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ABSTRACT

CULTURAL COPING STRATEGIES OF INVOLUNTARY MINORITY AND NON-MINORITY CHAIRPERSONS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

The purpose of this study was to examine if there was a difference in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons employed at doctoral, degree-granting universities in the American Southwest. The study also examined to what degree John Ogbu's cultural coping strategies were used by the university administrators. Furthermore, the perceptions of the chairpersons with regard to their selection as a chairperson, satisfaction with the chairperson position, and future administrative plans were also determined.

A 54-item questionnaire was self-administered by 119 department chairpersons located in 64 universities in the seven Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah. The instrument was designed to measure if chairpersons use Ogbu's cultural coping strategies which comprise the eight adaptive types he classified as assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and encapsulated.

iii
T-test scores were utilized at the .05 level to determine statistical significance. The t-scores indicated that part of Ogbu's concept (emissaries, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, and regulars adaptive types) was statistically significant at the .05 confidence interval. The t-test scores of the assimilators, alternators, ambivalents, and encapsulated adaptive types were statistically insignificant at the .05 confidence level. The means ranged from a 13.7 to 24.9 and indicated the degree of utilization of cultural coping strategies.

Approximately two thirds (61.1%) of non-minority and 69.3% of involuntary minority chairs agreed that they were selected to the chairperson position because they were fully qualified and not because of their ethnic status. The majority (72.2%) of involuntary minority and of non-minority (64.8%) chairs felt the chairperson position provided excellent administrative experience, but only 35% of involuntary minority and 29% of the non-minority chairs plan to pursue higher level administrative positions. The majority of the chairs (67.7% non-minority and 75.4% involuntary minority) replied that they had a high level of satisfaction with the university department chair position. Based on the analysis, five recommendations for further study were suggested.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the past, the United States was considered a melting pot where all immigrant cultures would blend into one unique mixture. Recently, however, Americans have been likened to a salad bowl filled with individual flavors, which combine tastefully (Weis, 1989, p.9). Many ethnic groups and culturally diverse individuals use cultural coping strategies when they encounter institutions such as the college and university system in the United States of America (Ogbu, 1988, p. 177). Persons who are members of cultural minority groups in the United States, in particular, are faced with a dilemma between their familiar birth culture and the unfamiliar, but dominant eurocentric cultural status quo dominating most major university systems. This cultural dichotomy often affects performance by minority individuals and frequently classifies many as poor achievers (Fordham, 1984, p. 18).

In John U. Ogbu's conceptual framework, minorities are classified into three groups -- autonomous, voluntary or immigrant, and involuntary or castelike (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198). Autonomous minorities are minorities in a numerical sense; that is, they have no special cultural and physical
traits that distinguish them from the majority. American examples are Jews and Mormons. All autonomous minorities in America are white. Voluntary minorities are mostly immigrants to America who conform to American society since they came to the United States voluntarily. The third group in America is made up of involuntary minorities which consists of groups of people who arrived in America involuntarily through slavery, conquest, or colonization. For example, African Americans were brought to America to serve as slaves, while American Indians and Hispanic Americans of the Southwest were incorporated as part of America's conquest and colonization. Within each of these minority groups, identifying with the dominant culture can be viewed as cultural betrayal. Working hard for a promotion, speaking standard English, and punctuality, for example, can create internal conflict for involuntary minorities (DeVos, 1967, p. 198). Therefore, involuntary minorities, in particular, must use cultural coping strategies in their everyday existence among the dominant eurocentric culture (DeVos, 1984, p. 199).

Ogbu classifies the eight adaptive types who use cultural coping strategies as assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and encapsulated (Ogbu 1989, pp. 198-199). These groups follow a continuum ranging from the assimilators who identify with the dominant society to the
encapsulated who reject any connection with them. These cultural coping strategies are used by some minority professionals in order to enhance social success (Ogbu, 1992, p. 11).

The cultural coping strategies of involuntary minorities encountering the university institutional system may generate a cultural model which imitates attitudes and behaviors of the dominant eurocentric group. When a minority individual wants to succeed in a department chair position at the university level, for example, problems of respect, sexism, racism, tokenism, and cultural barriers may develop (Ogbu, 1989, p. 184).

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in the use of cultural coping strategies exist between involuntary minority and non-minority department chairpersons at selected doctoral degree-granting universities located in the American Southwest.

**Research Questions**

1. Was there a statistically significant t-test difference at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons?

2. To what degree were the eight adaptive types that use cultural coping strategies developed by John Ogbu
utilized by involuntary minorities and selected non-minority department chairpersons?

3. What were the perceptions of involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons with regard to the following questions:
   a. Why was he or she selected to this administrative position?
   b. What administrative expectations did he or she have for the future?
   c. What level of satisfaction did he or she have with the chairperson position?

Significance of the Study

Many minorities have had a different cultural frame of reference than the American mainstream culture. As a result, they have experienced greater difficulty crossing cultural boundaries and establishing success in educational institutions (Forsyth, 1993, p. 88). As a case in point, involuntary minorities who were selected to serve in the American university department chair position may have had to develop or intensify cultural coping strategies in order to establish successful working relationships with support staff, professors, other chairpersons, and higher administration (Gibson, 1991, p. 262). This study contributes to the understanding of the difference in how involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons employed at selected doctoral degree-granting universities located
in the Southwest use cultural coping strategies when they encounter institutions established by the American mainstream culture. John Ogbu, author of the cultural coping strategies concept, agreed this study was important (Appendix A). This study will apply Ogbu's learning concept to department chairs and their cultural coping strategies.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were central to this study:

**Cultural coping strategies** - recognizable strategies that individuals striving for success use to shield themselves from peer criticism, isolation, and affective dissonance as well as to enhance their social success. The eight adaptive types classified by John Ogbu and used in this study include assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and encapsulated (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198).

**Assimilators** - minorities who choose to disassociate themselves from the minority identity and cultural frame of reference, a position which amounts to a kind of cultural passing. They are the minorities who have come to prefer dominant cultural norms and values that are in conflict with those of their own birth culture, especially with the cultural frame of reference of their own minority peers (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198).
emissaries - minorities who play down the minority identity and cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in mainstream institutions by mainstream criteria but without rejecting minority culture and identity (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198).

alternators - minorities who adopt an immigrant model which is accommodation without assimilation. These minorities do not reject their minority identity and cultural frame of reference, but elect to play by the rules of the system. They tend to adopt strategies to cope with the conflicting demands of peer groups and those of the institution (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198).

reaffiliated - the minorities who might have repudiated the minority cultural frame of reference and identity until they were confronted with an unacceptable experience which they interpreted as caused by racism. They often became more involved in minority activities and with their minority peers, but they may still continue to do well in the mainstream institutions (Ogbu, 1989, pp. 198-199).

ivy-leaguers - minorities who emulate middle class behaviors, belong to social clubs or fraternities, abide by institutional laws and routines, and dress well according to middle class standards. Ivy-leaguers tended to be churchgoers who are well-liked by their families and the authorities. They are
generally considered good workers within the institution (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199).

**regulars** - minority members who are accepted members of the street culture but do not subscribe to all of its norms. These minorities know how to get along well with everyone without compromising their own values and they interact with their peers without being encapsulated. They are not fully committed to street or peer culture and their values resembled those of the middle class. In institutions, they make good workers who conform to most conventional rules; they also maintain close family ties and rarely belong to controversial groups. The survival skills of the regulars include knowing the minority culture in coping with peers, engaging in relatively safe activities, knowing how to handle trouble successfully, and ensuring that trouble does not recur (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199).

**ambivalents** - minorities who were caught between the need or desire to be with minority peers and the desire to achieve by the criteria of mainstream institutions. Since they can not successfully resolve the conflict, their work performance tends to be quite erratic (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199).

**encapsulated** - minorities who not only equate institutional success with cultural betrayal, but also make no
attempt to succeed in mainstream institutions. They reject participation in institutions because of its identification with cultural denial. They simply do not conform to institutional rules of behavior and standard practices, since these are defined as being within the dominant cultural frame of reference. The encapsulated generally do not do well in mainstream institutions (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199).

**Minorities** - people whose physical appearance or cultural practices are unlike those of the dominant group, making them susceptible to different and unequal treatment. In such cases, the dominant group may have denied the minority group equal access to the wealth, power, and prestige that its own members enjoyed. Generally, a minority group had the following distinguishing features:

1. Identified by characteristics that are socially visible such as skin color,
2. Suffered various disadvantages at the hands of the dominant group such as being kept in low status positions,
3. Were a self-conscious group with a strong sense of oneness,
4. Were an ascribed status where membership was not voluntary such as women and African Americans,
5. Generally married within the group by choice or
necessity, (Farley, 1994, pp. 280-281).

**autonomous minorities** - people such as Jews and Mormons who are classified as cultural minorities in America because of their numbers; however, they do not have special physical traits that distinguish them from the majority group (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8).

**involuntary minorities** - people who were brought into a social system on an involuntary basis such as slavery, conquest or colonization. Examples are African Americans, American Indians and Hispanics of the American Southwest (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8).

**voluntary minorities** - people who were brought into a system on a voluntary basis such as immigrants who were willing to conform to American society (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8).

**non-minority/majority group** - a group of people who are in an advantaged social position relative to other groups, often having the power to discriminate against those other groups who have a different set of beliefs, attitudes, and rules for behavior (Farley, 1994, p. 590).

**chairperson** - the administrative officer of a department of instruction in a college or university (Gmelch, 1993, p. 260).
cultural frame of reference - the set of beliefs, language, rules, values, and knowledge held in common by group members (Ogbu, 1992, p. 5).

Southwest - the section of the United States of America composed of seven states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.

university - an institution of higher learning providing facilities for teaching and research and authorized to grant academic degrees at the doctoral level.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

This study was designed to examine the difference in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons at the university level. In the case of an involuntary minority chairperson working in a university setting where department members and administrators are minorities from the same or different ethnic groups but not from the dominant eurocentric culture, however, the cultural coping strategies may not be clearly defined (Suarez-Orozco, 1987, p. 299). This was a limitation of the study.

Delimitations imposed on this study were selecting only involuntary minority chairpersons and a second set of non-minority chairpersons at doctoral degree granting universities located in the seven Southwestern states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.
**Conceptual Base**

John U. Ogbu contends in his conceptual framework that the crucial issue in the relationship between cultural diversity and learning is the dichotomy between minority cultures and American mainstream culture. Minorities whose cultural frames of reference were different than the mainstream culture have greater difficulty crossing cultural boundaries. This difficulty creates problems in learning and academic achievement for minorities (Ogbu, 1992, p. 5).

This project focused upon the conceptual rationale that involuntary minorities who are department chairpersons at universities also have difficulties crossing cultural boundaries. These involuntary minorities had to develop cultural coping strategies in order to be successful in solving the conflict between their minority birth culture and the dominant culture (Ogbu, 1989, p. 198).

The conceptual framework John Ogbu developed states that three types of minority groups exist in the United States: autonomous, voluntary or immigrant, and involuntary or castelike. Autonomous minorities are minorities in a numerical sense. Examples in the United States are the Jews, the Mormons, and the Amish. No non-white autonomous minorities abide in America. The immigrant or voluntary minorities came to America because they wanted economic and
political well-being. They usually experienced preliminary problems due to language and cultural differences, but did not generally face failure in school. Involuntary or castelike minorities were brought into American society against their will, usually by slavery, colonization, or conquest. These involuntary minorities experienced greater difficulties with school learning (Ogbu, 1989; Weis, 1989; Gibson, 1991).

Voluntary minorities have been characterized by primary cultural differences; involuntary minorities, by secondary cultural differences. Primary cultural differences are those that existed before the minorities and dominant group came into contact with each other. Secondary cultural differences developed after the two populations came together. In order to cope with their subordination, minorities developed secondary cultural differences. The eight adaptive types who use cultural coping strategies were classified by Ogbu as assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and encapsulated. These groups follow a continuum ranging from the assimilators who identify with the dominant culture to the encapsulated who reject any connection with them (Ogbu, 1989, pp. 198-199).

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in the use of cultural coping strategies exist between involuntary minority and selected non-minority
department chairpersons at doctoral degree-granting universities in the seven Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.

Research Design

This quantitative study consisted of a 54 item questionnaire which examined the differences in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and other non-minority department chairpersons at selected doctoral degree-granting universities. The subjects chaired different academic programs of study in one of 64 doctoral degree-granting universities located in the seven Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah. The chairperson position was selected since it equates educational administration to middle management. The Southwestern states were chosen due to the rich cultural mixture of ethnic groups and the area of proximity to the base for the study, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). Doctoral degree-granting institutions were selected because of the quality of the credentials the institutions and professors possessed.

A non-minority group of chairpersons was utilized as a comparison to the involuntary group. Since involuntary minority chairs have been screened and trained in a similar manner to non-minority chairs, the research design of this study focuses on finding out if a difference exists
in the utilization of cultural coping strategies between the two groups.

The data collected from the involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons were analyzed for differences in use of Ogbu's cultural coping strategies. The data were also analyzed for the degree in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons. Furthermore, the data concerning the perceptions of the involuntary minorities and non-minority chairpersons were also analyzed regarding the basis on which they were selected and the expectations they had of the chairperson position. Finally, the data on administrative expectations and levels of satisfaction by chairperson in that position were analyzed from involuntary minority and non-minority points of view.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in the use of cultural coping strategies exist between involuntary minority and non-minority department chairpersons at selected doctoral degree-granting universities located in the American Southwest.

