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ABSTRACT
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“Marginal Men” and Double Consciousness: The Experiences of Sub-Saharan Africa Professors Teaching at a Predominantly White University in the Midwest of the United States of America

(224 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: Francis E. Godwyll

While research literature on faculty of color in predominantly White U.S. academe is growing, very little exists on international faculty from sub-Saharan Africa. The research literature on faculty of color teaching in predominantly White U.S. academe is generally limited to the narratives and experiences of ethnic minorities of the U.S. The quest to qualitatively document the experiences and perspectives of faculty of color in predominantly White U.S. universities cannot be complete without capturing the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors whose presence in predominantly White U.S. universities is growing due to socioeconomic and political challenges in Africa.

This study is a phenomenological inquiry into the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White university in the Midwest of the U.S. The rationale for the study is to gain understanding of the experiences and challenges of sub-Saharan African professors through their narratives. The study investigated the reasons for migrating to the U.S., classroom teaching experiences, experiences with students, other faculty members, and administrators; experiences with
tenure, promotion and professional development; experiences with race and racism; experiences with the university academic culture, and coping mechanisms used to deal with challenges.

The study revealed that factors such as political instability, better career opportunities, and personal reasons underpinned their reasons to migrate to the U.S. It also revealed that sub-Saharan African faculty had to put extra time and effort into their preparation towards teaching in order to prove themselves competent. The study also shows that sub-Saharan African faculty experienced occasional racist comments from students and complaints about their accent. The study found that while sub-Saharan African professors had congenial and friendly working and social relations with their White peers, they were unsuccessful in forging research collaborations. Some of the sub-Saharan faculty that had African American colleagues indicated having sharp differences in spite of tracing their descent from the same African roots. The study also revealed that 50% of the sub-Saharan professors tenured had bittersweet experiences with their tenure and promotion. Furthermore, the study revealed that the sub-Saharan African professors suffered from a two-world phenomenon, marginality, and loss of social status. Their coping mechanisms included working hard, developing love and passion for their teaching and research, exercising their faith through prayer, deriving support from family and network of friends and other Africans.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

As a Ghanaian studying in the United States, I have experienced many differences in the organization of learning and teaching in American universities compared to the pedagogy back home. In Ghana for instance, from primary school all the way through the university, students sit in rows facing the teacher/professor and listen while the teacher/professor deliver the lecture to students. The mode of instruction is didactic and there is little room for students to engage the teacher/professor or fellow students in the exchange of ideas. Knowledge is believed to reside with the teacher/professor who imparts this in a structured setting to students. Classroom organization and furniture is fixed at all the various levels of the formal educational system and there is hardly any variation of the sitting arrangement from primary school all the way to the university. Unlike the current site of this study where the mode of instruction takes different forms—lectures, seminars, watching movies and class discussions, that of Ghana and most sub-Saharan African countries is by and large the lecture method. Professors in Ghana rarely engage students in class discussions. Students are sent to teaching assistants to answer questions and to help students with tutorials.

I trace the differences between the U.S. educational system and that of sub-Saharan Africa to the genesis of formal education in the later. The educational systems introduced in Africa by the colonialists, mainly the British and the French were influenced to a great extent by the ideologies prevailing in the hegemonic countries at the time. In France, the ideology was egalitarianism which emphasized the notion that all
men were biologically equal and that government should take steps to equalize inequalities in income, wealth, and opportunity caused by capitalism. Flowing out of this egalitarian ideology was the policy of assimilation practiced by the French in their colonies to make Frenchmen out of Africans (Clignet & Foster, 1964). The British Crown on the other hand practiced the ideology of laissez-faire which emphasized minimal governmental control of the economy. The British ideology encouraged unfettered economic exploitation of the resources of the colonies with minimal degree of political interference. In practice, the British colonialists encouraged indirect rule through the devolution of political power to local agencies while the French emphasized assimilation by introducing regulations and uniformities into the social organization of its overseas territories in order to have them conform to that of metropolitan France (Clignet & Foster, 1964).

The assimilationist policies of the French colonialists encouraged the duplication of schools in its colonies parallel to the academic system in France. Although these schools were established by the Christian mission groups, the French colonial authorities firmly controlled the educational activities of the missions and the number of schools established and the curriculum taught. Due to stringent colonial administrative control in French colonies, the number of Africans converted into Black Frenchmen was minimal. French was the medium of instruction and lingua franca in all the French colonies. The trend in the British colonies on the other hand was that the Christian Missions were largely left to establish as many schools as they could. There were no controls over curriculum and instruction and as a result there were variations in the educational
standards. According to Clignet & Foster (1964), the policy of the British was that the missions at least practice the axiom of “adaptation of curricula to native life” at the primary level (p. 195). Vernacular languages were therefore used in the first years of primary education in the British colonies. At the secondary and tertiary level however, the British shifted focus from their laissez-faire policy in primary education to assimilationist practices akin to that of the French. In light of the policy of rigidly following the curriculum of metropolitan Britain at the secondary and tertiary level, Africans were allowed access to British higher institutions or to the ones modeled in the colonies on British educational traditions (Mazrui, 1994; Clignet & Foster, 1964).

According to Clignet & Foster (1964), although the various colonialists had different ideologies and different economic, political, and educational policies towards their colonies, the effect or consequences of the transmission of their educational systems in Africa were similar. For instance, ethnic groups in Africa who were closer to the centers of Christian missionary work had higher levels of education; the spread of formal education was related to socio-demographic change particularly, urbanization. As the economies of urban areas grew, so also people from different ethnicities flocked to these commercial centers for work. This phenomenon in turn sparked the demand for formal education. The practice of establishing educational institutions around missionary settlements and urban areas is largely the cause of the disproportionate geographic location and low levels of educational attainment of some ethnic groups at independence.

While formal education in the urban areas became the instrument of occupational security and mobility, it also broke down traditional patterns of affiliation and created a
new form of status. The new status based on formal education conflicted with the traditional notions of social status based primarily on descent. Clignet & Foster (1964) assert that some traditional rulers were reluctant to send their royals to school and this reluctance to take advantage of formal education created the Western-educated elite whose attitude towards traditional authority was ambivalent (p. 196). Another effect of the concentration of formal education in urban centers near Christian missions was the reproduction of the pattern of recruitment into secondary and higher education. Those whose fathers were working within the colonial system as clerks, managers and technical people had access to formal education. Farmers and fishermen because of their occupations became distinctly missing in the educational system.

Mazrui (1994) asserts that the educational system implemented by the colonialists was largely a transplantation of Westernized educational system that required assimilating European epistemology and culture to the abandonment of local knowledge and culture. The colonial educational system was highly successful in transforming and reconstructing Africa into Anglophiles, Francophiles etc, creatures who were stunted in creativity but adept at mimicry and regurgitation of foreign culture passively internalized (Nyamnjo & Nantang, 2002).

At independence, most sub-Saharan African countries inherited a Europeanized oriented, Christian missionary engendered educational system with very few schools at all the levels-primary, secondary, and tertiary. According to Bah-Diallo (1997), the gross rate of enrollment in primary education in Africa in 1960, near the end of the colonial era, was 36% as compared to 67% for Asia and 73% for Latin America. This average,
however, concealed large disparities between territories, urban and rural areas, sexes and religious and ethnic groups. For the French-speaking territories, the overall gross enrollment ratio was 38% (50% for the Belgium colonies and 31% for French colonies); for the English-run colonies it was 40%. The rate of illiteracy was over 90% for sub-Saharan Africa as a whole. For many independent African countries, enlarging the base, and changing the educational system to have bearing on the aspirations of the newly created nation-states became the goal. The need was identified to reduce the high illiteracy rate by expanding primary and secondary education to cover a significant proportion of the population.

At the tertiary level, efforts were made to establish universities that would not only continue with the traditional university courses but also to train personnel in agriculture and development studies who would manage the development agenda of the newly independent states (Mamdani, 1994). As a result of the above educational policies, between 1960 and 1983 the number of students in Africa increased at a rate of 9% per year, twice as rapidly as in Asia and three times as rapidly as in Latin America. At the primary level, the gross enrollment ratio increased from 36% to 75% in just 20 years. The content of education at the primary level was reformed to reflect the African context and needs of Africa. By 1983, twenty one countries replaced English, French and Portuguese as the language of instruction (Bah-Diallo, 1997).

The quality of education and the rate of enrollment in Africa sharply declined in the 1980s and early 1990s due to several factors. Some of these factors included corruption, pillage and transfer of large sums of state funds into private accounts abroad
by government functionaries; mismanagement of national resources; terms of trade imbalances due to the collapse in prices of Africa’s raw materials; disproportionate increase in price of crude oil; drastic reduction of bilateral aid from foreign donors; devaluation of local currencies as a condition for receiving loans from international financial institutions; implementation of structural adjustment programs to resuscitate ailing economies; the debt burden; an expanding population; and environmental degradation caused by nature and man (Mamdani, 1994; Mazrui, 1994; Nkinyangi, 1991). Consequently, many professionals including university professors left Africa for greener pastures in Europe and America (Nkinyangi, 1991; Nyamnjoh & Nantang, 2002).

All over the world, higher educational institutions enjoy the principle of academic freedom because of the belief that research, scholarship and service by the academe thrives in an environment of peace and freedom (Nyamnjoh & Nantang, 2002). After most African states gained independence and built universities to promote the development agenda, the states became interested not only in setting the development agenda for the universities but also controlling their administration. The problem of higher education transforming themselves into citadels of Africanized knowledge production and dissemination therefore became stifled by this insatiable thirst of the post-colonial state to own and control all factors of production including universities and research institutions (Mamdani, 1994). The penchant to dictate and exercise authority over the running of universities, to stifle freedom of speech and expression, and to squelch every form of dissent resulted in a headlong collusion between university students and professors on the one hand and coercive arms of governments (Mamdani,
1894). The inability of African universities to use their ‘autonomous’ status in the fight against post-colonial governments was due to the fact that, although they could lay claim to academic freedom, they did not possess the means to pursue their freedom (Hagan, 1994). They were dependent on the state for their financial sustenance. Their academic budgets were financed from national coffers.

The single most important factor that contributed to student protests in Africa since the beginning of the 1980s is the decline in socioeconomic conditions due to worsening of terms of trade with Western industrialized nations; increase in the price of crude oil; recurrent droughts; rising debt burdens; decline in official development assistance; widespread government corruption; questionable national policies; poor management of development programs; and human rights abuses. The decline in living standards in the 1980s forced both students and academicians to agitate for living wage (Mamdani, 1994; Nkinyangi, 1991). The agitation was seen as a challenge to the authority of the state and the maintenance of law and order. According to Nkinyangi (1991), violent confrontations on university campuses across Africa in the 1980s occurred in not less than 25 countries.

Structural adjustment programs recommended by the IMF and the World Bank to address the economic problems extended to educational reforms of cost-sharing; cutting back on educational subsidies, including the reduction of student and teachers’ allowances. The rise in inflation with its attendant exorbitant cost of consumer goods and services created general social unrest in most sub-Saharan African countries. Nkinyangi (1991) asserts that the austerity measures such as cost-recovery programs through the
institution of student loans and student charges for meals in university cafeterias (Kenya and Zambia); general cost-reduction plans to eliminate students and teachers allowances (Kenya, Sierra Leone, Cote d’Ivoire, Senegal, etc); educational reforms targeted at curtailing repetition at the university (Madagascar); and examination reforms (Mali); cutting of student food and lodging costs (Nigeria and Cote d’Ivoire) resulted in ferocious anti-government agitation and protests by students calling for freedom of expression and multi-party democracy (p. 161). Students and professors denounced the structural adjustment reforms by the IMF and the World Bank. In December 1988 and again in June 1989 for instance, students and the general population in Khartoum and Omdurman embarked on massive riots to protest against a 500% increase in the price of sugar, bread and other food staples. There were also riots in Zambia in 1986 and again in 1988, following government increases in the prices of basic foodstuffs (Nkinyangi, 1991, p. 162).

Worsening economic conditions of African nations in the 1980s also meant drastic reduction of budgetary allocations to education in general. For every $1 received in aid grants in 1999, the countries in the sub-Saharan African region paid back $1.51 in debt service. They owe $231 billion to creditors, that is $406 for every man, woman and child in Africa. Sub-Saharan countries spend over twice as much on debt service as on basic health care. They spend 6.1 % of GNP on education and spent 5.0 % of GNP on debt service. If Africa's debt were cancelled it could almost double its spending on education (Ledwith, http://www.infed.org/biblio/colonialism.htm, 11/08). The effect of the state of the economy on higher education included: student demonstrations; closure of
universities; deterioration in educational facilities such as classrooms, equipment, and non availability of books and teaching materials; serious erosion of the morale of teachers; mass exodus of professors to Europe and America; drastic fall in the quality of graduates; and general fall in educational standards of the population. The fall in general standards of education in turn provided fuel for a vicious cycle of low productivity leading to worsening economic conditions, and mass migration of professionals including university professors abroad.

Migration of sub-Saharan professionals abroad has cultural implications. Every human being is a product of the culture of its society. Culture therefore has a controlling influence over the way people live, think, speak and behave. As such everywhere one goes, one carries along a “cultural baggage”. This cultural baggage serves as the primary paradigm through which the world is explained and understood. It is expected that conflict, dissonance and disorientation will occur when one goes to live and work in a different culture (Kohls, 2001). For professors from sub-Saharan Africa to leave their societies and take up teaching appointments on other continents especially in the United States, a society very different from their own, could mean that they do so at a cost to their psychosocial wellbeing. It would therefore be worth finding out how the cultures of the respective African professors have shaped their experiences.

The media in the West have not made matters any easier for sub-Saharan Africa but continue to selectively report the negative aspects of the culture and events that happen on the African continent. To those who live in the West and have neither traveled to Africa nor objectively assessed media reportage on Africa, the continent is known only
for tribal wars, genocide such as in Rwanda, Liberia and now in the Sudan, HIV AIDS pandemic, widespread famine, and abject poverty. This negative reportage by the western media has perpetuated the negative stereotypes about Africa and left people with deep seated negative images of the continent. Hazel Carby suggested that the objective of stereotypes is “not to reflect or represent a reality but to function as a disguise, or mystification, of objective social relations” (1987, p. 22). These controlling images are designed to make such stereotypes appear to be natural, normal, and inevitable parts of everyday life (Collins, 2000). Even when the initial conditions that foster controlling images disappear, such images prove remarkably tenacious because they not only subjugate Africans but are essential in maintaining intersecting oppressions (Mullings 1997, p. 109-30).

Given that there is a pervasive negative representation in the U.S. media about sub-Saharan Africa, I am interested in finding out how professors from the region are perceived: whether they are accepted as equals among their peers and by the students they teach; whether they are able to easily integrate into the social life of the American academe; whether they duly get tenured and promoted. Finally, I am interested in finding out what role the color of the skin of professors from sub-Saharan Africa, their gender, their culture, their epistemology, and their style of pedagogy play in shaping their experiences in the American academe.

Statement of the Problem

Before I came to the United States, I learned that the country had a rich history of cultural diversity. I also learned that apart from the Asian Americans, Native Americans,
the Hispanic population, and African Americans, the rest of America’s citizens came mainly from Europe. I did not expect America to be a country of many cultures, where race and the color of one’s skin was a huge issue. Since I arrived in the United States, I have observed that issues that confront America do not escape analysis on race. Many of the biographical forms you fill for instance will ask you to indicate your race. I have also observed that some national, state and local issues almost always end up becoming an issue of color. As far as placement on the social, economic, class and power structure is concerned, people of color especially people of African descent find themselves on the bottom rungs of the ladder (Keith & Herring, 1991; McDaniel, 1995; Telles & Murguia, 1990; Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). In view of the assertion by Shipler (2005) that there exist racial, class and power structures in the American society and that there exists a pervasive perception that African Americans are not particularly highly esteemed in a predominantly White American society, I am interested in finding out how African professors from the sub-Saharan region live and work in America and for that matter at a predominantly White university in the Midwest. My interest is therefore to conduct an in-depth study by which I can examine and understand experiences of professors from sub-Saharan Africa.

**Purpose of Study**

The overarching purpose of the study is to understand the experiences of African professors from the sub-Saharan region teaching at a predominantly White American university in the Midwest. The other reasons for this study are to:
• Gain an understanding of the reasons why professors from sub-Saharan Africa leave their countries of origin, peoples and culture and come to live and teach in America, especially in predominantly White institutions where the people, the way of life and the way of doing things are different.

• Understand from the perspectives of the sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White American university their classroom teaching experiences, experiences with tenure and promotion, experiences with students, other faculty members, administrators, professional development, and with the academic culture in general.

• Understand how sub-Saharan African professors deal with challenges they face in practicing their teaching profession in a predominantly White University in America.

**Research Questions**

The overarching research question that would guide the study is to understand the lived experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a Midwest predominantly White university. The specific research questions include the following:

• What are the reasons for migrating to teach in U.S. higher education?

• What are the classroom teaching experiences and relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with the students they teach?

• What is the nature of relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their colleagues and mentors?
• What are the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with tenure, promotion, and professional development?

• What are the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with the academic culture of their U.S. higher educational institution?

**Significance of Study**

Educational leaders and administrators are constantly looking for ways and means to improve the working conditions and welfare of their workers. This research would therefore provide an invaluable resource for educational leaders and administrators at a Midwest predominantly White university in particular and America in general to understand the unique conditions of professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching in predominantly White American institutions.

The study will help policy makers understand the experiences of expatriate professors especially those from sub-Saharan Africa and enable them to devise appropriate policies to help the professors overcome any challenges that they may face.

There is an ongoing search by African governments and policymakers to find a lasting solution to the massive exodus of highly qualified African professionals and academicians to Europe and America. This research will contribute knowledge to better understand the issues surrounding African “brain drain” and what to do in order to solve the problem.

The study would also be a resource to potential African professors from the sub-Saharan region interested in coming to live and teach in America, especially in a predominantly White institution.
Finally, this study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on African faculty in the United States academe. There is a dearth of literature currently on African professors in the U.S. academe. This study would contribute to filling this void and help throw light on the experiences of African professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching in predominantly White institutions.

**Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

Africa is a continent with literally hundreds of people groups and cultures. The peoples of North Africa are broadly categorized as people of Arabic stock; those coming from sub-Saharan Africa are mostly considered Black Africans. The study will be limited to African professors that come from countries geographically located within sub-Saharan Africa and are broadly considered as Blacks that are teaching at a Midwest predominantly White University.

Currently there are nine male and three female professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching at the university where this Study is being conducted. Four of the professors’ hail from Ghana, three from Nigeria, all in West Africa, two from Kenya, one from Tanzania, one from South Africa, and one from Eritrea. This study is limited to sub-Saharan African professors from 6 countries in Africa who teach at a predominantly White university in the Midwest of the United States. As a qualitative inquiry, the focus of the study is therefore not on generalization, but on particularization. The delimitations and limitations will therefore not affect the outcome of the research.

**Definition of Terms**

The operational definitions of key terms in this study are as follows:
Race: A vast group of people loosely bound together by historically contingent, socially significant elements of their morphology and/or ancestry. A sui generis social phenomenon in which contested systems of meaning serve as the connections between physical features, and personal characteristics. In other words, social meanings connect our faces to our souls. Race is neither an essence nor an illusion, but rather an ongoing, contradictory, self-reinforcing process subject to the macro forces of social and political struggle and the micro effects of daily decisions. . . [R]referents of terms like Black, White, Asian, and Latino are social groups, not genetically distinct branches of humankind (Lopez, 1994, p. 3).

Culture: An integrated system of learned behavior patterns characteristic of the members of any given society. It refers to the total way of life of particular group of people. It includes everything that a group of people thinks, says, does, and makes- its systems of attitudes, and feelings. Culture is learned and transmitted from generation to generation (Kohls 2001, p. 25).

Pedagogy: It is the art and science of educating. More accurately, pedagogy embodies teacher-focused education. I am using the term to refer to the model where teachers assume responsibility for making decisions about what will be learned, how it will be learned, and when it will be learned. Teachers direct learning (Conner, 1997-2004)

Sub-Saharan Africa: Sub-Saharan Africa refers to the region of Africa south of the Sahara Desert. The term is refers to describe those countries of Africa that are not part of North Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa is also synonymous with Black Africa.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section reviews literature on faculty from sub-Saharan Africa and the educational, socioeconomic and political systems that produced them; and also accounts for their migration to other continents such as Europe and the United States. The sub-themes include sub-Saharan intellectuals; migration of sub-Saharan professors abroad; racial identity of Africans in the United States; and professors from Africa in the U.S. academe.

The second section of the literature review covers the experiences of minority faculty of color in the United States academe. The review provides among others, a statistical overview of the faculty of color in the United States academe; challenges that minority faculty of color in U.S. academe face such as, challenges of legitimate epistemology; challenges of double consciousness and marginality; challenges of job satisfaction; challenges of tenure and promotion; challenges in their teaching experiences; challenges of sexism and racism. A brief conclusion is provided to this section.

The final section focuses on theoretical frameworks. The emphasis of this section is a discussion of two theories which would underpin the research investigation and help understand the lived experiences of sub-Saharan African professors living and teaching in a predominantly White American institution in the Midwest. These theoretical frameworks are Double Consciousness as postulated by W. E. B. Du Bois, and the Marginal Man theory initially propounded by Robert E. Parks and reformulated by Everett V. Stonequist. The sub-themes of this section include the historical background to
the conceptual framework of double consciousness; the Du Boisian formulation of double consciousness; application of the theoretical framework in the literature; and application of the framework to this study. On the heels of the discourse on double consciousness are the sub-themes of marginal man theory. The sub-themes include the evolution of marginal man theory; application of the theory in the literature; and application of the marginal man theory to this dissertation.

Sub-Saharan African Intellectuals

This section reviews the literature on the educational culture that produced intellectuals from sub-Saharan Africa. The review captures the legacy of the colonial educational system and how successive post colonial governments have nurtured and remolded this educational legacy to produce the African scholar. The review also provides an analysis of the forces and factors driving the phenomena of migration of professionals from the African continent. The section closes with a review of how race and racial identity is used in the United States to determine the position of the individual on the hierarchy of social class and status.

The development of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa is a post-independence phenomenon (Mamdani, 1994). Before independence, the colonialists established very few universities with the near-exclusive emphasis on ‘technical’ education designed to train personnel for the colonial administration and the small private sector. After independence, the founding fathers saw the practical usefulness of education, including higher education in effecting the ‘Africanization’ of the civil service and the state owned corporations. Seen as an important element in producing human
capital to serve the development agenda of the newly independent states, more universities were established. Although the post-independence universities were established with the purpose of training personnel to manage the ‘development’ process of the newly independent African countries, their establishments were modeled on the patterns of Oxbridge and the Sorbonne (Mamdani, 1994)

Intellectuals produced in sub-Saharan Africa also known as the “educated African elite” from the strict sense of social production were a product of post colonialism. Even though educated individuals existed before the establishment of colonial educational system in Africa, these individuals were denied the agency by the colonial administration to produce or reproduce themselves (Mafeje, 1994). As a result of colonial domination of the politics, economics and educational systems of sub-Saharan African countries, indigenous African intellectuals had no option but to bow to the dominating system, and to serve it. Ideologically and culturally, the African intellectuals ended up becoming alienated from themselves and their own societies (Mazrui, 1994). Even though sub-Saharan African countries gained independence in the 1960s, their educational systems, especially their universities continue to reproduce graduates with uncritical westernized forms of thought. Ali Mazrui (1994) has this to say about African universities:

One paradox of the African university is that it is a champion of academic freedom but a transmitter of intellectual dependency. The African university was born as a subsidiary of a cultural transnational corporation-the Western academic establishment. The ‘lack of change’ in the conception of the transplanted
university caused a lot of changes in the attitudes, values and world view of its products. Since the university was so uncompromising to African cultures, its impact was more culturally alienating than it need have been. A whole generation of African graduates grew up despising their own ancestry, and scrambling to imitate others. It was not the traditional African that resembled the ape; it was more the Westernized one, fascinated by the West’s cultural mirror. (p. 119)

An important source of intellectual dependency of Africans south of the Sahara on the Western Europe is their inability to produce graduates and scholars using their local languages as the medium of curriculum instruction and learning. Almost all sub-Saharan African intellectuals conduct their most sophisticated conversations in European languages-English, French or Portuguese. Their most complicated thinking is also done in European language. The linguistic dependence results in producing an intellectual and scientific dependency (Mazrui, 1994). In Japan and China for instance, they have developed their language to accommodate a wide range of intellectual and scientific discourse paving the way for the production of indigenous economists, medical doctors, engineers, physicists etc. In sub-Saharan Africa however, it is impossible to find a medical doctor or an economist who practices his profession in his local language. In deed Black African intellectuals operate within the paradigm of linguistic neo-colonialism (Mazrui, 1994).
Migration of sub-Saharan Professors abroad

Scholars have identified a variety of push and pull factors that stimulate or generate migration and immigration. African immigration to the United States is ignored in immigration studies literature. A variety of economic, political and social factors are identified as responsible for immigration (Horowitz, 1992; Watkins-Owens, 1996; Fuchs, 1992; Logan, 1992). These factors also generate the movement of African immigrants to the United States. In dilating on push and pull factors that stimulate migration Chen and Yang assert that, “favorable conditions in receiving country, such as high salaries, high living standards, good research conditions, and career opportunities, pull professional migrants to the recipient country while unfavorable conditions in the sending country push the highly trained to leave” (1998, p. 628).

Mamdani (1994) identifies two historical events in the late 1960s and 1970s that changed the relationship between sub-Saharan African states and their universities, subsequently changing the fortunes of their professors. The first event was the growing state authoritarianism, and the second was the growing fiscal crisis of these states. Growing state authoritarianism manifested in the take over of universities as national assets and stifling their autonomy. This turned university campuses to battle zones between governments who used brute force to squelch student agitation. By the late 1970s when budgetary crisis was beginning to stifle development efforts of many sub-Saharan states, governments shifted their rhetoric from ‘development’ to maintenance of ‘law and order’ resulting in the repression of student agitation on university campuses.
The reduction in bilateral aid and foreign investment to most sub-Saharan countries in the 1980s forced them to accept loans from international financial institutions with severe budgetary disciplinary conditions of structural adjustment programs. Part of the fiscal discipline was the demand to devalue national currencies. The devaluation programs cheapened exported raw materials and primary products and increased the quantum of local currency. Sustained devaluation however spurred inflation resulting in the erosion of the living standards of citizens including academicians. The experience of collapsing infrastructure, declining levels of services and heavier teaching loads with less to show for it forced institutions of higher learning to join other discontented salaried workers in the larger society to agitate higher living wages and better conditions of service. As the agitation on campuses grew, so also was the repressive tendency of governments resulting in the closure of many universities forcing professors to seek greener pastures abroad. It is at this juncture that the World Bank stepped onto the university scene in sub-Saharan Africa to become a key player. Its modus operandi was to offer the needed carrot of financial resources; and the stick of academic relevance and financial discipline (Mamdani, 1994; Ake, 1994).

The demise of socialism and the westernization of the Soviet empire was another major blow to the fortunes of sub-Saharan African professors forcing them to leave their motherland. The phasing out of the cold war diminished the political and strategic significance of Africa. The erosion of Africa’s significance in a unipolar world also diminished the need to buy off African intelligentsia and less need to make concessions to their political postures (Ake, 1994). The diminished condition in status and income
forced many African professors to consider the exit option. The exit option was the migration of more and more African academics to the West, especially to the U.S. as researchers and university professors.

