship/background.html

Maryland, University of (2000a). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved November 4, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.provost.umd.edu/Strategic_Planning/Mission2000.html

Maryland, University of (2000b). Strategic Plan. Retrieved November 4, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.provost.umd.edu/Strategic_Planning/Plan.html#intro

Maryland, University of (2000c). The Consortium on Race, Gender and Ethnicity. Who we are section. Retrieved November 4, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.crge.umd.edu/whoweare/index.html

Maryland, University of (2003a). Diversity at Maryland. Retrieved November 4, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.union.umd.edu/diversity/

Maryland, University of (2003b). Office of Human Relations Programs, Campus Partnerships. Accessed on October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/OHRP/campus/campuspships.html#racism

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.

Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. Washington, DC: The Palmer Press.

McReady v. Byrd, 195 Md. 131 (Md. 1950).

Meier, K. (1993). *Politics and the bureaucracy: Policymaking in the fourth branch of government, 3rd ed*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Michael, S. (1998). Restructuring U.S. higher education: Analyzing models for academic program review and discontinuation. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 377-404.

Milem, J. (1994). College, students, and racial understanding. *Thought & Action*, IX (2), 51-92.

Milem, J. (2000). Why race matters: The individual and institutional benefits of diversity in higher education. *Academe*, 86 (5), 26-29.

Milem, J. & Astin, H. (1993). The changing composition of faculty: What does it really mean for diversity? *Change*, 25(2), 21-27.

Milem, J. & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education, featured report, In D. Wilds (author) *Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Millett, J. (1978). *New structures of campus power: Success and failures of emerging forms of institutional governance.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work.* New York: Harper and Row.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1991). The professional bureaucracy. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Montez, J., Wolverton, M, & Gmelch, W. (2002). The Roles and Challenges of Deans. The Review of Higher Education, 26 (2), P. 241-266.

Montgomery, R. (1989). The influence of attitudes and normative pressures on voting decisions in a union certification election. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 42, 262-79.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organizations.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Morphew, C., (2000). The Realities of strategic planning: Program termination at east central university. *Review of Higher Education* , 23(3).

Mortimer, K. & McConell, T. (1978). *Sharing authority effectively*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mote, C.D. (2000a). *Diversity panel vision and charge.* Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Committees/DiversityPanel/DiversityPanelMissionStatement/

Mote, C.D. (2000b). *Response to the diversity panel recommendations*. Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/Pres/statement_divrsp.html

Mote, D.C. (2002). *State of the campus address 2002-2003*. Retrieved October 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.inform.umd.edu/PRES/speech_state02.html

Mummery, W. & Wankel, L. (1999). Training adherence in adolescent competitive swimmers: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 21(4), 313-319.

Murphy, J. (1980). *Getting the facts: A fieldwork guide for evaluators and policy analysis*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Myers, D. (1990). *Social Psychology*. (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1997) *Cultivating humanity*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Office of Human Relations Programs (1998). Diversity Blueprint. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Office of Institutional Studies. (2002). [Faculty by rank, race and gender, 1975-2002]. Unpublished raw data.

Office of Institutional Studies. (2002). [Graduate student enrollment by race and gender 1975-2002]. Unpublished raw data.

Office of Institutional Studies. (2002). [Undergraduate student enrollment by race and gender, 1975-2002]. Unpublished raw data.

Olivas, M. (1988). Administering intentions: Law, theory, and practice of postsecondary residency requirements. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(3), 263-290.

Olivas, M. (1992). The political economy of immigration, intellectual property, and racial harassment: Case studies of the implementation of legal change on campus. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 570-598.

Paisley, C. & Sparks, S. (1998). Expectations of reducing fat intake: The role of perceived need within the theory of planned behavior. *Psychology and Health*, 13, 341-353.

Parker, D., Manstead, A. & Stradling, S. (1995). Extending the theory of planned behavior: The role of personal norm. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 127-137.

Pascarella, E., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L, & Terenzini, P. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenges in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 174-195.

Pascarella, E., Palmer, B., Moye, M.. & Pierson, C. (2001). Do diversity experiences influence the development of critical thinking? *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(3).

Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluations methods*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oak, California: Sage Publications.

Pearson v. Murray, 169 Md. 478 (Md. 1936).

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper.

Peterson, M.. & Spencer (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In W.G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pfeffer, J. (1991). The ambiguity of leadership. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row: NY.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Podberesky v. Kirwan, 764 F. Supp. 364 (D. Md., 1991).

Progress Report: The Campus Coalition Against Racism (1969). Unpublished Report, The University of Maryland.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978). Accessed November 5, 2003 World Wide Web: http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&navby=case&vol=438&invol=265

Rendon, L. & Hope, R. (1995). An educational system in crisis, *educating a new majority: Transforming America's educational system for diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rhoades, G. (2000). Who's doing it right? Strategic activity in publicr esearch universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 41-66.

Richardson, R., & Skinner, E. (1991). *Achieving diversity.* Washington, DC: ACE/Macmillan.

Roberts, C. & Smith, P. (1999). Attitudes and behavior of children toward peers with disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 46(1), 35-50.

Romanelli, E. & Tushman, M. (1986). Inertia, environments, and strategic choice: A quasi-experimental design for comparative-longitudinal research. *Management Science*, 32, 608-621.

Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 119-160.

Ross, R. (1977). Decentralization of authority in colleges and universities. *Research in Higher Education*. 6(2), 97-123.

