Spring 5-2014

Race, Gender, and Faculty Advancement at American Colleges and Universities

James Sharell Bridgeforth
University of Southern Mississippi

The University of Southern Mississippi

RACE, GENDER, AND FACULTY ADVANCEMENT AT

AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

James Sharell Bridgeforth

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy

May 2014

ABSTRACT

RACE, GENDER, AND FACULTY ADVANCEMENT AT

AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by James Sharell Bridgeforth

May 2014

Women and people of color are underrepresented in the American professoriate; although the presence of female faculty and professors of color is beneficial to the academy on various levels, these groups often face many barriers and challenges throughout the promotion and tenure process. This study was designed to examine whether race, gender, or a combination of race and gender made a statistically significant difference in reported opportunities for mentorship, faculty socialization, and scholarship in regard to faculty advancement in the academy. Data were collected from 650 tenured and tenure-track faculty through an online questionnaire. The data analysis revealed that women and people of color reported fewer opportunities for mentorship and faculty socialization in the academy.

The University of Southern Mississippi

Race, Gender and Faculty Advancement at American Colleges & Universities

by

James S. Bridgeforth

A Dissertation to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Kyna J. Shelley_____
Director

Thomas J. Lipscomb_____

Thomas V. O'Brien_____

James T. Johnson_____

Maureen A. Ryan_____
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2014

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this dissertation represents the beginning of a dream— the dream of becoming a university president and shaping higher education for the post-modern society. The journey to this point has been daunting, as there were many barriers to hurdle; in that sense, it is paramount to acknowledge a number of people who supported me throughout this dissertation process. Before I begin, however, I want to thank God for allowing me the opportunity and giving me the intellectual ability to write a dissertation. First and foremost, I want to begin by thanking Dr. Kyna Shelley, who birthed me into the world of research and has trained me to be a scholar-practitioner. It was her encouragement that gave me the confidence to produce such a scholarly study. Moreover, it is important to note that she stood closely by me in the early days as a doctoral student, and without her guidance this surely would have been impossible. I would also like to thank my committee, Dr. Thomas O'Brien, Dr. Thomas Lipscomb, and Dr. James T. Johnson, for their dedication and support. It is critical that I thank Dr. O'Brien, as he was the first person to inspire me to become an academic and use my writing as a prescription to address the social ills that plague the planet. I want to thank Dr. Lipscomb who, in a number of ways, has been a true mentor as he has equipped with me the ability to challenge everything through research and to only believe what you can prove. While this may seem odd, it has been the best advice one can give to a young doctoral student who is hungry to become a scholar. I would like to thank Dr. Johnson, as he taught me about the importance of ethical data management and has inspired me to become a leader in scholarship through data management. I sincerely appreciate the tremendous work,

dedication, and effort that my entire committee put into my development as a student and as an up- and- coming scholar.

Next I would like to thank Drs. Ronald Styron and Jennifer Styron, who simply would not let me quit. These two individuals spent countless hours listening to me discuss my research and reading and re-reading drafts. I would specifically like to thank Dr. Ronald Styron for his leadership and guidance throughout this process, and of course, for the numerous stories that helped to reframe my thoughts on scholarship. I would like to thank Dr. Jennifer Styron for her continuous encouragement and support, which was unwavering throughout this process; she has been a true friend from the very beginning.

I would like to thank my entire family, comprising too many people to name, for their encouragement and support throughout the dissertation process and my entire academic journey. I would unequivocally like to thank my grandparents, Thomas and Alice Colbert, who drove me to my very first college tour. Little do they know that experience changed my life forever and has continued to empower me to this very day. I would like to thank my biological father, who was never there, and while this may seem anomalous or even eccentric, his absence in my life allowed me to develop a level of persistence and determination that is unmatched. It was this persistence and determination that allowed me to never give up and keep moving in the face of stringent adversity; without these skill sets completing this dissertation would have been impossible.

Last and most importantly, I would like to thank my soul mate and my very best friend, Valerie Bridgeforth, as she has always believed in me when no one else did. Even at the beginning when the dissertation seemed impossible she continued to believe that I

would find a way to succeed. Without her encouragement, patience, support, and love I

would not have completed this process and earned this Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

          Underrepresented Faculty in the Professoriate
          Major Barriers for Faculty of Color
          Major Barriers for Women
          Statement of the Problem
          Purpose of the Study
          Research Questions
          Delimitations
          Assumptions
          Justification
          Definition of Terms
          Summary

          The Work of Faculty
          Faculty Salary
          Anecdotal Experiences of Underrepresented Faculty
          Theoretical Framework

          Research Questions
          Participants
          Instrumentation
          Procedure
          Research Design
          Data Analysis

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is anticipated that by 2050 people of color will be the majority of the American population compared to the current demographic in which White Americans constitute the overwhelming majority (Nivet et al., 2008). Over the past two decades the number of minorities has been on the rise among the American population, yet the number of minorities present among college faculty have remained relatively stagnant, which brings a host of challenges for the American professoriate (Nivet et al., 2008). Indeed, over the past 400 years of American higher education, women and people of color have been vastly underrepresented among the faculty (Nivet et al., 2008; Perna, 2005).

Underrepresented Faculty in the Professoriate

At the turn of the 21st century African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Latino Americans, Mexican Americans, and American Indians combined for almost 25% of the American adult population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009), yet minorities account for less than 20% of the professoriate (Turner, 2003). For example, of the full-time faculty in the United States, only 6% identify as African American, 4% identify as Hispanic or Latino American, 6% identify as Asian American, and 0.5% identify as American Indian or Native American (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009). The underrepresentation of female faculty and faculty of color is a persistent problem in American higher education (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Smith, Altbach, & Lomotey, 2002), with the majority of these faculty members holding positions at non-research intensive universities (Turner, 2003).

Umbach (2006) suggests that an increase in underrepresented faculty has a positive effect on preparing students to be pluralistic citizens in the global market, yet there has been limited success in increasing the number of underrepresented faculty in America's colleges and universities. Ryu (2008) states that people of color and women have failed to reach the most prestigious academic positions in the academy. Piercy et al. (2005) say there is also a higher turnover rate for underrepresented faculty than for Caucasian faculty, attributed to the number of challenges and obstacles minorities face. The underrepresentation of minorities and women among the faculty, particularly at the higher ranks of the professoriate, severely damages the academic pipeline for future racial and ethnic minorities as well as women (Jackson, 2007; Umbach, 2006).

Not only are there are too few faculty members of color in the academy today (Stanley, 2006a), among the nation's top-ranked private colleges and universities specifically, professors of color make up only 3% of the full-time faculty (Cross & Slater, 2002). At the top public research intensive universities in the country, faculty of color make up nearly 5% of the full-time professoriate (Alexander & Moore, 2008). Whereas research summarize (Cross & Slater, 2002; "The Status of Black Faculty," 1996) that faculty at many of the flagship institutions are more racially diverse than at many of the private elite institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and Stanford, there are simply not enough underrepresented graduate students being prepared for faculty positions, which they report is a major problem for universities in their efforts to increase faculty of color. Cross and Slater (2002) claim that many colleges and universities have a disproportionately low number of faculty members of color simply because they fail to actively recruit minorities.