The review of the literature followed four lines of inquiry relevant to the study: literature related to the taxonomy of minorities in the United States, literature related to the development of the eight adaptive types that use cultural coping strategies, literature related to cultural coping strategies, and literature on the department chair position. This provided a framework for the research problems and sub-problems that this study addresses.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework upon which this study was based contends that the crucial issue in cultural diversity and success within university systems is based on the dichotomy between the involuntary minority cultures and the American mainstream culture. John U. Ogbu's work elaborated on the social construction of the identity of what he called "castelike minorities." He stated,
Comparative and historical analyses of relationships between dominant groups and subordinate groups in castelike stratifications, such as between blacks and whites in the United States, indicate that these subordinate minorities usually react to their subordination and exploitation by forming ambivalent or oppositional identities as well as oppositional cultural frames of reference. (Ogbu, 1988, p. 176)

Minorities whose cultural frames of reference were different from the mainstream culture have had greater difficulty crossing cultural boundaries. This difficulty has created problems in achievement and overall success within American institutional systems including universities and colleges (Ogbu, 1992, p. 5).

Remarkable economic and technological achievement by other countries has inspired the thought that all American educational institutions should be teaching a core curriculum like Taiwanese and German schools do. Americans attributed these technological achievements to their superior education as evidenced by the fact that foreign students outperformed American students by every academic measure (Hirsch, 1987, p. 22).

The conceptual framework John Ogbu developed and that this study was based on is:

Involuntary minorities like African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanic Americans, often develop an identity system or sense of peoplehood which they perceive and experience not merely as different but more particularly as in opposition to the social identity system of their dominators or, in the case of blacks, 'white oppressors.' (Ogbu, 1988, p. 176)
Therefore, Ogbu asserted that involuntary minority individuals who want to achieve in institutional systems must consciously choose from a variety of secondary cultural coping strategies to shield them from peer pressures and other detracting forces of the community (Ogbu, 1992, p. 2). Ogbu noted:

In the area of behavior the racial minorities often come to define certain attitudes and ways of acting as not appropriate for themselves because these are attitudes and ways of members of the dominant group, or the white ways. And the minorities define opposing attitudes and behaviors as more appropriate for themselves. Thus from the involuntary minority point of view, there co-exist two opposing cultural frames of reference or ideal ways of behaving, one for white Americans and the other for involuntary minorities. (Ogbu, 1988, p. 176)

Ogbu also pointed out that pressures have discouraged involuntary minorities from adopting the standard American attitude and practices that enhance success because such attitudes are considered cultural betrayal.

Individual minorities who step into what their peers and community regard as the white cultural frame of reference, i.e., individuals who try to cross cultural and language boundaries, may experience both internal opposition or identity crisis and external opposition or peer and community pressures. (Ogbu, 1988, p. 176)

In the case of African American involuntary minorities, for example, the social pressures against "acting white" include accusations of "Uncle Tomism" or disloyalty to the minority cause and community. This may create fear of losing one's friends and one's sense of community (Fordham, 1984, p. 19).
Minorities have developed secondary cultural coping strategies in order to cope with their subordination. Ogbu labels people displaying these strategies as assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and the encapsulated (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8).

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in the use of cultural coping strategies exist between involuntary minority and selected non-minority department chairpersons at doctoral degree-granting universities in the seven Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.

**Taxonomy of Minorities**

A minority is defined as a part of a population differing from others in some characteristics and often subjected to differential treatment (Gibson, 1991, p. 329).

John Farley noted a difference, for he argued,

> Many societies have two or more ethnic groups which experience inequality and conflict. One or more ethnic groups are in an advantaged or dominant position with the power to discriminate, while other groups are in disadvantaged or subordinate positions and are often the victims of discrimination. Those in the advantaged or dominant positions are called majority groups; those in disadvantaged or subordinate positions are called minority groups. (Farley, 1994, p. 280)

The majority group was usually the majority in a numerical sense, as with whites in the United States. A numerical minority can be a majority group, however. In South Africa,
for example, about 5 million whites dominated more than 25 million native black South Africans in politics, economics, and other aspects of life. Similarly, minorities of color in America are often in a subordinate position in society and may be singled out for differential and unequal treatment due to their physical or cultural characteristics. Therefore, they regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination (Farley, 1994, pp. 280-281).

Minorities are usually all grouped in a single category differing from the majority (Eitzen, 1993, p. 547). To understand minority groups, their cultures, their languages, and their ability to cross cultural boundaries, however, one must realize that there are different types of minority groups or minority status (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8). For this reason, Ogbu classifies minorities into the three groups of autonomous, voluntary, and involuntary (Ogbu, 1992, p. 9).

**Autonomous Minorities**

Autonomous minorities are people who are minorities primarily in a numerical sense. Examples of autonomous minorities in the United States of America are the Jews, the Mormons, and the Amish. All autonomous minorities in the United States are white. While autonomous minorities may maintain a distinct ethnic, religious, linguistic, or cultural identity, they are not usually socially, politically, or economically subordinated. Since autonomous minorities have a cultural frame of reference which
demonstrates and encourages institutional success, they do not experience disproportionate and persistent problems in institutional adjustment and achievement (Ogbu, 1992, pp. 8–9).

**Immigrant or Voluntary Minorities**

Immigrant or voluntary minorities are people who have moved voluntarily into a society such as the United States (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8). Voluntary minorities usually move into a society because they desire a better economic standard, more and better opportunities, and more political freedom. Their expectations continue to influence the way they perceive and respond to events, including work and schooling, in their host society (Ogbu, 1992, p. 9). Voluntary minorities usually experience initial problems in institutional situations due to cultural and language differences as well as a lack of understanding of how institutional systems work. They do not, however, experience lingering and disproportionate institutional failure. The Chinese and Punjabi Indians are representative examples of voluntary or immigrant minorities in the United States. Refugees, on the other hand, are not voluntary minorities; they are not a part of the immigrant or voluntary minority classification (Ogbu, 1992, p. 9).
Castelike or Involuntary Minorities

Castelike or involuntary minorities are people who were originally brought into a society against their will. Examples of induction for involuntary or castelike minorities in American society consist of slavery, conquest, colonization, or forced labor. Thereafter, these minorities were often assigned to subservient positions and denied true assimilation into mainstream society.

A grouping into which a person is born that determines that person's status is called a caste. John Ogbu (1974, p. 38; 1978, p. 49) has described castelike or involuntary minorities as those who have been exploited and depreciated systematically over generations through slavery. Black African Americans in the United States, colonization of the Mexican territories, and conquest of Native American Indians and Hawaiians are primary examples. Puerto Ricans may qualify for membership in this category if they consider themselves colonized by the United States. The Koreans in Japan and the Maoris in New Zealand are examples outside the United States (Ogbu, 1992, p. 10).

Involuntary minorities usually experience greater and more persistent and continual difficulties in dealing with institutional adjustment and achievement within the system (Ogbu, 1991, pp. 249-250). The persistent difficulties are not merely problems of cultural and language differences, although these dissimilarities are important. Even more
vital and usually unrecognized is the nature of the relationship between minority cultures and language and the culture and language of the dominant white Americans and the institutions they control.

The relationship between the minority cultures and languages and the mainstream culture and language is different for different minorities. It is this variation in the relationship that is burdensome in the ability of the minorities to cross cultural boundaries and that calls for understanding in order to enhance the success of intervention and other efforts. The nature of this intercultural relationship and the implications for minorities who are dealing with the institutional systems lead to the development of Ogbu's eight cultural coping strategies (1991, p. 259).

The work of George De Vos (1967/1984) sheds light on the complex psychosocial consequences of prolonged exploitation and disparagement (pp. 199-200). De Vos noted,

Constant depreciation has concrete psychological consequences when a member of an involuntary group gets involved with the institutional systems in America (p. 200).

Further, according to Suarez-Orozco (1991), patterns of "expressive exploitation" led to forms of "ego rigidification" and the emergence of cultural coping strategies by minorities (Suarez-Orozco, 1991, pp. 37-38).

In an atmosphere of discrimination, intolerance, and mutual distrust, involuntary minorities come to experience
contact with educational systems such as universities as destructive. Suarez-Orozco states:

The traditional educational system run by Anglos, becomes psychologically a threat to the student's sense of ethnic belonging. When schools become a stage enacting the inequality and depreciation in the encompassing social structure success is limited. (Suarez-Orozco, 1987, p. 289)

This limitation on success in school may induce what De Vos (1984) has termed a state of "affective dissonance" (p. 49). In such a context; engaging in the behaviors required for success in school becomes dangerous; it may be understood by members of the group as a wish or attempt to escape one's ethnic identity (De Vos, 1984, p. 54; Suarez-Orozco, 1991, pp. 37-62).

Past attempts to remedy the problem of low success rates of involuntary minorities in schools include core core curriculum and multicultural education school reform (Banks, 1989, p. 9). Core curriculum and multicultural education advocates who feel that demanding higher standards, allowing for supposed individual deficiencies, and inadequate focus on cultural differences in content and form fail to realize that the critical issue is the relationship between the minority cultures and the American mainstream culture. Involuntary minorities whose cultural frames of reference oppose the cultural frame of reference of mainstream white American culture have greater difficulty crossing cultural boundaries in educational institutions (Ogbu, 1992, pp. 7-9). As a result, they do not succeed.
Advocates of core curriculum from the humanities (Bennett, 1984; Bloom, 1987; Finn, 1989; Hirsch, 1988) are called "assimilationists" by their critics (Carroll & Schensul, 1990) and seem to be more concerned about American economic status in international competition than about assimilating culturally diverse groups into the mainstream culture (p. 121). One assumption in the core curriculum movement, for example, is that the success of both minority and majority individuals depends on what goes on inside the schools; therefore, fixing the schools will solve the problem (Ogbu, 1990, pp. 141-168). Ogbu further states:

Core curriculum does not address the problem of minority cultural diversity and what children bring to school such as their communities' cultural models or understandings of social realities and their educational strategies that they, their families, and their communities use or do not use in seeking education. (Ogbu, 1987, p. 312)

Multicultural education, on the other hand, is primarily led by minorities and linked to cultural diversity.

Multicultural education fosters pride in minority cultures, helps minority students develop new insights into their culture, reduces prejudice and stereotyping, and promotes intercultural understandings. (Banks, 1981, p. 91)

Ogbu also adds with some warning:

Multicultural education may increase school success for minorities, however, multicultural education generally ignores the minority students' own responsibility for their academic performance. Also multicultural education theories and programs are rarely based on actual study of minority cultures and languages. Finally, multicultural
education fails to separate minority groups that are able to cross cultural and language boundaries and learn successfully, in spite of initial cultural boundaries, from those that are not able to do so. (Ogbu, 1987, pp. 312-334)

The problem has been not merely one of cultural and language differences, although these variations are important. More significant is the nature of the relationship between minority cultures/languages and the culture and language of the dominant culture and the public institutions they control. In addition, the relationship between minority and mainstream is different for dissimilar minorities. It is precisely this contrast in the relationship that causes problems in the ability of involuntary minorities to cross cultural and language boundaries and that calls for understanding in order to enhance success and intervention efforts (Ogbu, 1992, pp. 7-9).

**Cultural Coping Strategies**

Eight adaptive types who use cultural coping strategies were described by John Ogbu (1991, p. 259). In preliminary ethnographic studies, he noted that black youths displayed recognizable strategies that they used to shield themselves from isolation and peer criticism in order to enhance their social success in eurocentric slanted educational institutions. Ogbu listed the eight adaptive types or cultural coping strategies as assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars,
ambivalents, and encapsulated (Ogbu, 1989, p. 91). Each of the eight cultural coping strategies of adaptive types provides a context in which a minority can provide and practice a conventional coping strategy in his or her everyday dealings with the majority operated institutions.

The eight cultural coping strategies or adaptive types are used by involuntary minorities in their everyday existence among the dominant eurocentric culture. Ogbu indicated that:

Involuntary minorities experience more difficulties in dealing with educational institutions and work performance partly because of the relationship between their cultures and the mainstream culture. Involuntary minorities have a greater difficulty in dealing with educational institutions and work performance partly because they have greater difficulty crossing cultural/language boundaries when dealing with educational institutions than voluntary minorities with primary cultural differences. (Ogbu, 1992, p. 8).

Primary cultural differences are those that existed before the two groups came in contact, such as before immigrant minorities came to the United States. Secondary cultural differences appear after two populations come into contact or after members of a given population begin to participate in an institution controlled by members of another population, such as university institutions controlled by the dominant group. Secondary cultural differences develop as a response to a contact situation, especially one involving the domination of one group by another. At the beginning of the cultural contact, the two groups are
characterized by primary cultural differences; later, the minorities develop secondary cultural differences to cope with their subordination. The secondary cultural differences develop in two significant ways: from a reinterpretation of previous primary cultural differences or through the emergence of new types of cultural norms and behaviors (Ogbu, 1992, pp. 7-12).