**Racial identity of Africans in the U.S.**

This section provides a review of the literature on race and how racial identity was developed in the United States and how it is used to locate the individual on the social class and status hierarchy. The section provides an overview of how the race of the individual particularly Blacks in the United States is determined and how this determination becomes the yardstick for allocating them to their social class and measuring their capabilities. Although culturally differences exist between Blacks who are Americans as a result of slavery and Blacks who voluntarily migrated to the United States from Africa, the development of racial identity in the United States does not make this distinction. The construction of racial identity in the United States therefore has implications for sub-Saharan Africans who migrate to the United States.

Identifying people by race is a way of classifying people, usually by judging how closely their phenotype fits with the somatic norm images of what the different races “look” like (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). In the United States, having African-like features and dark skin color places one within the lower levels of the racial hierarchy (Keith & Herring, 1991; McDaniel, 1995; Telles & Murguia, 1990). As a social construct, the creation and development of race and its ideology in North America has its roots in European enslavement of the peoples of Africa (Drake, 1990; Smedley, 1993). Embedded in the race construct is the hierarchy of racial groups. Within this hierarchy, Africans
were on the bottom and Europeans on the top (Keith & Herring, 1991; McDaniel, 1995; Telles & Murguia, 1990; Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). Drake (1987) asserts that, “the system was justified by the deeply felt, and sometimes theologically sanctioned, belief that black people were born to serve white people” (p. 290). The slave was expected to be different from the master in physical appearance and the physical difference between the African and the European was therefore used as defining criteria of otherness.

Racial identification is a symbol of social status, and an important factor in the maintenance of group identification (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). Many scholars have demonstrated the close connection between racial identification and social status (Clark & Clark, 1939, 1940; Hoetink, 1962; Powell-Hopson & Hopson, 1988). Racial identity is believed to affect all racial groups within society in the same way but with different implications. An example of how racial identification has different implications is racial identification of Caucasian Americans with “Whiteness” as a confirmation of positive self-esteem among Americans of European origin. However, for African Americans this same cultural preference is a confirmation of their negative status within the society (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997).

The development of the U.S. racial system traces its roots to immigration (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). The early history of the United States shows that migrants from Western and Northern Europe constituted in the main the citizenry of the U.S. These were followed later by immigrants from Southern and Central Europe. These latter European immigrants were initially deemed undesirable and their “Whiteness” contested. Although immigrants do not come to America racially classified (Alba, 1990; McDaniel,
they are forced to assimilate as members of different racial groups because of racial stratification (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). While immigrants from Europe will typically be assimilated into “White” America, those from Africa would be assimilated into “Blacks”.

The major forms of social assimilation in the United States are cultural, physical and spatial (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997). In each of these types of assimilation, the African American is excluded (Hacker, 1992; Massey & Denton, 1993; McDaniel, 1995). African Americans are not being assimilated culturally, residually, or physically. They are not intermarrying as often as other groups, and residential segregation is increasing. The inability of African Americans to socially assimilate has implications for Africans from the motherland living in America. Although differences existed and continue to exist between Africans who immigrated to America and Africans who were brought as slaves, the power of monolithic view of the “Black race” persists (Butler, 1991 Du Bois, 1935; Horton, 1993; Bashi & McDaniel, 1997).

**African Professors in the U.S. Academe**

Minority faculty of color has contributed to the education of students in the United States for two centuries (Hendrix, 1995). However, there is paucity of research on the classroom experiences of professors of African extraction in the U.S., particularly being a minority group (Fordham & Ogbu 1986). Being black and functioning as a professional within an educational culture which is predominantly white has not attracted the interest of social scientists (Foster, 1990; Weinberg, 1997). As a result of the obvious omission of the classroom experiences, perspectives and pedagogical knowledge in
instructional and communication of Black professors, literature on United States education is found to be incomplete (Foster, 1990; Zelchner & Gore, 1990).

**Minority Faculty of Color in the U.S. Academe**

This section reviews the evolving literature on faculty of color teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities in the United States. The purpose of the review is to succinctly capture the salient themes that emerge from the body of literature on faculty of color, and to provide a detailed analysis of the multiple facets of their academic life. In the first segment of the paper, statistical overview of the various races and ethnicities that constitute American faculty is provided, followed by an analysis of how faculty of color is underrepresented in the academe. On the heels of the statistical overview is a discussion on the tension in the literature regarding whether the literature should focus on the challenges facing faculty of color as individuals or whether the focus should be on the structural and institutional challenges that hinder the progress of faculty of color in predominantly White colleges and universities. The first theme that captures my attention in the literature is the challenge of epistemological legitimacy faced by faculty of color. The next theme is the challenge of double consciousness with sub-themes of marginalization, biculturalism, code switching, and tokenism. Other major themes discussed include challenges to job satisfaction, experiences in teaching, and challenges to mentorship. The final theme is the issue of sexism and racism faced particularly by women faculty of color. I conclude by identifying what I perceive as gaps in the literature and the way forward.
**Statistical Overview**

The general demographic characteristics of the United States show that the country is highly diversified. The total population of the U.S. as at 2000 was 281,421,906. The breakdown of the population racially is stated as: White 69.1%; Black or African American 12.9%; Hispanic or Latino is 12%; American Indian and Alaska Native 1.5%; Asian 4.2%; and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander 0.3%; (2000, U.S. Census Bureau). Due to the different races that live alongside the dominant White race in the U.S., there is much discussion particularly on university campuses across the country to integrate diversity into student admissions, curriculum and instruction, and in faculty hire in order to reflect the diversity of talent among the races. According to Laden & Hagedorn (2000), one of the most visible and acknowledged demographic changes in higher education since the 1970s has been the increasing diversity of students. Many in higher education including presidents, chancellors, provosts, and deans value diversity because they believe that it captures the spirit and essence of freedom, equality, and justice, key values that United States stands for. According to Stanley (2006) 69% of faculty believes that universities value racial and ethnic diversity.

Although there is much rhetoric about diversity in higher education, and especially about a diversified faculty, concrete action has not matched the rhetoric. Available statistics indicate that minority faculty (African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders) are disproportionately low compared to their White counterparts (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The latest 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education
by the American Council on Education (ACE 2005) provides the following breakdown of full-time faculty in higher education, by Race/Ethnicity: Total percentage of full-time White faculty in higher education in 2001 was 81.7%. Total percentage of full-time Minority faculty in higher education in 2001 was 14.9%. The 14.9% of minority faculty broken down is as follows: African American 5.2%; Hispanic 3% Asian American including Pacific Islanders 6.2%; American Indian including Alaska Native 0.5%, and Foreign faculty 3.4%.

From the above statistics, it is clear that the percentage of minority faculty teaching in higher education are unfairly represented compared to their White counterparts. While minorities in America form 30% of the population, their representation among faculty of higher education is a meager 14.9%. On the other hand, while the population of the dominant White race is 69.1%, Whites constitute a whooping 81.7% of the population of faculty in higher education. The breakdown of the percentage of White faculty is as follows: White men 50.4%, and White women 31.3%. It is interesting to note that the proportion of White women faculty (31.3%) in higher education is even higher than the combined proportion of the population of minority races in America which stands at 30%. The disproportionately low numbers of minority faculty in higher education shown by the statistics undoubtedly leaves the impression that the dominant White race in America preaches diversity but in deed practices discrimination in the hiring of minority faculty. While the statistical numbers clearly infer hegemonic practices of domination by the White race in higher education, there is a strong tendency to believe that there is more to the story beyond the statistical figures.
**Challenges of Focus**

The literature on faculty of higher education reveals that unlike their White counterparts, there is paucity of national empirical research on the teaching experiences of minority faculty (Antonio, 2002; McGowan, 2000; Sadao, 2003; Turner & Meyers, 2000). Beyond researching the issues of recruitment and retention as barriers to faculty diversity, the value of faculty of color (African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders) to higher education has not been subjected to the same volume of research and debate (Antonio, 2002). Stanley (2006) asserts that there is a conspiracy of silence surrounding the experiences of faculty of color teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities. A major reason supporting the persistence of the conspiracy of silence is the lack of a critical mass of faculty of color in higher education who will champion the research agenda of faculty of color.

Available literature on minority faculty is plagued with the tension of focus. There is the tension of whether to focus on the individual faculty with regards to what minority faculty must do to survive in the academe or whether to focus on the structure of the academe- what the academe must do to recruit and enhance the critical mass of minority faculty (Johnsrud & Atwater, 1994). Two theoretical explanations are provided for this tension of focus. One explanation is that minorities are relatively newcomers into the academe and therefore need time to internalize the academe norms and standards. Once they internalize the norms and standards of the academe, they will be able to compete on an equal footing with their White counterparts (Johnsrud & Atwater, 1994).
I find this explanation re-echoing a popular cliché I have heard over and over again since I stepped foot in the U.S. The cliché states that America is a land of freedom and when you work hard you realize your dreams. The proponents of this cliché however do not take cognizance of the fact that the essence of freedom is framed by the dominant White population and culture to fit and benefit themselves and not other peoples. The framers of the U.S. constitution for instance, were all men and rich landlords. Their concept of freedom therefore was a reflection of their estate in life and not for men and women of other cultures. I therefore agree with Bernal & Villalpando (2002) who asserted that the popular claims that higher education is objective, meritocratic, color-blind, race-neutral, and provides equal opportunities, salaries and rank for all clearly do not hold up when analyzing the racial segregation and gender stratification of faculty in American colleges and universities (p. 170).

A study conducted by Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) on the “otherness” of minority faculty found that ethnic and minority faculty members do understand the norms, standards, and culture of the academe. Additionally, minority faculty are willing to accommodate majority faculty. Minority faculty also bring alternative perspectives and experiences which they expect majority faculty to also accommodate. Sadly, however, the White majority faculty do not honor minority perspectives and experiences, but rather denigrate them (p. 337). Considering the research findings of Johnsrud & Sadao, the argument that faculty of color are newcomers into the academe and are not able to understand the norms and standards of the academe is therefore unfounded.
The second explanation provided for the tension of what to focus on in researching faculty of color teaching experiences in the academe is that the academe is fundamentally a Eurocentric patriarchal institution. The norms, standards, and culture of the academe is framed by dominant White males consequently, they are not equally beneficial to minority faculty. The argument is therefore made that in order for minority faculty to succeed in the academe the causes of institutional racism must be identified and removed (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998).

My interpretation of the problem is that the racism faced by minority faculty in predominantly White colleges and universities is based more on “otherness” that is difference in skin color, and difference in visible physical structures of ethnicity/race than anything else. The reason for my assertion is based on the narrative of Karla Anhalt in Stanley (2006). In recounting her story, Karla indicated that people look at her in disbelief and are skeptical when she tells them that she is Mexican. Many question whether she should be counted as a minority faculty because by physical appearance, Karla has a fair skin, she has lost her foreign accent after staying in the U.S. for 15 years, and her name is of German origin (p. 42).

Challenges of Legitimate Epistemology

As I read the literature on faculty of color in the academe, the picture that kept forming in my mind’s eye was that of a tree engrafted with the branches of different fruit bearing plants. It was like an apple tree engrafted with mango, guava, pear, peach, and orange branches and fruits. The trunk of this apple tree which is the academe, I call Eurocentrism, and the apple it produces, I term White Anglo-Saxon values. The source of
nutrients of this apple tree is what I term Eurocentric epistemology. The engrafted branches are the African American, Latino, Native Americans, Hawaiian Islanders, and Asian faculties respectively. I see a struggle between the engrafted branches and the apple branch to define what legitimate knowledge in the academia is. Bernal & Villalpando (2002) succinctly pointed out the epistemological dilemma when they asserted that, “higher education in the United States is founded on a Eurocentric epistemological perspective based on White privilege and “American democratic” ideals of meritocracy, and individuality. This epistemological perspective presumes that there is only one way to knowing and understanding the world, and it is the natural way of interpreting truth, knowledge and reality” (p. 171). One of the challenges of faculty of color in a Eurocentric epistemological environment is the pressure to disregard their unique perspectives and experiences as sources of legitimate knowledge. Since the epistemological tradition of American higher education is based on the social history and culture of the dominant White race, scholarship produced by faculty of color grounded in their own racial history and culture is considered deficient and judged as biased and non-rigorous.

The findings of a study conducted by Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) captures what I see as challenges of the legitimacy of the epistemological perspectives of faculty of color. This is what they had to say,

The majority of the minority faculty members interviewed referred to a White Western orientation that they perceived as pervasive throughout the university an orientation in keeping with
the concept of elite racism that devalues any orientation that is not
Western or White. They saw the norms for performance and
success as determined from this narrow perspective. Both men and
women faculty described the university culture as driven by an
“elitist American viewpoint” that corresponds to “White Anglo-
Saxon values” perpetuated by “dominant White males. (p. 329)

The legitimacy that faculty of color faces with regards to epistemological
orientation is extended to research publications. The experiences of faculty of color show
that where they publish their research materials is used to determine the quality of their
research. According to Stanley (2006), the practice of evaluating research quality based
on where it is published is based on a socially constructed norm that benefits, in most
instances, majority White faculty (p. 723). Research articles published by minority
faculty in highly referenced or top-tier journals in one’s discipline are passed as good
research. On the other hand if for instance, a Hawaiian faculty does research that benefits
his community and decides to publish the research in a journal that can afford the
Hawaiian community access to the article, if the journal is not highly ranked or does not
appear on a Social Science Citation Index, the published article would be rejected as
lacking in rigor. This practice only leads me to agree with Bernal & Villalpando (2002)
that there is apartheid of knowledge in U.S. academia.

A common theme that runs through the literature is that Black women faculty and
other women of color are not accorded respect and recognition for their scholarship and
research agendas (Aguirre, 2000; Turner & Meyers, 2000). Mistakes made by women
minority faculty are unduly exaggerated (Edith & Njoki, 2005). According to Hollenshead & Thomas (2001) women faculty often come under pressure to change their research agendas to fit in with those of their units; colleagues have low expectation of them; they are under constant scrutiny by colleagues; and they have to work extra hard to be perceived as legitimate scholars. I capture here one of the stories in Hollenshead & Thomas (2001) to show the level of disrespect that women minority faculty suffer:

When I started teaching these courses-Chicano Literatures, U.S./Puerto Rican Literatures, Issues of Cultures in the U.S., and so on… one of my colleagues at one point talked to me and said, “You know…you should not continue doing this. You really should not enter this area of Latino Studies because that is very political, and before you know it, it’s going to be over…You really should just continue to do mainstream Latin American Literature.” And it made me think, “Well, why am I really doing this?” and I said, “Well, I really can’t change. I’m already too invested in it.” And I followed my heart…I said, “If I’m going to continue in academia, it has to be something that’s meaningful to me and to the students.” And I decided not to take his advice and to continue doing what I thought was right. (p. 171)

Challenges of Double Consciousness

From the literature, many faculty of color suffer from the clash of two cultures-the ethnic culture which encompasses where minority faculty was born and raised, and the
culture of the academia which is built on Anglo-Saxon values (Johnsrud & Sado 1998; Sado, 2003). The cultural clash that faculty of color experience in predominantly White academia is vividly captured by what W.E.B. Du Bois called “double consciousness.” Du Bois used this concept to refer to the complex identities of the “talented tenth,” the educated African American minority like himself who felt the alienation of the American system because of their awareness that their qualifications meant very little in a racist society. In explaining the concept of “double consciousness,” Du Bois (1903) penned the following:

After the Egyptian and Indian, the Greek and Roman, the Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world,--a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness,--an American, a Negro; two warring souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife,--this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and
truer self. In his merging, he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. (p. 3-4)

The concomitant result of the phenomenon of double consciousness experienced by minority faculty is marginalization. According to Park (1928), a marginal person is one who is:

A cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he has sought to find a place. He is a man on the margin of two cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated and fused. (p. 892)

In order for minority faculty to effectively negotiate the demands of the two competing cultures, they resort to what Sadao (2003) refers to as “code switching.” This process involves the application of parts of the two value systems to different situations as appropriate (p. 410). Faculty of color successfully balances their traditional beliefs and values with the university subculture in order to achieve success in their endeavors by becoming bicultural. Biculturalism is the achievement of adapting to the dominant culture enough to function effectively in it without sacrificing the belief systems of one’s ethnic group. It is a form of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity to the subtleties of discrimination and racism found in the dominant subculture of high education (Sadao,
I capture here the voice of one of the minority faculty—a Filipino-American in Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) study that depicts the phenomenon of double consciousness, biculturalism, and code switching:

One of our problems here is that we are on an island (Hawaii) and therefore we all have to get along with each other. Nobody rocks the boat. In Asian cultures, it is the thing that keeps everyone from going crazy—where the face-to-face confrontations are all very pleasant. But our problem as an American university in a Polynesian and Asian milieu is that we ourselves are somewhat schizophrenic. We are a Western university driven by questioning and difference of opinion. So, that, you have two sorts of value systems, two ways of operating, always somewhat at odds with one another. And there has to be some kind of compromise or compartmentalization where at some point you do this but you understand it as part of intellectual inquiry but you are not going to talk “stink” about somebody. And then when you get out of that mode and you are back with your friends, you observe the non-confrontational everybody-likes-everybody stuff that we do all the time. But I think one of our difficulties here is that Western-oriented faculty are uncomfortable, unwilling, or ignorant of compartmentalization. And I think those of us who are hyphenated Americans are certainly more practiced at it. I don’t know if we’re
any better. We are much more practiced because of the code
switching that you do one thing in public or when you’re in school
and when you go home you do something else. (p. 325)

While the literature points to the fact that White faculty considers faculty of color
negatively as the “other” and “outsider” who belong to the margins of a Eurocentric
academic subculture, Alfred (2001) asserts that African American female faculty do not
see marginalization as a negative thing but rather define the margin as a safe space to
withdraw to when the academic environment becomes disconcerting. Being abandoned to
the margins of society with the express intention of making you feel isolated and
unwanted becomes a rallying point for strength for African American women. This
example is worth emulating by all faculty of color. In transforming the margins to a
sanctuary for strength and resistance, hooks (1990) has this to say about marginality:

Marginality is much more than a site of deprivation; in fact… it is
also the site of radical possibility, a space of resistance. It was this
marginality that I was naming as a central location for the
production of a counter-hegemonic discourse that is not just found
in words but in habits of being and the way one lives. As such, I
was not speaking of a marginality one wishes to lose-to give up or
surrender as part of moving into the center-but rather of a site one
stays in, clings to even, because it nourishes one’s capacity to
resist. It offers to one the possibility of radical perspective from
which to see and create, to imagine alternatives, new worlds. (p. 149-150)

From the foregoing accounts, marginality becomes a dialectical construct. Within it lie both positive and negative forces. While the dominant White faculty use the construct negatively as an instrument of power and segregation, African American women faculty see it in a positive light—as an instrument of resistance and liberation from the domination of Eurocentric values and norms that impinge upon their culture.

**Challenges to Job Satisfaction**

In predominantly White colleges and universities where faculty of color are the “onlys” or “others” their level of loneliness and isolation is at much higher levels than their White counterparts. The isolation and loneliness is exacerbated by the low to nonexistent social and emotional support that they receive from their White counterparts. This issue is a barrier and challenge to their job satisfaction (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000). Below is an interview excerpt from the study of Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) highlighting the loneliness and isolation commonly experienced by faculty of color on predominantly White university campuses:

I have never in my life felt the coldness, the isolation and the… I don’t even have words to describe it. I know I was going to face problems. And I knew those problems were going to be significant. I thought that I was going to be strong enough and smart enough or whatever, to be able to conquer them. And maybe not only conquer them but to go beyond those problems. Oddly
enough, the technical problems I think I have solved. But I think the human warmth problems have no solution from my perspective. That’s what I find is lacking here… human warmth. People will say hello. People are extremely nice. In this college, there is this superficial level of camaraderie, but it’s very superficial. I think that you would have to be here five generations and still be an outsider. (p. 334)

According to Laden & Hagedorn (2000), faculty of color suffers unnecessary discomfort because of their distinct physical characteristics which stands out in a predominantly white campus. Sources of discomfort include, gestures, attitudes, stare, cuss words, verbal abuse, heckle, etc. Laden & Hagedorn asserts that in scholarly settings, the perceptible ethnic physical features and behaviors of faculty of color tend to be emphasized over their scholarly achievements (2000). The practice is to ensure that the superiority of White faculty is reinforced.

Faculty of color identified the issue of being perceived and treated as tokens as a major obstacles to their job satisfaction (Essien 2003; Johnsrud & Sadao, 2003). According to Essien (2003), as tokens, faculty of color are showcased on committees, panels, boards, etc, as representatives of their ethnic groups rather than on the merit of their professional competence. Tokenism is a practice by the dominant White faculty to strategically make minority faculty feel embraced. A closer look at the practice however reveals that the dominant White faculty uses tokenism to present a semblance of diversity while restricting access to advantaged positions. As one way that faculty of color
challenges and overcome marginalization, isolation and tokenism is the establishment of parallel institutions in the form of meetings and conferences to discuss the plight of faculty of color and to offer solutions (Essien 2003). Associated with tokenism is the constant pressure on faculty of color to play the role of multicultural expert (Johnsrud & Sadao, 2003). In this regard, faculty of color is forced to become a resource person and an expert on race related issues. This imposed role becomes a source of attraction to students of color to approach faculty of color for mentorship and help. Consequently, faculty of color ends up devoting more than necessary time to advising.

The literature shows that faculty of color are subject to higher levels of job-related stress than their White counterparts. According to Laden & Hagedorn, 2000), faculty of color perceive they are expected to work harder than White faculty, “or more simply put, work twice as hard to be treated as equal” (p. 61). Many faculty of color feel they are “always in the spotlight” and under constant scrutiny by their White colleagues (Turner & Myers, 2000, p. 90). The stress from scrutiny becomes unbearable when faculty of color serves on a number of frontline committees and targeted groups. In trying to understand the stress suffered by faculty of color teaching in predominantly white colleges and universities, I feel it is like being constantly followed by invisible eyes, looking over your shoulders to see whether your ways and actions live up to the almighty Eurocentric norm. That type of stress can be detrimental to the ability to perform effectively and one’s quality of health.

Getting tenured is a stressful process for all faculties. However, for faculty of color, the tenure process is one of the most stressful. It is the most stressful because it is a
process of getting a small group of people, mostly White men to decide whether you are
good enough to be admitted into the elite club of the professoriate (Stanley, 2006).
Faculty of color on tenure-track were expected to develop strategies to cope with the
many acts of politics and academic intrigue that goes on in their departments. Although
academic freedom is guaranteed to all faculties, but because the tyranny of silence is real
and anyone who attempts to rock the boat is promptly and firmly sanctioned, faculty of
color on tenure-track must use their freedom of speech frugally in order not to incur
negative evaluations when the time comes to go up for promotion. The stress of faculty
of color in predominantly white colleges and universities, especially the stress of the
process of tenure brings to mind one of the sayings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau that, man is
born free, but everywhere he/she is in chains. It is indeed saddening that in the land
widely acclaimed on earth as a bastion where individual rights and freedoms are
guaranteed the most, faculty of color should unfairly sacrifice some of their freedoms in
order to successfully go through the tenure process and receive their promotion.

The literature indicates that limited opportunities for advancement through the
ranks have been recorded for every faculty of color except for Asian Pacific Americans
(Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Turner & Myers, 2000). The implication being that other
minority faculty (African American, American Indians, and Latinos) are more likely to
be concentrated at the lower levels of the professoriate. Turner & Myers (2000)
concluded that tenure and promotion may be especially problematic for faculty of color.
They reported that many faculty of color were either told outright or indirectly that they
did not fit “the profile” when they were not reappointed or denied tenure or promotion (p.
The report also indicated that some faculty of color were advised to relocate to other institutions, presumably to institutions of lower status with perceived lower standards where tenure and promotion for faculty of color might be more likely. I find no other name to call this practice but to label is rightfully so, as blatant racism in the academe.

In dealing with factors that promote job satisfaction among faculty of color the literature points to intellectual challenge as the most important component. Other factors include, autonomy and independence in the workplace; developing a meaningful philosophy of life; followed by promoting racial understanding; and being able to help others in difficulty (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000). In seeking to understand why faculty of color consider intellectual challenge as a vital component in job satisfaction, I came to the conclusion that isolation and marginalization deprives faculty of color the environment of collegiality where ideas, insights, concepts, and scholarship can be discussed, and improved upon. The absence of “iron to sharpen iron” in this case the unavailability of majority White faculty to their minority counterparts to engender healthy intellectual discourse creates the void of intellectual stimulation among faculty of color.

**Teaching Experiences**

Faculty of color consider their teaching experiences in higher education classrooms as different from the experiences of their White counterparts (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Turner 2002). In Turner (2003) faculty of color describe teaching as a source of great satisfaction and accomplishment. However, these same faculty also speak about the challenges they encounter in the classroom from students and peers who
question not only their intelligence but their very presence as professors of color. According to McGowan (2000) the experiences of faculty of color inside and outside the classroom include: students reporting complaints about curriculum and instructional matters directly to the faculty member or to a higher authority figure such as the head of department or dean; negative behaviors and attitudes of students; challenges to their authority, expertise, and having lower level of respect for faculty of color. Additionally, most faculty of color experience negative evaluations of their teaching by students because of their ethnicity and teaching style. Studies on African American faculty classroom experiences in predominantly white colleges and universities specifically reported instances of White students directly challenging the authority of African American faculty in the classroom (Stanley et al. 2003; McGowan, 2000). In the Stanley et al. (2003) study, one participant stated that:

To be challenged in a classroom about things that I knew, that you could find out about in any library, was really about my authority, because I was Black. I realized that, because my (White) colleagues who were the same age as I was didn’t have the same kinds of problems. (p. 162)

McGowan, (2000) also reported similar incidences in her study. According to her:

There appears to be greater incidences of students challenging African American faculty members’ validity, many times aggressively noting minor flaws and stating the exception to each
generalization…The students frequently engaged in power struggles with the instructor, thus interfering with the students’ ability to focus on the teaching and learning process. (p. 21)

Faculty of color who teach multicultural courses in predominantly white colleges and universities face additional resistance and challenge from White students. White students frequently question the necessity and or the validity of such courses (Stanley et al., 2003).

The presence of faculty of color in predominantly white colleges and universities forces White students to confront their unconscious racial biases and prejudices. This psychological confrontation makes most White students feel uncomfortable and hence their negative reactions. According to McGowan (2000), while White students challenge the expertise of African American faculty many times, there were also frequent complaints from White students that the expectation of African American faculty regarding classroom performance was too high. Students frequently rebelled because they feel that African American faculty standards are too high and do not match that of White faculty (p. 21). I find the negative and contradictory behavior of White students against faculty of color in predominantly white colleges and universities as a concerted effort to put down, to harass, and to force minority faculty out of predominantly white educational institutions. In most cases, the persistent belittling and harassment affects the morale of faculty of color. The constant power struggle and undermining of the authority of African American faculty by White students most often results in African American
faculty choosing to discontinue with their teaching profession in predominantly white colleges and universities (McGowan, 2000).