Major Barriers for Faculty of Color

Current literature implies that there are major barriers that bar female faculty and professors of color both from earning tenure and being promoted in rank (Alexander & Moore, 2008). Stanley (2006b) reports there are actually four consistent themes that negatively impact hiring and retaining of minority faculty members: discrimination, campus life/climate, and teaching, tenure and promotion.

Sexism and racism, whether covert or overt, is said to have a major impact on the tenure process for women and people of color (Stanley, 2006b). This may begin at the graduate level as the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (2008) reports that faculty at research institutions prefer Caucasian teaching assistants over those of color by a factor of 2 to 1. Further, many faculty of color focus much of their research specialties within their own communities (Seifert & Umbach, 2008), which is often devalued by Caucasian faculty, causing a sense of racial bias based on research agenda (Cross & Slater, 2002). Numerous scholars point out that racism and sexism invade scholarship in the academy in this way with Caucasian faculty criticizing the research productivity of the underrepresented faculty (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999). Stanley (2006b) conducted a study which highlighted an assumption that White faculty are perceived to be more productive than minority faculty members, yet the research indicates that there is no significant difference in research productivity between Caucasian professors and faculty of color. Still, this perceived bias may lead minority faculty members to believe their work is not evaluated as positively as that of their Caucasian colleagues (Alexander & Moore, 2008), which may lead to a sense of isolation from their Caucasian colleagues. These barriers tend to be harsher for women

of color, as they suffer from the Double Bind Syndrome where they oftentimes have to deal with gender bias and racial bias (Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Stanley, 2006a). Studies (Allen et al., 2000; Anders, 2004; Myers & Turner, 2004) suggest this racism, whether covert or overt, has a major impact on faculty promotion for women and people of color as well as the viability of gaining tenure. The lack of promotion or tenure opportunities leads to attrition for underrepresented faculty (Allen et al., 2000; Anders, 2004; Myers & Turner, 2004). Additionally, limited networking opportunities perpetuate a system of failure for women and people of color, as they lack the social and academic integration needed for promotional success (Herzig, 2004). Moreover, underrepresented faculty members have argued that they lack professional mentorship, clear expectations, and access to departmental networks (Stanley, 2006b). This lack of support leads to disproportionate attrition rates among minority faculty members (Herzig, 2004).

<div align="center">Major Barriers for Women</div>

Like people of color, women are also underrepresented among college and university faculty in the United States (Jackson, 2008). According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), across institution types, women make up less than 25% of all tenured college faculty in the United States (Jackson, 2008). Similar to faculty of color, whether tenured or untenured, women report feelings of professional isolation, a lack of professional mentorship, and discredited research publications as the explanation of their failure in the promotion and tenure process (Sample, 2008). Research (Chang, Welton, Martinez, & Cortez, 2013; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011) emphasizes that the lack of female tenured faculty is consistent with a lack of social networks and mentorship. Perna (2005) used data from the National Study of

Postsecondary Faculty and found that women have less access than men do to collegial or social networks and that this may cause a hostile work environment for women. This may result in women having less job related information that leads to promotion and tenure. Research (Menges & Exum, 1983; Perna, 2005; Santo, Engstrom, Reetz, Schweinle, & Reed, 2009) has shown that women may have more difficulty identifying professional mentors than men and because of this, female faculty may not be promoted or earn tenure at the same rates as men. Therefore, women too become severely underrepresented among tenured faculty and full professorships (Perna, 2005).

<div align="center">Statement of the Problem</div>

The absence of underrepresented faculty has a negative impact on the retention and recruitment of undergraduate students (Modica & Mamiseishvili, 2010; Umbach, 2006). For example, many scholars (Alexander & Moore, 2008; Cole & Barber, 2003; Stanley, 2006b; Umbach, 2006) speculate that people of color fail to achieve degrees because they lack the needed support, mentorship, and recognition from academics who look like them and share their cultural background. On the other hand, research indicates that including underrepresented faculty provides richer academic learning environments for minorities in college and that underrepresented faculty create a more comfortable environment for mentoring students of color and women (Umbach, 2006). A study by Cole and Barber (2003) suggests that faculty of color may be beneficial for supporting those students who often lack a large presence within the academy. Moreover, studies (Antonio, 2002; Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009) have shown that those faculty members who have been traditionally underrepresented in the academy provide diverse perspectives and aid in the retention of minority student groups. Therefore, the

absence and attrition of underrepresented faculty blocks the academic pipeline for women and students of color (Jackson, 2007).

This is not to say that White professors are incapable of teaching people of color and women in academia; rather, it is indicative of the anecdotal yet highly documented experiences shared by people of color who believe that students of color would be more successful if there were more faculty who represented the racial, cultural, gender, and ethnic diversity displayed in the American demographic (Perna, 2005; Stanley, 2006b; Xu, 2008). The literature tells us that students of color are in need of more faculty of color to improve both graduate and undergraduate retention; hence, this suggests that there are not enough women and faculty of color in the academy to support minority students' academic, social, or cognitive development (Milano, 2005).

Purpose of This Study

This study examined whether race and gender are related to faculty tenure and promotion. This study generally addressed whether race and gender make a difference in the identified barriers and facilitators for faculty tenure and promotion. The researcher was also interested in the professional implications of mentoring and research productivity on the tenure and promotion process; this study was guided specifically by the following three research questions.

Research Questions

RQ1: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a difference in reported mentorship opportunities? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in reported mentorship opportunities? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in mentorship opportunities? (c) Is there a

statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to mentorship opportunities?

RQ2: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a difference in faculty socialization? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to faculty socialization?

RQ3: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a difference in research productivity? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in reported research productivity? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in reported research productivity? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to research productivity?

Delimitations

This scope of this study was limited by the following factors.

1. Faculty participants were limited to those from four-year degree granting institutions at baccalaureate degree and above.

2. Faculty were included from only accredited colleges and universities located in the United States.

3. This study was limited to self-reporting faculty members who volunteered to participate in the project.

4. This study was primarily designed to address the relationship among race, gender, and faculty promotion; it may not be used to determine causality.

5. This study was limited to only faculty who serve at post-secondary institutions as outlined by the 2010 Basic Carnegie Classification (Carnegie Foundation, 2010).

6. This study was limited to reports from faculty about racism and does not address how some historic policies such as Jim Crow may have impacted multiple American institutions such as K-12 education, higher education, churches, etc., as this is beyond the scope of the study.