Several features of secondary cultural differences are worth noting for their effects on success and in dealing with educational institutions. First, minorities emphasize differences in style rather than in content: cognitive style (Ramirez & Casteneda, 1974, p. 9), communication style (Kochman, 1982, pp. 77-78), interaction style (Erikson & Mohatt, 1982, pp. 132-135), and learning style (Au, 1981, p. 91). Yet another feature Lois Weis pointed out was cultural inversion. She stated:

Cultural inversion is the tendency for involuntary minorities to regard certain forms of behavior, events, symbols, and meanings as inappropriate for them because these are characteristic of white Americans. At the same time the minorities value other forms of behavior, events, symbols and meanings, often the opposite, as more appropriate for themselves. (Weis, 1988, p. 49)

Therefore, what is appropriate behavior for involuntary minority group members may be defined in direct opposition to dominant white eurocentric group members' practices (i.e., ambivalent and encapsulated strategies).
Cultural inversion may take several forms. It may be in-group meanings of words and statements, different notions and use of time, different emphasis of dialects and communication style (Baugh, 1984, p. 23), or an outright rejection of white American preferences or what whites consider appropriate behavior in a given setting (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986, p. 176). Ogbu adds:

Cultural inversion along with other oppositional elements results in the coexistence of two opposing cultural frames of reference from the perspectives of involuntary minorities. (Ogbu, 1992, p. 11)

Involuntary minorities sometimes use cultural inversion to repudiate negative white stereotypes or derogatory images. Other times they may use it as a strategy to manipulate whites (Holt, 1972, pp. 152-159). DeVos states:

Secondary cultural differences seem to be associated with ambivalent or oppositional social or collective identities. Voluntary minorities seem to bring to the United States a sense of who they are from their homeland and seem to retain this different but non-oppositional social identity at least during the first generation. Involuntary minorities, in contrast, develop a new sense of social identity of the dominant group after they have become subordinated. They do so in response to their treatment by white Americans in economic, political, social, psychological, cultural, and language domains. Whites' treatment included deliberate exclusion from true assimilation or the reverse, namely forced superficial assimilation. (DeVos, 1984, p. 16)

Involuntary minorities, such as African Americans, developed oppositional identity because for many generations they realized and believed that the white treatment was both collective and enduring. They were and still are not
treated like white Americans regardless of their individual differences in ability, training, education, place of origin or residence, economic status, or physical appearance. They still cannot escape from their birth membership in a subordinate and disparaged group by passing for white or by returning to a homeland (Green, 1981, pp. 69-77). Native Americans and native Hawaiians also have no other homeland to which they can return. In the past, some African Americans sought an escape by returning to Africa (Hall, 1978, p. 10) or by converting to the Muslim religion (Essien-Udom, 1964, p. 78).

Secondary cultural differences do not merely cause initial problems in the social adjustment and academic performance of involuntary minorities. Rather, difficulties appear to be extensive and persistent. This occurs because of the nature of the relationship between the minority culture and the dominant white culture. The cultural differences arose initially to serve boundary-maintaining and coping functions under subordination. Ogbu adds:

> When involuntary minorities and whites are brought together, as in desegregated schools and universities, secondary cultural differences evolved as coping mechanisms under oppressive conditions, and the minorities have no strong incentives to give up these differences as long as they feel that they are still oppressed. (Ogbu, 1992, p. 9)

Involuntary minorities interpret the cultural and language differences as markers of their collective identity to be maintained, not as barriers to be overcome. Among
involuntary minorities, getting along in educational institutions tends to be equated with the learning of the culture and language of white Americans. In other words, they must learn the cultural and language frames of reference of their enemy or oppressors. Therefore, involuntary minorities may consciously or unconsciously interpret success in educational institutions as a displacement process detrimental to their social identity, sense of security, and self-worth (Dumont, 1972, pp. 12-21).

Philips states:

Involuntary minorities fear that succeeding and learning the white cultural frame of reference, will make them cease to act like minorities and lose their identity as minorities and their sense of community and self-worth. Furthermore, reality has demonstrated that those who successfully learn to act white or who succeed in dealing with educational institutions are not fully accepted by the whites; nor do such people receive rewards or opportunity for advancement equal to those open to whites with similar education. (Philips, 1983, p. 95)

Many Native American students enter educational institutions with a cultural convention that dictates that they should not adopt the expected institutional norms of behavior and standard practices (Philips, 1970, pp. 260-266; Philips, 1976, pp. 30-32). Philips (1976) found that Native American students held views different from their non-Indian peers about student-teacher interaction and social interaction in and out of the classroom. Because the teachers did not adjust their behavior to accommodate cultural differences, they were not effective in classroom
management and in getting the students to learn and perform (p. 32).

A prerequisite for understanding the paradox of high aspiration and low school performance of involuntary minorities as well as understanding the persistent minority/non-minority gap in institutional success is to recognize the historical and structural roots of the phenomenon. The lower institutional success of involuntary minorities does not originate in the inadequacy of the involuntary minority, child-rearing agents of each individual involuntary minority, for example (Weis, 1989, p. 199). In addition, Ogbu has stated:

The problem originated in the involuntary incorporation of each member into American society, in the subsequent subordination and discriminatory treatment of involuntary minorities and in the adaptive responses of such minorities to their castelike status. All these resulted in a different institutional experience for involuntary minorities, which produces the lower success and performance. (Ogbu, 1991, pp. 9-26)

The dilemma of involuntary minorities is that they have to choose between "acting white" (i.e., adopting appropriate attitudes and behaviors or standard rules and practices that enhance success but are perceived and interpreted by minorities as typical of white Americans) and assimilating or acting black, Native American, or Chicano by adopting attributes (i.e., encapsulated strategy) that minorities consider appropriate for their group, but that are not conducive to success in schools (Ogbu, 1992, p. 10).
Ogbu noted four structural and cultural consequences of involuntary or castelike minority status: (1) differential status mobility, (2) cultural and intellectual derogation, (3) interracial conflicts and (4) the adaptive responses (Ogbu, 1991, p. 260). As a case in point, the concept of status mobility provides an opportunity to understand peoples' motives for responding to institutional involvement and success the way they do. A status mobility system can be defined as a folk theory and method of getting ahead in a society or within a given population (Gibson, 1991 p. 55). Members of a given population, for example, share a theory of getting ahead and a set of skills required to get ahead in their system. The status mobility system is successful if it confirms to its members the prevailing folk beliefs about getting ahead. It also influences how members of a society structure their responses to educational institutions such as universities (Ogbu, 1991, pp. 260-261).

The belief that success in educational institutions is a passport to a good life appears to be the basis of universities and schools and the educational striving of families and individuals. Non-minority individuals, especially middle-class whites, firmly believe that good education leads to having a high standard of living. This generalization is not true for involuntary or castelike minorities (Ogbu, 1991, p. 261), for the status mobility system tends to differ among various strata. Because
involuntary minorities have been defined as an inferior racial caste, they have been given an inferior education to prepare them for marginal roles. Moreover, when they complete their schooling, they are not permitted to compete freely for desirable jobs above the job ceiling. This situation affects the way involuntary or castelike minorities respond to educational institutions (Ogbu, 1991, pp. 261-262).

Many non-minorities denigrate involuntary or castelike minorities culturally, socially, and intellectually in several ways. The most prominent form of derogation historically was that involuntary minorities were neither "nontaxpayers" (Ogbu, 1991, p. 262) nor citizens. Low income involuntary minorities, like everyone else, pay property tax, if they own land, and income tax, if they earn wages, as well as sales tax, but they are publicly referred to and treated as nontaxpayers. As a result of this stereotyping, they are regarded and treated as incompetent and dependent people who make little or no contribution to social services such as institutions of higher education. Instead, other taxpayers are thought to carry the financial and social responsibility (Ogbu, 1991, p. 263).

Another characterization is that involuntary minorities, as nontaxpayers, "resist assimilation" into the "mainstream culture." Therefore, they are unwilling or unable to adopt values that would transform them into
taxpayers or "useful citizens." Nontaxpayers are also characterized as being caught in a "welfare cycle."

Non-minorities continue to view involuntary minorities as rearing their children to be welfare recipients (Ogbu, 1991, p. 264).

One prominent feature of involuntary minority/non-minority relationships is conflict. The two parties often compete over education, jobs and housing. Minorities usually boycott non-minority businesses to protest discrimination, and they frequently carry their complaints to federal and other government agencies. For example, non-minorites excluded minorities from public schools and institutions of higher learning for many generations. These conflicts have generated a tremendous distrust of white people and the educational institutions like universities which they control (Ogbu, 1992, p. 10). Ogbu adds:

The involuntary minority response to the individual and collective problems encountered with the barriers institutionalized by non-minorities is a set of cultural coping strategies, perhaps a type of oppositional identity and cultural frame of reference. (Ogbu, 1991, p. 264)

Although the situation is changing somewhat because of civil rights legislation, affirmative action programs, and intensified collective struggle, many involuntary minorities still claim discrimination. As a result, they often resort to the use of the eight cultural coping strategies in their encounters with the institutional system operated by the
non-minority groups. The eight cultural coping strategies which are used by involuntary minorities when dealing with non-minorities are: assimilators, emissaries, alternators, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, regulars, ambivalents, and encapsulated (Ogbu, 1992, p. 11).

**Involuntary Minorities and Higher Education**

A differential status mobility system, intellectual and cultural derogation, and interracial conflicts not only influence the type of education provided to involuntary minorities by the wider community and how they are treated within educational institutions, but they also influence how involuntary minorities perceive and respond to their encounters with educational institutions such as universities (Ogbu, 1991, p. 265).

The institutional system, of which universities are a major part, may present the involuntary minority with problems of differential access, contrasting within-school treatment, and denial of equal rewards for educational accomplishment such as income and housing. One aspect of the differential schooling is that involuntary minorities have had unequal access to quality education. Although officially sanctioned discrimination, in theory at least, no longer exists within the schools and universities, institutions still contribute to the lower school performance of involuntary minority children. Some problems Ogbu points out are:
... low teacher expectations and attitudes, clinical definitions of involuntary minority academic problems, testing and tracking, biased curriculum and textbooks, and socializing into lower expectations and inferior jobs. Historically, involuntary minorities have not been rewarded equitably for their educational efforts and accomplishments in terms of jobs, income, housing and social position. Therefore, the way involuntary minorities perceive and respond to schools and institutions is important in understanding their performance and related problems. (Ogbu, 1991, p. 265)

**Use of the Eight Adaptive Types**

Involuntary or castelike minorities lack some factors that motivate voluntary or immigrant minorities to cross cultural boundaries. Voluntary minorities try to overcome cultural, language, and other barriers because they believe that there will be a material payoff later. Involuntary or castelike minorities, who did not choose to be part of the United States, believe less strongly in the system; therefore, they lack the positive dual frame of reference of the voluntary minorities. In addition, voluntary minorities can compare their progress in the United States with that of their peers back home, but involuntary minorities can only compare their progress with that of white Americans. Gibson explains:

Involuntary minorities usually conclude that they are worse off than they should be, and they blame white Americans and other institutions which are controlled by whites. Therefore, involuntary minorities do not have strong incentives merely to play the game by the rules. (Gibson, 1988, p. 43)
When Ogbu (1989) encountered involuntary or voluntary minority communities, he found that some individuals were succeeding in the system, and others were having major problems with it (p. 181). He also found that some minority individuals know and use successful coping strategies that enhance their success with institutions which are controlled by non-minority Americans. With this in mind, he also studied the subgroups of involuntary minorities who use the cultural coping strategies to enhance their success in the system. It is important to note at this point that the strategies of voluntary minorities and those of involuntary minorities are not necessarily the same (Ogbu, 1989, pp. 181-204).

Voluntary minorities have a positive collective attitude towards participating with in the American system, but involuntary minorities are in a different situation. Although, involuntary minorities strongly verbalize their positive intentions, for example, there is less collective family and community pressure to achieve success within the institutional system (Ogbu, 1992, p. 11). As an illustration, involuntary minorities and their communities rarely attach any stigma to being a success. Therefore, peer pressures discourage cooperation or participation with the institutional system controlled by whites. Similarly, while voluntary minorities give a collective orientation toward striving for social success in the American system,
involuntary minorities practice cultural coping strategies above the conventional strategies used by voluntary minorities. Involuntary minorities apply these secondary cultural coping strategies, some of which promote social success and others which appear to the system, and therefore do not achieve social success as measured by mainstream America (Weis, 1989, p. 167).

Assimilators are involuntary minorities who chose to disassociate themselves from their minority identity and cultural frame of reference in favor of the white frame of reference. This may be considered a type of cultural passing. Some individuals have come to prefer white norms and values that are in direct conflict with their own minority/ethnic group. These individuals feel that they cannot remain a good member of their minority community or ethnic group and be successful in mainstream institutions such as universities. These individuals reason that they must repudiate or abandon their own minority/ethnic identity and cultural frame of reference. Ogbu points out:

Assimilators are usually successful in American society but at the price of peer criticism and isolation. This emulation of whites or cultural passing may result in high psychological costs to involuntary minorities using this cultural coping strategy. (Ogbu, 1989, pp. 198-199)

The emissaries are involuntary minorities who play down their minority/ethnic identity and cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in mainstream institutions by mainstream criteria but without rejecting their own
minority/ethnic culture and identity. The individuals who are defined as emissaries feel that their participation in mainstream institutions may contribute to the advancement of their minority/ethnic group. These individuals deliberately choose to follow rules established by the institution and may deny that minority status is important in determining success in American society, and they do not become encapsulated in minority peer activities or interests. As emissaries get older, they make career decisions based on their own interests and not on their minority/ethnic status (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199). Ogbu also points out:

Emissaries feel that their success in institutions like universities will put them into a position where they can make their contribution towards civil rights actions and their own minority group. This type of mind-set helps emissaries handle contradictions inherent in their situation, namely, the necessity to follow the rules and standard practices established by white Americans while being keenly aware of their membership in a disparaged minority/ethnic group. (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200)

Alternators are involuntary minorities who adopt an immigrant model which is accommodation without assimilation. They do not reject their minority identity and cultural frame of reference, but rather they elect to play by the rules of the American institutional system. Alternators tend to adopt strategies to cope with the conflicting demands of peer groups and those of the institutional system. This strategy adopted by alternators helps shield them from peer criticisms. Ogbu gives this example:
An alternator will get involved in what may be defined as minority/ethnic activities or acting as a clown in order to deal with peer and institutional pressures. (Ogbu, 1989, p. 199)

The reaffiliated are the involuntary minorities who might have repudiated their minority/ethnic cultural frame of reference and identity until they were confronted with an unacceptable experience they interpreted as having been precipitated by racism. They often become more involved in minority activities and with their minority peers, but they may still continue to do well in the mainstream institutions (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200).