**Challenge of Mentorship**

Diversifying faculty goes beyond hiring faculty of color. Integral to the concept of diversity in the academe is the incorporation of faculty of color through retention and empowerment (Essien, 2003). For faculty of color to be incorporated into the academe, a nurturing environment must be created to mentor to the strengths and weaknesses of the new faculty. The nurturing environment must have a climate that fosters a sense of belonging and community. It must have significant others who will polish the strengths of the new faculty and work towards the elimination of the weaknesses of the new member. Considering the fact that mentoring is essential to professional development one wonders whether in predominantly white colleges and universities faculty of color enjoy a nurturing and mentoring environment. Turner & Myers (2000) asserts that there is minimal guidance and mentoring of faculty of color toward reappointment, tenure, and promotion. According to Essien (2003) invisible barriers in the form of subtle and indirect actions and omissions are prevalent in predominantly white colleges and universities that undermine the personal and professional development of faculty of color. A catalog of some of these invisible barriers to incorporation and career advancement include: faculty of color being asked to teach low-status courses; being burdened with committee work that is trivialized in tenure decisions; being left out of the information loop; failure to credit publications in specialty focus journals as viable scholarship; being denied promotion because of one’s minority status delay or denial of
research funding; and encouraging visiting faculty to teach courses in competition with those offered by faculty of color (p. 68-69).

The literature on the other hand shows that many faculty of color had mentors who helped shape their scholarly development in the academe. Faculty of color who had the benefit of mentorship were helped with teaching and research, and to be good citizens. The mentoring process enabled faculty of color to develop a presence of leadership in their respective fields. Some faculty of color had mentors outside their disciplines, some in their home institutions, some benefited from cross-race mentoring, and others had same-race mentoring (Stanley, 2006). Stanley (2006) cites the following narrative to show the impact that mentorship had on the professional development of faculty of color:

I often reach back to a traditional value that many Latinos hold dear, the idea of community or “familia.” Even where the number of Latinos or faculty of color is slim, seek out a diverse network of committed teachers. They not only provide you with an extra set of eyes and ears for the classroom; they can also provide you with the type of honest feedback both you and your students require to succeed. While senior White faculty cannot address all the dilemmas encountered by Latinos, many have successfully navigated troublesome classroom waters. You owe it to yourself to avail yourself of their considerable knowledge and experience. Everyone talks a good talk about diversity. Look to those
colleagues (White as well as colleagues of color) who are doing
the work and walking the talk. (p. 712)

I find the pieces of advice in this narrative very enlightening indeed. I will take
this to heart and endeavor to practice this if I find myself in an American
classroom.

Challenges of Sexism and Racism

Women faculty of color face additional challenges because of their gender. The
literature reveals that women faculty in predominantly white colleges and universities
suffer from a type of invisible marginality for being women and being women of color.
The literature refers to this type of challenge faced by women faculty as the double-bind
syndrome (Alfred, 2001; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). In explaining the double-bind
syndrome Turner (2002) states:

Unfortunately, the lives of faculty women of color are often
invisible, hidden within studies that look at the experiences of
faculty of color. Women of color fit both categories, experience
multiple marginality and their stories are often masked within
these contexts. (p. 75-76)

The latest 21st Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education by the
American Council on Education (ACE 2005) provides the following statistics on the
number of full professors by race in the academe in 2001 as follows: White men 68.3%,
White women 19.7%, African American men 8.6%, African American women 2.6%,
Hispanic men 1.9%, Hispanic women 1.4%, Asian men 4.9%, Asian women 0.9%,
American Indian men 0.2%, and American Indian women 0.1%. The statistics show that women faculty of color are underrepresented in the academe. From the statistics one can also infer that not only is race a challenge to success in the academe, but more also, sexism is a bigger challenge for women.

Turner (2002) asserts that the lives of faculty women of color are filled with lived contradictions and ambiguous empowerment (p75). Even when faculty women of color obtain academic positions such as tenure, they often confront situations that limit their authority. Turner (2002) used the following narrative as an example of the phenomenon of ambiguous empowerment experienced by faculty women of color:

I’m the department chair, and I meet with a lot of people who don’t know me-you know, prospective students and their parents.

And I know that their first reaction to me is that I’m an Asian American woman, not that I’m a scientist or that I’m competent.

(p. 75)

In addition to the above challenges that face women faculty of color because of their gender, the literature also report other experiences of being ignored and their scholarship devalued, feeling isolated and grossly disrespected, their gender discounted, being torn between family, community, and career; and their authority and expertise challenged often by White students (Turner, 2002).

**Conclusion**

In reviewing the literature on faculty of color teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities in America, I observed that no mention is made about foreign
faculty who are not Caucasians. The literature distinctly defines faculty of color as African American, Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, Native Alaskan, and Pacific Islanders in the academe. It however leaves out faculty of color such as international faculty from Africa. While the literature is silent on foreign faculty they are however documented in the latest 21st Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education by the American Council on Education (ACE 2005) as part of the minority faculty. According to ACE (2005), foreign faculty form 3.4% of the U.S. professoriate.

Since the experiences of foreign faculty of color in the American academe are not necessarily the experiences of those captured by the literature, I am hopeful that future researches on faculty of color will embrace foreign faculty also. I intend to focus my doctoral dissertation on part of the gap in the literature by conducting my research on faculty from sub-Saharan Africa teaching at a Midwest predominantly White university. This I believe will be a giant step towards presenting a holistic picture of the experiences of all faculty of color in the U.S. academe.

If minority faculty born and bred in America are confronted daily with challenges of double consciousness, marginalization, biculturalism, tokenism, epistemological legitimacy, challenges to tenure, challenges to authority and expertise and the double-bind syndrome of racism and sexism, I am wondering how pervasive the challenges would be for faculty from sub-Saharan Africa. The least I can postulate is that their experiences will be a triple doze.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW CONTINUED: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Introduction

I propose to use two theoretical frameworks in my dissertation. These frameworks are Double Consciousness, and Marginal Man theory. I will trace the history; provide information on the major tenets of the frameworks; and proponents of these conceptual frameworks including the metamorphosis that the frameworks have undergone, if any. I will give examples of studies in which these theories have been applied and how I intend to apply them in my dissertation.

Double Consciousness: Historical Background

The literature indicates that before Du Bois ever used “double consciousness” the term was a figurative creation of European Romanticism and American Transcendentalism and by psychological research in the 19th Century (Bruce Jr., 1992; Allen Jr., 2003). Allen Jr. (2003) holds that the fascination with the concept of the double and divided self in Western Europe and the United States throughout the 19th Century had to do with the enormous challenges of spiritual and physical disorders experienced by individuals resulting from modernization: industrialization, urbanization, and corresponding changes in culture bringing about the formation of new modes of social organization (p. 28). Double consciousness as a term of Romanticism: a counter positioning of the quotidian to the preternatural, of everyday life to thoughts of the sublime, could be traced to oppositional constructs of Christianity especially to St. Paul’s emphasis on the tension between the flesh and the spirit (Allen Jr., 2003). I provide below
St. Paul’s discourse in the Epistles of Romans chapter 7 which vividly explicates the double consciousness phenomenon. In this scripture, St. Paul throws light on the agony of the war between two forces: good and evil incessantly going on within his body:

14 We know that the law is spiritual; but I am unspiritual, sold as a slave to sin. 15 I do not understand what I do. For what I want to do I do not do, but what I hate I do. 16 And if I do what I do not want to do, I agree that the law is good. 17 As it is, it is no longer I myself who do it, but it is sin living in me. 18 I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my sinful nature. For, I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out. 19 For what I do is not the good I want to do; no, the evil I do not want to do—this I keep on doing. 20 Now if I do what I do not want to do, it is no longer I who do it, but it is sin living in me that does it. 21 So I find this law at work: When I want to do good, evil is right there with me. 22 For in my inner being I delight in God’s law; 23 but I see another law at work in the members of my body, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of the law of sin at work within my members. 24 What a wretched man I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death? 25 Thanks be to God—through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I myself in my mind am a slave to God’s law, but in the sinful nature a slave to the law of sin. (NIV)
According to Bruce Jr. (1992), Emerson employed the term “double consciousness” in an essay in 1843 entitled “The Transcendentalist” to refer to a problem in the life of someone seeking a transcendental perspective on self and world. The problem of the transcendentalist is that, the individual is constantly being pulled back from the divine by the demands of daily life leaving him with only “moments of illumination”. Looking at his life from these “moments of illumination,” the individual realizes that his life is too much dominated by meanness and insignificance. This tension between the upward pull of communion with the divine and the downward pull by daily life is referred to by Emerson as double consciousness. According to Bruce Jr., Emerson explained the double consciousness phenomenon further by stating that, “the worst feature of this double consciousness is that, the two lives of the understanding and of the soul, which he leads, really show very little relation to each other: one prevails now, all buzz and din; the other prevails then, all infinitude and paradise; and, with the progress of life, the two discover no greater disposition to reconcile themselves” (p. 300).

In explaining how “double consciousness” was used in psychological research, Bruce Jr. (1992) asserted that the concept was used in 1817 in a New York professional journal called the Medical Repository. The title of the article in the journal was “A Double Consciousness or a Duality of Person in the same Individual.” The article chronicled the story of a young woman named Mary Reynolds who fell into a deep sleep at the age of 19 and woke up with no memory of who she was and with completely different personality. She again fell deeply asleep a few months later and woke up as her old self. This phenomenon of falling into deep sleep and waking up with one of two
personalities continued for a period of sixteen years. This case of having two distinctive selves made the editors in *Medical Repository* refer to Mary Reynolds case as “double consciousness” (p. 303). The use of the term to refer to the phenomenon of split personality remained largely constant in psychology throughout the 19th century (Bruce Jr., 1992; Allen Jr., 2003). Bruce Jr. (1992) further holds that “double consciousness” appeared in a psychology text published in 1890 entitled *The Principles of Psychology* written by Du Bois Harvard mentor William James during the period Du Bois was in Harvard. As indicated by Bruce Jr., the concept was a subject of extensive experimentation and debate in the medical field for at least seventy-five years before Du Bois used it.

Allen Jr. (2003) asserts that at the turn of the 19th Century, there were several versions of the “double consciousness” concept to the extent that some were overlapping and others were totally incompatible for Du Bois to draw upon while formulating his own unique framework (p. 28). Allen Jr. further explains that several literary figures in the 19th Century including Goethe, Emerson, William James, Henry David Thoreau, Robert Louis Stevenson, and George Eliot engaged in the discourse of using the concept to explain the phenomenon of the split personality. Allen Jr. further holds that the use of the concept by the above literary icons should not reduce the unique formulation of double consciousness by Du Bois to that of his predecessors (2003, p. 28). Having provided the historical background to the “double consciousness” concept, I will now turn my attention to Du Bois and his formulation of the framework.
Double Consciousness: Du Boisian Formulation


After the Egyptian and Indian, the Greek and Roman, the Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, — a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, — an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife, — this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merging he wishes neither of the older selves to
be lost. He would not Africanize America, for America has too much to teach the world and Africa. Who would not bleach his Negro soul in a flood of white Americanism, for he knows that Negro blood has a message for the world? He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American, without being cursed and spit upon by his fellows, without having the doors of Opportunity closed roughly in his face. This, then, is the end of his striving: to be a co-worker in the kingdom of culture, to escape both death and isolation, to husband and use his best powers and his latent genius. These powers of body and mind have in the past been strangely wasted, dispersed, or forgotten. The shadow of a mighty Negro past flits through the tale of Ethiopia the Shadowy and of Egypt the Sphinx. Throughout history, the powers of single black men flash here and there like falling stars, and die sometimes before the world has rightly gauged their brightness. Here in America, in the few days since Emancipation, the black man’s turning hither and thither in hesitant and doubtful striving has often made his very strength to lose effectiveness, to seem like absence of power, like weakness. And yet it is not weakness, — it is the contradiction of double aims. The double-aimed struggle of the
black artisan — on the one hand to escape white contempt for a
nation of mere hewers of wood and drawers (p. 2-4)

A close reading of Du Bois’s essay reveals the following tenet: a deep
psychological distress in the souls of African Americans. This overwhelming distress is
cased by the entrenched refusal by White America to acknowledge the humanity and
equality of Blacks. Du Bois uses his childhood school experience to explain how White
America has used race as a veil to differentiate and separate White Americans from
African Americans although both of them consider America their home. The essay goes
on to explain the futility of using academic excellence, excellence in sports including
boxing, and even hatred to take away from Whites their privileged position: dazzling
opportunities. Du Bois compares the futility of effort to overcome the White separation as
living in a straight, narrow, tall, and unscalable prison-house. Drawing on seven as the
number of perfection, Du Bois refers to the Negro as the seventh son, the perfect human
being with the gift of second-sight, to appreciate reality both from the African and
American perspectives.

Despite the unique gifting of African Americans, Du Bois laments over how the
measuring tape of the hegemonic socially constructed worldview of White America is
used to denigrate Africans by forcing them to see themselves as inferior human beings.
This knowing within the educated African that they are perfect human beings, as opposed
to the internalized socially constructed and quotidian position of the dominant White
race, that the Black man is inferior results in what Du Bois refers to as “double
consciousness.” As an educated colored person in America, one is ever conscious of two-
ness: an American, a Black; two souls; two thoughts; two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals all in one body. There is the tendency to be cursed and spit upon as an African, and doors of opportunity roughly closed in your face if you strive to be equal. There is also the potential of isolation and death if you desire as an African to co-construct the American way of life. Finally, despite the deep unquenchable hunger in the heart of the African American to use his unique gifting of second-sight of being African and American, to evolve into a higher self for the benefit of the world, the world looks on un-cooperatively with contempt and pity.

Allen Jr. (2003) holds that Du Bois formulated the concept of double consciousness for tactical political reasons. According to Allen Jr., Du Bois introduced the double consciousness concept in 1897 as part of the strategy of African American freedom struggle to place a small but growing educated black elite in charge of fighting for African American civil and political rights which was being threatened by the imposition of segregation in all corridors of southern life during the last quarter of the 19th century. During this period, Blacks were being stripped of fundamental vestiges of respect as human beings, and there were signs of evil maneuvers to create signs and mores that would fix in perpetuity the social and political inferiority of Blacks. This was also a period when the self-respect of African Americans was severely tested and seeds of despondency and self-doubt have gripped most African Americans. The task of the Black elite referred to as the “Talented Tenth” of the Negro race was that they become the leaders of the thought and missionaries of the culture among African Americans. These leaders were to be backed by their communities and given the power to exercise such
weapons as the experience of the world has taught and are indispensable for human progress (p. 34).

**Double Consciousness: Some Applications in the Literature**

Njubi (2002) holds that when Du Bois penned the double consciousness framework he was not thinking about the African American race in general but was reflecting on the multiple identities of the “talented tenth,” the educated elite like Du Bois himself who were conscious of their alienation because of the realization that their qualifications, their gifts, their second sight, meant very little in a racist society. Njubi further asserts that the double identity phenomenon described by Du Bois as “two-ness” is even more applicable to African exiles in the West today because of the loose social and cultural ties they have with the West than Afro-Europeans and African Americans. Njubi is of the view that African intellectuals in the West are closer to the African “souls” Du Bois refers to and are therefore prone to feel the pervasive racism and second class status accorded to Blacks in the West. Njubi identifies the way Africans at home see African intellectuals living and working abroad as a significant contribution to the severity of the double consciousness suffered by African intellectual living in the West. In recording the perception of Africans at home, Njubi has this to say:

This duality is intensified by the sense of alienation and guilt engendered by the widespread demonization of exiles as selfish and ungrateful wretches who escape to greener pastures as soon as they get their degrees instead of using their education to uplift the
poverty stricken societies that educated them at great expense.

(2002, p. 2)

To be an African in Europe or in America is to be an inferior human species to be treated with contempt and pity. According to Njubi (2002), the socially constructed perspective of the inferiority of the African is written in the faces of loathsome waitresses, it is manifested in the behavior of the teacher who slams the door of opportunity in your face, the policeman who treats you like a criminal, and the news reporter who floods the electronic media with stereotypical images of Africa with explicit intentions of poisoning and reinforcing racial inferiority of Africans. To be an African hailing from the continent and living in the West means the loss of one's ethnic identity and the subsequent entry into the hegemonic Westernized socially constructed African race of the subservient, the lazy, and the primitive. A Black African from the continent of Africa suffers from the syndrome of double-bind in the mist of descendants of African slaves in the West. Sharing common physical features and skin color does not ensure understanding and guarantees equality but rather, coming from the continent becomes a source of differentiation, disparagement, and competition.

In an article, *The Double Politics of Double Consciousness: Nationalism and Globalism in The Souls of Black Folk*, Vilashini (2005) used the Du Boisian double consciousness to show how the politics of nationalism and globalization overlaps and intertwines with each other. The writer argues that there is a striking simultaneity between the outer territories of domestic and world politics on the one hand, and racism at the national level with global racism on the other. This simultaneity of racism at the
national and global level calls for the study of the system of politics using the double consciousness paradigm. Double consciousness demands the discernment not only of warring identities of an American versus a Negro, but also of a set of competing and colluding discourses: the biological argument of race and the cultural, the socially constructed paradigm of race and the psychic, the material and the allegorical, the historical and the spiritual, the national and the global, the forward-moving plot of racial progress and the backward-moving gaze of racial memory, all paradoxically, explosively, condensed into the fraught figure of the black man in America (p. 306).

In a study entitled “Two Warring Ideals”: Double Consciousness, Dialogue, and African American Patriotism Post-9/11 Shaw (2004) used the theory of double consciousness to explore African American expressions of patriotism after the events of 9/11/2001. The voices of 87 students from a large Midwest, public university were sampled in a quasi-experimental focus group design. Shaw holds that African Americans experienced the Du Boisian concept of double consciousness in their attempt to settle within American society. Even after manumission Blacks were still being denied full rights as citizens by the “veil” of race and racism although they were using their gifts of “second sight” to contribute to America’s progress. As a result of the structured racism and inferior positions assigned African Americans, their expressions of patriotism was affected.

According to Shaw (2004), there are two types of African American patriotism: the invested patriotism and the iconoclastic patriotism. The invested patriots hold the belief that their invested Black labor, loyalty, and culture might one day be rewarded
with full racial equality. The iconoclastic patriots of whom Du Bois is one, on the other hand believe that Blacks must reject traditional forms of patriotism and instead display devotion by fundamentally challenging American racism. These two patriotic beliefs according to Shaw (2004) reflect the “American” versus “Black” duality of double consciousness post 9/11. Since 9/11 presented an exceptional opportunity for American solidarity across racial and cultural lines and has temporarily eroded the racial barrier of Du Bois “veil” it was an opportune time to test whether the African American has “merged his double self into a better and truer self.” The findings of the study revealed that African Americans were the least among the races sampled to have engaged in symbolic patriotic behaviors after 9/11. They were also the highest to consider their ethnic identities as more important than their American identities.

**Application of Double Consciousness to the Study**

My research samples are Black professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching in a predominantly White university in America. Like Du Bois and the small group of the “talented tenth” of African Americans, the Black professors from sub-Saharan Africa are intellectuals who could be counted as the “talented tenth” from the continent of African. They are migrants in America: while some are here by their own preference, others have been forced by pressures within their respective countries to migrate to the U.S. The push factors resulting in the migration of most of the African professors could be equated to the very forces on the continent that sold our forefathers into slavery. The African professor is a product of post-colonial Africa with all the trappings of Westernized intellectual epistemology, a situation similar to the African American intellectual a
product of manumission and American intellectual epistemology. The African professor has been trained in the rigors of Western scholarship and has this to offer including invaluable lessons from his African cultural background just as the “talented tenth” of African Americans have a gift to offer America as a result of their “Africanness” and American education. The African professor falls within the same racial category as the African American in White America because of their skin color and physical features.

Due to the above similarities between the African professor and the African American “talented tenth” I hypothesize that the African professor will be cast in the same racial paradigm as the African American intellectual. Consequently, the unique gifts of the African professor would be denigrated just as the African American intellectual. The same socially constructed racial barriers “the veil” that confronts African American intellectuals would be in the path of African professors, and just as these barriers prevent African American intellectuals from being assimilated into White positions of power and privilege, the same fate will befall African professors. I further hypothesize that as African professors see doors of opportunity shut in their face and are discriminated against, they will be forced to see themselves from the perspective of hegemonic White America. The internalization of this hegemonic social paradigm would result in psychological experiences of two-ness: two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body. The point of departure between the African professor and the African American intellectual is that while the African professor is coming from a superior estate as a free man who was never physically enslaved in Africa to take a subservient position in America, the case of the
African American intellectual is that he is a product of slavery and emancipation who is being rejected by the “slave master” to dine at the same table.

In light of the above hypothesis, I would be interested in my dissertation to find out how these hypothesis plays out in the lived experiences of the African professors especially in the following areas:

- Classroom teaching experiences
- Experiences with colleagues and mentors if any
- Experiences of tenure, promotion, and scholarship
- University community social life experiences
- Experiences based on cultural difference
- Experiences based on racial difference
- Experiences based on being a woman faculty

The Marginal Man Theory: Evolution

Robert E. Park originally postulated the marginal man concept. He formulated the concept as a result of his interest in issues of human migration, clash of cultures, amalgamation and assimilation. According to Park (1928), migration distinct from mere human movement is a social phenomenon which involves breaking of home ties, customs, loyalties, and loosening of local bonds with the concomitant effect of creating an individualized person and secularizing societal relations which were formally sacrosanct. The person who migrates becomes an emancipated person to an extent and “learns to look upon the world in which he was born and bred with something of the detachment of a stranger” (p. 888). While migration for various reasons takes place with
comparable ease and speed, the process of acculturation, assimilation, and amalgamation does not occur smoothly and at the same pace, especially when there are wide gaps between the cultures of the peoples. Park (1928) asserts that the inability of cultures and races to smoothly and quickly assimilate and amalgamate is a cause of racial problems.

In explaining how a migrant becomes a marginal man, Park (1928) used the Jews of Europe as a point of departure to explain the phenomenon. He explained:

Jews never were a subject people, at least not in Europe. They were never reduced to the position of an inferior caste. In their ghettos in which they first elected, and then were forced to live, they preserved their own tribal traditions and their cultural, if not their political, independence. The Jew who left the ghetto did not escape; he deserted and became that execrable object, an apostate. The relation of the ghetto Jew to the larger community in which he lived was, and to some extent still is, symbiotic rather than social. When however, the walls of the medieval ghetto were torn down and the Jew was permitted to participate in the cultural life of the peoples among whom he lived, there appeared a new type of personality, namely, a cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now
sought to find a place. He was a man on the margin of two
cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated
and fused. The emancipated Jew was, and is, historically and
typically the marginal man, the first cosmopolite and citizen of the
world. (p. 892)

In elaborating further on the concept, Park (1928) explained that moral dichotomy
and conflict is a characteristic of the immigrant who is in contact with the newer culture.
The migrant on the margins suffers from a relatively permanent inner turmoil and intense
self-consciousness. “Ordinarily, the marginal man is a mixed blood, like the Mulatto in
the United States or the Eurasian in Asia, because the man of mixed blood is one who
lives in two worlds, in both of which he is more or less a stranger. The Christian convert
in Asia or in Africa exhibits many if not most of the characteristics of the marginal man-
the same spiritual instability, intensified self-consciousness, restlessness, and malaise” (p.
983). It is in the mind according to Park where the conflict of culture, inner moral
turmoil, and fusion occur (1928).

Everett V. Stonequist was the next to elaborate on Park’s marginal man
conceptual framework. He defined the marginal man as:

The individual who lives in, or has ties of kinship with, two or
more interacting societies between which there exists sufficient
incompatibility to render his own adjustment to them difficult or
impossible. He does not quite ‘belong’ or feel at home in either
group. (1942, p. 279)
While Stonequist kept to Park’s general framework, he elaborated on and provided additional elements. Like Park, Stonequist situates the problem of the marginal man in the clash of cultures-bicultural or multicultural. Stonequist also uses the person with mixed blood to typify the marginal man concept. He however warns that his use of mixed race as a basis of analyzing the marginal man is only incidental. According to Stonequist (1935) “racial hybrid is likely to be a marginal character, not because of his mixture of blood viewed as a biological fact, but because his mixture places him in a certain social situation” (p. 7). People with mixed blood face cultural conflict and racial prejudice. They are pulled in two directions because by their biological constructs, they have to identify with two or more groups. A sense of superiority of one culture and race is counterbalanced by a sense of inferiority of the other. There is pride and shame; love and hate, and this divided attention and loyalty creates a feeling of ambivalence. As the dialectical process of responding to the two cultures is reproduced again and again, the racial status of the individual is continually called into question resulting in a heightened level of sensitivity, self-consciousness, race-consciousness, indefinable malaise, inferiority, and various compensatory mechanisms. As result of the psychological turmoil, the individual displays a dual personality akin to double consciousness described by Du Bois:

The Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, — a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-
consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, — an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (p. 6)

Stonequist however drew a distinction between Du Bois “double consciousness” and the marginal man theory. According to him, double consciousness refers to the process of habitually seeing oneself reflected in the attitude of others to the extent that you become unaware. The experience of the marginal man on the hand is such that the individual is looking simultaneously in two looking-glasses, and these two mirrors present a different image of the individual. The individual becomes conscious of the entire process unfolding before him: conscious of the clash of the two images, conscious of the two mirrors (1935, p. 7).

Stonequist provides two distinctive features of the marginal man concept. The first is that the concept represents a process of abstraction, core psychological traits which are inner correlates of the dual pattern of social conflict and identification. Variation in social conflict determines whether the person is oriented around the problem. Where the social conflict is intense and of a long duration, the individual exhibits a personality trait and is oriented around the problem and his mood is reshaped but, where the problem is minor, the individual does not exhibit any personality traits. The second distinctive feature is the existence of a life-cycle where individual traits very
with the stage of development. Stonequist identified three life-cycle stages. The first stage is when the individual is introduced into the two cultures. At this stage, the individual is not aware of the presence of two cultures and therefore encounters a level of assimilation. This stage is usually confined to childhood. The second is the crisis stage where the individual experiences cultural clashes and becomes rudely aware of the competing and conflicting cultures. The clash of the cultures produces shock, confusion, restlessness, disillusionment, and a divided personality resulting in the development of a new consciousness to reflect the new reality. The third stage involves a permanent resolution of the cultural conflict.

In reviewing the marginal man theory as postulated by Park and elaborated on by Stonequist, Goldberg (1941) redefined the theory as:

When an individual is shaped and molded by one culture is brought by migration, education, marriage, or other influence into permanent contact with a culture of a different content, or when an individual from birth is initiated into two or more historic traditions, languages, political loyalties, moral codes, or religions, then he is likely to find himself on the margin of each culture, but a member of neither. (p. 52)

Goldberg asserted that apart from individual migrants experiencing marginality, the phenomenon could also be found among groups. Goldberg therefore introduced the concept of “marginal culture” an anthropological term which also meant “marginal area.” Goldberg defined marginal area as “a region where two cultures overlap and where the
occupying group partakes of the traits of both cultures” (1941, p. 52). In distinguishing between marginal individual from marginal groups Goldberg said that:

If the so-called “marginal” individual is conditioned to his existence on the borders of two cultures from birth, if he shares this existence and conditioning process with a large number of individuals in his primary groups, if his years of early growth, maturation, and even adulthood find him participating in institutional activities manned largely by other “marginal” individuals like himself, and finally, if his marginal position results in no major blockages or frustrations of his learned expectations and desires, then he is not a true “marginal” individual in the defined sense, but a participant member of a marginal culture. (p. 53)

In his seminal paper titled, Toward A Refinement Of The “Marginal Man” Concept Antonovsky (1956) gave the “marginal man” a fresh outlook by referring to marginality as a social situation with the following characteristics:

1. Two cultures (or subcultures) are in lasting contact.
2. One of them is dominant in terms of power and reward potential.

This is the non-marginal culture of the two. Its members are not particularly influenced by or attracted to the other, the marginal culture.
3. The boundaries between the two are sufficiently permeable for the members of the marginal culture as well as that of their own.