Assumptions

1. The researcher assumes that demographic data was reported accurately.

2. The researcher assumes that all participants answered questions honestly and accurately.

3. The researcher assumes that all participants were full-time faculty of professional rank.

4. The researcher assumes that participants were employed only at universities located in the United States.

5. The research assumes that all participants had some understanding of the faculty promotion process at their institution.

6. The researcher assumes that all participants were employed at campuses that have some process for tenure and post-tenure review.

7. The researcher assumes that all responses were provided voluntarily.

Justification

There is a large gap in Ph.D. attainment between Caucasian and graduate students of color ("The Number of Blacks," 2003). Therefore, the American professoriate is made up of predominately Caucasian faculty (Lee, 2012). This may contribute to a significant

lack of professional advancement for women and people of color. Zhou and Volkwein (2004) assert that this roadblock is greatly impacted by the ethics and values of those at the top of the university hierarchy. Moreover, tenure and promotion are most often based on research expectations of those at the highest level of the academy. In most circumstances these leaders are White males. It has been documented that there is a glass-ceiling effect for women and other minorities in the academy, as they are promoted less often than White males (Lee, 2002). Many times women and people of color reportedly leave the faculty due to low research productivity (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Like many other faculty members, women and people of color claim they are overburdened with teaching and service commitments that interfere with their research. However, a study (Lee, 2012) of national faculty data shows that both female faculty and professors of color "have heavier teaching loads and more service assignments than their Caucasian male counterparts" (p. 61). It can be argued that some female faculty and professors of color find themselves in a "Catch 22"—in fact feeling that if they say no to more teaching and service and pursue a research agenda they put themselves at risk for not gaining tenure (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Meanwhile, minority faculty members are oftentimes so involved with teaching and service that they may put their research agendas at risk, which also has implications for their chances at promotion and tenure (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Conversely, senior faculty perceive this as insubordination or poor job performance (Allen et al., 2000).

The purpose of this study was to produce empirical research that focuses on race, gender, and faculty promotion. While there are numerous qualitative research studies that focus on this topic, there is little quantitative data that supports these reported experiences

of women and people of color who make claims of racism at Predominately White Institutions (Allen et al., 2000; Fenelon, 2003; Stanley, 2006b; Turner, 2003). Thompson (2008) indicates that minority faculty members consistently report feelings of isolation and marginalization while serving in the professoriate. Moreover, common themes throughout the literature (Burden, Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Mahtani, 2004; Wong et al., 2001) maintain that female faculty and professors of color report fewer mentoring opportunities and, therefore, a lack of research productivity, which may contribute to small numbers of women and people of color among the professoriate. The literature (Modica & Mamiseishvili, 2010; Umbach, 2006) suggests this is a serious problem in the American academy, as the reduced presence of minority faculty may be related to attrition of minority students in undergraduate and graduate education. This may very well lead to a higher rate of unemployment and low level of economic stability for women and people of color (Umbach, 2006). The National Center for Education Statistics (2010d) data projects that there is a link between degree attainment and unemployment. For example, the unemployment rate for African Americans who have a college degree was only 7%, which was below the national average of 9% at the time of this report. In stark contrast, the unemployment rate for African Americans without a degree during the same period was three times the rate, 21.5%, than for those with bachelor's degree. These data echo the fact that college degree attainment is critical to economic success. The high unemployment rate, therefore, may partly represent the need of academic institutions to recruit, retain, and support more women faculty and professors of color.

Definition of Terms

African American Faculty: Persons who identify as Black, of an African descent or heritage.

American Indian Faculty: Persons who identify as Native American Indian or of American Indian descent/heritage.

Asian American Faculty: Persons who identify as of Asian or Pacific Islander descent/heritage.

College: Post-secondary institutions whose baccalaureate degrees account for at least 10% of all degrees awarded and fewer than 50 master's degrees (Carnegie Foundation, 2010).

Faculty: Persons employed at an accredited post-secondary bachelor's degree-granting institution of higher education who hold legal status an American citizen.

Faculty of Color: Those faculty members who identify as African American, American Indian, Asian American, Hispanic or Latino/a American, or Mexican American (Chang et al., 2013; Stanley, 2006b).

Hispanic American Faculty: Persons who identify as of Hispanic or Hispanic descent/heritage.

 Majority (Faculty): This term refers to the largest and most dominant group of tenured faculty based on data provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (2009), which is Caucasian males.

Minority (Faculty): This term refers to the pockets of smaller populations represented in the American professoriate as outlined by the National Center for

Education Statistics (2009), which are those members also described as underrepresented faculty.

Mentorship Opportunities: Mentoring opportunities can be defined by the frequency with which that faculty engage in professional development that includes providing criticism, feedback, advice, and assistance, as well as modeling the appropriate behaviors, sharing cultural norms, and historical context (Tiernany & Bensimon, 1996). This research construct will be further defined by the items outlined in the Bridgeforth Promotion & Tenure 2013 Questionnaire scale.

Promotion: The process of faculty achieving the ranks of the professoriate from assistant professor to associate Professor, leading to the position of a tenured full professor.

Underrepresented Faculty: Members of college and university faculty who identify as women, African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Latino Americans, Mexican Americans, or Native Americans or American Indian (Nivet et al., 2008; Perna, 2005).

Tenure: since 1940 tenure has been viewed as a mechanism to protect academic freedom, additionally; it is an arrangement whereby faculty members, after successful completion of a period of probationary service, can be dismissed only for adequate cause or other possible circumstances and only after a hearing before a faculty committee (American Association of University Professors, 2011). In this study tenure is further defined as a period when faculty must perform adequately in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

University: An American foundation charged with the historic responsibility of bridging culture, class, race, gender, and ethnicity into an academic and social format thereby allowing its participants, visitors, stakeholders, and students to take part in a shared community for self-improvement, holistic growth, and cognitive development, which has been designed to breed economic empowerment, social justice, and intellectual freedom. These institutions are most often required to be accredited by the federal government for financial support; it is these educational organizations that are considered post-secondary institutions that annually award baccalaureate, master, and doctorate degrees as defined by the Carnegie Foundation.

White Faculty: Persons employed at an accredited post-secondary bachelor's degree-granting institution of higher education who identify as White, Caucasian, or European American and those who are of Caucasian or European American descent/heritage but hold legal status an American citizen.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Less than 3% of all Americans hold a doctorate degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011); however, more Americans are earning doctorate and terminal degrees than ever before (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). This increase in advanced degree attainment has been inspired by a belief that there will be available jobs as college faculty (Wulff, Austin, & Associates, 2004). Despite this assumption, the arduous task of attaining the doctorate is simply not sufficient to be adequately prepared for careers within the professoriate. Many new professors report being ill-prepared and improperly trained to effectively manage the workload (i.e., teaching, service, and research responsibilities), or they are not psychologically primed for the long work hours required to meet the expectation. Moreover, the literature (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Hambright & Diamantes, 2004) suggests the pressure of balancing teaching, research, and service is a challenge for junior faculty, which may lead to frustration and ultimately, attrition.