One step farther on the continuum are ivy-leaguers, involuntary minorities who emulate middle class behaviors. They usually belong to social clubs or fraternities, and they abide by institutional laws and routines. They usually also dress well, by middle class standards. Ivy-leaguers tend to be churchgoers, and they are well liked by their families and the authorities. They are generally considered good workers within the American institutional system (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200).

The regulars are involuntary minority members who are accepted members of the street culture, but they do not subscribe to all of its values and norms. These minorities know how to get along well with everyone without compromising their own values. They can interact with their peers without being encapsulated. They are not fully committed to street or peer culture, and their values
resemble those of the American middle class. In institutions they are good workers who conform to most conventional rules, and they maintain close family ties and rarely belong to controversial groups. The survival skills of the regulars include knowing the minority culture in coping with peers, engaging in relatively safe activities, knowing how to handle trouble successfully, and ensuring that trouble does not recur. The success of the cultural coping strategy of the regulars lies in their ability to camouflage or disguise true attitudes and behaviors. They use a variety of techniques such as pretending not to care about their own personal success within American society (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200). Ogbu also notes that:

The camouflaging individual plots his/her success in secret or becomes involved in minority activities. (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200)

The ambivalents are those involuntary minorities who are caught between the need or desire to be with minority/ethnic peers and the desire to achieve by the criteria of mainstream institutions. They do not successfully resolve the conflict. As a result, their work performance tends to be quite erratic (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200).

The encapsulated are the involuntary minorities who do not only equate institutional success with cultural betrayal but make no attempt to succeed in mainstream institutions such as American universities. They reject the institutions because they feel their participation within this system is
cultural denial. As a result, they simply do not conform to institutional rules of behavior and standard practices, since these are defined as being within the dominant cultural frame of reference. The encapsulated generally do not do not have much success in mainstream institutions (Ogbu, 1989, p. 200).

**The Department Chair Position**

The success of an academic institution is in large part a function of the success of its individual departments. It is at the department level that the real doings of the institution—teaching, research, and service—is done. The ultimate success of the institution turns significantly on the degree to which objectives at the department level are both appropriately defined and realized (Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 11).

Organizational charts testify to the key positioning of the department chair. The chair sets the academic tone of the institution. Mistakes chairs make can be difficult to correct elsewhere, and things left undone may be impossible to fix later on. The most important thing a chairperson does is provide assurances of academic integrity to other institutional leaders (Bennett & Ehrle, 1988, p. 21).

Specifically, it is the chairperson who must monitor the departmental or divisional curriculum, ensuring that it meets the needs of a changing student body and the mission of the institution. It is the chairperson who is responsible for seeing that course assignments are made judiciously, and that individual faculty talents
are aligned with instructional needs. It is the chairperson who is in the best position to promote racial and gender balance in the faculty and to encourage continued personal and professional growth. And it is the chairperson who must attest to the adequacy of institutional research. No dean, provost or president can easily speak of this issue. All are dependent upon chairs. Accordingly, it is the chair who must function as custodian of academic standards of his or her department or division (Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 11).

Besides setting the academic tone for the institution, department chairs must evaluate the curriculum. Periodic program review requires the elimination of redundancies and excessive specialized courses. It requires monitoring patterns of present student demand and the forecasting of future student interests and needs. Curriculum evaluation involves adjusting departmental emphases as student and societal needs change, and as the institutional mission changes to reflect these shifts. Besides being concerned that appropriate programs are in place, chairs may need to review the actual delivery of instruction. For example, chairs are in a position to evaluate pedagogical and curriculum matters. The chairs are in a position to evaluate if schedules are arranged for the convenience of faculty or students (Lockwood & Davies, 1985, p. 24).

The chairperson must address problems with faculty members. Faculty problems may include evaluation and salary placement, slipping public esteem for university professors, short falls in hiring at the entry level, minimal mobility, and restricted advancement. Challenges with morale may
result if the chairperson does not provide continued faculty
development and growth opportunities. Since financial
incentives are rarely available, chairs must rely on peer
esteem and communal recognition (Hickson & Stacks, 1992, p. 8). Hickson and Stacks also state:

Additionally, a number of chairpersons must deal
with strains between younger and older faculty members. Not infrequently the younger faculty
come with better credentials than their older
colleagues could sport at a comparable age and
point in the development of their careers. As a
result, the younger faculty may feel exploited,
laboring under the impression that more is
demanded of them. For their part, older faculty
may feel that the rules under which they were
hired have changed and that their contributions
are no longer valued (Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 13).

The chairperson may face problems of role ambiguity.
For example, faculty may perceive the chairperson as an
individual who performs clerk duties such as paper work,
travel reimbursements, and maintenance problems and not as a
person with leadership guidance. On the other hand, some
faculty view the chair with totally unrealistic
expectations. If things go wrong, these faculty blame the
chair even if the event was out of his or her control
(Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 13).

Bennett and Figuli also state:

All these factors contribute to the frequent
complaints of chairs regarding the role ambiguity
they feel. This role ambiguity or role conflict
seems to trouble chairpersons in all sectors of
higher education. The common factor is the
discomfort felt in being expected to represent two
sets of interests that are often competing and
sometimes conflicting. Both faculty and
administrators look to the department chair to advance their specific objectives. The chairperson is often forced to take the larger institutional viewpoint and to call for faculty loyalty even when such loyalty might conflict with personal and disciplinary interests and values. This situation is inherently awkward and stressful (Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 14).

Stress on the chairperson may also be created when periodic evaluation of senior faculty is presented. The federal uncapping of mandatory retirement age presents a situation of continued aging of the faculty. Collegiality, in a properly structured program of evaluation for senior faculty may prevent problems of stagnation and loss of vitality (Bennett & Figuli, 1990, p. 15).

Chairpersons may find themselves generating funds outside the normal institutional structure. In short, chairpersons will be exploring ways to form relationships with the commercial world. Such support will enhance salaries, laboratory expenditures, scholarships, internships, and employee exchanges. Chairpersons will have to pay attention to student recruitment, enrollment, and retention. Additionally, the recruitment of new faculty is always of significant concern (Hickson & Stacks, 1992, p. 11).

Hickson and Stacks note:

To some, culture is something that social groups have, just as they have language, attitudes, or space. Others see culture as a way of life, a way of thinking about group activities and properties. While both views provide organizational insight, the latter best displays the internal workings of academic departments. Departmental culture
signifies the values, norms symbols, images and social practices underlying daily events. It provides the recipes for action and serves as a context for management (Hickson & Stacks, 1992, p. 2).

In summary, the task of the chairperson is to create a unity out of a group of individuals. The chair must find ways of harmonizing this diversity and keeping it moving in the same direction. In some cases vastly different value systems must be accommodated. The chair has a unique opportunity to shape the department's self-perception and spirit.

This study contends that the crucial issue in cultural diversity and success within university systems is based on the relationship between the involuntary minority cultures and the American mainstream culture.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methods that were used to examine and compare the differences in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and other non-minority department chairpersons in doctoral degree-granting universities are described in this chapter. A questionnaire was used as the instrument in this comparative, quantitative survey. The selection of subjects, data collection procedures, and validity are described.

Correspondence from Dr. John U. Ogbu (Appendix A) from the University of California, Berkeley revealed that past studies measuring the eight adaptive types were ethnographic and that no quantitative survey had been developed. He further stated that the eight adaptive types which use cultural coping strategies were developed from reading the literature and from qualitative studies. The typology of the eight adaptive types which use coping strategies are based on ethnographic and related studies such as interviews and observations. Ogbu also noted that there are no specific questions in his ethnographic study that deal with the eight adaptive types which use coping strategies but that he would welcome the chance to give input as a survey
was developed. Dr. Ogbu's early correspondence via letter was a direct influence on the development of the survey. His initial suggestions and his writings were also considered in the development of the questionnaire.

Selection of Subjects

Subjects chosen for this study were involuntary minority chairpersons at doctoral degree-granting universities located in the Southwestern United States. A comparative group of an equal number of non-minority chairpersons was also selected. Selection of the non-minority chairpersons was based on age, gender, department, and years of teaching and administrative experience in comparison with the involuntary minority group. The subjects were chairpersons in different programs of study, but all were chairpersons at universities authorized to grant doctorates which are located in the seven southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah.

It was determined that 64 doctoral degree granting universities exist in the seven southwestern states. The following number of doctoral degree granting universities from each state qualified as doctoral degree granting universities in the American Southwest and were selected to participate in this study: Arizona, 3; California, 24; Colorado, 8; Nevada, 2; New Mexico, 3; Texas, 22; and Utah, 2.
Every provost, vice-president for academic affairs, affirmative action officer, or personnel director from each of the 64 selected universities was sent a letter requesting the names, addresses and telephone numbers of involuntary minority (i.e., African-American, Hispanic-American, or Native-American) department chairpersons (Appendix A). A comparative list of non-minority department chairpersons was also generated. Each comparative person on the non-minority list was matched as closely as possible to a person on the involuntary minority list using the basis of age, gender, and years of teaching and administrative experience. All 64 doctoral degree granting universities responded to the invitation/request to participate in the study; however, 16 (25%) of them did not have any involuntary minorities serving in the department chairperson position. The 48 (75%) universities that did have involuntary minorities in chairperson positions provided a population of 252 subjects; composed of 126 involuntary minorities and 126 non-minority chairpersons who were utilized as a comparison group.

Agreement to participate in the study was obtained from each subject via telephone. When direct contact was not established, voice mail messages asked for help and indicated that a questionnaire would soon be arriving. When direct or indirect contact, for example through a secretary, was established, the identical protocol of self-
identification, solicitation of help, and message indicating mailing of questionnaire was noted. After agreement to participate in the study was obtained via telephone contact, questionnaires were sent to all chairpersons who qualified for the study (Appendix B).

Chairpersons were selected for the study because the position was determined to be deeply rooted in the university faculty. Dr. Walter H. Gmelch, Director of the Center for the Study of the Department Chair, in the CSDC Newsletter (11/1993), indicated the dilemmas in the chairperson role as scholar/administrator, interesting challenge/routine work, friend/evaluator and decentralization/centralization administration. Telephone and mail correspondence indicated, however, that the topic of cultural coping strategies had not been covered by the newsletter or any other piece of work he had reviewed. Additionally, the materials sent by Dr. Gmelch via mail indicated that the newsletters covered the topics of stress, leadership, job satisfaction, administrative transition, and roles of the department chair. The chairperson position was the last chance for middle management experience as an administrator at the university level. Chairpersons in universities in the American Southwestern states were selected because of the rich cultural mixture of ethnic groups and the area of proximity to the base for this study, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV).
Chairpersons who worked at doctoral degree-granting institutions were selected because it is the equivalent in educational administration to the corporate middle management experience. The total number of identified involuntary minorities who were serving in the department chairperson position per state was: Arizona, 9; California, 43; Colorado, 15; Nevada, 3; New Mexico, 8; Texas, 47; and Utah, 1. The total number of involuntary minority chairpersons who worked at doctoral-degree granting universities located in the American Southwestern was 126.

The survey instrument contained a fixed-choice question format which forced the chairpersons to agree strongly, agree somewhat, agree slightly, disagree slightly, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with every item. Every item was coded on a +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, -3 likert-type scale. The strongly agree response being coded as a +3 and the strongly disagree response being coded as a -3. Items were designed to provide demographic information as well as specific insights into the kinds of cultural coping strategies each minority and non-minority chairperson used in his or her administrative position. The mail survey method produced a 47% return rate in this study.

Interviewer bias however, often a problem with the personal interview design, was reduced by the use of a self-administered questionnaire. Every effort was made to adhere to effective data gathering methods (Dillman, 1978, p. 89).
Instrumentation

The questionnaire was designed to discover the answers to the following research questions:

1. Was there a statistically significant t-test difference at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons?

2. To what degree were the eight adaptive types that use cultural coping strategies developed by John Ogbu utilized by involuntary minorities and selected non-minority department chairpersons?

3. What were the perceptions of involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons with regard to the following questions:
   a. Why was he or she selected to this administrative position?
   b. What administrative expectations did he or she have for the future?
   c. What level of satisfaction did he or she they have with the chairperson position?

Each item on the instrument was designed to ascertain information on how a chairperson used cultural coping strategies in dealing with the university institution. After consulting the related literature, five items were developed for each of the eight adaptive types who use coping strategies. Five separate items were designed to
measure the perceptions of chairpersons with regard to administrative appointments, future administrative goals, and satisfaction level with the university chairperson position. The final nine items were devoted to obtaining demographic data on university chairpersons. Qualitative data were also requested regarding the dilemma each chairperson faces between university frame of reference and his or her individual culture frame of reference. Therefore, there were 55 items of data gathered from each university chairperson who was questioned.