4. These patterns, in their entirety, cannot be easily harmonized.

5. Having acquired the goals of the non-marginal culture, members of the marginal group are pulled by the promise of the greater rewards offered.

6. The barriers between the two tend to be hardened by discriminating from the one side and by pressure against “betrayal from the other”

7. Marginality acquires particular intensity when the clash persists through more than one generation. (p. 57)

Critiquing Stonequist, Dickie-Clark (1966) held that Stonequist’s elaboration of the marginal man makes it easy to become confused over whether “being a marginal man” means being in a marginal situation. The source of the confusion is traced to Stonequist’s inability to stress that marginal situation involves being excluded from a system of group relations, but rather emphasizing the seriousness of the psychological effects of marginality on the individual, knowing that the effects vary in severity and can be vague (p. 364). Antonovsky, 1956 hold that “marginal man” should be distinguished from the “marginal situation.” Marginal situation is a place of low status, subordination and inferiority assigned to the marginal man by the dominant, the powerful and the privileged. It involves placing socially constructed barriers in the way of the marginal individual to prevent him from enjoying the privileges and freedoms of the dominant
social system. Dickie-Clark (1966) defines the marginal situation as “those hierarchical situations in which there is any inconsistency in the rankings in any of the matters falling within the scope of the hierarchy” (p. 367). Examples of marginal situations include: caste and caste-like societies based on skin color; apartheid system as practiced in South Africa also based on color of skin; and the Trokosi system in West Africa based on religious patriarchy. Being in a marginal situation therefore has nothing to do with being a biologically mixed race, and or suffering psychologically from “double consciousness” (Dickie-Clark, 1966).

**The Marginal Man Theory: Some Application in the Literature**

In his study, *Marginal Men on an American Campus: A case of Chinese Faculty*, Seagren (1994) used the refined conceptualization of the marginal man theory by Antonovsky to analyze the marginality of some Chinese professors teaching selected American universities. These professors left China due to repressive tendencies of the government to pursue the American dream; the prevailing conditions in China discourage them from returning; due to communist ideological focus on workers, intellectuals are held in contempt; academic freedom is suppressed; remuneration packages are poor; and opportunities for research, scholarship, and professional development are limited. The study explored the marginality encountered by Chinese professors at a Midwest university. The social situations that gave rise to their marginality were identified; and the impact of marginality on the personality of the professors, and the compensatory mechanisms that the professors developed to cope with the marginal social situations were described.
Weisberger (1992) in his study, *Marginality and Its Directions* reconstructed Park’s original concept of marginality to yield a more complex general theory of marginality. Weisberger asserts that Park believed marginality resulted when individuals in migrant groups are barred by prejudice from complete acceptance into a dominant culture. He however argues that the marginal person having taken on elements of the dominant culture is also unable to return unchanged to his or her original group. The marginal person is therefore caught in a structure of double ambivalence: unable to leave or to return to the original group; unable to merge with the new group or to distance from it. Marginal persons typically react to this field of cross-cutting pressures in four directions: assimilation, return, poise, and transcendence. German Jewry of Wilhelmine era was used to test the marginality theory. According to Weisberger (1992) application of the theory resolved some of the salient difficulties attending efforts to understand post-emancipation German Jewry.

Yael (1989) applied the marginal man theory in a study titled *Change of Values during Socialization for a Profession: An Application of the Marginal Man Theory*. According to Yael, Social work is a marginal profession, ranking between a white-collar occupation and a full-fledged profession. When the training toward such a profession is part of a well-established academic organization and students at the school come from a lower socio-economic background than those who choose other academic fields, the marginality is accentuated. The marginal-man theory therefore offers an explanation of the attitude changes undergone by social work students during socializing at a university-based professional school.
It was found that in each stage of their professional socialization, the (marginal) Socializees adopted the values of the dominant group. Thus, while at the university, the social work students adopted the attitudes prevalent in the academic subculture (represented by social science students). Upon graduation, the young social workers changed their attitudes and adopted attitudes similar to those held by other members of their professional subculture, i.e., veteran social workers and supervisors. Each of these attitude changes were interpreted as attempts to cope with the marginal situation (Yael, 1989).

**Application of Marginal Man Theory to Study**

The premise for using the Marginal Man theory to explain the immigrant status of African professors at a Midwest predominantly White university is based on the following: The African professors at the site of this study migrated to America with aspirations to pursue the American dream. America has become the dominant culture in terms of power and reward potential in their lives and the cultures of their home countries have become the marginal culture. Factors that pulled them to America include:

1. Low regard for intellectuals. Most sub-Saharan African countries continue to be ruled by military men turned politicians or individuals whose academic backgrounds lack rigorous intellectual acumen. Their inability to articulate and engage in complex critical thinking processes when it comes to dialogue on national economic and good governance issues makes them perceive the dissenting voice of intellectuals especially professors on university campuses as a threat to their rule. Many a university in sub-Saharan Africa has been closed down because professors voiced their opinion on issues
of national economy and good governance. It is not uncommon to find intellectuals in sub-Saharan Africa labeled with such demeaning tags as “book long people”. Meaning all that intellectuals know is to sit in their ivory towers called universities and pontificate long discourses.

2. Suppression of academic freedom. Most sub-Saharan universities were either closed down or their autonomy taken over directly by government in order to squelch academic freedom and muffle divergent opinions and the right of individual to expression.

3. Low remuneration. Many university teachers in sub-Saharan Africa are poorly paid compared to their colleagues who work in public corporations, and their counterparts elsewhere in the world.

4. Lack of research facilities. Higher educational institutions in sub-Saharan Africa do not have libraries that can boast of books that are abreast with the times. They also lack modern laboratories where any meaningful scientific research projects are carried out. Any serious intellectual who wants to be an expert in his field must live and work in a technologically advanced country to pursue his dream.

5. Lack of professional development opportunities. Almost all sub-Saharan African countries are considered highly indebted and poor. They therefore do not have the financial resources to support the academic development of their university professors. Funds to travel to academic conferences are hard to find. The institutions of higher learning also lack effective communication technology such as internet and computers to connect with the outside world.
Although these professors now live in America, they continue to have contact with their home countries and culture. Some visit family and relatives back home regularly, others have business connections that compel them to be in close contact, and most of them if not all, regularly communicate either by phone, internet or by post. They also make regular remittances to those left behind. By constantly communicating with family members, friends and business partners back home, the African professors in America are ensuring that the boundaries between the dominant culture-America and the marginal culture-respective African countries are sufficiently permeable.

I further propose that despite their qualifications and expertise, African professors at a Midwest predominantly White university would be treated as inferior beings based on the structural, systemic and entrenched racial practices in America. Race would be a barrier to their attainment and enjoyment of the privileges and power that America has to offer, an attraction which in the first place brought the African professors to America.

The above situations would create a sense of superiority of one culture and race counterbalanced by a sense of inferiority of the other. There would be pride and shame; love and hate, and the divided attention and loyalty would create a feeling of ambivalence. In the words of Stonequist, the African professors would be seeing themselves simultaneously in two looking-glasses, and these two mirrors present a different image of the individual. The individual becomes conscious of the entire process unfolding before him: conscious of the clash of the two images, conscious of the two mirrors (1935, p. 7).
According to Seagren (1994) several researchers have suggested the application of the theory of marginal man to intellectuals but actual attempts are few. He further indicated that the existing literature on the application of the theory to intellectuals is limited primarily to women professionals. Considering the dearth of research on the use of the theory, my conclusion is that my research would not only be plugging a gap in the literature, but will be contributing to the body of knowledge on the application of the marginal man theory to African men in the academe in American higher educational institutions.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter addresses the methodological approach employed during the course of the research on the experiences of sub-Saharan professors teaching at a predominantly White Midwest university. The chapter provided a detailed description of the research design. The description included the qualitative methodological approach chosen to guide the study, the role of the researcher, site selection, selection of participants, data sources and collection procedures, and research instrument.

Research Design

Methodological Approach

According to the eminent scientist Albert Einstein as cited by Patton (2002), “not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that counts can be counted” (p. 12). Einstein’s wise saying sums up the purposeful difference between quantitative and qualitative research. Some research questions lend themselves to numerical answers—positivist paradigm; while others seek for detailed understanding—interpretive (also referred to as constructivist) paradigm, which focused on social constructs that were complex and always evolving, making them less amenable to precise measurement or numerical interpretation (Glesne, 1999).

This research carefully and thoroughly captured and described in detail the lived experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White Midwest university. This study did not lend itself to numerical analysis and answers. Since the focus of this study provided a thick and rich description of the experiences of
professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching at a predominantly White university in the Midwest, the study fell within qualitative research. The rationale for collecting material on the lived experiences of the African professors was to understand from their perspectives what their experiences mean to them. It was also to give voice to their experiences which have to the best of my knowledge hitherto not been heard among the voices within the U.S. academe. According to Bogdan and Biklen, qualitative research is descriptive. The data collected take the form of words or pictures rather than numbers (2007). The appropriate qualitative methodological approach to the study was therefore phenomenology.

Phenomenology focuses on describing the meanings people give to their lived experiences (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 1998). Phenomenology studies the essence of a phenomenon i.e. what makes a ‘thing’ what it is. According to Manen (1990), phenomenology aims at gaining a deeper understanding of the nature or meaning of our everyday experiences. Phenomenology asks, “What was this kind of experience like?” (p. 9). The purpose of phenomenology is to describe a lived experience before the experience is conceptualized, categorized, or reflected upon. In other words, the task of phenomenological research and writing is to construct a possible interpretation of the nature of a certain human experience (Manen, 1990, p. 41).

Generally, a variety of techniques are used in collecting phenomenological data. One method is for the researcher to ask the individual whose experience is to be studied to write down his/her experience. The original written text of the person under investigation is called “protocol.” The protocol becomes a data source for the phenomenologist to
work with. Interviewing is another method used to collect lived experiences. In phenomenological studies, interviewing is used to explore and gather experiential information. It is also used as a means of engaging in conversation with the interviewee with the purpose of understanding the meaning of an experience. Another method used to collect phenomenological data is close observation. This method is appropriate for collecting lived experience of children. With the method of close observation, the researcher is expected to be a participant and an observer at the same time (participant observation technique). The method also requires that the researcher constantly steps back to reflect on the meaning of the situation. In situations of close observation for lived meaning, the researcher gather data termed as anecdotes i.e. a certain kind of narrative with a point (Manen, 1990). Other sources of material for phenomenological studies include literature, poetry, novels, biographies, autobiographies, personal life histories, diaries, journals, logs, stories, and plays. According to Manen (1990) non-discursive artistic material such as painting, sculpture, music, cinematography, etc are also resources for phenomenological studies (p. 74).

This study was an attempt to enter into the academic lives of sub-Saharan African professors at a predominantly White university in the Midwest in order to document what their reality or life world experiences were. Their lived experiences make up their reality and therefore subject to their interpretation. I therefore described truths from the perspective of my respondents and not facts from a positivist science perspective. These truths were shaped by my respondents’ cultural and linguistic paradigms and were therefore socially constructed (Patton, 2002).
I considered the phenomenological approach as the most appropriate design for my study because surveys for instance, could not capture the depth and breadth of the lived experiences. Lived experiences cannot be quantified, but can only be narrated, richly described, and understood through a face-to-face interaction with respondents. The technique of in-depth interviewing had the strength of yielding large amounts of data quickly. I had the opportunity in the face-to-face interview to ask follow-up questions and sought clarifications immediately, a process not available when using survey instruments (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

A weakness of using phenomenological approach was that by entering the life of my respondents, my presence, my questions, and the words used by my respondents to narrate their experiences may have distorted their objective reality. The response to this weakness is that there is no value-free science. Even the positivist survey questions are crafted by human beings who introduce their biases into the questions right from the onset. To minimize my intrusion into the study I followed what Patton (2002) referred to as emphatic neutrality (p. 49). I was not too involved in order to cloud my judgment; neither did I remain too distant in order to reduce my understanding of my respondents perspectives. The outcome of my study was not to generalize to a broader population but only to deal with the particular experiences of my respondents. Although this was a phenomenological case study bounded in time and situated in a specific context, decisions about the usefulness of the outcome could be transferable to other settings.
Site Selection

The site of this study was at the previously disclosed site. The university was founded in the early eighteenth century. The university has enrollment population above 20,000 students. Women make up over 50% of the undergraduate student population. The population of White undergraduate students was over 90% and the population of both African Americans and Africans was below 5%.

Selection of Participants

The research sample for this study was drawn from sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White university in the Midwest. The population for this study was all the sub-Saharan African professors teaching in the selected Midwest University. There were twelve sub-Saharan African professors teaching in the selected Midwest University. Thus, all the sub-Saharan professors were chosen as part of the sampled population because the population size was small and also because the research was a case study. The study captured the experiences of tenured, tenure-track, and untenured professors to provide a holistic picture of their experiences.

Participants in this study were selected using the purposeful sampling technique. Purposeful sampling technique was used in the selection of participants in order to ensure that participants provided rich data regarding their lived experiences in the U.S. university academe. According to Patton (2002), purposeful sampling has the power to produce information-rich cases for in-depth study. Thus in this study only professors who bore the core characteristics of hailing from sub-Saharan Africa were purposefully selected. They therefore not only provided a rich source of information, but greatly
enhanced the quality of data collected, and shed great light on the phenomenon being studied.

**Data Sources and Collection Procedures**

**Data Sources**

Data for this study was generated from in-depth, open-ended interviews of sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White university in the Midwest. The interviews were complemented with observations of classroom teaching experiences of sub-Saharan faculty. The data gathering sources included in-depth open-ended interviewing, and direct observation. Glesne (2005) held that using multiple data collection methods contributed to enhancing the trustworthiness of the study. In expounding on the utility of using multiple data gathering methods Patton (2002) had this to say, “studies that use only one method were more vulnerable to errors linked to that particular method than studies that use multiple methods in which different types of data provide cross-data validity checks” (p. 248).

In order to increase credibility of the lived experiences data gathering and management process, I audio taped all the interviews in addition to taking hand written notes. I also transcribed verbatim what my respondents said. Secondly, I observed some of the classes the sub-Saharan African professors taught. The aim of attending these classes was to observe the verbal and non-verbal communication between the professors and their students. By attending the classes of my respondents, I observed a first hand part of their teaching experiences. I believed combining the interviewing technique with
participant observation in the classrooms of the professors strengthened the credibility of the data gathering process, and the trustworthiness of the outcome.

Due to the personal interactive nature of interviewing, the technique has limitations and weaknesses. The extent to which my respondents cooperated with me determined the success of my study. My respondents decided to answer all my questions and in great detail. My respondents were comfortable sharing in great detail their lived experiences with me. My respondents understood my questions judging from the answers they gave. Where they did not understand the questions, they gave me the opportunity to rephrase them. I ended up receiving adequate responses. My ability to frame questions properly, to ask probing questions, to be a good listener, to comprehend the responses of my respondents, and to have good interactive skills strengthened the interviewing technique (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

A possible weakness in the design was the fact that I was the instrument that framed the interviewing questions and collected the data. There was therefore the possibility of introducing my perspectives into the research outcome through the framing of the questions or my ability to listen and read the verbal and non-verbal cues of my respondents correctly. To mitigate this weakness, I relied on the literature review to help me frame the interview questions. When I prepared the interviewing protocol, I gave it to my peers and dissertation committee members to look over it and give me their suggestions. I pilot tested the interview protocol with one of the faculty to see how clear and appropriate the questions were, and what I could do to improve on my interview skills. The strength of the interview method was that although it was emergent, it was
also an interaction between me and my respondents; and therefore became a co-construction of knowledge.

**Data Collection Procedure**

In-depth interviewing case study technique was utilized in the collection of the lived experiences of the sub-Saharan African professors. Interviewing technique was in sync with phenomenological data gathering. According to Patton (2002), to gather phenomenological data, one must undertake in-depth interviewing with people who have directly experienced the phenomenon of interest as opposed to secondhand experience (p. 104).

Case study is an in-depth investigation of a discrete entity (which may be a single setting, subject, collection or event) on the assumption that it was possible to derive knowledge of the wider phenomenon from intensive investigation of a specific instance or case (Becker, 1970, p. 75). Case study as a qualitative methodological approach is a blanket category that applied to a number of research types, each of which has particular procedures and benefits (Patton 2002). Some of the case study methods include: observational case studies, interview case studies, organizational case studies, life history case studies, and multi-site and comparative case studies. A case study is both a process of inquiry and the end product. Some case studies were referred to by the methodological technique used in studying them with the view to emphasizing their process of study for instance, observational case study, interview case studies, and comparative case studies (Creswell, 1998). Other case studies emphasized the end product of the inquiry and were
therefore referred to by the end product labels. Examples of case studies that emphasize the end product included organizational case studies and life history case studies.

Case studies range on a continuum of being simple to being complex. The unique distinguishing factor was that it was always one among others. Studying for instance, one student among all Sociology 604 students is a case; on the other hand, studying a class of Sociology 604 students among other Sociology classes is also a case. Studying the professor who teaches Sociology 604 was a case but researching into the teaching of Sociology 604 is not a case study because it lacks the specificity of being bounded as a unit in time and space.

According to Denzin & Lincoln (2000) a case in the social sciences and human services has working parts, it is purposive, often has a self, and it is an integrated system; it has a behavior pattern which is coherent and prominent (p. 436). Hurricane Katrina as an example of case study falls on the complex end of the case study continuum because it was a bounded case. Hurricane Katrina had a setting; it was a prominent weather condition with a life and behavior pattern of its own; it caused systematic flooding and destruction of lives and property; it displaced particular groups of people from a specific geographic region. The disaster called for specific actions of humanitarian relief, relocation of affected people, and reconstruction of levees, homes, and people’s lives.

Denzin & Lincoln (2000) identified three types of case study i.e. the intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. Intrinsic case studies were undertaken when the researcher was interested in the case because of its particularity. Examples of intrinsic cases were individual patients that were seen by the doctor. The doctor was attending to these
patients not because he/she wanted to generalize the findings about their conditions, or use the findings about their health condition to frame a health policy, but rather, the doctor was interested in the particular case because the case was of interest on its own merit. An instrumental case study provided insight and facilitates the understanding of something else. In instrumental case studies, the case itself was of secondary interest. When a researcher was studying for instance, hurricane Katrina as a case with the intention of providing rapid response teams in the humanitarian field with understanding of how to tackle future hurricanes, the study of Katrina would be considered an instrumental case study. Collective case study refers to studying several cases jointly with the purpose of better understanding or better theorizing about still a larger collection of cases.

Although researchers look out for the particularistic in case studies, all case studies must collect rich data full of thick description on what was common and what was uncommon about the case. All case studies therefore must collect material on:

- The nature of the case
- The historical background of the case
- The physical setting
- Context and situations- economic, political, legal, and aesthetical
- Other cases through which this case was recognized
- Informants through whom the case can be known. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 438)
The interviewing case study technique utilized in this research fell under the collective case study type described above. The case was collective because the sampled population had twelve professors who came from different countries and cultural backgrounds in sub-Saharan Africa. I also employed participant observation technique when I sat in the classroom of six of my respondents to observe their teaching and how students reacted and responded to them. I was unable to observe all the ten professors because four of them were not lecturing during the period of data collection: summer and fall academic quarters of 2008. Out of the four professors one went on a one year sabbatical leave just after granting me his interview. One of the professors was a school director and teachers during the spring. The third professor does half teaching outside the United States and half teaching in the U.S. during the winter. The fourth professor was working on a research project and not teaching for two quarters.

I sat twice in the classes being taught by six of the sub-Saharan African professors. Before I attended the classes, I informed the professor of my intention to observe the class and we agreed on the days I could attend. Out of the six professors I interviewed, two introduced me the first time I attended the class. On my second attendance, I was not introduced. Overall, I did not observe any change in the behavior of the students before and after I was introduced. In all my observations, I went early and sat down before most of the students came into the class. As they came into the class, most of them engaged in conversation with their colleagues until the professor showed up and it was time for the class to start. Although my population sample was twelve professors, two of them excused themselves from participation. I was able to interview ten African
professors in order to understand their lived experiences and perspectives of living and teaching in a predominantly white American university.

I employed the use of case study in my study not as the end product but rather as part of the process and technique of data collection. In using the interviewing case study approach, I conducted in-depth interviews with each professor so that I could collect descriptions on their particular experiences. Through the interviews, I collected thick descriptions of their classroom teaching experiences and relationships with their students, the nature of their relationship with other professors and mentors, their experiences with promotion, tenure, and professional development. I also collected information on their experiences with the academic culture. The interviews were one-on-one, semi-structured, audio-taped and later transcribed. The rationale for collecting the rich, thick description of the experiences was to ensure that I captured and documented a firsthand experience of the phenomenon as much as the professors who experienced the phenomenon.

**Instrument**

The data gathering instrument was a semi-structured interview protocol. According to Patton (2002), interviewing allows researcher to enter into respondents perspectives and find out what is in and on the mind of respondents (p. 341). The interview instrument consisted of a list of questions to guide, probe and explore the perspectives and experiences of my respondents. The interview guide ensured that limited time on the hands of respondents was well utilized and every respondent was systematically interviewed with the same questions. The interviews were conducted in a face-to-face setting and were recorded on audio tape.
The interview protocol used in this study consisted of 18 open-ended questions (See Appendix A). It covered general background of respondents; reasons for migrating to the U.S.; professional experience; classroom relationship with students; attitude of students towards African professor; relationship of other faculty and administrators towards African professor; academic culture; experience based on otherness; and future plans of respondents.

**The Researcher**

Bogdan and Biklen (2007) asserted that the personal characteristics of the researcher affect fieldwork relationships with subjects encountered. As a result, it was imperative that as the researcher, I understood how my personal characteristics and status might affect fieldwork. Following the advice of Bogdan and Biklen (2007), I provided a description of myself as the researcher. I was born and grew up in Ghana, West Africa. I also received my basic and college education in Ghana. After graduating from college, I worked for fifteen years in the nonprofit sector in Ghana. The nature of my job afforded me the opportunity to travel and interact with many nationalities in the West Africa sub-region, as well as attend training programs in Europe, Canada and the United States. As a traveler, I was exposed to the cultures of other African peoples, and also saw differences that existed between Africans, Europeans, and Americans. As a nonprofit executive who worked with consultants many of whom were university professors, I was inadvertently exposed to some of the cultural practices of the African academe. This work related experience provided me with general knowledge about the workings of academic life in Africa.
Over the past five years, I have been living in the United States as a student in a predominantly White university. My experiences as a foreign student from sub-Saharan Africa provided me with knowledge about what it felt like to be an emigrant living in a culture alien to your own. The challenges I faced as a foreign student, and the steps I took to overcome the challenges gives me insight into the experiences of African professors from sub-Saharan Africa teaching in America. My experiences as an African student coupled with my education have shaped my perspective.

As the researcher and the main instrument of research playing the role of interviewer, listener and observer, I carried with me my experiences and perspectives into the research. In order to minimize my intrusion into the study, I practiced what Patton (2002) referred to as “emphatic neutrality” (p. 49). I was not too involved in order to cloud my judgment; neither was I too distant in order to reduce my understanding of my respondents perspectives.

**Credibility and Trustworthiness**

Gorman & Clayton (2005) asserted that in order to ensure credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research the following 8 steps must be followed:

- Triangulation, the collection of data from several different sources or by employing several different methods.
- The full documentation of data, including a ‘chain of evidence’ so that appropriate reference can be made to particular transcripts, documents, events and other data sources in the event any were challenged.
• Logical connection between what was examined and the conclusions drawn from these data
• The conscious and deliberate inclusion of data that might not support the thesis being argued or interpretation being drawn.
• A preparedness to entertain alternative explanations of phenomena observed, even if these alternatives were then discounted.
• Self-reflection on the part of the researchers, where they attempt to allow for their own perceived prejudices and biases
• Review of draft reports by participants and/or independent observers who can confirm that the report gives a fair impression of a situation or event.
• An awareness of limitations in both data obtained and the generalizability of a study (p. 25).

This study ensured trustworthiness of data collection procedures by combining purposeful sampling technique with participant observation method, and interviewing technique. Additionally, it used semi-structured interview protocol to collect the lived experiences from several sub-Saharan African professors. Transcribed narratives used in the study were sent back to respondents for validation. The study also analyzed several literature relevant to the experiences of faculty of color in the U.S. academe. Field notes, interview transcripts, and audio tapes dated and labeled with appropriate designations. During the data collection process, the problem of reliability was mitigated by practicing what Patton (2002) offered as a solution called, “empathic neutrality.” By “empathic neutrality”, Patton was of the assertion that there was a middle ground between becoming
too involved, which could cloud judgment, and remaining too distant, which could reduce understanding (p. 50). I therefore engaged my respondents in a friendly but professional manner during the interview process.

**Interpretation of Data**

Being a qualitative research, this study was taken through the inductive process of analysis and interpretation. The process of qualitative data interpretation involved taking the raw data through the process of analysis and transforming it into findings. According to Patton (2002) transforming raw qualitative data into findings was akin to the metamorphoses that takes place in a caterpillar from its unattractive beginning into the splendor of the mature butterfly. The analytical process of my data passed through the transformative process of organizing the data, segmenting the data into meaningful units, coding, synthesizing, and looking for emergent patterns, themes and categories. The findings which emerged after data analysis became the product for interpretation. Data interpretation refers to “developing ideas about findings and relating them to the literature and to broader concerns and concepts (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The interpretation process also involved explaining the importance of the findings, how it elucidated relevant theory and other scholarship, how it informed policy and future action that needed to be taken.

**Reflections on Data Gathering Phase**

After I got approval from the Institutional Review Board for my study and research protocol, I emailed all my respondents requesting their permission, date, time and venue to interview them. In the email, I provided relevant portions of the IRB that
guaranteed confidentiality of the interviews. While the process of constructing the emails and pressing the send button were easy, the apprehension and anxiety that the professors would either respond in the negative or not respond at all was agonizing. To my uttermost astonishment and relief, I received positive replies from the professors within few hours of sending the emails. Not only did I feel elated about this initial positive response from my respondents. More than that, I felt the professors were very generous to me considering the fact that majority of them spend their summer vacations working on their research projects and publications. Their speedy and positive responses to my initial contact through the email also reminded me of the pervasive spirit of hospitality granted to strangers across the length and breadth of sub Saharan Africa.

Out of the twelve sub-Saharan professors that form my population ten granted me interviews. Out of the two who I could not interview, one responded and said she had moved out of the university and did not know when she would be back. The second declined to grant me the interview indicating that he did not feel comfortable sharing his personal and professional experiences. Out of the ten professors who granted me interviews, nine granted me interviews in their offices on the university campus. The tenth professor granted me the interview in his office at home. According to him, he worked from home and not from campus so I had to go to his house to interview him. Although the interviews were supposed to be in two segments, the professors preferred to grant me one long session to respond to all my questions. Most of them commented that the reason they granted me the interview was that they felt my study was very important
in that it would contribute knowledge to the paucity of literature on the experiences of sub-Saharan faculty in the U.S. academe.