The Work of Faculty

Many new faculty members who leave the professoriate report being unprepared to deliver the expectations and manage the work load (Wulff et al., 2004). Typically faculty workload includes three major components: teaching, research, and service. Eighty-three percent of faculty report being attracted to the professoriate for their deep love of teaching; others seek the professoriate because they enjoy the service component (Wulff et al., 2004). For many, as doctoral students, research is the least popular aspect (Wulff et al., 2004). Yet, the Doctor of Philosophy is a degree for which the recipients should be trained to conduct research (Wulff et al., 2004) focused on addressing issues

through the coordination and application of scientific inquiry. Many doctoral students, however, cite lacking the appropriate skills to conduct the professional level of research competencies needed for a successful faculty career.

Wulff et al. (2004) indicate that less than 50% of new professors are able to conduct sole-authored research or to publish upon landing their first faculty job. This barrier complicates the faculty landscape and increases the work hours, particularly for new faculty. A study conducted by Lucas and Murry (2002) examined the status of faculty work hours in relationship to similar professions. Their study found that college faculty work more hours than any other profession in the United States. These researchers liken faculty work hours to those of salaried attorneys who work at a law firm. Specifically, they propose that faculty members struggle to understand and adapt to the organizational culture when they compete for tenure, which is a process that is parallel to achieving partnership at a law firm. Further, much like a law firm, the type of law practiced determines an attorney's work hours and the professional culture. Likewise, the academic discipline determines faculty work load and academic culture. The Higher Education Research Institute (1999) reports that faculty spend most of their time teaching (Wulff et al., 2004). Specifically, the National Center for Education Statistics (1999) indicates that on average faculty spend 59% of their time teaching, 23% of their time on service, and 18% of their time conducting research (Wulff et al., 2004). Although college faculty typically spend only 9 to 12 hours per week teaching, this does not include time to prepare for the classes (Lucas & Murry, 2002).

Jacobs (2004) examined teaching responsibilities and the relationship to faculty work hours and found that teaching responsibilities were only partly responsible for

faculty working longer hours than other professions. Further, faculty employed at research universities work the longest hours of all faculty members, with data from the National Study on Postsecondary Faculty showing that faculty employed at research intensive universities work 55 to 56 hours per week (Jacobs, 2004). This investigation points out that across all institution types, faculty members must work on average a minimum of 50 hours per week to keep up with their work load and remain competitive for tenure. It should be noted that this shift toward working longer hours began in the late 1990s due to external pressure related to tuition hikes and criticism from journalists regarding faculty prestige (Jacobs, 2004).

Not only do faculty work longer hours than other professions, there is a gender gap in hours worked in many professions, including the professoriate. Jacobs (2004) found that in general, the average male non-university employee works 43 hours per week and the average female employee works 37 hours per week. In contrast, the average male managerial or professional level employee works 46 hours per week while the average female managerial or professional level employee works 39 hours per week. In comparison to these others, male professors work 12 hours per week more than the average male employee and 9 hours more than other male professional employees. Likewise, this research demonstrates that female faculty work 16 hours more per week than the average female employee and 14 hours more than the average professional female employee.

Similar to his work that showed difference in faculty workload across gender, Jacobs' (2004) research also investigated the work hours by faculty rank and indicated that the average male assistant professor works 55.8 hours per week while the average

female assistant professor works 53.5 hours per week. Additionally, according to Jacobs (2004), male professors are likely to work 60 hours per week more often than their female counterparts. For example, half of all male professors work 60 hours per week compared to only one-third of female faculty. This research provides data that shows the gap in hours worked may be a key attribute that leads to males gaining tenure more readily than females.

<div align="center">Faculty Salary</div>

The salary levels for college faculty have increased in recent years. The National Center for Education Statistics (2010a) reflects that college professors earn five times more today than they did 40 years ago. For example the average faculty salary in 1970 was only slightly above $12,000.00, which is equivalent to $67,440.00 today based on the national rate of inflation, whereas in 2010 the average annual faculty salary had risen to almost $75,000.00.

Research conducted by Vesilind (2000) contends that the driving factor behind faculty salary is institutional type: teaching universities, public research universities, and private research universities. Vesilind's (2000) findings show that teaching universities are the lowest paying mainly because these institutions do not require research or publication, in addition to teaching and service, for promotion. The research also details that private research universities are typically the highest paying institutions because they include medical, law, and other professional schools whose faculty top the salary grade among the professoriate. Non-elite public universities are behind elite private institutions in salary because most do not have the financial caliber to maintain the highest salaries. Yet positions at many non-elite public institutions are still sought-after and remain good

options for faculty to obtain employment due to their availability. Finally, Vesilind (2000) points out that faculty mobility is the second factor impacting salary, with today's professor more likely to relocate for opportunities at higher paying institutions.

Salary by rank has similarly increased over time. For example, in 1970 the average salary for an assistant professor was $11,000.00, followed by $13,000.00 for an associate professor and almost $18,000.00 for a full professor (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010a). In 2010 the average salary for an assistant professor had increased to $62,000.00, to $74,000.00 for an associate professor, and to $103,000.00 for a full professor. Yet there is; however, a sharp difference in salary when broken down by gender.

Jacobs' (2004) research concludes that female faculty earn 23% less than their male colleagues. Data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (2010a) has shown that male professors at every rank have significantly higher salaries than female professors. Overall, without considering years in rank or general productivity, the average annual salary for male faculty is $80,885.00 compared to $66,653.00 for female faculty. This trend is reflected at each rank. For example the average starting salary for a male assistant professor is $64,450.00 compared to $60,000.00 for a female assistant professor, and this difference continues to the ranks of associate and full professor (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010a). The average male associate professor earns a salary of $76,000.00 compared to $71,000.00 for the average salary for female associate professors, while the average salary for a male full professor hovers at $108,000.00 compared to $92,000.00 for the average female full professor. The National Center for Education Statistics (2010a) data reflect that the average starting salary for

male faculty is statistically equal to the overall average compensation for female faculty across all ranks. This research proposes that the gender gap in salary is partially tied to lifestyle and, specifically, to the varying hours worked between male and female faculty.

Faculty Rank

Since 2005 the number of individuals in the American professoriate has increased by 8% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010b). Today there are a total of 728,977 faculty members across more than 3,700 institutions of higher learning (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010b). This number is up from 675,624 in 2005. Although faculty promotion and responsibilities differ across the various institutional types (Vesilind, 2000), the U.S. Census Bureau (2011) suggests that the most common progression in faculty rank begins with assistant professor, then associate professor, and last, professor, often referred to as a full professor. Most faculty members enter the professoriate at an assistant professor rank with the average age for a starting assistant professor being 40 years old (Wulff et al., 2004).

The number of associate professors increased by 2% from 2005 to 2009; relatedly, the number of full professors has increased over the past four years as well (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010b). Yet the largest increase among the ranks of the faculty has occurred at the assistant professor level, which increased by 3% between 2005 and 2009 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010b).