Rousseau, D. (1988). The construction of climate in organizational research. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol*,3), New York: Wiley.

Rousseau, D. (1989). Price of success? Security-oriented cultures in high reliability organizations. *Industrial Crisis Quarterly*, 3, 285-302.

Rousseau, D. (1990). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol 3)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 153-192.

Rousseau, D., Shortell, S., Gillies, R. , Kraus, W., Draper, E., & Wagner, D. (1990). Culture in intensive care units: Behavioral norms of nurses and physicians and their links to unit performance and nurse turnover. Paper presented at Academy of Management, San Francisco.

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing : The art of hearing data*. San Diego: Sage Publications.

Rudenstine, N. (1996, April 19). Why a diverse student body is so important. *The Chronicle of Higher Education 4*2(32), pp. B1-B2.

Rudolph, F. (1965). *The American college and university: A history*. New York: Vintage.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuman, H. & Johnson, M. (1976). Attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 161-207.

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L. & Krysan, M. (1998). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schwenk, C. (1988). The cognitive perspective on strategic decision-making. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25, 41-56.

Schwenk, C. (1988). *The essence of strategic decision-making*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Schwenk, C. (1989). Linking cognitive, organizational and political factors in explaining strategic change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26, 177-187.

Scott, W. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 483-511.

Seashore, S. (1954). *Group cohesiveness in the industrial work group*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Shaw, M. (1976). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Martin, M., & Stallworth, L. (1991). Consensual racism and career track: Some implications of social dominance theory. *Political Psychology*, 12(4), 691-721.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: Sage Publications.

Simon, H. (1976). *Administrative behavior (3rd Ed.)*. New York: Free Press.

Simon, H. & March, J. (1993). *Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Skinner, E. & Richardson, R.(1988). Making it in a majority university: the minority graduate's perspective. *Change, 20*(3), 34-42.

Solmon, L. & Tierney, M. (1977). Determinants of job satisfaction among college administrators. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48(4), 412-431.

Slaughter, S. (1998). Federal Policy and Supply-Side Institutional Resource Allocation at Public Research Universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 209-244.

Smedley, B., Myers, H. & Harrell, S. (1993). Minority status stresses and the college adjustment of ethnic minority freshman. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(4), 434-452.

Smith, D. (1995). Organizational implications of diversity in higher education. In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. A. Constanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, D. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Sparks, P., & Shepherd, R. (1992). Self-identity and the theory of planned behavior: Assessing the role of identification with "green consumerism." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 388-399.

Springer, L., Palmer, B., Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., & Nora, A. (1996). Attitudes toward campus diversity: Participation in a racial or cultural workshop. *Review of Higher Education*, 20(1), 53-68.

Sproull, L. (1981). Beliefs in organizations. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stage, F. & Manning, K. (1992). Enhancing the multicultural campus environment: A cultural brokering approach. In M.J. Barr & M.L. Upcraft (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services* (Vol. 60, pp. 62-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series.

Steele, C. (April, 1992). Race and the schooling of Black Americans. *Atlantic Monthly*: 68-78.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Straw, B. (1981). The escalation of commitment to a course of action. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 577-587.

Swenk, J. (1999). Planning failures: Decision cultural clashes. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(1), 1-21.

Terry, D., & Hogg, M. (1996). Group norms and the attitude-behavior relationship: A role for group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 776-793.

Thousand, J. & Burchard, S. (1990). Social intergration: Special education teachers' attitudes and behaviors. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 94, 407-419.

Tierney, W. (1997). The parameters of affirmative action: Equity and excellence in the academy. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(2), 65-96.

Tierney, W. (2000). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. In M. Brown II (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Pearson Custom Publishing

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000d)

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 207-232.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgement under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124-1131.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211, 453-458.

Twombly, S. (1992). The process of choosing a dean. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(6), 653-683.

U.S. Department of Commerce (1999). *The emerging minority marketplace: Minority population growth: 1995 to 2050*. Washington D.C.: Minority Business Development Agency.

Walker, J. & Lawler, J. (1982). University administrators and faculty bargaining. *Research in Higher Education*, 16(4), 353-372.

Wally, S. & Baum, J. (1994). Personal and structural determinants of the pace of strategic decision-making. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 932-956.

Wei, W. (1993). *The Asian American movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychological of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. (1985). Sources of order in under-organized systems: Themes in recent organizational theory in Y. Lincoln (Ed.), *Organizational theory and inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Whetten, D. & Cameron, K. (1991). Administrative effectiveness in higher education. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Whitt, E. J. (1991). Artful science: A primer on qualitative research methods. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32(5), 406-415.

White, J. (2002, February 1). U-M's push for diversity serves all, from students to business. *The Detroit Free Press.* p. 11A.

Wilds, D. & Wilson, R. (1998). *Minorities in higher education: Sixteenth annual status report.* Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

Wilson R. (1994). The participation of African Americans in American higher education. *Minorities in Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: ACE/ORYX Press, 195-209.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W., Wolverton, M., & Sarros, J. (1999). Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. *The Review of Higher Education* 22(2), 165-185

Yin, R. (1984). *Cases tudy research.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (1989). *Case study research, design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (1991). *The case study method as a tool for doing evaluation.* Cosmos Corporation.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research, design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, K. & Takeuchi, D. (1998). Racism. In L. Lee and N. Zane (Eds.), *Handbook of Asian American Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zalesny, M. (1985). A comparison of economic and noneconomic factors in predicting faculty vote preference in union representation election. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 243-55.