Throughout the interviews, I believe my respondents were aware that I was listening with rapt attention and open mind to what they were saying, and expressing to me. They also felt I was ready to learn from what they had to say, and to seek understanding by asking them to elaborate on their responses. As a result, they went beyond superficial answers to share very deep and intimate personal experiences. Subsequent to this positive development all the interviewees went beyond the one hour allotted for the interview session. At the end of the interview sessions all of the respondents told me not to hesitate to contact them if I had further questions to ask them or if I had any point in the interview that needed further clarification. During the process of coding the data, I contacted some of my respondents by email to clarify some of their responses which they did also by email. The clarifications focused on whether their mentors were internal or external, and the extent to which they collaborated on research with their American peers. When I finished writing the draft findings, I highlighted for each respondent the quotes I used from their interviews for validation. I sent the findings to them by email and I received their feedback through the email. Those who did not give me feedback through the email, I went to see them a second time to ensure that I had validation from all my respondents. The feedback I received did not change any of the findings nor the substance of the interviews granted originally. The feedback was mainly about taking additional care to protect the identity of my respondents.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is to present the outcomes of the interviews conducted with ten sub-Saharan African professors on their experiences as professors in a predominantly White Midwest University. The chapter also reports findings regarding the observations of classroom dynamics of the professors as they interact with their students. The stories that these professors shared through interviews, and the observations I conducted in their classrooms present the reader with multiple realities and perspectives on the agency and experiences of the sub-Saharan professors in a predominantly White university in the Midwest. This study was predicated on five research questions. The research questions were designed to unearth reasons why sub-Saharan African professors left Africa to live in the U.S. and to teach in the U.S. academe; Classroom teaching experiences and relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their students; Nature of relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their colleagues, and mentors; The experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with tenure, promotion, and scholarship; The experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with the academic culture of U.S. academe.

In analyzing the background data regarding why my respondents migrated to the United States, the following themes emerged: Attractive career opportunities; unfavorable political climate; and, personal reasons.

Data on the second research question about classroom teaching experiences yielded the following themes: preparing for classes and dealing with issues of
competency; classroom interaction and pedagogy; student complaints and accent; classroom attitude and behaviors; outside classroom attitude and behaviors.

The themes that emerged from the third research question about relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with colleagues and mentors were: collegiality and friendship; collaboration and inclusiveness; relationship with African American professors; and, mentorship.

The fourth research question about sub-Saharan African professors’ experiences with tenure, promotion, and scholarship elicited the following themes: bittersweet tenure and promotion; and experiences with scholarship.

Experiences of sub-Saharan African professors within U.S. academic culture were the fifth research question and the themes that emerged from this theme included: two-world’s phenomenon; otherness and marginality; racism; job satisfaction; loss of social status; and, coping with challenges.

The above themes have their grounding in the interview and observation data collected. Each theme has been presented using the rich descriptions of the respondents. The presentation of each theme was followed by a discussion of the findings and its bearing on the literature. Implication of results for theory and policy were discussed in Chapter 6.

**Background of Sample**

Ten out of the twelve sub-Saharan African professors at the selected predominantly White Midwest University granted me interviews, and I had the opportunity to observe the classes of six of those professors. Two woman and eight men
granted me interviews. Two of the respondents were full professors; two were associate professors; four were assistant professors on tenure track; the ninth was a visiting professor and the tenth was a Faculty-In-Residence. All my respondents held PhDs with the exception of one faculty who had an MBA degree. The professors came from a variety of arts and social science disciplines.

Below is Table 1 summarizing gender and academic qualifications of my respondents.

Table 1

*Academic Qualification of sub-Saharan African Faculty interviewed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>In Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the ten faculty members four of them obtained their PhDs from the United States. Three had their PhDs from Europe, two had theirs from Canada and Africa respectively and the last faculty also had her MBA from the U.S. Out of the four who obtained their PhDs in the U.S. one went back initially to Africa to continue his academic career while the other three stayed in the U.S. to teach. With regards to the three who
obtained their PhDs in Europe, one went back initially to teach in Africa, the second stayed in Europe to teach before moving to the U.S., and the third came directly to the United States to continue his career in the U.S. university academe. The one professor who obtained his PhD in Africa taught for several years in Africa before moving to join the United States university academe. The professor who obtained his PhD in Canada came directly to the U.S. to continue his university teaching career. One of the female faculty who granted me the interview was among those who obtained their PhDs in the United States and decided to stay and teach in the U.S. academe.

Table 2 below shows where respondents acquired their PhDs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>PhD &amp; MBA in U.S.A</th>
<th>PhD from Europe</th>
<th>PhD from Africa</th>
<th>PhD from Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One female faculty has a PhD and the second has an MBA and is Faculty-In-Residence

Out of the eight sub-Saharan African professors who obtained their PhDs outside Africa only two initially returned to Africa. Only 25% of my research sample went to Africa after their PhD program. 75% continued in the Western academe. Out of the five
that studied in the U.S. three remained and two went initially back home to Africa. Out of the three that obtained their PhD programs in Europe, one went initially back to Africa. Three out of the ten professors interviewed were civil and public servants in their respective home countries in Africa before embarking on their graduate programs abroad. The remaining seven professors taught in universities in their respective African home countries before pursuing PhD programs abroad.

In keeping faith with the Institutional Review Board requirement of protecting the rights and welfare of my respondents, I have used pseudonyms to protect the identity of my respondents throughout this study.

When I asked my respondents why they chose teaching in the university as a career majority of them said they did not choose teaching as a career but that the teaching profession rather chose them. The following response of Dr. Shine elaborated what most of my respondents said about the choice of university professorship as a career:

I was chosen I did not choose the academe. During my graduate days one of my professors felt I was gifted as a creative writer and actor and I won prizes in fiction, poetry during my graduate studies as the best student. I was very versatile and my professors felt that the only way I could be secured was to be a lecturer. I was an all round student and studied poetry, literature, and theory. At the masters level I was the best student in the faculty of arts and the vice chancellor gave me a job before I finished my masters. Before
I completed the graduate program, I was made a graduate assistant
and as soon as I finished I was given a full time job as a lecturer.

Dr. Sweetie also made a similar statement about how the academe chose her
although she applied to jobs in the field of research and development work in Africa none
of those institutions offered her a job except the academe.

I did not choose the academe when I completed my PhD and was
ready to start my professional career. The academe was one of
three options. My dream was that I would get a job in either
research or development or the academe after I graduated. So when
I graduated, I applied to all these three sectors all over especially in
Africa but the one that responded faster and in great numbers was
the North American academe and that was why I ended in the U.S.
academe plus, I also enjoy teaching

The above responses were generally typical of how most people determine their
destinies in Africa. The guidance Dr. Shine received was typical of the belief in Africa
that knowledge and wisdom resided with the elders and the younger generation was
expected to be led and guided by the elders of society. Since there was a strong belief in
predestination, it was not uncommon for a profession to choose you and not you choosing
your profession.

Dr. Politics on the other hand was not chosen by the teaching profession. He
chose the university academe among other things for the stability and security of tenure
track faculty employment, the freedom in the university academe, and the flexible
working hours offered by teaching in a university. Dr. Politics explained why he chose the university academe as his career path with the following words:

I had some nasty experiences working in industry in New York and other places in the United States. I therefore decided to get a teaching position in a university. I did not want to continue working in an environment where your boss could come and tell you that I he does not like you, and does not want you anymore. I want a job where I know the expectations were clear, the job descriptions were clear and you know that when you do 1, 2, 3 you will get your promotion. Apart from the job security, it was fulfilling and it gives me freedom.

My respondents generally viewed the teaching profession as their calling. As a calling, they found themselves being drawn by their passion to be educators. They also saw their call to teach being confirmed and affirmed by their former professors. Having explained that they were called to the teaching profession, I was curious to find out where my respondents were called to practice their profession. The next theme provides the window into where my respondents were called to practice their teaching profession.

**Reasons for Migrating to America**

According to Arthur (2000) there were four reasons why Africans migrate to the U.S. These were: educational pursuit; economic reasons; to join family; and for political reasons. The reasons given by my respondents for migrating to America could be categorized into three groups-attractive career opportunities, unfavorable political
climate, and personal reasons. The literature refers to the first two factors for migration (attractive career opportunities abroad and unfavorable political climate at home) as part of the “push and pull” factors. Cheng and Yang (1998) elaborate on the “push and pull” factors by stating that, “favorable conditions in the receiving county, such as high salaries, high living standards, good research conditions, and career opportunities pull professional migrants to recipient country while unfavorable conditions in the sending country push the highly trained to leave” (p. 628).

**Attractive Career Opportunities**

The first category was those who came to the U.S., Canada and Europe to do their PhDs and were pulled by the attractive teaching career opportunities offered by the U.S. university academe. Prior to coming to the U.S. the media and friends painted rosy images in their minds about the unlimited possibilities that exist in America for personal development and prosperity. The response of Dr. Politics provided insight into the factors that pulled this first group of sub-Saharan scholars to the American university academe. Dr. Politics remarked:

> Basically U.S. propaganda that creates the impression that U.S. was the best place to ever live influenced my decision to live and work in America. The impression about the U.S. was created in the media such that when you were growing up you think that U.S. was the best place to ever go. There were opportunities to even go to Europe after my undergraduate program but everybody thinks that U.S. was the place to go. This was portrayed in magazines,
movies etc and we used to call the U.S. heaven on earth in my university back home in Africa. So the impression was that U.S. was the greatest place to ever live. That was the only motivation.

Dr. Shine was also attracted to the United States because of the perception that there were attractive career opportunities in the U.S. Dr. Shine elaborated on this perception as follows:

In studying geography in high school, watching films and television, and reading about the U.S., my perception about the U.S. was that it was a place where I could do things that I could not do elsewhere. For instance I had a vision to be a film maker and I could not do that in England but felt I could do that in the U.S. because I am in literature, theater, and performance. Many people say that my plays were cinematic and I felt if I had the chance in America I could cease defining myself only as a scholar earning salary and engage in filmmaking that was one major reason I was attracted to the U.S.

As narrated above, some of my respondents chose the United States as the place to practice their calling because of the positive imagery painted in the media about America as an attractive destination for a career in the academe. On the other hand, some of my respondents wanted to teach in their home countries but had to leave because of the hostile political atmosphere that posed threats to their lives and to academic freedom.

The next theme deals with my respondents who were “pushed” out of their countries.
Unfavorable Political Climate

The sub-Saharan African professors who went back to Africa to teach but were pushed out by forces beyond their control form the second category of my respondents. The reasons given by those who fall in the “push” category include military dictatorship stifling academic freedom, death threats to one’s life, curtailment of fundamental freedoms of dissent and free speech, corruption in government resulting in frustration and lack of job satisfaction, and corruption in the university administration resulting in an atmosphere of compromise of one’s principles. Here was the lamentation of Dr. Sheba who was forced to leave his country because the government of his country decided to close down the only university in the country which he was teaching at.

Why I had to leave my country and come to the United States was that there was a non democratic, dictatorship in my country.

Churches have been affected, mosques have been affected. There was a huge crackdown on opposition. For me, why I came to the United States was that the University I was teaching at was shut down completely. The only national university in the country was closed down by the government. As an academic what do you do? The university was still closed down. Otherwise, I would still have been in Africa.

Dr. Shine had to flee his home country for his life because his life was in danger for exercising his academic freedom in ways that spoke truth to the powers governing his country at the time. He had this story to share about why he migrated abroad.
I had lots of problems with the government because one of my plays depicted the atrocities that the government was committing in the Niger delta over oil exploration and the government was monitoring my activities. One of my plays which were a number one hit in Nigeria dramatized everything that was happening and was still happening in the Niger delta area— the killing of the chiefs, the destruction of the environment and livelihood of the people etc. That play was written in 1987 long before Ken Saro-Wiwa was killed in 1995. It was a prophetic play that I wrote. I was being harassed in subtle ways by the Nigerian government. At that time I was doing consulting work for the British Council so they advised that I apply for one of their fellowships because they felt that if I continued to stay in Nigeria I was going to be killed. They offered me the fellowship which took me to England to do my PhD and that was how I left Nigeria.

Dr. Pius also falls within the category of those who left their country of origin and migrated to the United States due to unfavorable political climate. Dr. Pius unlike Dr. Shine and Dr. Sheba was a civil servant working with the Federal Health Ministry in his country. Although Dr. Pius loved his work, his people and country, he became very frustrated with the governmental system and had to leave for the United States. Dr. Pius had this to say about why he migrated to the United States.
As a health officer in the Federal Ministry of Health in charge of educating citizens on the harm of substance abuse, I became interested in ensuring that the tobacco company of my country had slogans put on their packages as part of the advertisement that tobacco use was injurious to human consumption. My boss told me to go for it. I designed 5 of those slogans detailing with the effect of tobacco on health and informed the tobacco company. For this to become effective it had to go through Congress and become a law so I put everything together and we lobbied our senators and House of Representatives. We were able to get the bill through the House of Representatives and also the Senate although it was very tough but when the bill got to the desk of the president to be signed into law he refused to sign the bill. So the tobacco companies were not mandated to put the sign on their packages without the law and the senators were also not able to veto the action of the president. I learnt later that the president did not sign because he was a terrible smoker himself and for personal reasons he refused to sign a law that affected the health of 120 million people so I became frustrated and that was why I left and came back to the U.S.

The narratives detailing the unfavorable political climate that forced my respondents from Africa reflected what Mamdani (1994) identified as the ever growing state of authoritarianism that swept across Africa in the 1970s. Part of the manifestation
of this wind of authoritarianism which swept across sub-Saharan Africa was the takeover of university campuses by the State resulting in the stifling of academic freedom and turning university campuses into battle zones between government forces and the university community. Scholars who could not work under such atmospheres of repression, insecurity and mayhem had to leave for foreign destinations.

There was yet a third group of my respondents whose reasons for migrating to the United States did not fit the lure of attractive career opportunities in the U.S. academe or leave their home countries due to threats to their lives and academic freedom. They said they migrated to the United States due to personal reasons.

**Personal Reasons**

My respondents who said they either came back to the U.S. or stayed in the U.S. after their PhD programs for other reasons apart from “push and pull” factors were grouped into the category of personal reasons. The personal reasons given for staying or migrating to the United States included marriage to an American spouse, having children who liked the American educational environment, and not finding a job elsewhere after completing PhD program.

Dr. Union married an American when he was pursuing his PhD program here in the United States. Dr. Union felt it was more prudent to live and nurture his academic aspirations and marriage within the culture of his spouse which he Dr. Union was familiar with rather than take his wife back home in Africa-a foreign land and culture which was unfamiliar to her. Dr. Union stated his reasons for choosing to stay in the U.S. as follows:
By the time I finished my PhD program I had gotten married and my wife was a U.S. citizen so the decision to move back to my country or stay here became a problem. I do not know whether I would have gone back to my country if I were not married. One of the things that anyone wants to do was that you want to find out whether you can practice what you have learnt. So I would have taken advantage of practical attachment here in the U.S. for at least a year before going home if I were not married. But since I was married going back to my country became an issue. We did not have children at that time so I guess my motivation to stay in the U.S. was more about proving myself and staying because I was newly married to a U.S. citizen.

Dr. Bishop was a professor in one of the universities in his country before coming to the U.S. for his graduate program. After completing his PhD he went back to his teaching appointment in his home country. After teaching for seventeen years, Dr. Bishop relocated to the United States and has been a visiting professor for the past five years. In narrating his reasons for migrating to the United States Dr. Bishop has this to say,

Even though it was a good option for my children to come and study in the U.S., I would not want my children to be in the U.S. without following up to see what was going on with them. That was the personal reason. When my son gained admission to a university in the U.S., I felt that I should be in the U.S. to follow
up and ensure that he was doing ok so for the past five years I have
been living in the U.S. to be able to know what my children were
doing and their progress in terms of their education.

Dr. Renown and Dr. Grace studied outside the U.S.A for their PhDs. While Dr.
Renown had his PhD from South Africa, Dr. Grace had his from Europe. They were
invited initially to the U.S. as visiting professors. When they came, they realized that
their children liked the environment where the university was located and they discovered
that the environment was safe and conducive to the upbringing of their children so they
decided to take permanent appointment in the university which happened to be
predominantly White. The narrative of Dr. Renown reflects this personal reason for
migrating to the U.S.

What brought me to the U.S. was to come and teach as a visiting
professor just for one academic year. I agreed to come and I came
with my kids and after the one year, my kids liked the place so
much and I observed that it was a good place for the kids so I
decided to stay here and teach fulltime. The main reason therefore
was because the local environment not America was a very good
place for my children to grow and go to school.

Dr. Grace who had his PhD in Europe and came to the U.S. immediately after
completing his doctoral program intimates that he would have gone back to his home
country if his family did not moved to the U.S. with him. According to him it was
difficult relocating from one country to the other when children were involved. Dr. Grace explained his predicament as follows;

Left to me alone I would have gone home long ago but based on the pressing domestic issues I have to hang on. Other attractions were secondary issues for hanging on. Where there was family involved in your movement it becomes very difficult the more you stay in one place for long. When children were involved it becomes difficult to move.

The falling standards of education especially higher education across sub-Saharan Africa since the 1980s when most African countries initiated structural adjustment programs to salvage their tattered economies forced many well meaning Africans who could afford foreign education to send their children abroad for better educational opportunities. As explained by Nkinyangi (1991) the downward slide of the economy since the 1980s in sub-Saharan Africa had deteriorating effect on educational facilities, such as classrooms, educational equipment, availability of books and teaching materials. The downward spiral of the economy of sub-Saharan African region also precipitated the drastic fall in the morale of teachers, the quality of education and educational standards. The stories of my respondents who migrated to the U.S. for personal reasons especially the need to see their children acquire quality education echoes the fallen standards of education in sub-Saharan Africa asserted by Nkinyangi (1991).

The story of Dr. Sweetie stands out among the others regarding reasons for migrating to and teaching in the U.S. academe. According to Dr. Sweetie, she initially
wanted to do her PhD in her home country because of the blatant racism she encountered in Europe when she was pursuing her master’s degree. Over the course of time, she had to change her mind because the research institute she worked for in her home country looked favorably on American PhDs and actually hired American PhD holders than those from any other country. After finally deciding to come to the U.S. to obtain her PhD, she planned that she would go back to work in Africa as soon as she completed her program. Unfortunately for Dr. Sweetie she could not get a job either in research, teaching, or development work in Africa when she completed her PhD program. And since she could not afford to wait hoping for a job opportunity to open up for her in Africa or her home country, she had to take up a teaching appointment in the U.S. Dr. Sweetie remarked:

I actually applied to several jobs in the field of research, development, and the academe in Africa but I did not get those jobs. In the end I had interviews from several universities here in North America to teach. My former university was the first American job I applied for and they employed me. I felt I did not have the luxury to go back home and wait for a year or more expecting to get a job. I have younger siblings that I was putting through school who needed my help and I could not afford to wait for a job. My family would have thought that I was mad.

The reasons why my respondents came to the United States were categorized into three groups. Some of my respondents migrated to the U.S. because of the attractive career opportunities; others have relocated to the U.S. because of the unfavorable
political climate in their countries; and the rest said they came to the United States for personal reasons. The first two reasons given by my respondents for migrating to the United States: favorable academic career opportunities in the U.S.; and unfavorable political climate in home country are captured in the literature as “pull and push” factors (Cheng & Yang, 1998). Arthur (2000) captures the third reason: personal reasons as one of the four reasons why Africans migrate to the United States.

The next theme that emerged was classroom teaching experiences of my respondents. Below were the narratives that elaborated their experiences in a predominantly White classroom.

**Classroom Teaching Experiences of sub-Saharan African Professors**

The second research question was addressed in this section. The research question focused attention on the classroom teaching experiences and relationship between sub-Saharan African professors and their predominantly White students. From the narratives of my respondents their classroom teaching experience starts from the preparation of their lesson notes which was most often done several weeks before the quarter commences to the first meeting with students at the beginning of the quarter, the actual delivery of lectures, grading of papers and student advising. The major themes that emerged included challenges to preparation towards teaching and dealing with issues of competency, classroom interaction and pedagogy, student complaints about accent, and attitudes and behaviors of students inside and outside the classroom.
Preparing for Classes and Dealing with issues of Competency

Most of my respondents remarked that they had to put in seven to ten times effort into their preparation towards teaching compared to their White colleagues. This extra effort was to ensure that the perception that African professors did not know enough to teach White students was not in any way confirmed. In responding to why the need to put in so much extra effort into preparing syllabi and lesson notes my respondents said that students entered the classroom under the perception that African professors were not scholarly enough and competent enough to teach White students. Dr. Shine succinctly addressed this negative perception about African professors as follows:

I have written more courses that anybody else in the world. I do not know any other person who has written many new courses like I have done on this planet. The curriculum here in the U.S. was a White curriculum and each course I teach has to be new and different. You have to validate it and you have to make it appealing and exciting and cover new material and if you were not well read and show that you know more than they know you will be eclipsed. You have to be 7 times more intelligent than those you were working with to survive here if not you will be wiped out.

In commenting on White students’ perception that African professors do not have the requisite scholarship and competency to teach White students, Dr. Pius narrated how on one occasion some White students insulted him by saying in his face, “who brought this African boy to teach us.” Dr Pius went on to say that,
The challenge was that you have to work hard-seven to ten times more than your White colleagues to show that you were competent enough to do the job. The environment does not favor minorities and you have to work hard to prove that you were competent to the task.

Dr. Union provided a contrasting overview between how professors in his home country prepare towards teaching and how as an African professor in the United States he prepared himself for each quarter.

Preparation towards teaching starts before the quarter begins. It starts with the preparation of the syllabus. Here in the U.S. you know 1 year in advance what you were going to teach during any given quarter. Whether it was a new course or an old one you still have to prepare. In science the courses do not change because biology was biology but in the social sciences and the arts new books were being written and you have to keep moving abreast with new developments. You can decide to stick with your old textbooks but if you do that you were cheating your students and yourself because you will not have up to date information. One thing I realize back home was that our professors use the same lecture notes over and over again throughout the years. I do not think that was a good thing. Usually 2 weeks before the quarter begins you start the preparation with your course outline and
readings and you post it out there. At the beginning of the quarter
you start with introduction of the course syllabus, the
requirements, expectation etc.

The narratives of my respondents show that they pay careful and extra attention in their preparation towards teaching. The pressure to invalidate the perception that African professors were not scholarly enough to teach White students puts a lot of stress on my respondents. The psychological pressure to perform in class and to invalidate the stereotype that African professors have inferior scholarship confirms the literature that faculty of color were subject to higher levels of job-related stress than their White counterparts (Smith & Witt, 1993).

Classroom Interaction and Pedagogy

In exception of Dr. Renown a full professor who teaches two classes during the entire academic year, the rest of the professors teach a minimum of two classes every quarter. Dr. Renown teaches only two classes because he divides his time between teaching in America and working in a theater company in South Africa. The courses taught by the African professors were both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. With the exception of Dr. Bishop and Dr. Sweetie who teaches some undergraduate classes with as many as 120 students the others teach classes ranging between fifty to ten students. The undergraduate classes and classes where undergraduate and graduate students were mixed were always bigger than the graduate classes. The professors who teach large undergraduate classes indicated that their departments provide them with graduate assistants to help them with their teaching duties.
The larger classes were taught in theater rooms where the furniture was fixed to the floor and does not allow for rearrangements. Dr. Bishop who taught in those theaters said he used the lecture method as the basic medium of teaching while students were expected to take notes. Instructional technology such as overhead projector was used to enhance the communication. My respondents said they used documentary films often to augment their lectures and to sustain the interest of students in the subject matter. This was what Dr. Politics said in relation to the use of visuals:

The comments students make about my classes were mostly positive ones. They tell me they enjoy my classes especially with the video and pictures that I use to teach.

In the smaller classes which often were the graduate classes, my respondents said they applied the seminar method of pedagogy. Those classes were largely discursive and in-depth analysis of required readings. The duties of the professor in those classes were to provide discussion points and general guidance based on the course objectives and readings for that session. In all the classes I observed I noticed that where the class size was small and where the furniture was not fixed to the floor, the professors chose to have the furniture arranged in a horse shoe or oblong form to allow for face to face interaction among the students and the professor.

When I was conducting observation of Dr. Grace’s classes I noticed that he encouraged students to bring food during some class sections to be shared as a community of students. According to Dr. Grace the idea behind having potluck during classes was to foster among other things a learning community characterized by sharing
and interaction. I observed at first hand the sharing and interaction taking place. For example, time of sharing the food and eating which was always at the beginning of class, the students and Dr. Grace discussed current news related to the topic for the day. This informal discussion created a synergy and a blending of the students and the professor into one unit. There were a total of eighteen students in this class. Fourteen were White Americans; three were from Africa, and one from the Middle East. I noticed that some of the students who sat in the class initially without showing any emotions or talking to their colleagues gradually warmed-up and joined the rest of the class in the discussions.

All my respondents remarked that although they teach the dominant White epistemology, they blend this with their African communal pedagogy. Dr. Sheba shed light on the blend of White epistemology with African pedagogy as follows:

My African culture and personality influences the way I teach. I do not think there should be any kind of hierarchy anyway. I do not believe that I know everything and my students should be taught everything. For me it works both ways. It was a give and take. There was a sharing and the communal aspect of teaching and learning was important to me and it was African. What I do with my African culture in my pedagogy was to bring my African examples into teaching while I ask students to also share examples from their culture.
Dr. Shine explained that he goes beyond just teaching White epistemology. He goes to his classes with an agenda to destroy the notion of White supremacist epistemology by bringing examples from other cultures to establish his point. The paradigm that European and Western epistemology was superior was what I have been destroying in my classes so when I come at it I come with a certain passion and the students can see that this professor has a certain agenda and they were excited about my courses.

In explaining how he goes beyond the chalk and the talk to opens up the classroom space for interaction and introduce African culture, Dr. Shine had this to say:

When I am teaching, I tell students what exists in their own culture, I celebrate it and I also tell them what exists in other cultures that they do not know. I tell them that these things were missing from their own curriculum and that their curriculum only focuses on their nation and forget about the world around them so when I start this way and start talking about African culture, Caribbean culture etc then I sing, and I dance and I let them watch videos then they get into it. I also get the students to sing the songs and do the dances.

The interaction of my respondents with their students in the classroom was geared towards creating an ambiance of community where there was sharing and caring. The classroom pedagogy of my respondents depicted democratic pedagogy where there was
give and take on the one hand between faculty and students and on the other hand among students. The classroom interaction and pedagogy reflected the co-investigation and co-construction of knowledge (Dewey, 1944).

**Student Complaints about Accent**

Some of my respondents reported that students complained about their accent as African professors. According to Ochukpue (2004), where immigrants combine African sounding names with pronunciations and inflections of British-flavored accent, they evoke or reinforce discriminatory treatment. Dr. Politics disclosed that some students wrote on their student evaluations requesting that he be fired for having an accent.

The students wrote that they do not understand why the university should employ a professor like me with an accent and that I should be fired for having an accent.

Due to the complaint about having a foreign accent Dr. Politics said he normally told students at the beginning of every quarter that they should tell him whenever they did not comprehend his words. He said students rarely told him that they did not understand his accent. Whenever he was teaching he watched with keen eyes the nonverbal cues of his students to ensure that they understood every word he used. Whenever he was not sure students understood his accent, he wrote the word he used on the board. Dr. Politics said that having had his education from primary school to the undergraduate level in Africa, he was aware that some of his pronunciations differed markedly from American pronunciations. When I observed Dr. Politics class, I noticed at one point that a White male student turned to his colleague and wrote on a sheet of paper a word the professor
used and started laughing. I overheard the student mimic the professor’s pronunciation several times to the hearing of his colleague sitting on the same desk.