Race and Gender

Few people of color and other minorities hold a doctorate degree (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010c). Further, this same source shows that in 2009 Caucasian Americans dominated the academic landscape in regard to doctoral degree attainment.

Table 1

Doctoral Degree Attainment by Race/Ethnicity

Race	Number of Degrees	Percentage
Caucasians	39,648	58.6%
African Americans	4,434	6.5%
American Indians/Native Americans	332	0.5%
Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders	3,875	5.7%
Hispanic Americans	2,540	3.8%
Non-Resident Aliens	16,887	24.9%

Anecdotal Experiences of Underrepresented Faculty

Introduction

It is has been previously stated that there are very few minority faculty members serving in the academy. Many scholars have documented, rather than empirically investigated, the anecdotal experiences of women and professors of color that are presumed to have stunted the growth and advancement of minorities in the professoriate. In the pages to come, this section will outline various examples that depict some experiences that have been said to handicap women and other minorities from achieving tenure and promotion.

Experiences of Faculty of Color

The National Center for Education Statistics indicates that approximately 20% of the nation's faculty are people of color (Taylor, Apprey, Hill, McGrann, & Wang, 2010) and Stanley (2006a) documents that many times faculty of color feel isolated due to this

lack of cultural peers. This, according to Alexander and Moore (2008), results in many

underrepresented faculty experiencing mental and emotional stress. They propose that

this lack of other faculty of color within the department or institution may, ironically,

cause a heightened visibility, in which oftentimes, Caucasian professors notice more

details about those in the minority. Allison (2008) makes the claim that cultural isolation

in the workplace along with heightened visibility may create an expectation in which

professors of color are often expected to prove themselves to their Caucasian peers.

Numerous faculty members of color report frustration having to routinely demonstrate

their worth through the quality of their work (Burden et al., 2005; Stanley, 2006a).

Simply stated, there is evidence of an attitude that the work of faculty of color is not good

enough (Smith et al., 2002).

Some literature emphasizes that faculty of color feel they have to work twice as

hard as their Caucasian peers (Allison, 2008; Lee 2012), especially new faculty who,

according to Dixon-Reeves (2003), have access to far fewer mentoring opportunities than

Caucasian faculty who are new. Although most faculty members gain the respect of their

students and colleagues by effective teaching, studies have shown (Bower, 2002;

McGowan, 2000; Stanley, 2006a) many professors of color report that college students

often provide negative feedback or question the validity of their teaching in the

classroom. Further, this literature indicates that the lack of confidence causes feelings of

marginalization among faculty of color. Antonio (2002) asserts that although race and

culture in academia have been topics for discussion for decades, advancements in this

area have not materialized since the 1960s.

Stanley (2006b) argues, on the other extreme, that because there are so few professors of color, they are often called upon to be the speakers for their race. Allison (2008) agrees with Stanley, proposing that many professors of color become overcommitted because they are called upon to serve on committees more often than Caucasian faculty. Allison (2008) goes on to articulate that faculty of color are overcommitted because the academy simply does not have enough professors of color to serve the diversity needs of the institution. Oftentimes, students of color seek faculty of color to become informal mentors, as well as catalysts for their emotional and cognitive growth (Allison, 2008). Moreover, Allen et al. (2000) state that students of color will frequently seek out faculty of color because they feel a greater sense of trust and support.

Cornelius, Moore, and Gray (1997) also suggest that the political climate surrounding race has serious implications for the success of faculty of color. Elmore and Blackburn (1983) support Cornelius's statements, holding that the introduction of affirmative action policies has actually handicapped the idea of scholarly research for faculty of color. Antonio (2002) points out that the academy is making slow progress to increase the number of people of color within college faculty, but the sluggish movement toward diversification of faculty has the effect of impeding success mostly for students of color. Additionally, this lack of diversity may inadvertently support a cyclical system of racism and political disenfranchisement among people of color in the academy (Cornelius et al., 1997). Alexander and Moore (2008) and others have said that there are many direct benefits to having people of color among the professoriate. For example, Darden, Kamel, and Jackson (1998) make the claim that at predominately white institutions there is a positive correlation between student of color enrollment and faculty of color retention. It

may be an obvious conclusion but it has been established that the more support there is for students of color the more likely they are to persist in college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Therefore, Cross and Slater (2002) suggest that with approximately 1500 people of color being awarded Ph.D.s annually, it would be helpful to students and faculty if universities would recruit some of these newly awarded Ph.D.s of color. Umbach (2006) argues that diversity within the faculty is an important aspect of undergraduate education.

Yet, at the same time, it is well documented (Alexander & Moore, 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Stewart, 2012) that racial stereotypes are the biggest stumbling blocks for faculty of color and students alike. Allison (2008) states that Caucasians prefer to "interact with undereducated people" of color (p. 642). Allen et al. (2000) report that racial barriers are a persistent challenge for faculty of color and, in fact, African American faculty specifically face many historical, cultural, and social barriers that impact their relationship(s) with Caucasians generally. Lee (2012) emphasizes that professors of color are seeking respect and equality among Caucasian peers, but, according to Allison (2008), faculty of color have to confront stereotypes and prejudices held by Caucasian faculty and students. Stanley (2006b) claims that in many cases these stereotypes are often due to lack of multicultural awareness. While racism may be a perceived factor, the burden of racism cannot be placed on higher education alone. Jim Crow laws have had a profound historic impact on numerous American institutions (Alexander, 2010). Therefore, it may be necessary to conduct an investigation regarding the history of Jim Crow and its impact on America and higher education to further understand these perceived underlying reports of racism in the academy—which is beyond the scope of this study.

In efforts to become successful, many faculty of color have engaged in code switching. Diggs et al. (2009) define code switching as a behavior in which one must move back and forth between identities to succeed in separate communities. Diggs et al. (2009) further summarize that faculty of color may become successful only if they learn to simultaneously operate in two ideologies, which are the dominant culture and what is referred to as the oppressed culture. Allen et al. (2000) indicate that this can be a difficult task for people of color as they navigate the academic ranks.

Experience of Women

By and large, when compared to male faculty, women more often have lower academic rank, are less likely to be tenured, earn lower salaries, have heavier teaching responsibilities, receive less support for research productivity, and are required to serve on committees more (Xu, 2008). Women claim they are not integrated into academic departments the same as men; this, according to Winkeler (2000), creates inequitable work environments that contribute to attrition among female faculty, thus resulting in differential faculty turnover due to gender.

Leaks in the pipeline—the progression of students from undergraduate and graduate education to professorships—occur when women or people of color fail to navigate the stages of academia (Jackson, 2008). Based on data regarding women (Jackson, 2008; West, 1995), their pipeline is blocked and leaking female faculty as women express dissatisfaction with the tenure process. There are simply not enough female faculty members in full professorships, according to the American Association of University Professors who claim that only 24% of all full professors in the United States are female (Jackson, 2008).