**Operationalization of Concepts**

The first five items of the questionnaire corresponded to the cultural coping strategies used by the assimilator adaptive type. The five coping strategies were as follows:

1. Did the chairperson feel a disassociation from his or her own cultural frame of reference in favor of the university (institutional) frame of reference?
2. Did the chairperson have conflicting norms and values between university and personal norms and values?
3. Did the chairperson have conflicting norms and values between university peers and ethnic group peers?
4. Did the chairperson feel unsuccessful at keeping close to his or her ethnic group and being a success at work?
5. Did the chairperson abandon his or her ethnic identity or cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in the chairperson position?

Questionnaire items six through ten corresponded to the adaptive type Ogbu called the "emissaries." The five main cultural coping strategies of emissaries developed in the survey were:

1. Did the chairperson feel he or she had to play down his or her cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in the chairperson position?
2. Did the chairperson feel that participating in mainstream institutions contributed to the advancement of his or her ethnic group?
3. Did the chairperson feel ethnicity was not important in determining success in the chairperson position?
4. Did the chairperson make career plans on the basis of individual interests and abilities with little reference to ethnic status?
5. Did the chairperson, regarding civil rights, feel that advancements for ethnic groups could be accomplished through his or her own success in an administrative capacity?

The five main cultural coping strategies of the alternator adaptive type corresponded to questionnaire items 11 through 15. The five main alternator strategies were:
1. Did the chairperson feel that accommodation without assimilation provided the best form of success as a university administrator?

2. Did the chairperson reject his or her ethnic identity or cultural frame of reference and then elect to play by the rules of the university system?

3. Did the chairperson need to adopt definite strategies in order to cope with conflicting demands between ethnic group peers and personal demands?

4. Did the chairperson need to adopt definite strategies in order to cope with conflicting demands between university and personal norms?

5. Did the chairperson get involved in activities sponsored by his or her ethnic group at the university as a means of coping with conflicting demands between his or her ethnic group peers and university expectations?

The reaffiliated adaptive type exhibits five main cultural coping strategies which corresponded to questions 16 through 20. The reaffiliated adaptive type cultural coping strategies were operationalized by utilizing these constructs:
1. Did the chairperson abandon his or her ethnic frame of reference and then reconsider and accept his or her ethnic identity/cultural frame of reference due to acts of prejudice?

2. Did the chairperson get involved in activities sponsored by his or her ethnic group in hopes of making changes in the university system?

3. Did the chairperson lose focus in an administrative capacity after facing examples of racism (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?

4. Did the chairperson maximize involvement in his or her ethnic group activities despite university policy (written in reverse form)?

5. Did the chairperson feel that prejudices established by the university culture force him or her to reject his or her own cultural frame of reference?

The ivy-leaguer adaptive type exhibits the five main cultural coping strategies that were related to questionnaire items 21 through 25. The ivy-leaguer adaptive type was operationalized by utilizing these constructs:

1. Did the chairperson seek membership into social groups affiliated with university peers?

2. Did the chairperson emulate middle-class behaviors in order to obtain approval from higher echelon administrators?
3. Did the chairperson abide by university laws and routines in order to succeed in an administrative capacity?

4. Did the chairperson believe in the slogan "dress for success" in his or her administrative role?

5. Did the chairperson feel that attending church services would give him or her more respect in the workplace?

The regulars exhibit the following five main constructs that were incorporated into questionnaire items 26 through 30:

1. Did the chairperson hesitate to subscribe to all norms and values of his or her ethnic group, although he or she is an accepted member of that ethnic group?

2. Did the chairperson get along with his or her ethnic group and university officials without compromising personal values (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?

3. Did the chairperson interact with university peers without becoming encapsulated (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?

4. Did the chairperson not fully commit to either the university culture or his or her ethnic group (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?
5. Did the chairperson maintain close ethnic group ties without subscribing to an extremist group?

The ambivalent adaptive type was incorporated into the following five main cultural coping strategies in questionnaire items 31 through 35:

1. Was the chairperson caught between the need to identify with his or her ethnic group and his or her desire to achieve according to mainstream criteria?

2. Was the chairperson unable to resolve the conflict which may have arisen or does exist between his or her ethnic identity and his or her desire to achieve according to mainstream criteria (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?

3. Was the chairperson's administrative performance affected by conflict between the desire to identify with his or her ethnic group and the desire to achieve according to mainstream criteria?

4. Was the chairperson feeling a need to identify with his or her ethnic group and to succeed in his or her administrative capacity?

5. Was the performance of the chairperson erratic because of conflict between birth culture and university culture?

The five cultural coping strategies of the encapsulated adaptive type were incorporated into questionnaire
items 36 through 40:

1. Was the chairperson equating success in the administrative position with giving in to the university cultural frame of reference?
2. Was the chairperson refusing to emulate middle-class behaviors?
3. Was the chairperson refusing to affiliate with university associations (written in reverse form on questionnaire)?
4. Was the chairperson choosing to pursue his or her own interests instead of interests of the university?
5. Was the chairperson refusing to follow general rules established by university officials?

The subproblems of the study were addressed in the questionnaire with questions 41 through 45.

1. Was the chairperson feeling that his or her selection to the chairperson position was based on qualifications and not on ethnic status?
2. Was the chairperson feeling that the administrative position provided excellent experience, which he or she would use in future administrative positions?
3. Was the chairperson planning to pursue higher administrative positions?
4. Was the chairperson feeling a high level of satisfaction with the chairperson position?

5. Was the chairperson feeling that acquiring the chairperson position was not based on ethnic status (written in reverse form in survey)?

**Validity**

The content validity of this instrument was determined by using a panel of five experts who have had experience in the chairperson position at a major American Southwestern university. A draft of the questionnaire and a letter of instructions (Appendix A) were sent to the experts. Three of the five expert members on the panel identified as involuntary minorities were of Hispanic heredity and the other two members of the expert panel were of non-minority status. Three of the five expert panel members were of the female gender. The majority of the expert panel was familiar with Ogbu's work, and they averaged five years of administrative experience at the chairperson position. The panel also averaged 19 years of teaching at the university level and 34 years living in the American Southwest.

Each panel member examined each item of the instrument and participated in a pilot study by administering the survey to themselves and returning their findings. The findings indicated that the transition flow from item to item was rough due to random placement of the items. Based on this feedback, the questionnaire was redesigned to have
all items from one adaptive type grouped together instead of being arranged in a random order.

The cohort group in the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education at UNLV which consisted of twelve students in their final doctoral year also lent further validity to the measures. The group aided in the evaluation of each item in the survey. Furthermore, direct correspondence with John Ogbu, the designer of the eight adaptive types, led to the formation of the questionnaire, but his input on the final version was never obtained. It is important to note that two copies of the proposed questionnaire were mailed to Ogbu, but his approval on the final survey was never obtained. Furthermore, Ogbu's work studied the relationship between learning of minority students, while this study focused on the difference of the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary and non-minority chairpersons.

Distribution of the Instrument

Initial approval from all chairpersons was established by phone before the questionnaires were sent out to the departmental administrators. Once initial approval was secured, the questionnaires were mailed out to each individual chairperson. Each packet was constructed for maximum return with the questionnaire lipped on the cover of a post-paid return envelope. The questionnaire and post paid return envelope were wrapped in a cover letter which
explained the study, and all three pieces were inserted into a letterhead envelope which was addressed to each chairperson (Appendix B). A return address, facsimile number, and telephone number were also included in the package. After a one week period, phone contact was reestablished with each chairperson to insure the arrival of the questionnaire. If there was no response two weeks after the original mailing, a second questionnaire and follow-up letter were sent out to each non-return (Appendix B). After a three week period, a postcard reminder was mailed. Finally, a certified mail copy of the questionnaire was sent after a four week period from the original mailing date.

**Statistical Tests Utilized**

The data for the study were analyzed with the assistance of the statistical software program SPSSx 6.0. T-tests were utilized to determine the extent to which group means differed, and to determine if differences between, or among, group means were statistically significant -- not just due to sampling error or a chance occurrence. This study utilized a 95% confidence level in determining statistical significance.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the data gathered from the questionnaire responses are summarized and analyzed. As a review, the following questions served as a basis for collecting and analyzing the data. The research questions addressed by this study were:

1. Was there a statistically significant t-test difference at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons?

2. To what degree were the eight adaptive types that use cultural coping strategies, developed by John Ogbu, utilized by involuntary minorities and selected non-minority department chairpersons?

3. What were the perceptions of involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons with regard to the following questions:
   a. Why was he or she selected to this administrative position?
   b. What administrative expectations did he or she have for the future?
   c. What level of satisfaction did he or she have with the chairperson position?
Demographic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics give insight into the descriptive background, social positioning, and teaching and administrative experience of the respondents.

Ethnicity

Of the total sample of 119, 62 (52.1%) were European American, 42 (35.3%) Hispanic, 11 (9.2%) African American, and 4 (3.4%) Native American. Table 1 illustrates the ethnicity data.

Table 1
SUMMARY OF ETHNICITY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State of Residence

Involuntary minorities and non-minorities serving as departmental chairpersons from the seven American
Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah were surveyed on the use of cultural coping strategies. The data sample of 119 was comprised of 40.3% of chairpersons from Texas; California 28.6%; Colorado 16.8%; New Mexico 5.0%; Nevada 4.2%; Arizona 2.5%; Utah 1.7%; and 0.8 percent responded as other. Table 2 illustrates the state of residence data.

Table 2
SUMMARY OF STATE OF RESIDENCE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating University List

Thirty-eight (38) universities of the possible 64 doctoral-degree granting universities had department chairpersons who participated in the study. Participating universities are listed in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Frequency of Participating Chairpersons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arizona State</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. California State</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Golden Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Diego State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. San Francisco State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Santa Clara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. U. of Cal., Berkeley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. U. of Cal., Davis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. U. of Cal., Irvine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. U. of Cal., Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. U. of Cal., Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. U. of Cal., Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. U. of San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. U. of San Francisco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. U. of Southern California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. U. of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. U. of Colorado, Colo. Springs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. U. of Colorado, Denver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. University of Denver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. U. of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. U. of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. U. of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. U. of New Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Baylor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Our Lady of the Lake</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. St. Mary's University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Stephen Austin State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Texas A &amp; M, College Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Texas A &amp; M, Kingsville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Texas Woman's University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. U. of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. U. of Texas, El Paso</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. U. of Texas, San Antonio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. U. of Texas, Health Sci., SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. U. of Texas, Pan American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Utah State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38 Total Universities</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 64 doctoral degree-granting universities eligible to participate in the study, 16 had no involuntary minority department chairpersons. Eleven of the remaining 48 universities had involuntary minorities as department chairpersons, but the administrators did not return their questionnaires (see Appendix B for the list of all total eligible universities). Therefore, the 38 universities and the 119 department chairpersons listed in Table 3 made up the sample for this study.

**Age**

The 119 chairpersons who responded had a mean age of 51.2 years, with a mode of 50 as 10 of the chairpersons had experienced the mid-century mark. The age range of the chairpersons was from 30 years to 70 years, and the median was 51.

**Gender**

Of the 119 respondents, 40.3% were female and 59.7% were male as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Experience

The mean for teaching experience of the 119 chairpersons who responded to the questionnaire was 18.8 years. The median and mode were 20 years. The administrators had a range of 1 to 47 years of teaching experience.

Administrative Experience

The chairpersons responding to the questionnaire had administrative experience which ranged from 1 to 26 years. The administrative experience mean, median and mode were 7.5, 5.0, and 5.0 years, respectively.

American Southwest Residency

Chairperson respondents exhibited a range from 2 to 62 years of residency in the American Southwest. The American Southwest in this study was defined as the seven states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas and Utah. The mean was 29 years, while the median and mode were both 25 years.

Table 5 illustrates the ethnicity of respondents by state. The data indicate that the greatest number of the comparison sample of non-minority chairpersons (29) were employed at Texas universities.
Table 5

SOUTHWESTERN STATE BY ETHNICITY SUMMARY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southwestern State</th>
<th>Non Minority</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Place of Birth**

Of the 119 respondents, 104 were born in the United States of America and 15 were born in another country. Thirteen of the chairpersons were immigrants, while 106 were not.

**Eligible but Non-Participating Universities**

The following 16 universities qualified to participate in the study, but did not have any involuntary minorities in the chairperson position at the time the study was conducted: Biola University, California Institute of Technology, La Sierra University, Pepperdine University, United States Institute University, University of California at Laverne, University of San Diego, University of Colorado Health Sciences, New Mexico Institute of Mining, East Texas State University, University of Houston,
University of North Texas, University of Texas at Arlington, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at Houston, University of Texas Southwest Medical Center at Dallas, and Brigham Young University.

Eleven other universities which had involuntary minorities in the chairperson position but did not participate in the study because they did not return their questionnaires included: Northern Arizona University, University of Arizona, University of California at San Diego, University of California at Santa Cruz, University of the Pacific, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, New Mexico State University, Lamar University, University of Dallas, and University of Saint Thomas.

In summary, 64 universities were eligible to participate in the study according to the limitations of the study, but 16 of the 64 eligible universities did not have any involuntary minorities in the chairperson position and were therefore non-participants. Also, 11 other universities that were eligible to participate according to the limitations of the study did not participate because the chairpersons failed to return the questionnaire.