Dr. Sweetie remarked that before she started teaching in her former university in the U.S. she had to be trained as a foreign faculty in how to teach American students. During the orientation she was told that she had to tell students at the beginning of every new class that she had an accent and that students had to pay extra attention to her. Dr. Sweetie said she observed later that this orientation was not right because anytime she told the students that she had an accent, negative comments about her having an accent appeared in the students’ evaluations. However when she decided not to state upfront that she had an accent, students did not complain about her having an accent although once in a while one or two students would comment on her accent in their evaluations.

Dr. Pius also highlighted the complaint of students about him and other African professors for having an accent. He said instead of feeling bad about the complaint he normally used the opportunity to educate students on diversity, the multicultural nature of America, and challenge them to embrace the differences of others.

Dr. Pius had this to say:

Some of the students in class comment on my accent but this is not a big deal because I usually tell them that they were lazy in learning about other cultures and peoples. If they were not lazy they will make the attempt to understand my assent because I also make the effort to understand them because they also have an accent. If I can understand them and they cannot understand me
then they were telling me that I am more superior to them or that they were simply lazy to learn. They also have an assent so if I can understand them then they must also try to understand me.

The above narratives of my respondents show that they experience complaints from students about their accent. The complaints sometimes found its way into student evaluations. The English spoken by my respondents is flavored with British and African accent thus the difficulty of some of the students to comprehend their accent. The next sub-theme would highlight the general attitude and behavior of students in the classrooms of my respondents.

**Classroom Attitude and Behaviors**

My respondents said their classroom interaction with their students were generally cordial, interactive and enjoyable. According to them their classroom interactions were in the main reciprocally respectful. A typical description of the interaction between African faculty and students was recounted by Dr. Shine. He remarked:

I can tell you that I have a cordial relationship with my students.

For instance a White student sent me an email yesterday that he was very bored and that we should go out together for a drink. I taught this student only one course. Then we met and talked about a play I am writing to take to Paris and he was excited about this. The very bright students want to be around me always. They become very close and very good friends. It happens consistently.
Those cordial atmospheres were however disrupted at other times by latent racist behaviors when students want to get away with their academic failures and weaknesses. Dr. Sheba explained how he used to be bothered about covert racism from students when he started teaching but had to grow out of this persistent and worrisome issue. According to Dr. Sheba,

The resistance of students was very subtle. You can tell their resistance when they start complaining about their grading, when they complain that instructions were not clear enough, when they get aggressive in their emails to you about specifications of the grading system. Oh yeah, the racist encounters were almost weekly. In the beginning, I kept questioning myself why this aggressiveness but now that I know that these aggressive behaviors from the students were racist behaviors I have adjusted myself to them. So now when they send me aggressive emails, I respond and say ok you can come to my office for us to sort the issue out. So now I have developed strategies of dealing with it. The first year I did not know what was happening. I do not want to create the impression that there was no racism, in fact there was a great deal of racism from students but it was very difficult to identify it and fight it because it was covert.

Dr. Politics narrated a story about how a White student insulted him in class when he was advising the class about the number of hours students should spend on each
subject areas in order to make good grades. According to Dr. Politics, the student blurted out and said what he the professor was saying was “crap” This open attack infuriated the other students and they reprimanded the student but he was adamant stating that since he came to the university as a student he was never told by any professor to commit so much time to his studies as being advised. I captured here Dr. Politics story.

I had an instance where the same student emailed me and said, “Dr Politics I have some friends coming to visit me and we were hitting the bars to go and drink so if I do not come to lectures tomorrow know that I was drunk.” Although this student would not study and do his assignments he had the audacity to email me to tell me that he was going to get drank with his out of town friends. In advising them in class, I told them that if you were taking a 4 credit course this was the amount of time you needed to spend on the course and he told me that all that I was telling them was crap. One student even said to him you were so rude. He went on to say that since he came to the university he has not been studying so why should I ask them to put in so many hours into my course. I asked him whether he was doing well in the other classes and he said yes. I give them an exam and he failed. And he told me that I was giving them too much reading to do.

Dr. Politics believed that the reaction of the other students showed that this student was racist and that he would have reacted differently to a White professor than the way he
reacted towards him. According to Dr. Politics another White student came to him privately and demanded that he fails the racist student but he declined. Dr. Politics also revealed that:

The student who considered my advising as crap together with a few other absentee students who were failing class exams reported me to the dean that they did not like my teaching and that I should be fired. The dean told the students to go back and follow the proper channels of communication by reporting first to the school director. They did and the school director also told them to come to me first to address their grievances before coming to him. The student never confronted me and that ended the matter.

The negative behavior of students towards Dr. Sheba and Dr. Politics confirmed the assertion of McGowan (2000) that White students challenge the authority and the coursework given to them by faculty of color in the classroom in predominantly White colleges and universities. The stories of my respondents revealed a tension between having an overall cordial and respectful relationship with students in the classroom on the one hand and having covert racist attacks on the other. Attitude and behaviors of students towards minority faculty in predominantly White educational institutions was an important recurring theme in the literature (Stanley et al. 2003; McGowan, 2000). In their study of 15 African-American faculty across a variety of ranks Stanley et al. (2003) found that the majority of participants enjoyed teaching, describing their teaching style as
“interactive” (p. 158). On the other hand, many of the participants reported instances where White students directly challenged their authority in the classroom.

**Outside Classroom Attitude and Behaviors**

My respondents described their experiences with student attitude outside the classroom as very interactive and friendly. They painted a picture of being constantly sought after for advising and help. Dr. Pius has this to share about his experiences with students outside of the classroom.

All my students (over 400) know me very well because although I am the school director I make time and listen to all of them. I teach two classes every quarter and I advise 97 of those students personally, so I have their folders with me here. So they come to me and talk to me about various problems they encounter and as part of my responsibility I have to counsel them and help solve their problems. I am very close to my students so they respect me because I go out of my way to ensure that their concerns were taken care off.

My respondents used the African concept of community to explain their relationship with their students both in and outside of the classroom. According to the African professors the concept of community was all embracing and transcends boundaries of formal and informal structures, it provided a caring and nurturing environment both within and outside of formal structures. Here was how Dr. Grace explained his relationship with his students.
My concept of pedagogy was relational. It was about training the head and the heart. It was about creating learning communities. That was why for instance, if we have classes that were very long which go beyond dinner time, we bring food and eat. I relate to them as a brother in the sense that I have an open door policy towards my students. I am available to them anytime they come to ask me for assistance. For instance if I am working on a project in my office and a student comes in to ask for my assistance I put aside what I am doing and help the person.

Overall, my respondents experienced a feeling of camaraderie with students outside the classroom. While the literature (Stanley et al. 2003; McGowan, 2000) indicate that faculty of color experience negative behaviors and attitudes from students both in and outside the classroom, the cordial and respectful outside the classroom experiences of my respondents did not confirm the assertion.

**Relationship of Sub-Saharan African Professors with Colleagues and Mentors**

This section addressed the third research question of the study: the nature of relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their colleagues and mentors. This question explored the formal and informal relationships that my respondents have with their colleagues. The study investigated experiences of collegiality, collaboration, inclusiveness, and friendship that exist between my respondents and other faculty members. The narratives of my respondents revealed a general trend towards collegiality
and friendship. However, some of my respondents lamented over the dearth of collaborative ventures and inclusiveness.

**Collegiality and Friendship**

Most of my respondents classified their experiences with colleagues as collegial and friendly. They intimated having a good working relationship with their White colleagues. They also said their scholarship and views were equally respected both in formal and informal settings. Dr. Sweetie described her relationship with her colleagues as very positive and friendly.

My relationship with my colleagues was very good because we socialize a lot. I go to the gym with my mentor and we have a lot of dinners together. A lot of my colleagues were friends. I know a lot of their spouses and I go to their homes and sometimes socialize with their spouses without them being present. My husband and I get invited to their homes and we also invite them to our homes. For the most part they were not only our colleagues but we consider them our friends. I have never been to the homes of the two colleagues who were full professors but our interaction here in the department was very good. One was a man and the other was a woman and my interaction with the woman was really very good
Dr. Union on the other hand explained the level of collegiality and friendship he enjoyed currently among his peers by contrasting it with his experiences in a prior university where he taught briefly and the university where he did his PhD.

My relationship with colleagues at least in this department was very friendly compared to my relationship with colleagues in my former university. My former department was not a happy department. Since I left, I have been told that the department over there has colleagues who have conflicting personal relations to the extent that some do not speak with others. In the university where I did my PhD there were 2 professors who were at enmity to the extent that when students work with one professor they could not work with the other professor. If one was on your dissertation committee the other will not serve but here we do not have that. My relationships with colleagues were pretty good.

In explaining how such standards of collegiality and friendship was attained my respondents pointed to the social gatherings that they strategically organize and also attend to foster a sense of belonging. In shedding light on the importance of organizing and attending social gathering as a means of fostering collegiality and friendship Dr. Pius commented:

Faculty members come to my house every fall quarter for social interaction. We were very cohesive and we all eat together and interact. During other quarters one of the faculty members will
invite U.S. to go out somewhere to eat and drink. Although I do not drink I attend and we have a good time. All school directors and heads of departments meet regularly although not all of them attend the meetings. We were about 53 but about 23 or 30 meet to discuss student and other administrative issues. When I talk they listen attentively and because of my assent I see them making the effort to listen attentively to me when I am speaking.

Dr. Union observed that having children also helped promote friendship among colleagues. The promotion of friendship among colleagues was done through inviting colleagues and their families with children to birthday parties and reciprocally being invited and attending theirs. Social gatherings and programs for children became a forum for colleague parents to meet and build friendships and network

Usually if you have children who share similar hobbies you meet colleagues at some of these places like playgrounds etc. Also you meet faculty at conferences and other places where you share the same interests. I have met my colleagues in conferences which were organized by other departments because we shared common interest in the topic of discussion. Because of our children we also meet other faculty members at children birthday parties. Faculty members who also have children attend those parties.

The experiences of my respondents regarding collegiality and friendship with their White colleagues were generally positive. This positive relationship did not support
the literature that minority faculty of color on predominantly White campuses suffer from isolation and loneliness, and that they experience nonexistent social and emotional support from their White peers (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000). My respondents felt their scholarship and views were also respected by their White peers. The positive collegial experiences of my respondents with particular reference to the respect accorded their scholarship do not support the literature (Aguirre, 2000; Turner & Meyers, 2000) that the scholarships of minority faculty of color are not accorded respect and recognition.

**Collaboration and Inclusiveness**

Although most of my respondents said their colleagues respect them and appreciate their contributions and friendship, they had very little collaborative ventures on scholarship with their White colleagues. Dr. Bishop lamented the lack of inclusiveness of sub-Saharan African faculty in collaborative endeavors by their White peers.

I would say that a major challenge was fundamentally not having a platform of genuine collaborative endeavor with your White colleagues. By this I mean that one would always be seen as being on the periphery as someone that was coming from a different place from different continent from different racial configuration. This perception was always there and I feel that it was always a major challenge to integration and collaborative work and research. Since the university academe has become a marketplace the relationship has also become material which was a major
challenge. I have found the relationship based on the marketplace model detrimental to scholarship especially in a predominantly White institution.

Dr. Grace explained that the only time he enjoyed fruitful relationship with his colleagues were those rare occasions when they had to collaborate on research or academic program.

My relationship with my colleagues was interesting. It was an up and down relationship. There were times it was at its height and at other times it was cold and you feel like you do not want to be here. As to the nuances as to why the atmosphere changes from time to time it was another whole ball game. Strangely enough it was more difficult now to find something to say positive because the last few years have been less than desirable experiences and I find less than positive things to say about the relationship.

Collectively there were some positive things that have transpired. I would say what I enjoy with my colleagues was when there were some collaborative work of research. I would say my memorable times were when there were possibilities and when we work jointly on promoting research and academic programs.

Dr. Sheba on the other hand echoed sentiments of collegiality and friendship between him and his peers but stressed that he collaborated on scholarly work more with colleague sub-Saharan African professors than with his White counterparts.
I have good working relations with my colleagues especially those that I know. My department was a large one and I do not have working relationship with all of them. I have a good relationship with those that I work closely with. In African Studies Program, I have a good relationship over there. I have been organizing things with most African professors on campus where our work overlaps and the connection works well.

Most of my respondents shared Dr. Sheba’s sentiment of having closer collaborative endeavors with other sub-Saharan African professors in the university than their White colleagues. They confirmed that the presence of a strong African studies program at the university brought them together and served as a major strategic network for uniting them and promoting scholarly collaborations.

Unlike most of my male respondents who have had little or no collaborative work with White colleagues, Dr. Sweetie has had lots of collaborative research with colleagues. Dr. Sweetie commented that she has had more collaborative research work with White colleagues within and outside of her current university more than faculty of color. Dr. Sweetie had this to say,

My experience with collaborative research work was that you have to make it happen. You have to think up ideas and invite people to work with you-people that you know can work well together.

My respondents generally found themselves on the periphery of collaborative research ventures with their White counterparts. My respondents saw the U. S. academe
as a marketplace working on the principles of demand and supply of branded products. The positive collaborative experiences of Dr. Sweetie a female faculty with her White colleagues did not support the literature that women faculty of color often come under pressure to change their research agendas to fit in with those of their units; that colleagues have low expectation of them; and that they have to work extra hard to be perceived as legitimate scholars (Hollenshead & Thomas, 2001).

**Relationship with African American Professors**

It would be expected that being Africans and laying claim to the same racial identity would be a rallying point and concretizing factor in the relationship between my respondents who come from sub-Saharan Africa and their colleague African American professors. This logic was however not the case with two of my respondents Dr. Shine and Dr. Grace who have African American faculty colleagues. My respondents had intriguing experiences about their relationships. According to Dr. Shine, when he came up for tenure his African American colleague who was the chair of his tenure committee went to great lengths to ensure that he was denied tenure. He said that if not for the unflinching support and pressure from his White colleagues and an appeal to the university provost which led to the setting up an independent committee to look into his tenure issue, he would never have been tenured.

When I came up for tenure, my White colleagues at the department and students strongly supported me except one guy, an African American who engineered my being denied tenure. He felt threatened by my presence and put the dean into trouble. He was
peeved that students wrote a play about me as their hero and were always praising me.

Dr. Grace also commented on how one of his African American colleagues was working assiduously behind the scenes to tarnish his image and destroy his credibility as a scholar among other faculty members and even among students. My respondents explained that the animosity exhibited by some African American professors towards their African counterparts ran deeper than personal jealousy and hatred. They asserted that because African professors from the continent do not share the same history of slavery, of emancipation, and the fight for civil rights and liberties with their African American counterparts they were seen as outsiders coming to compete with them. Dr. Union expressed this view as follows:

The reason why African Americans do not want to engage Africans was because they feel that we do not have that background and history of slavery and the things they went through. For the White majority it was a good thing for Africans not to have that baggage of Jim Crow, civil rights, slavery etc and for the African American it was the opposite. Since the African do not have the history of the African American, the African American does not want to engage the African because we were not the same. They also play the reverse snobbish behavior and look down on the African. If you ask me about discrimination I would say there was much more discrimination from African
American against Africans than from White Americans against Africans. That was my experience.

My respondents explanation of the cause of ill feeling between them and their African American colleagues confirmed the assertion of Arthur (2000), that the distinguishing and enduring socio-cultural and economic characteristics that Africans carry with them to the United States have the tendency of differentiating them from African Americans. These differentiating socio-cultural and economic characteristics were sometimes the causes of hostility and misunderstanding between the two groups of people.

Mentorship

Some of my respondents said they have mentors while others did not. Those who did not have mentors explained that they had mentors when they were pursuing their PhD programs but the relationship ceased to exist after they started their teaching careers in the U.S. university academe. My respondents also explained that their departments did not have mentorship programs for new faculty. They therefore relied on their previous teaching experiences in Africa and elsewhere to guide them. Additionally, my respondents remarked that when they have faculty related problems and need advice, they consulted their friends in other universities elsewhere in the U.S. for counsel.

Dr. Grace on the other hand remarked that although there was a mentorship program in his college the associate dean felt that since no faculty in the college was working directly in his research areas the prudent thing was to link him with outside faculty with similar research interests. Dr. Shine however has two mentors both of them
White male professors. Dr. Bishop the visiting professor also said he had two mentors. He said the White professor who chaired his dissertation committee continued to serve as his mentor and the second mentor was a professor from his department back in Africa.

The department of Dr. Sweetie had a mentorship program and Dr. Sweetie had a mentor who was also a faculty of color. Dr. Sweetie remarked that overall she found the mentorship program and her mentor very helpful. Dr. Sweetie said that sometimes however, her personal perceptions and judgments conflicted with the advice of her mentor and she got confused about how far she could trust the advice.

We also have a mentoring system in my department. Once in a while my mentor would talk to me about something or someone to watch out for. Your mentor has your best interest at heart and some of the advice was shocking. And I wonder whether I am unable to read the situation correctly or she was not able to read the situation correctly. Most times I take her advice and do what she tells me but sometimes it goes against my values because I am big headed and I would like to logically argue out an issue to determine why it happened and I do not like to be told that, ‘that was how it was done here’ without questioning it. In my situation as a junior faculty however I have to accept the advice of my mentor and not challenge. You also want to be careful that you do not challenge and rub people on the wrong place.
The stories of my respondents about not having mentors and mentorship programs in their respective departments to nurture and polish their strengths echoed the assertion of Turner and Myers (2000) that there was minimal guidance and mentoring of faculty of color in predominantly White American colleges and universities. The comments by my respondents especially those on tenure track that have little nurturing by way of mentoring also confirms the claim of Essien (2003) that predominantly White American colleges and universities do very little beyond diversifying faculty to incorporate them into the university academe.

**Academic Professional Support**

My respondents acknowledged receiving annual designated professional development funds from their departments to attend academic conferences to present papers at least once a year. Most of my respondents confessed that these professional development funds were meager and they have to supplement them with their own personal monies in order to do their research, to attend all the important conferences, and to present their research papers. The remark of Dr. Shine captured the experiences of most of my respondents:

> I am a professor of international theater and I get a chance to attend international conferences and be visiting professor to represent the university. But here I am a professor of international theater going to the University of Barbados to teach and I am not being paid for June to August. I have not been told that if I do not stay and teach I will not be paid. The argument was that if I cannot
travel and do research as an international professor of theater then where was the support for professional development.

What you get for conferences was $300 and the most was $500 and you get this twice in a year. And if you travel to Britain and you do not have a relative to stay with how can you live on $300. Most of the time, you have to spend your own money on these conferences. Since I came to this university I have attended about 30 conferences and I have to foot the bills myself. It was because the funds available were very small and limited and you cannot get the maximum of $500 more than twice in a year.

Some of my respondents said they applied and received competitive research grants from their respective colleges over the years. Dr. Sweetie who got some of these university wide competitive research grants wished that there were situations where tenure track professors could receive competitive grants and have one course load taken off in a given year where the grantee could use the time solely for research.

Since joining the university in 2006, I have received a challenge grant to do fieldwork. There were also internally competitive grants which were all university grants and I also received some. I also get the $1000 dollar grant from the department for conferences. Sometimes the college also adds $500 to attend a conference and a half each year. I wish there was room to get
research grant where you can get a course off in a year in an open competitive situation.

Dr. Politics who had applied two years in a row for such competitive college research grants but was not awarded felt he had been discriminated against because of his race.

The overall experiences of my respondents with academic professional support were that they received what was available to their White counterparts. In exception of Dr. Politics who applied two years in a row for a competitive college research grant and did not win, other respondents were able to secure competitive college research grants for their research work.

**Sub-Saharan African Professors Experiences with Tenure, Promotion and Scholarship**

This section addressed the fourth research question. The focus of this research question was to understand the experiences of my respondents with tenure, promotion and scholarship. The tenure and promotion process of some of my respondents reflected the bittersweet success for many faculty of color in predominantly White colleges and universities in the U.S. (Fenelon 2003; Santa Cruz, & Chao, 2003; Nakanishi, 1993).

**Bittersweet Success with Tenure**

Out of my four respondents’ tenured, Dr. Pius was tenured before joining the current university while the other three received their tenure and promotion in the university where they were currently teaching. Dr. Union who got tenured in recently remarked that the requirements for tenure and promotion were clearly stated to him when he joined his department seven years ago. His awareness of what the tenure and
promotion requirements were from the onset helped in no small measure in smoothing the process. The tenure and promotion process of Dr. Renown and Dr. Shine were bittersweet successes.

The story of Dr. Renown was that he was initially invited as a visiting professor to teach for one year. After the expiry of the period, the department offered him a tenured faculty position of associate professor but he refused to accept it. Being an accomplished scholar with many years of teaching experience and having far more scholarly publications and books to his name than those who were full professors in the department he told the committee that he would not accept anything lower than a full professorship position. Dr. Renown commented on the bittersweet experience as follows:

When I was negotiating my appointment the dean at the time insisted that I should be employed as an associate professor despite the fact that I was coming with all the credentials that far exceeded the accomplishments of their full professors. She insisted that I should be an associate professor despite my stature as an internationally recognized scholar. I told them they can take their associate professorship, I was greater than all their professors and they cannot argue that fact. So the other faculty members pressured the Chair to employ me as a full professor. She felt this guy could not just come from Africa and become a full professor but the others in the department prevailed on her and she had to agree to my conditions.
According to Dr. Shine, he went through a tortuous tenure process. He was initially denied tenure when he came up. The shock of being denied tenure negatively impacted his life and had to spend time in hospital and at home for psychosomatic disorders. Dr. Shine described part of his bittersweet experience as:

After all the things I have done having taught for 6 years, having published 15 articles and my book was accepted, and have directed the best play which was adjudged the best since the establishment of the university for 200 years, I was still denied tenure. Although my track record stretches all the way to England and although a Noble laureate wrote one of my letters of recommendation, I was still denied tenure. There was no basis. They tried to use records of my teaching and I produced all of them. Then they asked for averages and I produced them and yet the dean was asking how I produced these averages although the averages could be verified from the Secretary’s office. You could see from the way they were acting that they had decided not to tenure me. Anyway the problem was not from my department. My colleagues at the department and students strongly supported me except one guy, an African American who engineered all these. He felt threatened by my presence and put the dean into trouble. He was peeved that students wrote a play about me as their hero and were always praising me.
After fighting the “tenure denied” verdict for one year culminating in an appeal to the university provost and the setting up of an independent committee by the provost to revisit his case the decision not to grant Dr. Shine tenure was finally reversed with apologies from the office of the university provost. Dr. Shine goes on to say:

My African American colleague who was chair of my committee made sure that most of my stuff was not even sent to the external evaluators. If I had taken the case to court he would have been fired but he was still around. When I wrote my appeal the dean became aware that there was something fishy. Meanwhile my tenure committee chair had already made the dean to look like a liar. When the provost received my appeal, he set up a committee to investigate the matter and the provost wrote an apology stating that this should not have happened. That was how I got tenured.

Although Dr. Shine’s case may be termed reverse discrimination since the denial of tenure was orchestrated by an African American, the support of the dean who was White reflects the bittersweet experience that many faculty of color go through in predominantly White colleges and universities across the United States.

Experiences with Scholarship

All my respondents said they were aware of the required number of scholarly works-articles including books needed in order to be tenured and promoted. They devised various ways of achieving this target over a period. Dr. Union commented on the process:
Initially I was doing my research side by side my teaching and it did not work for me so I abandoned that approach. I decided to concentrate on teaching and teaching related matters during the quarter then spend summer and winter breaks to do my research, do all the readings, write the research papers, fine tune it and send it for publishing. So during the quarter, I concentrate on teaching, attending to family life, and do my readings to prepare for classes the next day. During winter break I have 6 weeks to do my research and summer I have 3 months solid block of time to do my research. This gives me freedom not to be too stressed in my teaching. That also means that I do not also have any vacation.

Dr. Sheba remarked that there was the temptation to sit on many committees so as to be seen to be fulfilling the requirements of the policy of diversity of the university. But for the negative effect the time serving on all these committees might have on his scholarship, he agreed with his chair to limit the number of committees he should serve on.

I tend not to be in many committees. I need time to do my research and publish papers because I am on tenure track. As a tenure track faculty you were expected to fulfill certain requirements. With the understanding of the chair I tend not to be involved in many committees because it takes too much of your time. On the other hand, I am involved in many committees because, since I came I
helped organize the Literary Festival where mostly African writers were invited to the conference here in my university. I am also involved with organizing institutes for the African Studies program. I am kind of doing too much. Now, I am also associate director of the African Studies program.

My respondents were aware of the need to conduct research and publish articles in reputable journals as part of the requirement of tenure and promotion. To this end, they have set aside time to research and to publish.

**Experiences of sub-Saharan African Professors with U.S. Academic Culture**

The fifth research question of this study was addressed in this section. The question sought to understand the overall experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with the U.S. university academic culture—the habits, practices, norms, and values in a predominantly White educational institution. Themes that emerged include living in two worlds, otherness and marginality, racism, job satisfaction, and loss of social status.

**Two Worlds Phenomenon**

Although the cultural background and social identities of my respondents were diverse and varied, they grew up in African societies where they were racially the same people. Bringing these diverse cultural and social identities face to face with the academic culture of a predominantly White university in the Midwest produced experiences of a two world phenomenon. Dr. Sweetie figuratively and poignantly described her experience of living in two-worlds as being torn between two cultures and immobilized.
I do feel that I am torn between two cultures and to survive as a tenure track faculty I have to submit to the dominant culture. It was like you have set out yourself to do different things, you have the ideas etc but you were handcuffed and in shackles and cannot do what you want to do. It was like I can hardly wait to be free to do what I want to do. It was all connected to being an African, a minority that was why my hands were tied.

Dr. Politics described the interface between the African culture and a predominantly White American university culture as a challenging marriage. The challenge was that as a minority you have to marry your culture with the dominant American culture and the challenge becomes how to navigate the two cultures without losing your identity. The American environment was challenging because racism and discrimination exists here. Most of the Whites in a small college town like this have not seen a Blackman before and their perception and ideas about a Blackman was not what you would expect.

By alluding to the interface of African culture and identity with the culture of a predominantly White American university as a “marriage of challenge” Dr. Politics was referring to the contention by Bashi and McDaniel (1997) that racial identification was a symbol of social status and had different implications for different racial groups. By
racial identification the Blackman in a predominantly White cultural setting becomes the
derdog and inferior being while the dominant White was the superior and overlord.

Dr. Sheba drew attention to the history of slavery in America that has shaped the
perception of Africans in a predominantly White American cultural setting in the
Midwest. He contrasts the perception of Africans in the Midwest with New York.

There was a difference between how foreign professors from
Africa were treated in New York as opposed to the Midwest. New
York, for instance, was a multicultural society. But in the Midwest
you should never forget the history of slavery, discrimination, and
racism. There was always this history which was brought unto the
table when something happens and used as a basis for interpreting
what happened. I am an African, and colonialist history has taught
them that the African was inferior.

The narrative of Dr. Sheba explains the assertion of Njubi (2002) that the perception that
Africans were inferior was a perspective which was socially constructed. The perception
that the African was inferior forces him in a predominantly White culture to live in two
worlds—the world of his original culture and that of the dominant American culture. In
commenting on his two world experience and how he has learnt to cope with the two
cultures, Dr. Pius shared the following:

It took me sometime before I got acculturated even up till now
some things still worry me about the American culture although I
have lived here close to 30 years now, I do not sacrifice my
principle for anything. What I think right was what I do. I am first an African, a native of my country of origin before being an American. Although I have an American passport I also have my native passport. At home I still speak my native language. I do not eat the American hamburger and their French fries. If I have to eat it at all I do so once in 2 months or something close. I eat the American food only if it was absolutely necessary. We still go to African market once a month to shop and buy African food which we eat at home. I only abide by the American laws; I go to their church although my church at home was very different from theirs. That was why sometimes I miss home very badly and feels like packing and leaving.