Whereas one could argue that it is simply that fewer women have terminal degrees compared to men, Jackson (2008) claims the underrepresentation of women among the faculty is largely due to the gender discrimination that negatively impacts salary, promotion, and support for female faculty. This, in turn, leads to greater female faculty turnover (Xu, 2008). Winkeler (2000) proposed that women are less likely to gain tenure than men due to differing gender-based expectations. Women have argued that lack of productivity is due to feelings of disconnectedness, marginalization, and isolation (Winkeler, 2000). Because achievement among the faculty is measured by research productivity and publication, Xu (2008) speculates that the structure of the tenure process favors a system of networks to which most female faculty are denied access. She continues that this invisible network provides the relationships and information that lead to tenure.

Jackson (2008) and Xu (2008) suggest that faculty mentoring may help to break down feelings of isolation and marginalization faced by female faculty members. Tiernany and Bensimon (1996) define mentoring as providing criticism, feedback, advice, and assistance as well as modeling the appropriate behaviors, sharing cultural norms, and explaining historical context. However, according to Perna (2005), women have routinely felt excluded from these mentoring networks in the academy and may simply have less access to and opportunities for mentoring than men. Moreover, she claims that women derive different benefits from professional mentors than male faculty. Perna postulates that female faculty often gain emotional support from mentors, whereas men often gain technical knowledge of the job and opportunities for professional advancement. However, because women are underrepresented at the highest ranks of the

faculty (Perna, 2005), there are, therefore, fewer senior level women in academia available to mentor new female faculty (Perna, 2005). Jackson (2008) claims the lack of available senior and tenured women professors to mentor and support new female faculty causes further blockage in the pipeline and contributes to attrition.

Similarly, Winkeler (2000) concludes that there is a link between productivity, marital status, and parenting that the tenure structure fails to acknowledge. Perna (2005) supports this claim by citing that the number of married female faculty or female faculty with children, are underrepresented among the professoriate. She goes on to assert that few departments identify support mechanisms for female faculty who may be married or with children and it is well recognized that women are migrating from academia to join the corporate ranks where there is more support for women and their families in regard to promotion (Perna, 2005; Xu, 2008). Sample (2008), like many others, assumes that biases about female faculty have greatly contributed to the reduction in advancement opportunities for women.

Expectations for Faculty: Teaching, Research, and Service

Establishing clear faculty expectations is critical for new members of the professoriate, and there is evidence that setting clear guidelines and work expectations leads to a successful career (Greene et al., 2008; Trower, 2009). The importance of informing new faculty of their professional role and objectives cannot be overstated, as many new faculty members report receiving little to no information about the job at the time of employment (Trower, 2009). Numerous studies have examined the importance of establishing clear faculty expectations (Greene et al., 2008; Modica & Marmiseishvilli, 2010; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). Rice et al. (2000) say that many new faculty

members perceive that the lack of information about expectations is a professional

challenge. Moreover, Greene et al. (2008) argue that the failure of administrators to set

clear expectations serves as the major professional barrier to faculty promotion and, more

importantly, to tenure. Furthermore, Greene et al. (2008) speculate the lack in direction

and shared information has direct impact on attrition for new faculty members. Santo et

al. (2009) found that unclear expectations have a positive correlation to anxiety that

compounds the faculty attrition rate. Further, multiple studies (Trower, 2009; Turner,

2003; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004) suggest that the failure of university administrators to

provide clear expectations about the role has resulted in a significant financial loss for

numerous institutions of higher learning, and they express an urgent need for institutions

and administrators alike to clearly identify faculty expectations, as well as outline

requirements for tenure (Dee, 2004; Stanley, 2006a; Trower, 2010).

     The Carnegie foundation cites that faculty members who are employed at research

universities are typically expected to spend 40% of their time on research, 40% on

teaching, and 20% on service activities (Greene et al., 2008). Lucas and Murry (2002)

point out that while this may not be true for all colleges and universities, virtually every

tenure-track professor is expected to perform these functions (Bess & Webster, 1991;

Bland, Seaquist, Pacala, Center, & Finstad, 2002; Jacobs, 2004). In contrast to faculty

employed at research universities, professors at comprehensive colleges and universities

are expected to spend their time in the following manner: 60% teaching, 20% service, and

20% research (Greene et al., 2008). Regardless of institution type, however, Gappa,

Austin, and Trice (2007) and Greene et al. (2008) delineated that the overwhelming

majority of faculty job descriptions indicate need for a percentage of time conducting

research, teaching, and service with a commitment to all three components (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002a).

The Faculty Paradigm

Trower (2009) reports that members of the American professoriate constantly struggle to balance the demands of research, teaching, and service, with the majority of new faculty members experiencing high levels of stress in attempting to meet these demands (Sorcinelli, 1994) . Premeaux and Mondy (2002a) clearly state that the only way for faculty to achieve tenure and promotion is to discover this balance and successfully navigate the research, teaching, and service paradigm.

Whereas there has been little research provided to help faculty members be successful in promotion and tenure (Greene et al., 2008), some propose (Amey, 1992; Greene et al., 2008; Piercy et al., 2005; Santo et al., 2009; Trower, 2010) that the institution is responsible for helping faculty balance the demands and expectations of the professoriate as well as for nurturing the appropriate skill sets that these employees need for advancement. They go on to say that unclear expectations and lack of support lead to imbalanced priorities among new college faculty. Indeed, faculty members who understand academic expectations and departmental values are often more successful than those who do not (Trower, 2009).

Greene et al. (2008) refer to this imbalance as faculty overload, which can be the cause of high stress levels and professional anxiety. Their research reflects that this anxiety forces faculty, regardless of gender and race, to work on weekends and vacations, which perpetuates a loss of family and personal time, in turn, leading to faculty burnout and turnover. Xu (2007) and Cariago-Lo, Dawkins, Enger, Schotter, and Spence (2010)

propose that faculty members frantically fight these imbalanced lifestyles to navigate the research, teaching, and service paradigm to achieve tenure.

Despite the presumed emphasis on achieving a balance of teaching, research, and service, tenure is primarily based on research productivity and publication (ASHE, 2008; Greene et al., 2008; Premeaux & Mondy, 2002a). Ross (2006), Lucas and Murry (2002), and Markie (1994) also confirm that research productivity is the major metric by which tenure is granted.

However, the requirement to publish is often placed second to teaching and service responsibilities. Greene et al. (2008) found that 74% of faculty believe that it is extremely difficult to balance teaching, which consumed the largest amount of faculty time, and service commitments while maintaining high levels of research productivity. Similarly, Santo et al. (2009) pointed out that heavy teaching loads, rigorous advising schedules, and other service commitments greatly imposed on the faculty members' ability to conduct research. This point is further made by Gappa et al. (2007), who confirm that the requirements for faculty to teach and engage in service pulled them in too many directions to maintain a proper focus on research. This is critical because, as Santo et al. (2009) suggest, teaching and service have little effect or influence on tenure and promotion. Premeaux and Mondy (2002a) state that while the current recommended formula for tenure is 40-40-20, many faculty feel that the paradigm required for tenure is 90% research, 5% teaching, and 5% service.