**Major Variables and Interrelationships**

The major variables in this study were involuntary minority chairpersons, non-minority chairpersons, and their reactions to the eight adaptive types. As cited earlier, the purpose of this study was to determine if
differences existed in the use of the eight adaptive types by the two classifications of chairs at selected doctoral degree-granting universities in the American Southwest. The eight adaptive types which use cultural coping strategies and that were utilized in this study were

1. assimilators
2. emissaries,
3. alternators,
4. reaffiliated,
5. ivy-leaguers,
6. regulars,
7. ambivalents, and
8. encapsulated.
1. The Assimilator Adaptive Type

The assimilator adaptive type section of the questionnaire (Appendix B, questions 1-5) asked if

1.1 chairpersons disassociated from their cultural frame of reference in favor of the university's (institutional) frame of reference,
1.2 chairpersons encountered conflicting norms and values between university and personal norms and values,
1.3 chairpersons identified conflicting norms and values between university peers and their ethnic group peers,
1.4 chairpersons felt unsuccessful at keeping close to their ethnic group and being a success at work, and
1.5 chairpersons were abandoning their ethnic identity/cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in the chairperson position.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the assimilator adaptive type (see Table 7), involuntary minorities had a mean score of 14.3 while non-minorities had a mean score of 13.7. The t-test for the assimilator adaptive type indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups means at the .05 level. Therefore, the variability among and within the two chair groups is not large enough
to justify making any inferences or generalizations about the chairperson population from the selected sample which this study surveyed.

Table 7

ASSIMILATOR ADAPTIVE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[t = -0.38, p = 0.701\]

2. The Emissaries Adaptive Type

Questionnaire items 6 through 10 describe the cultural coping strategies of the adaptive type John Ogbu called the emissaries. The cultural coping strategies of emissaries developed in the survey were that the chairperson

2.1 did not play down his or her cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in the chair position,

2.2 felt that participation in mainstream institutions would contribute to advancement of his or her ethnic group,

2.3 felt ethnicity is not important in determining success in the chairperson position,
2.4 made career plans on the basis of individual interests and abilities with little reference to his or her ethnic status, and
2.5 felt that advancements for his or her ethnic group, in the civil rights arena, could be made with his or her success in the chairperson administrative role.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the emissaries adaptive type (see Table 8), non-minorities had a mean score of 24.9 while involuntary minorities had a mean score of 20.2. The t-test result (t=3.91) for the emissaries adaptive type indicated a statistically significant measure beyond the .0001 level. The large t-score notes that a statistically significant difference does exist between the non-minority and involuntary minority groups in the emissaries adaptive type cultural coping strategies. The statistically significant difference leads this study to infer that this section of Ogbu's concept holds true and that there is a difference in the use of emissaries adaptive type cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons.
Table 8

EMISSARIES ADAPTIVE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t=3.91, \ p=.000 \]

3. The Alternator Adaptive Type

The five main cultural coping strategies of the alternator adaptive type corresponded to questionnaire items 11 through 15 (Appendix B). These items asked if chairpersons

3.1 felt that accommodation without assimilation provided the best form of success as a university administrator,

3.2 did not reject their ethnic identity or cultural frame of reference and elected to play by the rules of the university system,

3.3 needed to adopt definite strategies to cope with conflicting demands between their ethnic group peers and personal demands,
3.4 needed to adopt definite strategies to cope with the conflicting demands between university and personal norms, and

3.5 got involved in activities sponsored by their ethnic group at the university as a means of coping with conflicting demands between their own ethnic group peers and university expectations.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the alternator adaptive type (see Table 9), the non-minority group had a mean score of 18.9 while the involuntary minority group had a mean score of 18.7. The t-test for the alternator adaptive type indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two group means at the .05 level. Therefore, the variability among and within the two chair groups is not large enough to justify making any generalizations or inferences about the chairperson population from the selected sample which this study surveyed.
Table 9

ALTERNATOR ADAPTIVE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.3, \ p = .895 \]

4. The Reaffiliated Adaptive Type

The reaffiliated adaptive type had five main strategies which correspond to questions sixteen through twenty in the questionnaire. The reaffiliated coping strategy items surveyed if the chairperson

4.1 abandoned his or her ethnic frame of reference, he or she then reconsidered and accepted their ethnic identity/cultural frame of reference due to acts of prejudice,

4.2 was involved in activities sponsored by their ethnic group in hopes of making changes in the university system,

4.3 lost focus in the administrative capacity after facing powerful examples of racism,
4.4 maximized involvement in personal ethnic group activities despite university policy,
4.5 was forced to reject his or her personal cultural frame of reference due to prejudices established by the university culture.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the reaffiliated adaptive type (see Table 10), non-minorities had a mean score of 20.1 while involuntary minorities had a mean score of 16.4. The t-test result (t=2.36) for the reaffiliated adaptive type indicated a statistically significant difference at the .05 level. The large t-score notes that a statistically significant difference does exist between the non-minority and involuntary minority groups in the reaffiliated adaptive type cultural coping strategies. The significant difference leads this study to infer that this section of John Ogbu's concept holds true and that there is a difference in the use of reaffiliated adaptive type cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons.
Table 10

REASSOCIATED ADAPTIVE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t=2.36, \ p=0.020 \]

5. The Ivy-Leaguers Adaptive Type

The five main cultural coping strategies of the ivy-leaguers adaptive type related to questionnaire items 21 through 25. These items asked if chairpersons

5.1 sought membership to social groups affiliated with their university peers,

5.2 emulated middle-class behaviors in order to obtain approval from higher echelon administrators,

5.3 abided by university laws and routines in order to succeed in an administrative capacity,

5.4 believed in the slogan "dress for success" in their administrative role, and

5.5 felt that attending church services will give them more respect in the workplace.
When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the ivy-leaguer adaptive type (see Table 11), non-minorities had a mean of 22.1 while involuntary minorities had a mean score of 16.6. The t-test result \( t=3.20 \) for the ivy-leaguer adaptive type indicated a statistically significant measure at the .05 level. The large t-score notes that a statistically significant difference does exist between the non-minority and involuntary minority groups in the ivy-leaguer adaptive type cultural coping strategies. The significant difference leads this study to infer that this section of Ogbu's concept holds true and that there is a difference in the use of ivy-leaguer adaptive type cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority department chairpersons.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVY-LEAGUER ADAPTIVE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t=3.20, p=.002 \)
6. The Regulars Adaptive Type

The following five main attributes of the regulars were incorporated into questionnaire items 26 through 30. The items asked if the chairperson

6.1 did not subscribe to all norms and values of his or her ethnic group, although he or she is an accepted member of that ethnic group,
6.2 gets along with his or her ethnic group and university officials without compromising personal values,
6.3 interacts with university peers without becoming encapsulated,
6.4 is not fully committed to either university culture or an ethnic group, and
6.5 maintains close ethnic group ties, but does not subscribe to extremist groups.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the regulars adaptive type (see Table 12), non-minorities had a mean score of 21.1. The t-test result (t=2.25) for the regulars adaptive type indicated that a statistically significant measure existed at the .05 level. The large t-score notes that a statistically significant difference does exist between the non-minority and involuntary minority groups in the regulars adaptive type cultural coping strategies. The significant difference leads this study to infer that this section of Ogbu's
concept holds true and that there is a difference in the use of the regulars adaptive type cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons.

Table 12
REGULARS ADAPTIVE TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t=2.25, \, p=.027 \]

7. The Ambivalent Adaptive Type

The coping strategies of ambivalents were incorporated into the following five main attributes in questionnaire items 31 through 35. The items asked if chairpersons

7.1 felt caught between the need to identify with their ethnic group and the desire to achieve by mainstream criteria,

7.2 could not resolve conflict which may have arisen between their ethnic identity and their desire to achieve according to mainstream criteria,
7.3 felt their administrative performance was affected by conflict between their desire to identify with their ethnic group and their desire to achieve according to mainstream criteria,

7.4 felt a need to identify with their ethnic group and to succeed in an administrative capacity, and

7.5 felt that their personal performance was erratic because of conflict between their birth culture and the university culture.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the ambivalent adaptive type (see Table 13), non-minority chairs had a mean of 17.6 while involuntary minority chairs had a mean of 16.4. The t-test result for the ambivalent adaptive type indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two group means at the .05 level. Therefore, the variability among and within the two chair groups is not large enough to justify making and generalizations or inferences about the chairperson population from the selected sample which this study surveyed.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t = .60, \ p = .552 \)

8. **The Encapsulated Adaptive Type**

The following five main cultural coping strategies of the encapsulated adaptive type were incorporated into survey items 36 through 40. The items asked if the chairperson had

8.1 equated success in the chairperson position with giving in to the university's cultural frame of reference,
8.2 refused to emulate middle-class behaviors,
8.3 refused to affiliate with university associations,
8.4 pursued his or her own interests instead of interests of the university, and
8.5 refused to follow official rules.

When testing for significant differences between mean scores of the encapsulated adaptive type (see Table 14), non-minority chairs had a mean of 20.0 while involuntary
minority chairs had a mean of 17.8. The t-test for the encapsulated adaptive type indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two group means at the .05 level. Therefore, the variability among and within the two chair groups is not large enough to justify inferences about the chairperson population from the selected sample which this study surveyed.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCAPSULATED ADAPTIVE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.23, \ p = .221 \]
Adaptive Type Data Summary

The data of the eight adaptive types are summarized in Table 15. A .05 level of statistical significance was used in determining if a significant difference existed in the means of the two groups.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Type</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference In Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assimilators</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>13.7 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emissaries</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24.9 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alternators</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18.9 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaffiliated</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20.1 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.4 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ivy-Leaguers</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.1 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regulars</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24.5 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ambivalents</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.6 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.4 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Encapsulated</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=119 (non-minority=62, involuntary minority=57)

level of statistical significance utilized=.05
Adaptive Types that Upheld Ogbu's Concept

The t-scores of the emissaries (3.91), reaffiliated (2.36), ivy-leaguers (3.20), and regulars (2.25) indicated a significant statistical difference at the .05 confidence level, and therefore upheld John Ogbu's concept that involuntary minorities use cultural coping strategies and adjust differently in order to acquire success in America. The adaptive types of the emissaries, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguers, and regulars all use cultural coping strategies that help them succeed in mainstream institutions by mainstream criteria. All four of these adaptive types seek success according to middle-class standards.

Checking for Response Effect on the Eight Adaptive Types

Table 16 illustrates the frequencies data.

Table 16
RESPONSE EFFECT CHECK ON THE 8 ADAPTIVE TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Minority</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In. Min.</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the responses across the Likert-type spectrum indicates that response effect was not a concern in this study.
Summary of Subproblems

The subproblems of the study were addressed in the questionnaire with questions 41 through 45. The items asked if the chairperson

1. felt that his or her selection to the chairperson position was based on qualifications and not on ethnic status,
2. felt that his or her chairperson position has provided excellent experience which will be used in future administrative positions.
3. plans to pursue higher administrative positions,
4. had a high level of satisfaction with the chairperson position, and
5. felt that acquiring the chairperson position was not based on ethnic status.
The subproblem data and the difference in the responses is summarized in Table 17.

Table 17
SUMMARY OF SUBPROBLEMS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subproblem Number</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference In Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>6.1 Non-Min.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 In. Min.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.6 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 In. Min.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.8 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 In. Min.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.0 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 In. Min.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6.0 Non-Min.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 In. Min.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=119 (non-minority=62, involuntary minority=57)

level of statistical significance utilized=.05

The t-score mean comparisons of subproblem items one (3.71) and five (3.63) were found to be statistically significant at the .05 confidence level. The t-scores of items two (1.21), three (1.22) and four (0.50) were found to be statistically insignificant at the .05 confidence level.

Of the total involuntary minority chairs polled, 69.3% felt that they obtained the chair position based on their qualifications and 61.1% of non-minority chairs felt they
obtained the chair position due to qualifications rather than on ethnic status, a difference of 8.2%.

The majority of involuntary minority chairs (72.2%) and non-minority chairs (64.8%) felt the chair position provides excellent administrative experience which they plan to use as they move up the administrative ladder.

Few minority (35%) and non-minority (29%) chairs actually plan to apply for higher administrative positions. Most chairs, however, minority (75%) and non-minority (67%) have a high level of satisfaction with the chair position.

Finally, 72% of involuntary minorities polled and 79% of non-minorities polled agree that acquiring the chair position was not based on ethnic status.

The highest level of agreement of the survey items was established when 40 of the 62 non-minority chairpersons strongly agreed that they had a high level of satisfaction with the chairperson position.

**Individual Survey Items of Interest**

Although this study has analyzed and classified the survey items according to their corresponding adaptive type, there were some interesting individual findings which should be discussed. For example, item number two on the survey asked chairpersons if they felt that the norms and values of their employer university system were in conflict with their cultural norms and values. Seven involuntary minority chairs and zero non-minority chairs strongly agreed while
six involuntary minority and 21 non-minority chairs strongly disagreed with this item. The results of this item seem to reinforce Ogbu's concept. Ogbu (1992, p. 8) states that many involuntary minorities experience difficulties in dealing with educational institutions because of the relationship between their birth cultures and the mainstream culture.

Item number eight also provided interesting findings. Twenty non-minorities and five involuntary minorities strongly agreed that their ethnicity and cultural frame of reference was important in determining success in their chairperson position. Six non-minorities and twelve involuntary minorities strongly disagreed with that same item. This was an interesting finding because according to Ogbu (1978, p. 49) a grouping into which a person is born determines that person's status or caste. Castelike or involuntary minorities, according to Ogbu, have been exploited and depreciated systematically.