Sadao (2003) asserts that faculty of color become adept at code switching—applying “parts of their separate value systems to different situations as appropriate” (p. 410). The comments of Dr. Union classically illustrated this assertion.

I have not lost my Ghanaian identity because I still eat Ghanaian food, listen to Ghanaian music, my children know Ghanaian songs because they listen to it. I still speak my language although not as I should. Other aspects of my culture I have deliberately lost or excluded from my personality. I cannot accept African time anymore. I cannot stand lateness anymore. Another thing was ostentatious living although I cannot say that this was African per
se but I cannot understand why the President of my country must wear a gold chain which costs $65,000 that was disgusting to me. Although I have a dual identity I am still a Ghanaian and I cannot stand some of these things.

Dr. Sweetie described the culture of the U.S. academe as conservative lacking the propensity to change. As a progressive, she preferred to know all about the academic culture in order to work within it than to become assimilated into it.

I have come to conclude that the American academe was full of very progressive people but they do not like change. The American academe was a conservative institution. They would preach change in their classroom and all that but they would still hold on doing the same old things. When you talk to people about change they will say yes but they will tell you that it costs so much to change so they should just continue with the same old thing.

Because of the conservativeness, I hope I do not get to the point where I am the one telling young faculty that let U.S. not change things because that was the way we have always done things. In a sense I would not want to be assimilated into the academic culture.

It was good to know how the institutional culture was.

The foregoing narratives show that my respondents have become bicultural in order that they could function effectively in their predominantly White cultural environment without sacrificing their principles, belief systems, and values of their native
origins. The bicultural posture of my respondents affirmed the assertion of Sadao (2003) that biculturalism was a form of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity to the subtleties of discrimination and racism found in the dominant subculture of high education.

My respondents also pointed to the African community as a vital support system in negotiating their way through the maze of two worlds. To my respondents the African community comprising African students, their spouses, their children, and other African faculty members constitute an extended family with strategic cultural and social capital playing the role of supporters and counselors. The narrative of Dr. Sheba succinctly captured the essence of the sentiment of my respondents.

I must say that I have a strong bonding and friendship with the African community. If the African community were not here I would not have stayed here. I have friends within the international community but I must say that, I am deeply indebted to the African community here. If anything happens, I know who to call. The connection was very strong and very clear. Not that I would discriminate but understand what I am talking about. If something happens, I would call on members of the African community because they know what to do to help me. If something happens to my family for instance, and I call particular members of the African community they will tell me what to do and they would be most willing to help me in any way possible. I feel very comfortable with them. Without them I would not be able to work
the way I am working now, I would not be happy the way I am now, my children would not be happy the way they were doing now. If there were no African community, my children would not be dancing Ghanaian dance the way they were learning to do that now. The Midwest was not only a predominantly white environment but was also a place where Africans have lived, where other Africans can live and negotiate their space. Without this space to negotiate, forget it.

Looking up to networks of the same race, ethnicity, and extended family members for support in order to successfully negotiate the contours of the two world phenomenon was in sync with the assertions of Johnsrud and Sadao (1998); Sadao, (2003); and Segura (2003) that many faculty of color learn to develop coping strategies such as the support of parents, extended family, mentors etc in order to effectively work in two cultures. The comments of Dr. Politics also reflected this assertion

One of the ways I navigate the two cultures without losing my identity was to keep in touch with my country folks both here in the U.S. and in Ghana. I buy international calling card which was cheap here and I call home and talk to family and friends. And there was a big Ghanaian community and association in the big city nearby that I participate in. My research was based in Ghana and that provided me the opportunity to go home twice every year.
The experiences of my respondents show that there exist a tension between their cultural and social identities, and the culture of the U.S. academe. This tension forced my respondents to experience a two-world phenomenon. In order to cope with this phenomenon, my respondents have to resort to “code switching” and biculturalism, a cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity to the intricacies of discrimination and racism found in hegemonic subcultures of higher education (Sadao, 2003).

**Otherness and Marginality**

Many of my respondents said that their experiences with a predominantly White university academic culture revealed that the culture did not have built-in structures that integrate minority faculty of color. The policy of diversity which was touted in formal circles as a platform for embracing people of other ethnicities, cultures and orientations largely remained superficial. My respondents contended that the superficiality of the policy of diversity reduced African professors to tokens. Dr. Sheba remarked on being perceived as tokens as follows:

> Generally, American educational institutions offer positions to African professors to teach in their universities. That was why we were here. At the same time there was also the need for American universities to fundamentally decolonize the way they work. Decolonize the academe and its culture in a way that they should not see African professors as tokens. There was the need to diversify the U.S. faculty and get a more international oriented faculty.
Dr. Shine also commented on the idea of African professors being tokens. He observed:

The only reason you were here was because you have something they need not because they love you or because you were one of them but because you were seen as expedient in the making of the culture viable with a human face because they have been accused for many centuries of being a racist society. You were accepted here so that the accusation and perception that America was a racist society can be changed. The truth was that you were a mere token.

Commenting further on the inadequacies of the structures in a predominantly White university to be inclusive, recognize and celebrate the work of African faculty in their midst Dr. Sheba remarked:

Your chair tells you were a highly appreciated teacher. Your chair knows that you were truly good because he gives you good recommendations. He was also aware that your students give you good evaluations. At the same time, the environment was predominantly White such that, for example, you do not get nominated by the students for the best teacher award. I do not see that happening because it was not in the students’ perception. The general population was yet to think multicultural and start asking what was happening. If that should happen, it would surprise me.
The race issue was still there. It was not on their agenda to promote blacks.

Dr. Shine perceived the experience of sub-Saharan African professors being treated as “outsiders” and without avenues for integration into the university academic culture as intentional and structurally programmed. He explained the “conspiracy” as follows:

You were hired because you were ‘other’. As a professor of international theater I am here because of what I know and without that I would not have been here. If you do not have something beyond what they know they would not hire you. That was what the students come to get from me. If all that I know was what they know they would have hired a White person to do the job. So otherness was ingrained in the structure of employment that I can only be hired as the other if they do not have what I have. So if you think that you will ever be accepted as one of them you were mistaken because you were here precisely because you were the ‘other’. People have tried it in England and elsewhere to integrate. They have tried to change their assent, eat like Whites, marry Whites and do all kinds of things to be accepted but it will never happen.

Antonovsky’s “marginal situation” concept shed light on the perspectives of Dr. Sheba and Dr. Shine narrated above. According to Antonovsky (1956) marginal situation
was a place of low status, subordination, and inferiority assigned by the dominant, the powerful, and the privileged to men on the margins of society. It involves placing socially constructed barriers in the way of the marginal individual to prevent him from enjoying the privileges and freedoms of the dominant social system. From the foregoing it was clear that my respondents constitute marginal men confined to the periphery by the structures of predominantly White university academic cultures and prevented from experiencing true integration and power of the dominant society.

My respondents explained that the culture of sub-Saharan Africa was predominantly communal and collectivistic while that of the U.S. was individualistic. And when their African communal and collectivistic culture came into contact with the predominantly White American academic culture it resulted in a clash. To resolve the conflict they have to subject their African culture to the dominant American culture. Dr. Shine explained the phenomenon thus:

Well any White administrator was only interested in you as a Black if he can use you to further his imperial agenda. No administrator was interested in you because you were Black or because you were intelligent or charismatic. They find that uncomfortable and intimidating. They will easily hate you if they find that you were charismatic because if you were charismatic it means you have power. Their society does not understand that when you were speaking you were not speaking for yourself but for the group because they were individualistic while Africans
were communalistic. When you speak in a community in Africa you speak for the entire community. When someone was speaking in a community meeting in Africa others urge him on by saying, let him talk, let him talk because they know that what they want to say was what he was saying for all of them. That does not exist in this society because of its individualistic nature. They expect that you do only your part and they also do theirs. If you were too visible they will hate you. It means you have power. In order not to be mistaken for being power hungry, you have to be quiet and only do your part.

The above narrative of Dr. Shine provided insight into the marginal man theory of Park (1928) when he asserted that the marginal man was:

A cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now sought to find a place—he was a man on the margins of two cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated and fused. (p. 892)

Dr. Union observed that for sub-Saharan African professors to be viewed as “other” was not only about being seen as an outsider and someone on the margins of a
dominant society, it also included being seen as not fitting the stereotypical sub-Saharan African image but living outside the traditional mold. Dr. Union explained this experience as follows:

I have a faculty colleague who was 65 years old and he was White.
On several occasions he said to me that I don’t see you as Black.
He means to say that when I see you I do not see your color I see what you do and what you say. Here it was probably symptomatic of being treated as the other. This was not reverse discrimination but reverse assimilation. Why should he mention that he does not see me as Black? He was trying to say that you were not a stereotypical African or an African American. I do not fit into any of these categories and this plays to our advantage. Being an African studying here you do not fit the typical African Masai dancing with spears or dying with hunger and starvation, and secondly you do not fit the typical African American gang. So they cannot fit you into any of those boxes.

My respondents experienced marginality as they tried to integrate into the culture of the U.S. academe. They felt they were tokens because of the superficial implementation of the policy of diversity in their university (Essien, 2003; Johnsrud & Sadao, 2003). Their experience is akin to what the literature described as marginal men in marginal situation (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1935; Antonovsky 1956).
All my respondents acknowledged that there was racism in the United States and in their predominantly White university academe. They also confirmed experiencing various levels of racism either from students, colleagues or from university administrators. The racist experiences ranged from being subtle and covert to being blatant. Dr. Sheba for instance, commented that he faced weekly subtle racism from students. These covert racist acts were exhibited through the unreasonable complaints about class readings, tests, grading, and aggressive emails. Dr. Sheba also had an overt racist experience with an administrator to share.

My saddest moment happened this year when someone who did not know me wrote about me and by mistake the email was sent to me. This person was a lady in administration from the dean’s office who wrote nasty racist things about me saying nobody knows where he was from and he was not understandable. And I said ok, where was the evidence because I do not know this person. And why do you have to say these nasty things about someone you have never met. I kind of struggled with this. Now I have documentation and I have filed the case with my chair and with the dean about what was happening.

Dr. Grace on the other hand expressed having very depressive discriminatory acts and behaviors from departmental colleagues towards him. He said his colleagues were in the habit of fault finding by writing long and accusatory emails to him, saying very
negative things about him to other colleagues and students in order to damage his credibility and integrity, and unreasonably holding him responsible for weaknesses of students who were assigned to him for advising. When I asked Dr. Grace to talk about the future of his relationship with his colleagues, he had this to say:

My suggestion will be that we should move more towards understanding each other better and each person moving a little bit in his or her own domain to accommodate the other. If you ask me how long I can continue, I do not know. For now I feel I have a commitment to finish with the students I am working with at the PhD level. After that I do not know whether there was something left for me here, I do not have any idea.

The narratives of my respondents showed that they experienced covert and overt racism from students, colleagues, and administrators as they tried to integrate into the culture of the predominantly White university where they taught. Their experiences were in consonance with the literature that race and ethnicity largely influenced how faculty on U.S. university campus were treated (Bower, 2002; McGowan, 2000).

**Job Satisfaction**

My respondents affirmed that in spite of issues of racism, marginalization, and living in two worlds, the level of job satisfaction experienced particularly in their predominantly White university makes a big difference in their decision to continue teaching in the U.S. than to teach in their home countries. My respondents pointed out that compared to their home countries where educational infrastructure was deteriorating
each passing day; the infrastructure at their predominantly White American university was constantly being enhanced creating a congenial atmosphere for fruitful academic endeavor. The comment of Dr. Bishop described this issue vividly.

Personally, the level of job satisfaction was what makes the big difference. Back in Nigeria the infrastructure constricts self satisfaction in terms of access to internet, library materials, doing library research the infrastructure was not there, but here I find it very satisfying because I can go to the internet and find the latest journal article that may have been published in my field and I can access any book that has been published in the same year; and that I get to be supported to attend conferences and present a paper adds to the sense of job satisfaction I get at an institution like this than what I would get back in my former university. I would see the two as entirely on a different scale because of the differences in infrastructure and technology available in the classroom to be able to present materials in power point etc all adds to my sense of job satisfaction.

Dr. Pius also made a similar comparison between infrastructure at home in Africa and what was available here in the U.S. He intimated that he would have preferred to stay at home in Africa however, the working conditions were unsatisfactory. He blamed African politicians for the brain drain on the continent because according to him the politicians were not doing enough to arrest the deteriorating infrastructural conditions. It
was therefore satisfying to work in an environment where the tools were available than to work in an environment which was unsafe and lacked the basic working tools.

I prefer to stay at home in Africa but back at home the resources and tools to work with were not available and there was also no security and safety at home. You were afraid to get outside, you were afraid of armed robbers and the politicians were not improving the plight of the people. If the politicians improve the infrastructure then we can go back home. For instance for two weeks when I went home to Nigeria this summer, there was no electricity, so how can you function? Everybody was asking me how they can come here to the U.S. which meant that politicians were not working to improve the infrastructure needs of the country. The politicians were greedy. For instance if you see the mansion the governor of my state was building for Obansanjo the past president-50 bedrooms-what does he need that for? He has several houses. It was all greed and selfishness because those funds could have been used to improve the health sector by providing hospitals and clinics for the people but they will not do it. It will take divine intervention to do the right thing back at home and until such improvements come most brains will continue to leave.

Most of my respondents remarked that beyond the adequacy of infrastructure available in the university where they teach, the positive feedback they got from their
students was a great source of joy and satisfaction to them. The experience of my respondents confirm the assertion in the literature that faculty of color describe their teaching as a source of great accomplishment and satisfaction (Turner, 2003). Dr. Grace described the satisfaction he got from his students as a cardinal experience that was keeping him in the U.S. He had this comment to make.

The satisfaction that I get mostly from my students keeps me going. For instance from my last class, I showed a movie and 75% of the class was stunned. I ended up the class with my own story of discrimination and most of the students broke down and one student screamed in the midst of tears with broken voice and said, how can such a thing happen to a good professor like you; and this was an undergraduate class where students would take their bags 10 minutes to time and run but they always stayed to the end. This gives me a feeling that the work was being done and an impact was being made. If the students were taken out I would have no cause to be here.

Dr. Bishop, Dr. Sheba and Dr. Shine explained that influencing young minds to become change agents in their communities and workplaces were the factors that motivated them to become teachers. To have students therefore coming back to give testimonies of their lives being changed by their teaching was a great source of pride and satisfaction. Dr. Sheba explained the experience this way:
I get a lot of pleasure from teaching. A student said to me recently that she was completely transformed by my teaching. She said because of your class and the interaction in your pedagogy, I came out of myself which was racist and small worldview and now sees things from a global context. For me as a teacher that was a great compliment and I said Whoa! I do not have any contact with this student but I can say that she should be doing very well in the world.

Dr. Bishop referred to a feedback he received directly from a student as one of his memorable experiences.

One of my memorable moments in this university would be an experience I had with a student in 2007. One afternoon as I was walking towards my department I met a former student of mine and after we greeted he said he wanted to express his appreciation for the way I shaped his thinking about the world and what was going on in the world, that he has come to a more clearer understanding of world events beyond his immediate environment. To me that was very memorable and satisfying and addressed the reason why I was in the academe to impact students.

On his part, Dr. Shine said his students show him a lot of respect and appreciation. This appreciation was displayed in the material things they constantly
procure for him. He remarked that a student even made a movie about him and the passion with which he executed his teaching duties.

The things I teach were the things which were important to me.
They were my articles of faith. The paradigm that European and Western epistemology was superior was what I have been destroying, so when I come at it I come with a certain passion and the students can see that this professor has a certain agenda and they were excited about my courses. The students show so much appreciation. They buy me gifts such dresses etc to show their appreciation. One student even made a film about me. He first wrote a play about me and later changed it into a screen play and took it to Hollywood. Hollywood wanted to buy the play but the student refused. The student was later given $700,000 to make the movie which he did and made me act the part of the “professor”

Adequate educational infrastructure including access to educational materials through the internet which were lacking in the higher educational institutions of my respondents home countries contributed greatly to a positive job satisfaction. The overall positive responses and feedback that my respondents received from their students also contributed in enhancing their job satisfaction. The desire by my respondents to continue teaching in their predominantly White American university despite experiences of racial discrimination confirmed the literature that adequate educational infrastructure and job
satisfaction were some of the key factors that “pull” immigrant professionals from Africa to the United States (Arthur, 2000).

**Loss of Social Status**

My respondents intimated that their academic profession was enhanced by living and teaching in the U.S. university academe. However, in comparing their social status of being university professors here in the U.S. to their status back home, they were of the view that the recognition and prestige they enjoyed back home was higher than in the U.S. university academe. Commenting on the loss of social status, Dr. Sheba remarked:

> I would be honest about this. In my country, I was considered one of the leading academic intellectuals. I was consulted and asked on practically any question on political, cultural and literary issues going on in the country. Here I am only a university teacher. If I would do something in my research areas in Africa I would do something with my knowledge. For example, in Africa, I would go to the field and collect my data and I would have the opportunity to share my findings with the media or policy makers who will use it.

Dr. Renown who spends part of every academic year working back home also had similar experiences to share about having a higher status in Africa. Back home I am a celebrity. My work was celebrated I am on TV all the time. When I am here I am even called upon often to comment on things which were happening in South Africa. When there was the case of xenophobia in South Africa for instance they
called me from the U.S. to comment on the story. So I continue to do active work in South Africa even when I am not physically present. I am called to comment on political issues etc of my country. I like the fact that I live here because it helps me to sit back and reflect on what was happening back home, give my comments, and also do my work. There were too many demands on me if I am physically there.

Dr. Pius attributes the loss of social status of the sub-Saharan African professor in a U.S. university academe on the one hand to the liberal nature of the American society, and on the other to the legacy of the British sociopolitical system.

In the U.S. university academe nobody cares about social status that was why they call you by your first name. America was a liberal country where titles do not mean much but at home titles were status symbols where they will call you professor but not here. In the U.S. we have no social status but back at home we were located on a very high pedestal. We have social status back at home because of the British legacy of status symbols which we inherited.

Dr. Politics explained that the loss of status in America sometimes served as a disincentive for some professionals to want to continue working in the U.S.

My social status in my country was far higher than over here. For example here when I go to the store all that the cashier was looking
at was a Blackman that was all that they see if you go to the restaurant etc. I went to a restaurant in Cape Coast in Ghana and when they saw me they said hey professor and greeted me with respect and decorum. Maybe because of the liberal American culture nobody cares who you were. That was why sometimes people get fed up over here and decide that they were going home because they would be treated with dignity and respect back home.

Unlike my male respondents who said they experienced loss social status as a result of teaching in the U.S. academe, Dr. Sweetie a female African professor remarked that her social status in the academe was enhanced by teaching in the U.S. compared to teaching in her country in Africa. Dr. Sweetie explained that when she taught in the university in her country of origin, her male colleagues did not respect her because of her gender. Dr. Sweetie on the other hand felt her countrymen in Africa would respect her more than the respect accorded professors here in the U.S. Dr. Sweetie intimated:

I will feel more respected about my knowledge back home. The students and the general public will respect me more back home than here. As a woman I am respected more here than I would have been respected back home because when I taught in the university back home my colleagues did not respect me because I was a woman. We would have meetings and my male colleagues would tell me to go get them tea and that would not happen here. The reason why I feel I would be respected more in my country was
that the U.S. was the only place where being smart was frowned upon. To be dumb was cool and being smart was frowned upon even among high school kids. They talk about how Obama was smooth talking and cannot be trusted. So in some social settings I feel I cannot correct because I do not want to come across as arrogant but in my country I can tell them exactly what I think. In Kenya it is acceptable to express your knowledge to the point of being rude as long as you know what you were talking about.

Although Dr. Sweetie shared the same sentiments with his male sub-Saharan counterparts that she would have been more respected back in her country for her knowledge, she gained social capital by accepting a teaching position in the U.S. academe. Being a woman, Dr. Sweetie’s experiences of gaining social status as a result of teaching in the U.S. academe were at variance with the literature that women faculty of color in the U.S. academe suffer from double-bind and invisible marginality (Turner, 2002; Alfred, 2001; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). Dr. Sweetie’s experiences and perspective of gaining respectability in the U.S. academe could be traced to the strong patriarchal nature of sub-Saharan African societies and societal expectations of women. According to Kuenyehia (1995), irrespective of the career a woman chooses, her duties and expectations as a woman are primarily to serve in the home as wife and mother.

Coping with Challenges

My respondents pointed to the love and passion for their profession and hard work as major forces that motivate them daily to keep going in the midst of prejudice,
discrimination, and marginalization. Dr. Renown lucidly explained love and passion for his profession as the driving force like this:

As a scholar, the love of art and the enjoyment of writing, painting and creativity was what keep me going in the midst of all the challenges I face.

Other respondents referred to their faith in God as a sustaining force, working hard, and directing all their energies into their profession. Dr. Pius commented that a combination of hard work and unceasing prayer was what keeps him going.

The challenge was that you have to work hard—seven to ten times more than your White colleagues to show that you were competent enough to do the job. The environment does not favor minorities and you have to work hard to prove that you were competent to the task. The other important thing was that you have to be prayerful and commit your ways to the Lord. Those of us from Africa who were teaching in the U.S. go through various headships the way forward was that you have to endure, persevere, pray and work hard and then you will be fine.

Dr. Sheba stated that apart from hard work as a mechanism of coping with the challenges that exist in teaching at a predominantly White American university, peaceful coexistence with others, focusing on his work, and keeping himself informed on issues were his keys.
I work hard. I try to live and allow others to live. What keeps me going was my work. I like to focus on my work as a professor in African literature and critical theory. I however keep myself informed about the ideological, political, racial issues that go on around me although it can be disturbing at times.

Dr. Bishop talked about staying focused and dwelling on the positive rather than the negative as his strategy to dealing with the challenges that exist in teaching at a predominantly White American university. He remarked:

I would say my approach to coping with challenges here in a predominantly White American university was to be as much positive as possible as I conduct myself, relate to colleagues, teach, and do my research. Whatever I do, I try to be positive rather than focus on the negative. I have been able to stay on course and cope by focusing my mind on the positive side of things.

Dr. Sweetie remarked that whenever she has problems with the academic culture, she talked to her husband who was American and who serves as her cultural interpreter.

One of the people I refer to when I am having problems with the academic culture was to talk to my husband who was American and he tells me how a particular issue was culturally interpreted here. So he acts as my cultural interpreter when we were here in the U.S. and I also act as his cultural interpreter when we were in Africa because he also does his research in southern Africa.
My respondents adopted various ways of coping with the challenges they faced as a result of teaching in a predominantly White university. Foremost among these coping mechanisms was to devote their energies and passion to teaching and research. While all of them mentioned hard work as a coping mechanism, some combined hard work with faith in God through prayers to God for counsel and guidance. They also mentioned pursing peace in their endeavors, keeping themselves informed about events happening around them, and talking often to family and friends about their challenges.
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors who teach at a predominantly White American university in the Midwest. The purpose dictated the methodological approach used to navigate the contours of the study. The methodological approach used to understand the lived experiences of the sub-Saharan African professors who participated in the study was phenomenology. Specific techniques used to gather data on the experiences of research participants were interviewing and observation. The data gathering techniques yielded a rich volume of thick descriptions of experiences of research participants which were categorized and thematically analyzed under the various research questions.

Information in this concluding chapter was organized as follows: summary of findings, conclusions, theoretical and policy implications, and recommendation for future research.

Summary of Findings

This study used interview and observation techniques to capture the experiences of ten sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White American university in the Midwest. The overarching research question that guided the study was: What were the lived experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White university in the Midwest of United States of America. The interviews and observations were based on five specific research questions which were:
reasons why sub-Saharan African professors left Africa to live in the United States and teach in the U.S. academe; what were the classroom teaching experiences and relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their students; what was the nature of relationship of sub-Saharan African professors with their colleagues and mentors; what were the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with tenure, promotion, and professional development; and what the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with the academic culture U.S. academe were.

The findings of the study yielded very fascinating perspectives on the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching at a predominantly White American university in the Midwest. Although the findings do not represent the experiences of all sub-Saharan African professors teaching at predominantly White American universities in the Midwest some of the themes and findings that emerged from the study were consistent with the themes in the literature that exist on minority faculty in the U.S. university academe. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the study yielded very rich descriptive data full of depth and breadth. The findings of this study therefore represented only the prominent themes that emerged in response to the research questions.

**Concluding Discussions**

This concluding section presents a reflection on the themes that were gleaned from the interviews and observations of research participants. The themes that emerged were attractive career opportunities; unfavorable political climate at home; personal reasons; preparing for classes and dealing with issues of competency; classroom interaction and pedagogy; student complaints about accent; classroom attitudes and
behaviors; outside classroom attitude and behaviors; collegiality and friendship; collaboration and inclusiveness; relationship with African American professors; mentorship; bittersweet success with tenure; experiences with scholarship; two worlds phenomenon; otherness and marginality; racism; job satisfaction; loss of social status.; and coping with challenges.

In his book “Invisible sojourners” Arthur (2000) identifies four reasons why Africans migrate to the United States. According to Arthur (2000) the motivations by Africans to migrate to the U.S. included educational pursuit; economic reasons; to join family; and for political reasons. The overarching reason why Africans migrate to the United States was to attain higher educational levels (Arthur, 2000). The interview data showed that majority of my respondents came to the U.S. to pursue higher education and stayed on to teach after completing their doctoral programs. The reasons why African professionals who were educated in the United States do not go back home but stay and work in the U.S. have been identified to include declining economic conditions manifesting in high levels of poverty, and deteriorating infrastructure in their home countries (Mamdani, 1994; Mazrui, 1994; Nkinyangi, 1991; Nyamnjoh & Nantang, 2002). Coming to live and work in the U.S. because of attractive career opportunities and personal reasons such as to join family members, for health reasons, or for peace of mind speaks to both economic decline and political instability that was pervasive on the African continent.

My respondents commented on the need to prepare very well before entering their classrooms in order to prove their competency beyond all shadow of doubt confirmed the
perception among minority faculty of color that they were expected to work harder than their white colleagues, “or more simply put, work twice as hard to be treated as equal” (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000, p. 90). Although all of my respondents received their higher education in the West and endeavor to teach the Western epistemology the same way they received it in graduate school, their remarks showed that White students still scrutinized their scholarship due to their race. The psychological pressure on my respondents, to prove that they were competent, and up to the task of teaching, could be interpreted as an effort to surmount the barrier of prejudice that separates them from their White students.

My respondents corroborated the assertion that higher education in the United States was founded on Eurocentric epistemological perspectives of White privilege, democratic ideals of meritocracy and individuality. They further confirmed that the American epistemology presumed that there was only one way of knowing and understanding the world, interpreting truth, and reality (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). My respondents introduced African perspectives and examples into their classrooms in order to challenge the dominant epistemology. By bringing African pedagogical perspectives into the classroom and setting the agenda to dismantle the Eurocentric epistemology the actions of the African professors gave credence to the assertion that minority faculty have a task in defining what legitimate epistemology was (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998).

Contrary to the claims by Bernal & Villalpando (2002) that in an environment where Eurocentric epistemology was the dominated paradigm, minority faculty of color were pressured to disregard their unique perspectives and experiences as sources of
legitimate knowledge, my respondents maintained that they effectively brought their African epistemologies to bear on their pedagogy, challenge the Eurocentric epistemology in their various classrooms, and also conduct their respective African oriented researches with the financial support of their departments and colleges.