Santo et al. (2009) claim that faculty productivity and promotion are measured specifically by the number of annual peer-reviewed publications, citing that the reason is that research productivity is the most tangible indicator of faculty performance. Research

universities typically require two publications annually in highly respected peer-reviewed journals for promotion (Greene et al., 2008). Yet studies conducted by Santo et al. (2009) and Bland et al. (2002) found that insufficient time and poor collegial environments were often the key contributors to not meeting this standard.

Gappa et al. (2008) summarize that while many university professors struggle to find time to conduct research, it may be beneficial for the institutions to provide more support and guidance to help new faculty members manage their commitments for research, teaching, and service. Santo et al. (2009) found that in many cases professors who are motivated to focus on research were more productive than those who were not. Multiple studies (Brayboy, 2003; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004; Tien, 2000) confirm that faculty who are more passionate about conducting research are often more productive and, ultimately, more successful.

Finally, there is an ongoing controversy among professors regarding the importance of research productivity versus teaching and service (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2005; Jacobs 2004), with many faculty members claiming that too much emphasis is placed on research and publication (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002a). Yet, while faculty might propose that teaching is the most important function of the faculty, they would consistently agree that research productivity is necessary to gain tenure (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002a). This is supported by a number of authors who confirm that research has long been the banner of a successful faculty career, as research productivity is the benchmark of academic prestige (Markie, 1994).

Institutional Culture: Socialization and Mentoring

Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, and Tucker (2007) point out that all new employees—including faculty—are required to adapt to their new environment and institutions very quickly, as this is part of the socialization process. Faculty support generally consists of a socialization period and a transition into the institutional culture that requires collegiality as well as mentorship (Alexander & Moore, 2008; Stanley, 2006b; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). This support is necessary for assisting faculty to learn institutional values, identify mentors, and become socially accepted within the academic department (Greene et al., 2008). Research (Greene et al., 2008; Santo et al., 2009; Stanley, 2006b) contends that many new faculty members do not have sufficient skill sets and lack the knowledge needed to be successful in their first position. Furthermore, these researchers conclude that faculty support is a process consisting of mastering an understanding of the institution, the position, departmental social norms, gaining colleagues, and being mentored through the promotion and tenure processes.

It is often difficult for new faculty members to identify and comprehend the organizational politics and practices without proper institutional support (Trower, 2009; Xu, 2007). Because of this lack of clarity, Greene et al. (2008) contend that new faculty experience higher levels of stress during their first five years of the professorship. Santo et al. (2009) and Gappa et al. (2007) suggest that, understandably, confusion about the socialization process creates fear and anxiety about the new position.

Regarding faculty socialization, Bland et al. (2002) along with Fogg (2006) identified that in the professional environment, collegiality is the most powerful retention tool for new faculty. Still, numerous new faculty members experience feelings of

separation, loneliness, and isolation in the professoriate because they lack the necessary support (Cariago-Lo et al., 2010; Herzig, 2004; Trower, 2009; Xu, 2007).

In order to improve the socialization process, Saks and Ashforth (1997) say that the interactions with supervisors and colleagues are critical keys to improving collegiality for new comers. Collegiality, they state, is essential for long-term faculty success. Ross (2006) contends that faculty members must understand that the university is much like a corporation that functions in large part by a series of relationships whereby employees are hired, trained, and promoted as part of the socialization process. In fact, the literature (Cornelius et al., 1997; Ross, 2006; Stanley, 2006b) indicates that many university relationships actually appear to be more important than research and publication, as the faculty colleagues often identify what is accepted as "good" research, teaching, and service. Greene et al. (2008) found that new professors are more successful when they had access to relationships with senior faculty and suggest that a lack of collegiality greatly increases faculty turnover (Dee, 2004). Austin (1990) agreed that collegiality is an essential component of faculty support, as these relationships serve as informal networks that provide feedback and knowledge as well as aid the transition and promotion of new college faculty.

Trower (2009) makes a similar claim, pointing out that collegiality and interdepartmental socialization have enormous implications for faculty job satisfaction, performance, turnover, and, ultimately, tenure. She states that although most faculty believe that universities are merit-based organizations in which those who are meritorious are retained and rewarded, the modern university is, according to Trower, a relationship-based organization founded on social acceptance.

Along with socialization, mentoring can have a profound effect on the success of new faculty. Savage et al. (2004) define mentoring as the process by which an experienced person guides the development of an entry-level employee. Mentoring is an ongoing relationship steeped in professional development that provides formal and informal feedback and access to organizational capital. Furthermore Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson, (2011) say that mentoring is also necessary to remove barriers that may increase faculty promotion and retention. It is, according to Hambright and Diamantes (2004), an appropriate method to help junior and new faculty balance the demands of research, teaching, and service. Whereas many new faculty members do not receive any kind of mentorship, both formal and informal support can be beneficial, increasing the overall job satisfaction and productivity of new employees, as well as increasing the likelihood of promotion (Greene et al., 2008). Trower (2009) further explains that professors who are more satisfied with their work environment are more productive.

Studies by Hambright and Diamantes, (2004) and Santo et al. (2009) have shown that mentoring is a critical aspect of establishing a positive and productive workplace for faculty by inspiring professional confidence in new and junior faculty, and providing a network of formal and informal support and socialization. Trower (2010) identifies formal mentoring as taking place in a department or organizational system where new faculty may be paired with a panel of senior faculty members or a single top-level faculty whereby the senior faculty coaches the new professional but is not mandated to do so. Literature (Hambright & Diamantes, 2004; Savage et al., 2004; Trower, 2010) indicates whether formal or informal, mentoring is beneficial for the development of new faculty. It is an effective conduit for faculty to gain clear job and organization expectations.

Further, mentoring allows new faculty members to have a smooth transition into the professoriate as well as into the department culture (Hambright & Diamantes, 2004).

Many have tied mentorship to more measurable outcomes. Bland et al. (2005), for example, contend that formal mentorship and support greatly improve research productivity. Other studies suggest that mentoring creates a more nurturing and supportive environment that reduces isolation and increases faculty retention and promotion (Greene et al., 2008; Hambright & Diamantes, 2004; Stanley, 2006b).

Mentoring, however, is not always present and does not always work. According to Savage et al. (2004), even the current model for faculty mentoring is often an obstacle for new faculty, as the most senior faculty are male and tend to be less supportive and helpful to new faculty members. The researchers claim that poor quality mentoring programs have allowed professional barriers and a sense of isolation for new faculty.