Twenty-eight non-minorities and eight involuntary minorities strongly agreed with item number nine which states that chairpersons make career plans on the basis of their individual interests and abilities with little reference to their status. One non-minority and 12 involuntary minorities strongly disagreed with this item. The results suggest that involuntary minorities consider their ethnic status when making career plans. Ogbu would
agree with these findings since he feels involuntary minorities usually experience greater and more persistent difficulties in dealing with institutional adjustments and achievements in dealing with the system (Ogbu, 1991, p. 249).

Two non-minorities and 11 involuntary minorities strongly agreed with item number 17 which states that they have become involved in activities sponsored by their ethnic group in hopes of making changes in their university system. Five involuntary minorities and 29 non-minorities strongly disagreed with the same item. The results of this item suggest that involuntary minorities are trying to make changes in their university system by getting involved in ethnic group sponsored activities.

Six non-minorities and one involuntary minority strongly agreed with item number 29 which stated that chairpersons were fully committed to both their ethnic group and university culture. Twenty non-minorities and 28 involuntary minorities strongly disagreed with this same item. The results of this item seem to agree with Ogbu's concept which notes that involuntary minorities may face conflict between their ethnic group status and university culture (Ogbu & Fordham, 1986, p. 176).

Eight non-minorities and 28 involuntary minorities strongly agreed with item number 34 which stated that they had a need to identify with their ethnic group and to
succeed in their chairperson capacity. Two involuntary minorities and ten non-minorities strongly disagreed with that same item. The results indicate that involuntary minority chairpersons differentiate between ethnic group and institutional success. Dumont (1972, p. 12) states that involuntary minorities must learn the cultural and language frames of reference of their oppressors and that involuntary minorities may interpret institutional success detrimental to their identity.

Thirty involuntary minorities and 13 non-minorities strongly agreed with item 39 which states that chairs would rather pursue university interests instead of their own interests. These results indicate that most involuntary minorities are not of the encapsulated adaptive type.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in the use of cultural coping strategies exist between involuntary minority and non-minority department chairpersons at selected doctoral degree-granting universities located in the American Southwest.

Summary

This study obtained data from 119 chairpersons (62 non-minority chairpersons and 57 involuntary minority chairpersons) employed by 39 doctoral degree-granting universities in the seven American Southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah. The purpose of this study was to examine

1. if a statistically significant t-test difference existed at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons,

2. to what degree were John Ogbu's cultural coping strategies used by the eight adaptive types utilized by involuntary minorities and selected non-minority department chairpersons,
3. what were the perceptions of involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons with regard to the following questions:
   a. why was he or she selected to this administrative position,
   b. what administrative expectations did he or she have for the future,
   c. what level of satisfaction did he or she have with the chairperson position?

This research utilized John U. Ogbu's theory which notes that involuntary minorities (African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans) use cultural coping strategies in their everyday existence among the dominant eurocentric culture. Ogbu's concept classifies cultural coping strategies within the eight adaptive types
   1. assimilators,
   2. emissaries,
   3. alternators,
   4. reaffiliated,
   5. ivy-leaguers,
   6. regulars,
   7. ambivalents, and
   8. encapsulated.

The eight adaptive types, according to Ogbu, materialized because involuntary minorities were brought into American society through slavery, conquest or
colonization. Involuntary minority individuals striving for success use these cultural coping strategies to shield themselves from peer criticisms, isolation, and affective dissonance. Since involuntary minority chairpersons are screened and trained similar to non-minority chairpersons, a selected non-minority group of chairpersons was utilized as a comparison. T-tests were used to analyze the data for statistical significance at the .05 confidence level.

Conclusions and Continued Summaries

Conclusions based on the data compiled from the 119 (57 involuntary minority and 62 non-minority chairpersons) self administered questionnaires addressed the three main research questions. T-tests were utilized in analyzing the statistical significance of the data at the .05 level.

The first research question of this study asked if a statistically significant t-test difference existed at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority chairpersons at doctoral degree-granting universities in the American Southwest. This study selected the five main cultural coping strategies utilized by each of Ogbu's adaptive types and developed an item on the questionnaire for each cultural coping strategy. Responses were analyzed individually and by adaptive type group. The data in Table 15 illustrates the responses for each adaptive type by noting the group means, difference in the means, t-score, and p value.
T-scores indicate that statistically significant differences at the .05 level existed between the two chair groups in the emissaries (3.91), reaffiliated (2.36), ivy-leaguers (3.20), and regulars (2.25) adaptive types. T-scores also indicated assimilators (-0.38), alternators (0.13), ambivalents (0.60), and encapsulated (1.23) response differences between the two chair groups were not statistically significant at the .05 level.
Table 15

DATA SUMMARY OF EIGHT ADAPTIVE TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Type</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference In Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assimilators</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13.7 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emissaries</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24.9 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alternators</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18.9 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaffiliated</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20.1 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.4 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ivy-Leaguers</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.1 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regulars</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24.5 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ambivalents</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.6 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.4 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Encapsulated</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0 Non-Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8 In. Min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=119 (non-minority=62, involuntary minority=57)

level of statistical significance utilized=.05

In conclusion, t-test results indicated that part of Ogbu's concept (emissaries, reaffiliated, ivy-leaguer, and regular adaptive types) held true and that there was a statistically significant difference at the .05 level in the use of cultural coping strategies between the two groups.
The statistically significant t-score results support many inferences between involuntary minority and non-minority chairs. One major implication of the results is that involuntary minority chairpersons play down the minority identity and cultural frame of reference in order to succeed in the university system by mainstream criteria without rejecting their minority culture and identity. A second implication is that involuntary minority chairpersons might have repudiated the minority cultural frame of reference and identity until they were confronted with an unacceptable experience which they interpreted as caused by racism. They often become more involved in minority activities and with their minority peers, but they may still continue to do well in the mainstream institutions. Involuntary minorities may emulate middle class behaviors, belong to social clubs or fraternities, abide by university routines, and dress well according to middle class standards. The final implications the results support are that involuntary minority members are accepted members of the street culture but they do not subscribe to all of its norms. They get along well without compromising their own values.

The second problem was to examine to what degree were the eight adaptive types which use cultural coping strategies and developed by Dr. John U. Ogbu utilized by involuntary minorities and selected non-minority department chairpersons. The means in Table 15 indicate the level at
which the chairpersons felt they utilized the eight adaptive types.

The third subproblem examined the perceptions of the chair groups with regard to why they were selected to the administrative position, what administrative expectations they had for the future, and what level of satisfaction they had with the chair position. Table 16 indicates data used to answer these questions.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subproblem Number</th>
<th>t-score</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference in Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>6.1 Non-Min.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 In. Min.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.6 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 In. Min.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.8 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 In. Min</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.0 Non-Min.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 In. Min</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>6.0 Non-Min.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 In. Min</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-score mean comparisons of subproblem items one (3.71) and five (3.63) were found to be statistically significant at the .05 confidence level. The t-scores of items two (1.21), three (1.22) and four (0.50) were found to be statistically insignificant at the .05 confidence level.
Of the total involuntary minority chairs polled, 69.3% felt that they obtained the chair position based on their qualifications and 61.1% of non-minority chairs felt they obtained the chair position due to qualifications rather than on ethnic status, a difference of 8.2%.

The majority of involuntary minority chairs (72.2%) and non-minority chairs (64.8%) felt the chair position provides excellent administrative experience which they plan to use as they move up the administrative ladder.

Few minority (35%) and non-minority (29%) chairs actually plan to apply for higher administrative positions. Most chairs, however, minority (75%) and non-minority (67%) have a high level of satisfaction with the chair position.

Finally, 72% of involuntary minorities polled and 79% of non-minorities polled agree that acquiring the chair position was not based on ethnic status.

The highest frequency on the survey was obtained when 40 non-minority chairpersons strongly agreed that they had a high level of satisfaction with the chairperson position.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Five recommendations for further research were derived from analyses of the findings of this study and from examination of the conclusions. These recommendations would further highlight current understanding related to the study of cultural coping strategies utilized in an administrative setting.
First, the principal framework for this study was developed by John U. Ogbu between the years of 1974 and 1992. Consideration through time should also be given to the non-minority experience and the cultural coping strategies they must utilize in a multicultural institutional setting such as a university. At this point, a new multiethnic model of tolerance could be developed and utilized to examine the cultural coping strategies of all ethnic groups.

Second, the majority (72.2%) of the involuntary minority and 64.8% of the non-minority chairs felt that the chairperson position provided excellent administrative experience which they planned to use as they moved up the administrative ladder. Only 35% of the involuntary minority and 29% of the non-minority chairpersons, however, actually plan to apply for higher administrative positions. This study recommends that further study be undertaken to determine why the majority of the chairs feel their administrative experience is positive, but only a few seek higher posts.

Third, the present study could be expanded to include other doctoral degree granting universities, specific chairperson groups examined by age, gender, teaching and/or administrative experience, and affirmative action officers instead of chairpersons.
Fourth, the present study could be expanded to include an identification of the programs or departments which were involved in the study. The program or department data could be compared to the cultural coping survey responses and speculations on which adaptive types exist in which programs could be formulated.

Fifth, the present study could be expanded to include at what university the chairs received their training and in which state they are employed. Correlations between adaptive types and training/employment could be examined.
APPENDIX A

(RESEARCH CORRESPONDENCE)

DR. JOHN OGBU CORRESPONDENCE AND REPLY,

DR. WALTER H. GMELCH CORRESPONDENCE,

APPROVAL, PROVOST, COVER AND REMINDER LETTERS
Mr. Paul James Vigil  
5625 West Flamingo, Apt. #2005  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89103

Dear Mr. Vigil:

I have been away from Berkeley for a while and that is why I have not been able to respond to your mail before now.

I have read your proposal and the subject of your research is both important and interesting. You apparently derived your typology of coping strategies from two pieces of my work, published in 1982 (Child Development) or 1985 (in a book edited by Spencer et al) and a chapter in a book on school drop out (1989) edited by Weis. The earlier work describes types of people using the strategies (e.g., assimilators or emulators, alternators, etc.); the second article describes the strategies themselves (e.g., assimilation or emulation of whites, camouflaging, etc.). If you are focusing on types of people, based on the earlier article, you should eliminate "ivy-leaguers" because that will be hard for you to identify. If you are using the typology of coping strategies you should consult my recent article in Educational Researcher, Nov. 1992 ("Understanding Cultural Diversity and Learning."). It is probably better to use both.

Unfortunately, we have not developed an instrument to measure these attributes. The typology in the earlier article was derived from reading the literature, looking at various qualitative studies, including my earlier study in Stockton. The later article contains a typology of strategies also based on ethnographic and related studies.

Thus far, our knowledge of the coping strategies or attributes of minority adaptation is based on ethnographic interviews and observations, not from quantitative surveys. This is borne out in the following passage from the analysis manual of my current study among blacks, chinese and hispanics in Oakland, California. More information about the study is attached.

(From the manual)

PART XI
N. Individual Coping Strategies

Focus: There are no specific questions in the survey dealing with this category. However, some questions in the section on educational strategies, such as camouflaging, fit in here or should be considered when the analysis is done.

Note, however, that there are within each minority group a repertoire of perceptions, interpretations, and responses to white American treatment that have been developed by members of the group over the course of their presence in the United States. Different individuals within a given minority community may thus perceive and interpret as well as respond to white treatment differently, but the responses are within the realm of the repertoire of the perceptions, interpretations and responses within the group from which such individuals come. The variety of responses among black Americans, for example, include the following: emulation of whites or cultural passing; racelessness; camouflaging; accommodation without assimilation; encapsulation; etc.

****

Here the concern is with "strategies" used rather than "attributes" of users.

You should try to develop your own instrument and I can give you a feedback.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

John U. Ogbu
Alumni Distinguished Professor
COMMUNITY FORCES AND MINORITY EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

SPRING 1992

Principal Investigator: John U. Ogbu
Alumni Distinguished Professor
Department of Anthropology
& Survey Research Center
University of California, Berkeley

Administrative Assistant: Sarah Haessler

Funding: California Policy Seminar
Carnegie Corporation
Exxon Educational Foundation
W.T. Grant Foundation
John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
The Rockefeller Foundation
Russell Sage Foundation
Spencer Foundation
The Ford Foundation
The State of California Department of Education
A major dilemma of American education has been the difference in academic achievement among primary ethnic and racial groups in the United States: Asian, Black, Latino/Hispanic, and White. Although many reasons have been suggested, from the schools to the family to individual biology, very few explanations have centered on the ethnic group itself and its own ideas about how education works and how to get it.

In Community Forces and Minority Educational Strategies we are looking specifically at minority communities and their ideas and actions with the hope of gaining a better understanding of what factors influence students to be more or less successful in school. With this study we are trying to answer such questions as:

1. What are the beliefs of the members of each racial/ethnic group about what it means to be a minority in America?

2. What explanations (or folk theories) do members of each racial/ethnic minority group have for how one gets ahead in the United States, and of the role of education in getting ahead?

3. What are the beliefs about and explanations for how education affects one's group identity and membership?

4. What is the degree of trust, distrust, or acquiescence that one's group has for the public schools and for those who control these schools?

5. Based upon these ideas, what actions and behaviors do students, parents and community members have regarding education?