A typical example of transmitting African epistemology was what Dr. Shine does in class.

I go beyond the chalk and talk to encourage students to use their bodies in songs and dance in the learning process. The use of body movements, songs and dance in learning is a unique African traditional pedagogical tool.

Being an African with an emic perspective, I am aware that dance and music is a powerful pedagogical tool used to transmit knowledge and other cultural norms in African traditional societies. Dr. Shine further dilated on his pedagogy thus:

The power I have was that I know how to go beyond the chalk and talk into how to use the body and how to get students to use their bodies through songs and dance in the learning process. This was different from how others teach mostly in the university.

According to Ochukpue (2004), African immigrants from countries which were once colonies of Britain speak English with a blend of British accent with their local dialect. When these African immigrants come to graduate school or become faculty in the U.S. they were ridiculed and sometimes discriminated against on the basis of their accent (Manrique & Manrique, 1994; Antwi & Ziyati, 1993). The assertion in the literature that
accent was a basis for discriminating against African students and professors in the U.S. university academe was confirmed by some of my respondent sub-Saharan African professors. They mentioned being negatively evaluated by students based on their accent and one narrated how an administrator wrote racist remarks about him because of his accent.

My respondents described teaching as a source of great satisfaction and success especially when one considered the fact that most of them said they did not choose teaching but teaching chose them. The sweet teaching experiences of satisfaction and accomplishment of some of my sub-Saharan African professor respondents was set in direct contradiction to the bitter classroom experiences of challenges to their competence, authority, covert and overt racism from some White students. The bittersweet experiences of my respondents confirmed the assertion by Turner (2003) that what was taught, how it was taught, and who teaches always affects classroom dynamics. The classroom teaching experiences of my respondents confirmed the literature that although most minority faculty of color teaching in predominantly White American universities say they derived great satisfaction and pride from teaching, they also face challenges from White students to their authority, open and hidden racism, and disrespectful behavior from White students (McGowan, 2000; Stanley et al. 2003).

My respondents remarked that they were respected by their White colleagues. They also stated that they have fruitful social and friendly interactions with their White professor peers. These experiences of respect, social and friendly interaction with their White peers goes contrary to the assertion of Laden & Hagedorn (2000) that minority
faculty of color have low to nonexistent social and emotional support. Commenting on levels of loneliness and isolation of minority faculty in the U.S. university academe, Laden & Hagedorn stated that, “faculty of color often face issues and barriers, such as low to nonexistent social and emotional support and heightened feelings of loneliness and isolation at a level much higher than that experienced by their White counterparts” (p. 58, 2000). I believe that a plausible explanation as to why sub-Saharan African professors in a predominantly White university in the Midwest felt respected and embraced by their White peers lay in the identity of Africans from the continent as opposed to that of African Americans. Dr. Union addressed this issue succinctly. According to him:

The identity of immigrant Africans from the African continent to White America does not carry the baggage of the history of slavery and inferiority. White America knows that things that have happened here such as slavery and its aftermath has nothing to do with you the African immigrant so you have a clean slate and you do not have all those racial tensions over slavery and civil rights etc so you do not have any problems. You just have to start from there and go on.

The level of interaction of my respondents changed that from friendly social and emotional interaction to negligible collaboration on scholarship with their White colleagues. According to my respondents the African studies program at the university provided them with a platform to collaborate on research endeavors among themselves as sub-Saharan African professors than with their White colleagues in their respective
departments. The minimal scholarly collaboration between the sub-Saharan African professors and their White counterparts could be traced to the perception that minority faculty were involved in research deemed peripheral to the dominant White American research interests.

The lack of scholarly collaboration between my sub-Saharan African professor respondents and their White peers reflects the broader discussion about what constituted legitimate epistemology in higher education in the U.S. In pointing out what constituted legitimate epistemology Bernal & Villalpando (2002) asserted that, “higher education in the United States was founded on a Eurocentric epistemological perspective based on White privilege and “American democratic” ideals of meritocracy, and individuality. This epistemology presumes that there was only one way to knowing and understanding the world, and it was the natural way of interpreting truth, knowledge and reality” (p. 171). The enjoyment of minimal scholarly collaboration from majority White professors becomes a pressure valve for minority faculty of color to engage in scholarly interests that were acceptable in White journals (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Banks, 1984).

The negative experiences of two of my respondents with their African American faculty peers seems to confirm the assertion of Arthur (2000) that although African immigrants and African Americans were of the same race, they do not necessarily share the same history, culture and economic paradigms and as a result these differences sometimes became a source of tension and animosity among the two groups. In her study of eight African immigrant professors in two historically Black universities in a Southeastern State, Ochukpue (2004) revealed that her African immigrant professor
respondents experienced pernicious discrimination, career glass ceiling, isolation, stress, tenure tension, lack of career advancement, and negative estimation of competence. She concluded that, despite their shared racial characteristics and common African heritage with African Americans, her study showed that African immigrant professors have not melted into the cultural pot of African Americans (p. 170).

The mentoring experiences of my respondents were in consonance with the literature. Majority of my respondents did not have mentors. According to the literature many faculty of color lament the fact that they have received very little or no mentoring from senior faculty colleagues (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). My respondents who had mentors affirmed that they benefited from the mentoring relationship. This positive experience of my respondents mirrored the assertion by Tillman (2001) that productive mentor-protégé relationships lead to improvements in teaching, performance and research productivity. The case of Dr. Grace who has to look outside of his university for a mentor reflected the findings of Thomas & Hollenshead (2001) that some faculty of color have to look beyond senior faculty in their department to find mentors elsewhere. Remarks by my respondents on tenure track that they have little mentoring from senior White faculty also confirmed the assertion of Essien (2003) that predominantly White American colleges and universities do very little beyond diversifying faculty to incorporate them into the university academe.

The literature describes the tenure and promotion process of minority faculty of color in predominantly White American colleges and universities “bittersweet” (Fenelon 2003; Santa Cruz, & Chao, 2003; Nakanishi, 1993). This description aptly fitted the
experiences of two out of the four sub-Saharan African professors who were tenured in the predominantly White American University. According to Blackburn, Wenzel, & Bieber (1994), the “often stated remark that minorities publish significantly fewer articles than their majority colleagues” needs to be substantiated with more research (p. 271). My respondents who had negative experiences with tenure proved that the often stated remark that minorities publish considerably fewer articles than their majority colleagues was not the issue but rather a case of discrimination. The bittersweet experiences of my respondents who were tenured also mirrored the literature that the tenure process for minority faculty of color in predominantly White colleges and universities was stressful because it was a process that involved a small group of people, mostly Whites who decided whether you were good enough to be admitted into the elite club of the professoriate (Stanley, 2006).

My respondents explained that by devoting a lot of time to preparation and delivery of lectures, having open door policy to student advising, being asked to serve on various committees and organizing conferences etc. they have to work extra hard to conduct their scholarly researches and write their research articles for publication. As a result of the time they devote to the above issues, my respondents said they felt they were tokens. The experiences of “working hard” by my respondents confirmed the literature that minority faculty of color perceived that they were expected to work harder than their White counterparts, “work twice as hard to be treated as equal” (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000, p. 61). The perception by my respondents that they were treated as tokens also confirmed the assertion of Essien (2003) that minority faculty of color in predominantly
White American educational institutions were treated as tokens by showcasing them on committees, panels, boards, etc as representatives of ethnic groups rather than on the merit of their professional competence.

My respondents were unanimous in their remarks about their experiences of a two-world phenomenon as they worked within the predominantly White university academic culture. As their African cultural heritages clashed with the academic culture of a predominantly White American university built on Anglo-Saxon values, they experienced what Du Bois (1903) referred to as “double-consciousness.” This experience of “twoness” of having “two warring souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body” (Du Bois, 1903, p. 4) forced them to become bicultural, and “code switch” as and when it becomes necessary. The experiences of my respondents resonated with the literature on minority faculty of color teaching in predominantly White American colleges and universities. According to the literature the outcomes of the clash of the cultures of minority faculty of color with the academic culture of predominantly White American higher education institutions were two-world phenomenon, “code switching”, and biculturalism (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Sadao, 2003; Segura, 2003). The two-world phenomenon experienced by my respondents is further discussed in the theoretical implications section of this study.

The comments of my respondents regarding their level of incorporation and assimilation into the culture of the predominantly White American educational system indicated that they experienced otherness and marginality. Although they saw themselves as part of the university system, their level of integration was largely determined by the
degree to which the climate of the university culture was hospitable (Harvey, 1991).

Although my respondents see themselves as “marginal men” (Park, 1928) in a marginal situation (Antonovsky, 1956) their position on the margins was not necessarily a negative thing but a sanctuary where they were able to retain the essence of their culture, and to successfully navigate to the center and participate in the work of the university. The attitude of my respondents to their otherness and marginality synchronized with what bell hooks (1984) had to say about the power of being a minority on the margins of a predominantly White society. According to hooks (1984):

> Being in the margin was to be a part of the whole but outside the whole. This sense of wholeness, impressed upon our consciousness by the structure of our daily lives, provided us with an oppositional world view-a mode of seeing, unknown to most of our oppressors that sustained U.S., aided us in our struggle to transcend poverty and despair, and strengthened our sense of self and our solidarity.

(p. ii)

I have elaborated further on the marginality of my respondents and their marginal state in the theoretical implications section of this study.

The racist experiences of some of my respondents confirmed the literature that minority faculty in predominantly White colleges and universities suffer from discriminatory practices based on race. The literature refers to racism in higher education as “elite racism” According to Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) elite racism in the academe was when individual majority faculty members were not moved to question their beliefs,
attitudes, or actions toward those who were different, or their judgment as racist but rather see themselves as part of the educated elite whose collective responsibility was to uphold standards of scholarly integrity. Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) offer an insightful explanation as to why faculty of color despite their comparable academic qualifications with majority faculty were still discriminated against. According Johnsrud & Sadao (1998) minority faculty in predominantly White American colleges and universities suffer from racial discrimination because:

They were different from the dominant group; they were bicultural, not monocultural, and have accommodated to the dominant culture. But they exercise their own values and preferences. They were “other.” They were different and differentness was perceived as deficient, not in keeping with the standards of the academy. In this way, the dominant group maintains its values and its power to define who was to be included and who was to be excluded from, or remain peripheral to the academy. (p. 16)

The narratives of my respondents regarding the level of job satisfaction vis-à-vis the issues they have with racism, marginalization, and living in two-worlds can best be described as a lived contradiction. The contradiction lies in the fact that despite the challenges of racial discrimination, marginalization, and double consciousness they all said they were satisfied with their jobs. My respondents affirmed that in spite of issues of racism, marginalization, and living in two worlds, the level of job satisfaction experienced particularly in their predominantly White university makes a big difference
in their decision to continue teaching in the U.S. than to teach in their home countries. The satisfaction and accomplishment of my respondents on the one hand and their challenges of racism and marginalization on the other was in sync with what Turner (2003) referred to in the literature as the bittersweet experiences of minority faculty of color in predominantly White universities.

It was enlightening to note that my respondents chose to compare their job satisfaction in the predominantly White American university where they taught with their experiences back home rather than among other African professor peers in the U.S. or among other U.S. universities. The rationale for this comparison lay in the fact that my respondents have been forced by racism and exclusionary practices of otherness and tokenism to live on the fringes of the predominantly White university academic culture; and instead of looking in to their present situation for a basis to compare, they were forced by their marginal situation to look back. The experiences of my respondents confirmed a characteristic of marginal men postulated by Stonequist (1935). Stonequist held among others that, “a marginal man was in the habitual process of looking simultaneously in two looking-glasses, and these two mirrors present different images of the individual. The individual becomes conscious of the entire process unfolding before him: conscious of the clash of the two images, conscious of the two mirrors” (1935, p. 7).

Majority of my respondents commented on the loss of their social status, as a result of leaving their professorial jobs in Africa to teach in America. Unlike Africa where their status as university professors meant so much cultural capital, over here in the U.S. this invaluable capital meant very little. My respondents saw the American
university system as a marketplace where one’s cultural capital was objectified and sold without the corresponding enhancement of the cultural networks necessary for sustaining their field of influence. In Africa, educational achievement was a major status symbol in society. To be a professor in Africa not only meant that one has become an expert in one's field, but more importantly a professor was seen as a reservoir of knowledge and wisdom to be tapped by all sectors of society. The recognition in Africa of the university professor as an embodiment of wisdom was accompanied with influence, power and privilege. It was this loss of returns in the form of influence, power, and privileges from “embodied” cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) that my respondents were lamenting over.

The above experiences of my respondents reinforce their state of marginality. As marginal men looking simultaneously in two looking-glasses, my respondents do not only see the gains they have made by migrating to America, they also see their loss of power and privilege at the same time.

**Policy Implications**

The most recent Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education by the American Council on Education (ACE 2005) shows that the population of foreign faculty in America stands at 3.4%. The population size of foreign faculty (3.4%) comes third after Asian American 6.2%, and African American 5.2%. The implication being that foreign faculty of which my respondent sub-Saharan African professors form an integral part play a significant role in educating American college students issues affecting the welfare of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White American university therefore have policy implications for American higher education.
There were a number of findings that this study unearthed that need policy attention. Notable among the issues that call for policy initiatives include: taking diversity programs in predominantly White American universities and colleges beyond the rhetoric by responding to the unique differences between sub-Saharan African professors and their African American counterparts; fostering an atmosphere that enhances research collaboration and mentorship; and curbing racism, prejudice and discrimination of all forms in the academe.

The revelation by my respondents that diversity policy in their predominantly White university was superficial; and the data by the American Council on Education and the American Association of University Professors (2000) that 69% of faculty believe their universities value racial and ethnic diversity and yet rhetoric does not always match action must be addressed. Diversity must go beyond the window dressing stage of hiring a few faculty of color to teach at predominantly White American colleges and universities. The policy of diversity must also transcend merely offering new courses in diversity, assigning faculty of color as tokens to more and more committees, designing programs to work with students of color, and offering helpful suggestions to all students on how to be a more friendly institution. In order for diversity to be true and a long lasting reform policy initiative, it must tackle the underlying structure and philosophy of predominantly White American colleges and universities. Diversity programs must refocus and rethink the underlying structure and philosophy of historical legacies of institutional, epistemological, and societal racism that pervade American colleges and universities (Brayboy, 2003). In order for diversity to succeed in predominantly White
American colleges and universities, the language of diversity and efforts to implement
diversity as a reform initiative must receive institutional commitment and blessing; the
strategies of diversity must be incorporated into research, teaching, and service missions
of all faculty and not only faculty of color.

The literature was consistent with the findings of this study that there exist
marked differences between my respondents from sub-Saharan Africa and their African
American colleagues (Arthur, 2000; Ochukpue, 2004). Grouping them together and
treating them as one homogeneous people of African descent without recognizing their
unique differences becomes a disservice to diversity programs in predominantly White
American higher educational institutions and a challenge to their job satisfaction. The
unique linguistic, ethnic, and cultural characteristics of sub-Saharan African professors
should be taken into consideration in crafting recruitment policies for minority faculty of
color particularly African Americans and faculty from sub-Saharan Africa. The
distinction between African Americans and Africans from sub-Saharan Africa should be
clearly made in evaluation forms used by students, by administrators, and other faculty
members; and in the crafting of institutional diversity policies and programs. Lumping
the two ethnicities as one homogeneous group and treat them as such does a disservice to
their unique cultural and historical trajectory and characteristics, and scholarship.

My respondents’ experiences with the absence of collaborative endeavors
between them and their majority White peers has implications for policy. It was not
enough to hire faculty of color for their otherness, and for the multicultural perspectives
they bring to the predominantly White university academe. It was also not enough to treat
them as tokens by making them serve on several committees. White majority faculty must show signs of genuine interest in minority faculty of color by involving them in collaborative research endeavors. In order for diversity to become the true melting pot on predominantly White American university campuses, faculty research collaboration across different ethnicities and groups should become a faculty performance evaluation criterion.

Mentoring minority faculty of color has policy implications for their retention in a predominantly White American university academe. The literature indicates that mentoring was a key strategy for improving promotion and tenure rates as well as retaining faculty of color in predominantly White colleges and universities (Hutcheson, 1997; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). According to Stanley and Lincoln (2005), “there was nothing more isolating and alienating than to be the first or only person of one’s race and/or ethnicity to be hired in a department, and a mentoring relationship was one way to escape from that isolation” (p. 46). The lack of a mentoring program in the departments of most of my respondents was a source of their marginality. There was therefore the need for administrators to build a climate of collegiality by fostering productive and responsible mentoring relationships between senior White faculty and sub-Saharan African faculty members.

The narratives of my respondents confirm the literature that racism, prejudice, and discrimination against minority faculty in predominantly White American colleges and universities were alive and kicking (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997; Turner & Myers, 2000; Turner, 2000). The racist and discriminatory experiences of my respondents
have implications for a social justice policy in predominantly White American higher educational institutions. In crafting social justice policies to combat racism in predominantly White educational institutions, systems that accord students, majority faculty, and administrators power, resources, and privilege over minority faculty should be dismantled and a leveled academic landscape created to reflect the diversity of faculty, administrators, students body, and the entire American society.

In order to address the “brain drain” pandemic facing sub-Saharan Africa, governments and educational policy makers of the region should design distance education programs that would use innovative long distance educational information and communication technologies to tap the scholarship and expertise of sub-Saharan African professionals where ever they have migrated to in the West and North America. Individual countries and the African Universities Union could jointly establish databanks on African professionals living abroad with the purpose of fostering collaborative endeavors with them and their colleagues on the African continent.

The literature has amply identified the current educational system in Africa as being driven by the thirst to consume Western epistemology and cultural values (Mamdani, 1994; Mazrui, 1994; Nyamnjoh & Nantang, 2002). This trend should be addressed. Addressing this consumption pattern requires reviewing the curricula of primary, secondary and tertiary educational institutions with the view to expunging educational content and materials that perpetuate Western hegemony and intellectual enslavement of Africans. Nyamnjoh & Nantang (2002) makes this issue clear when they stated that, “There is the need for an insightful scrutiny of current curricula-their origin,
form, content, assumptions, and practicality-followed by the decision whether to accept, reject, or modify” (p. 22). There must be concerted effort by African nations to indigenize the curricula. Closely related to the process of indigenization of the educational curricula is the need to review the mode of learning and instruction. African educational institutions lean too much on rote learning where they mimicry and regurgitate information. This process is inimical to critical thinking and creativity. Other functional ways of learning and instruction which has the potential of unearthing the creative powers of students should be explored. Holistic education which emphasizes the training of the head, the heart and the hands should be adopted. Democratic education which requires the co-investigation and co-construction of knowledge both by student and teacher should be implemented.

The dependency of African intellectuals on Eurocentric epistemology and culture as a source of legitimacy, and the problem of “linguistic neo-colonialism” which has bedeviled the educational systems of sub-Saharan African countries could be addressed by African governments and educational policy makers vigorously pursuing the use of local languages in at least primary schools as a medium of instruction. This policy could gradually evolve into choosing or creating a national local language which would ultimately become the medium of instruction and learning in the respective African countries. Since the key to any culture lies in the language of its people, sub-Saharan African countries would only be able to experience accelerated development if their educational systems are founded on a solid local language.
Implications for Theory

This study sought to understand the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White American university in the Midwest through the theoretical lenses of the Marginal Man Theory, and the framework of Double Consciousness.

Marginal Man Theory

The narratives of my respondents largely confirmed my assertions. According to Goldberg (1941),

When an individual was shaped and molded by one culture was brought by migration, education, or other influence into permanent contact with a culture of a different content, or when an individual from birth was initiated into two or more historic traditions, languages, political loyalties, moral codes, or religions, then he was likely to find himself on the margin of each culture, but a member of neither. (p. 52)

The narratives of my respondents reflected the characteristics of a marginal man stated above. All my respondents were born and bred in Africa. They were molded in the cultures of their respective ethnic groups as well as in a Eurocentric epistemological tradition. Through migration and education they came to live and work in the United States university academe. The contact with the American culture and that of the American university academe has been enduring. My respondents continue to communicate in their native languages as well as in English, the language of the
dominant culture. As a result of their race, their accent, their culture, values, and belief systems my respondents are unable to assimilate into the dominant American culture. They therefore find themselves on the margins of the American culture and that of the predominantly White university academe. Being treated as the other, as tokens, and being discriminated against on the basis of their race, accent, and their way of doing things their state becomes a reflection of marginality.

The narratives of my respondents confirm that they are marginal men. The narratives also substantiate their marginal situation. According to Antonovsky (1956), marginality is a social situation when it bears the following characteristics:

- Two cultures (or subcultures) were in lasting contact.
- One of them was dominant in terms of power and reward potential. This was the non-marginal culture of the two. Its members were not particularly influenced by or attracted to the other, the marginal culture.
- The boundaries between the two were sufficiently permeable for the members of the marginal culture as well as that of their own.
- These patterns, in their entirety, cannot be easily harmonized.
- Having acquired the goals of the non-marginal culture, members of the marginal group were pulled by the promise of the greater rewards offered.
• The barriers between the two tend to be hardened by discriminating from the one side and by pressure against “betrayal from the other”

• Marginality acquires particular intensity when the clash persists through more than one generation. (p. 57)

The narratives of my respondents show that their cultures were in lasting contact with that of the American culture. Although they live in the U.S., they still eat African food, speak African languages, associate with members of the African community, and travel back home to Africa periodically. They came to the U.S. to attain their educational goals and got attracted to the promises and greater reward system of the U.S. My respondents suffer from racial discrimination by living in America. There was pressure from their home countries to return home to contribute to the socioeconomic development of their nations.

From the analysis above, the experiences of my respondents contain enough characteristics of the theory of marginality to conclude that my respondents were marginal men in a marginal social situation.

**Double Consciousness**

The narratives of my respondents show that they experienced the phenomenon of living in two-worlds. The social and cultural world of Africa where they migrated from and the social and cultural world of American where they live and work The interface between these two cultural and social identities creates a tension forcing my respondents to develop coping strategies of “code switching” and biculturalism.
The narratives of my respondents also show that they suffer from prejudice and racism. Their experiences show that although they were hired as faculty on the basis of their qualifications and expertise which they earned in American universities and in other Western countries they were not accorded the same recognition as their dominant White peers. And even though they brought to the university academe a cultural and epistemological dimension beyond their dominant White colleagues they were still not dully respected but forced to think that they were inferior beings. Although my respondents were from sub-Saharan Africa where they were never enslaved, the history of slavery of African Americans and the label of being Black and an inferior race was used to discriminate against them. The essence of this experience was captured by the Double Consciousness framework of Du Bois (1903) when he stated:

The Negro was a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, — a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It was a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, — two souls, two thoughts, two un-reconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (p. 6)
It was worth stressing that although Du Bois was referring to the experiences of African American intellectuals in the United States who were denied recognition despite their academic achievement and treated as inferior beings because of their history of slavery, the sub-Saharan professor was also forced to see himself as inferior due to his race and the color of his skin. My respondent sub-Saharan African professors experienced double consciousness on the basis of their race and not on the basis of their history.

Judging from the experiences of my respondents and the theoretical analysis made above, my conclusion was that the sub-Saharan African professors who form my research population fit the description of marginal men with double consciousness.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The study of the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White American university academe was a groundbreaking research. The subject matter has previously not been researched. As a forerunner study, this research paves the way for further investigation of some of the findings and related issues. The following are recommended for further study:

- This study utilized qualitative methodological approach to understand the experiences of ten sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White American university in the Midwest. Further research of the same population using a larger sample from across the United States may yield results that can be generalized to the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities across the U.S.
• Although sub-Saharan Africa represents the Black race as opposed to the Arabs who occupy the northern portion of Africa, the peoples of sub-Saharan Africa were of varied ethnicities and therefore bring with them their unique cultural values, beliefs, and norms into the United States and the U.S. university academe. It would therefore be worthwhile to conduct a comparative study of the experiences of these different ethnicities from sub-Saharan Africa teaching in predominantly White American colleges and universities.

• Given that there were also predominantly Black Colleges and Universities in America popularly known as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU.U.S.), a comparative study of the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in both predominantly Black and White colleges and universities would be highly recommended.

• There was the need for further comparative research into the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors with their African American counterparts and other Black professors who come from other parts of the world to teach in the U.S.

• Future research into the experiences of sub-Saharan African professors teaching in a predominantly White American university in the Midwest by a researcher other than a native African like me would be recommended. This may remove any emic biases that my identification with the research subjects may have introduced into the study.
Conclusion

Sub-Saharan African countries continue to suffer from massive emigration of their highly skilled and educated citizens to Western Europe and the United States due to the worsening socioeconomic and political conditions on the continent. While many governments and the media accuse those who leave for greener pastures abroad as being unpatriotic and selfish (Njubi, 2002), very little research was done to identify ways and means to reverse the “brain drain” issue. Beyond categorizing the factors that engender brain drain in sub-Saharan Africa into “push and pull” factors African governments and civil society institutions interested in the development of the continent must among other things listen to the stories of those living abroad and seek ways to correct the conditions that forced them out of their countries or devise systems where their expertise could be tapped wherever they now reside.

A major approach that African countries could use to draw on the expertise of their sons and daughters living abroad was to invest in the ongoing technological advances being made in information and communication technology to transmit knowledge and technology from the developed north to sub-Saharan Africa. The internet and other modern telecommunication real time interactive tools such as cell phones and iPod could be used to engage African professors living abroad in distance education. The forces of globalization- the heightened technology of information, communication and travel shows no signs of ever receding. The trend was that it will grow in intensity further shrinking the world into a small village. Sub-Saharan African countries cannot therefore afford to continue behaving like the proverbial ostrich that contended that she was hiding
from everybody by sinking her head in the sand while her whole body was on top of the sand. Every effort must be made to reap some of the benefits of globalization. By investing in instructional technology that anchors on long distance education, and by engaging sub-Saharan African professors abroad to teach in Africa through long distance education programs, the challenge of sub-Saharan African professors living on the margins of Western and American academic cultures would not only become minimized but would be turned into a strength and a source of great benefit to the educational systems of Africa.
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APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN FACULTY

Background Questions

1. Tell me about yourself
2. Tell me about your professional experience before moving to the U.S.

Reasons for migrating to the United States

3. What influenced your decision to migrate and teach in the U.S.?
4. What were your initial impressions of America, the people, their culture, and the U.S. academe before you started teaching?

Academic Qualification and Career

5. Why did you choose the academy as your profession
6. Describe how you spend your time in a typical academic quarter

Professional Experience

7. Can you share one or two memorable professional experiences with students, colleagues or university administrators
8. Tell me about your working relationship with you’re a) students, b) colleagues, and c) administrators of the university
9. Describe your interaction with a) students, other b) faculty and c) administrators as an African faculty
10. In what ways does your race as an African, language and culture influence your teaching and instruction?
Academic Culture

11. What are your experiences with being involved in the decision-making process of your department and the university?

12. What kind of support do you receive towards your professional development?

13. How would you compare your professional status here with that from your home country?

14. How would you compare your social status here with that from your home country?

15. How would you describe the level of assimilation of Africans from sub-Saharan Africa into the U.S. culture?

Experiences based on the ‘other’

16. What has been your experience as a foreign faculty teaching in OU and the U.S.?

Beyond the crucible

17. In what ways has being an African professor been a challenge to you? What keeps you going?

18. What other perspectives, experiences, and suggestions would you like to share that would help this research enterprise.