To give us comparative and cross-cultural information, we have focused on three minority groups in Alameda County, California:

1. The Black community in Oakland

2. The Cantonese-speaking Chinese community in Oakland (long-term residents and recent immigrants).

3. The Mexican-American community in Union City (long-term residents and recent immigrants).
The results of this study will be used in several ways. These include:

1. **Information for community members and school districts**: A report of the results and recommendations for change will be published and given to community members and staff of the school districts for use in promoting the academic success of children. The reports for the Chinese and Mexican-American communities will be bilingual.

2. **Actively Planning for Change**: The directors will be available to work with interested community institutions and school districts to translate the results into policies and programs. We are already working with The Achievement Council, a state-wide organization of minority leaders formerly based in Oakland.

**RESEARCH METHODS:**

To learn about the beliefs and action of the ethnic communities, we have:

1. Talked informally with members of the community, including students, parents, and community leaders, in homes, churches, schools, and public gatherings.
2. Talked with members of the school system, including staff, teachers, and administrators.
3. Interviewed formally a selected group of elementary, middle-school, and high school students and parents.
4. Gathered information from newspapers, pamphlets, and school records on the history of the community, the ideas of the community and the school achievement of the students.

**TIME PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1988-August 1989</td>
<td>Informal interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-December 1989</td>
<td>Formal interviewing of students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-December 1990</td>
<td>Student survey given preliminary data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1991-December 1992</td>
<td>Interview data transcription, coding and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-December 1993</td>
<td>Final Analyses, final reports written for dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMO

TO: Paul Vige
FROM: Walter Gmelch
DATE:

Attached are some materials which may be of interest to you. Good luck with your research. Let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Walter H. Gmelch

Washington State University
November 4, 1994

Paul James Vigil
Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
7877 Mountain Man Way
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113

Dr. John Ogbu
University of California, Berkeley
Department of Anthropology &
Survey Research Center
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Dr. Ogbu,

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your confidence in my work and for taking the time to write and talk to me via telephone. In our communications you mentioned that you would look at my questionnaire and give me some input on its construction and content.

Attached is a copy of the survey questionnaire I developed from your conceptual framework and theory. I would appreciate your input on its final construction and I further realize that your research is of ethnography type but I would still appreciate any expertise you would like to shed on the construction of the instrument.

Thank you for your time and interest,

[Signature]
Paul James Vigil
TO: Paul James Vigil

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director, Research Administration

DATE: 7 September 1994

RE: Status of human subject protocol entitled:
"Cultural Coping Strategies of Minority Chairpersons"

The protocol for the project referenced above has been reviewed by the Office of Research Administration, and it has been determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from full review by the UNLV human subjects committee. Except for any required conditions or modifications noted below, this protocol is approved for a period of one year from the date of this notification, and work on the project may proceed.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.
October 5, 1994

Dear Provost or Personnel Director,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Learning at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The topic of my dissertation deals with the cultural coping strategies of minority department chairpersons at the university level in the American Southwest. I am interested in obtaining the names, addresses and work phone numbers of any African-American, Hispanic-American and Native-American persons who serve as department chairpersons within your university system. Since this is a comparative study, I am also interested in an equal number of names, addresses and work phone numbers of any Euro-American department chairpersons who closely match the age, gender and years of experience of the minority chairpersons.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality and your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Each department chairperson participating in the study will be asked to answer a short questionnaire.

The composite results of this research will be made available to educators and all interested parties. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the information you mail to me.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (702) 873-3647.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Vigil
Project Director

Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453002 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3002
(702) 895-3491
November 22, 1994

Dear Chairperson,

Cultural coping strategies are used by many university administrators in the department chairperson position. The middle management position demands that individuals encounter situations of conflict between a personal frame of reference and university norms and values. Many chairpersons are faced with a dilemma between birth culture and an institutional frame of reference based on different mores and norms.

This study invites you to participate in research that examines cultural coping strategies that university chairpersons in the Southwestern United States use in their everyday administrative capacity.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality and your cooperation is voluntary. The questionnaire has an identification number for follow-up mailing purposes only. This is so we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The composite results of this research will be made available to educators and all interested parties. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (702) 873-3647.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Vigil
Project Director

Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453002 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3002
(702) 895-3491
December 6, 1994

Dear Chairperson,

Cultural coping strategies are used by many university administrators in the department chairperson position. The middle management position demands that individuals encounter situations of conflict between a personal frame of reference and university norms and values. Many chairpersons are faced with a dilemma between birth culture and an institutional frame of reference based on different mores and norms.

This study invites you to participate in research that examines cultural coping strategies that university chairpersons in the Southwestern United States use in their everyday administrative capacity.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality and your cooperation is voluntary. The questionnaire has an identification number for follow-up mailing purposes only. This is so we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The composite results of this research will be made available to educators and all interested parties. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

I would be willing to answer any questions you might have concerning the study. Please write or call. The telephone number is (702) 873-3647.

This is the second copy of the questionnaire I send to you, so if you have already returned the first copy please disregard this copy and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Paul Vigil
Project Director

Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453002 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3002
(702) 895-3491
APPENDIX B

(QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION)

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE, QUESTIONNAIRE SCORING

AND LIST OF ELIGIBLE UNIVERSITIES
CULTURAL COPING STRATEGIES
OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS
AT SOUTHWEST UNIVERSITIES:

A survey examining the dilemma which persons in this middle management position encounter between a personal frame of reference and university norms and values.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Department of Educational Administration
Paul J. Vigil-Project Director
4505 South Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3002
The main purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference in the use of cultural coping strategies between involuntary minority and non-minority university chairpersons. Many people face a dilemma between their birth culture and the cultural frame of reference the university system perpetuates. Other research questions search for the degree cultural coping strategies are utilized by selected chairpersons. Your responses are very important and necessary for the results to be meaningful. There is room on the back of the questionnaire for additional comments. Thank you for your cooperation.
Listed below are a number of statements. Each statement represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. As a university chairperson, you will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in after each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

If you agree strongly, circle +3
If you agree somewhat, circle +2
If you agree slightly, circle +1
If you disagree slightly, circle -1
If you disagree somewhat, circle -2
If you disagree strongly, circle -3

1. In performing my chairperson duties, I must disassociate myself from my cultural frame of reference in favor of the university frame of reference.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3

2. I feel that the norms and values of the university system I work at are in conflict with my cultural norms and values.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3

3. I feel that my cultural norms and values are not in conflict with university peers that share the same ethnic group as mine.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3

4. Throughout my teaching and administrative career, I have found it easy to remain successful at work and still remain close to my ethnic group.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3

5. I feel that in order for me to succeed in my chairperson position, I must repudiate or abandon my cultural frame of reference.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3

6. I feel that I do have to play down my cultural frame of reference and ethnic identity in order to succeed in my chairperson position.
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
7. I feel that my successful employment as an administrative chairperson will not contribute to the advancement of my ethnic group.
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

8. I feel that my ethnicity and my cultural frame of reference are important in determining success in my chairperson position at the university level.
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

9. As my administration experience progresses, I make career plans on the basis of my individual interests and abilities with little reference to my ethnic and cultural status.
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

10. With regard to civil rights activities, I feel that I can best make my contribution to my ethnic group with my individual success in my administrative capacity.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

11. As a university administrator, I feel that accommodation without assimilation provides the best form of success.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

12. I do not reject my ethnic identity or cultural frame of reference and I elect to play by the rules of the university system.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

13. Throughout my chairperson duties, I have found that I do not need to adopt definite strategies to cope with the conflicting demands between my ethnic group peers and myself.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

14. Throughout my chairperson duties, I have found that I do not tend to adopt definite strategies to cope with the conflicting demands between university norms and my own norms.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

15. I find that I get involved in activities sponsored by my ethnic group at my university as a means of coping with the conflicting demands between my ethnic group peers and university expectations.
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
16. In the past, I have repudiated or abandoned my ethnic frame of reference, but acts of prejudice have made me reconsider and accept my ethnic identity and cultural frame of reference.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

17. I have become more involved in activities sponsored by my ethnic group in hopes of making changes in my university system.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

18. Although I have faced examples of racism I continue to remain focused and succeed in my administrative capacity.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

19. Policies of the university system have forced me to minimize my involvement in my activities sponsored by my ethnic group.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

20. Prejudices established by university culture have forced me to reject my cultural frame of reference.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

21. I do not seek membership to social clubs affiliated with the university system.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

22. I do not emulate middle-class behaviors in order to obtain approval from higher echelon administrators.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

23. I abide by university laws and routines in order to succeed in my administrative capacity.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

24. I believe in the slogan "dress for success" in my administrative capacity.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

25. I attend church services and because of this I feel I am more respected at my workplace.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]

26. I am an accepted member of my ethnic group, but I do not subscribe to all of its norms or values.
   \[ +3 \quad +2 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad -2 \quad -3 \]
27. I feel I can not get along with university officials and my ethnic group members without compromising my own values.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

28. I feel I can not interact with university peers without becoming encapsulated.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

29. As a university chairperson, I feel that I am fully committed to both my ethnic group and university culture.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

30. I maintain close ethnic group ties but I do not subscribe to extremist groups.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

31. I feel that I am caught between the need or desire to identify with my ethnic group and the desire to achieve by mainstream criteria.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

32. I feel that I can resolve the conflict which may arise or does exist between the desire to identify with my ethnic group and the desire to achieve by mainstream criteria.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

33. I feel that my administrative performance is not affected due to the conflict between my desire to identify with my ethnic group and the desire to achieve by mainstream criteria.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

34. I feel a need to identify with my ethnic group and to succeed in my administrative capacity.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

35. My performance as a chairperson is erratic because of the conflict between my birth culture and university institutional culture.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

36. I equate success in my chairperson position with giving in to the university culture frame of reference.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3

37. I refuse to emulate middle-class behaviors.
   +3  +2  +1
   -1  -2  -3
38. I refuse to affiliate with untraditional university associations.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

40. I refuse to learn or follow general rules established by university officials.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

41. I feel that I was selected to my chairperson position because I am fully qualified and not because of my ethnic status.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

42. I feel that the chairperson position has provided excellent administrative experience, which I plan to use as I move up the administrative levels.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

43. I plan to pursue higher administration positions.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

44. I have a high level of satisfaction with my chairperson position.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

45. My perceptions as a chairperson indicate that my acquiring the chairperson position was based on my ethnic status.  
   +3 +2 +1   1 -2 -3

Demographics:

1. Age: ________  
2. Gender: A Female______  
   B Male_______

   C Asian-American______  D Hispanic-American______  
   E Native-American______  F Other______________

4. Where were you born?__________________________________

5. Are you an immigrant to the United States of America?  
   1 Yes_______  2 No_______

6. How many generations has your family been in the United States of America?__________
7. How many years of teaching experience at the university level do you have? _______________

8. How many years of administration experience at the university level do you have? __________

9. How many years have you lived in the American Southwest? ___

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the cultural coping strategies you may or may not use in your chairperson position at the university level? If so, please use the space below for that purpose. Also, it will be appreciated if you have any comments you wish to make that you think may help us understand any dilemma between your own cultural frame of reference and the university frame of reference. Either use the space provided here or attach a letter.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The time and effort you have devoted to these questions is greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). We will see you get one.
Table B-1

**QUESTIONNAIRE SCORING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Reversed Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agreed strongly, he/she circled +3,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed somewhat, he/she circled +2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed slightly, he/she circled +1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreed slightly, he/she circled -1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreed somewhat, he/she circled -2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreed strongly, he/she circled -3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-2
LIST OF PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>LOCATION (CITY)</th>
<th>INST. CON.</th>
<th>STU. BODY</th>
<th>TOTAL INVOLUNTARY MINORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern Arizona Univ.</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Univ. of Arizona</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biola University</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>California Inst. of Tech.</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>California State Univ.</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Golden Gate University</td>
<td>San Fran.</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>La Sierra University</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Diego State Univ.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Francisco State Univ.</td>
<td>San Fran.</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
<td>St. Clara</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>United States Inst. Univ.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Berkley</td>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Davis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Los Angeles</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Riverside</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>U. Of CA, San Diego</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>St. Barbara</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>U. Of CA, Santa Cruz</td>
<td>St. Cruz</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>U. Of CA, La Verne</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Univ. of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>U. Of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Fran.</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>U. Of Southern Cal.</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>U. of the Pacific</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Colorado Sch. of Mines</td>
<td>Golden</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Ft. Collins</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>U. Of Colo., Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>U. Of Colo., C. Springs</td>
<td>C. Springs</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>U. Of Colo., Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>U. Of Colo., Health Sci.</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>U. Of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Univ. Of Nev., Las Vegas</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Univ. Of Nev., Reno</td>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type(s)</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>New Mex. Inst. of Mining</td>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>New Mexico State Univ.</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Albq.</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type(s)</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>East Texas St. Univ.</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lamar University</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Our Lady at the Lake U.</td>
<td>St.Antonio</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>St. Mary's University</td>
<td>St.Antonio</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Stephen Austin St. U.</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>College Sta.S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Texas Women's U.</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>S W</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Univ. of Dallas</td>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Univ. of Houston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas, Arlington</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas, El Paso</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas, San Ant.</td>
<td>St.Antonio</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>U of Texas, Health Sci.</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>U of Texas, Health Sci.</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>U of Texas, Pan American</td>
<td>Edinburg</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>U of Texas, SW Med. Cen.</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type(s)</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>I-R C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- S=State Controlled
- I=Independent Religious
- I-R=Independent Religious
- C=Coed
- W=Women
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