Cropsey et al. (2008) have linked a lack of mentoring for new faculty members to attrition within the professoriate. Without support, mentoring, and clear expectations, most new faculty members are at risk (Hambright & Diamantes, 2004). Similarly, a lack of balance while attempting to execute the expectations of research, teaching, and service leads to higher rates of turnover (Cropsey et al., 2008; Savage et al., 2004). Faculty members in their first five years of the professoriate are particularly vulnerable (Sorcinelli, 1994), experiencing high levels of stress that contributes to burnout and, therefore, turnover. Other contributors to turnover include the work environment being inconsistent with the faculty members' personal and professional goals (Xu, 2007) and low levels of satisfaction not only with salary, work conditions, course loads, and

university support, but also with university values such as research productivity (Cropsey et al., 2008).

Faculty turnover indeed is the Achilles' heel of the modern university and is a costly expenditure that negatively affects all institutions of higher education. Studies show that faculty turnover often accounts for 5% of the university budget (Savage et al., 2004). Not only is faculty turnover costly in terms of loss in revenue, it has a negative impact on student retention and productivity (Cropsey et al., 2008) and represents a serious problem within the organizational culture of the institution (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).

Access and Attrition: Challenges in Diversifying the Professoriate

As already noted, the road to tenure is a socialization process in which new faculty are mentored and afforded access to resources, networks, mentors, and new skill sets that can lead to promotion and tenure (Stanley, 2006b). Stanley (2006a) and Brayboy (2003) claim there is a major disparity between the socialization of Caucasian faculty versus that for both female faculty and people of color in the professoriate and that this leads to turnover. Specifically, women and people of color have consistently been shown to have a much higher turnover rate than Caucasian males which, may be attributed to the lack of social integration among faculty (Allen et al., 2000; Fenelon 2003; Stanley, 2006a). Researchers (Alexander & Moore, 2008; Allen et al., 2000; August & Waltman, 2004; Modica & Mamiseishvili, 2010) further conclude that the high rates of turnover are consistently linked to additional barriers that exist for underrepresented faculty, which center on poor support, lack of mentorship, and a misunderstanding of the job expectations. Xu (2007) explains that underrepresented faculty consistently lagged

behind their Caucasian male peers because they lack the needed resources for professional development and promotion. The literature is replete with examples. For instance, professors with a mentor are twice as likely to be promoted as those who do not have a mentor (Cropsey et al., 2008). Further, Brayboy (2003) and Herzig (2004) put forth that women and faculty of color often fail to properly integrate into the culture at research universities, which then leads to higher turnover rates. Herzig (2004) cautioned that women and faculty of color must be able to adapt and transition well into the institutional culture in order to be successful faculty members. If not, the feelings of isolation, professional loneliness, and marginalization are compounded for them (Taylor et al., 2010; Tower, 2009). Finally, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) assert that faculty turnover is exacerbated by a discrepancy of values and ethics among the faculty. Cropsey et al. (2008) suggest that this variability among those values often leads to isolation and isolation, in turn, translates into accelerated turnover.

Many propose (Allen et al., 2000; Lucas & Murry, 2002) that research is the major barrier for women and faculty of color. Ross (2006) points out that it is critical for faculty of color to understand how to conduct research. Gregory (2001) and Stanley (2006b) also believe that women and other minorities among the faculty must be more engaged in research productivity if they seek promotion. Brayboy (2003) claims that underrepresented faculty are so focused on teaching and service that they often fail to meet the publication requirements for tenure. Yet, as Xu (2007) points out, promotion and tenure are rarely rewarded on the basis of teaching and service. Brayboy notes that senior faculty, who are most often Caucasian males, tend to view this focus on teaching and service as a refusal to meet the job expectations.

It has been established that faculty with high research activity have a lower rate of turnover (Xu, 2007; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Yet women and people of color have much lower levels of research productivity when compared to Caucasian males (Cropsey et al., 2008). This may be due to the difficulty women and minorities have in breaking the research barrier that comes from the majority of senior faculty not feeling comfortable nurturing new professors (Savage et al., 2004). This lack of achievement in research, Trower (2009) suggests, is evident from the largest numbers of women and minorities being clustered at the instructor and assistant professor rank. Beoku-Betts (2004) goes on to claim that women are virtually absent from the highest ranks of the professoriate. The result, according to Herzig (2004), is that the lack of social integration for minorities results in a homogeneously Caucasian male faculty absent of gender, racial, cultural, or ethnic diversity. Diversity is extremely essential to the academy, as it provides an array of fresh ideas, differing perspectives, and new values that, in turn, improve the professional environment (Herzig, 2004; Stanley, 2006b).

Tenure

Tenure began as a protection that allowed faculty to teach controversial ideas in public without the fear of being fired or terminated (Latif, 1998). Though initially designed to protect academic freedom, tenure also makes the professoriate as a profession more attractive and, thus, helps reduce turnover (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). For the individual, then, the move toward tenure has become a socialization process that assists in the development and retention of faculty (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002a; Stanley, 2006b; Trower, 2009). Today 90% of all colleges and universities, including public and private, and 99.5% of all doctoral degree-granting institutions have an identified process for

tenure (Pearce, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Tenure is often considered the chauffeur of faculty prestige; 71% of *public* colleges and universities have a tenure system of some kind (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Cariago-Lo et al. (2010), Savage et al. (2004), and Premeaux and Mondy (2002a) say that tenure should be a function of promotion and reward for those faculty who demonstrate commitment and excellence to research, teaching, and service. In a study of tenured versus non-tenured faculty, Premeaux and Mondy (2002a) found that professors overwhelmingly believed that tenure is necessary for job security. The decisive factor, however, in granting tenure is research. Similarly, research productivity is the major criterion for faculty promotion (Li Ping Tang & Chamberlain, 2003) and, in fact, many professors view tenure and promotion as providing motivation to conduct research (Tien, 2000). And while some suggest that teaching and service alone have little effect on tenure and promotion (Premeaux & Mondy 2002a; Santo et al., 2009), others (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002b) have gone so far as to say that tenure has often been used as a reward for poor teaching and prolific research over prolific teaching and poor research. This contest between teaching and research is often the source of confusion (Savage et al., 2004). Tenure may be viewed as a post-probationary period that has a lifetime reward for teaching, research, and service (Rybarczyk, Lera, Lund, Whittington, & Dykstra, 2011; Szybinski & Jordan, 2010). Despite the claim by some that tenure leads to unproductive long-term employees, Premeaux and Mondy (2002b) state that tenure leads to faculty longevity and higher rates of research productivity. Tien (2000) also found that a reward system such as promotion and tenure stimulates and encourages faculty productivity.

Tenure is not unique to colleges and university faculty. Premeaux and Mondy (1997) point out that many professions such as law, medicine, and government service have some form of job protection system for continuous employment that aids in staff retention. Tenure may not only be valuable to an institution because it reduces faculty attrition (Latif, 1998), but it also allows the university to attract the most qualified faculty. Xu (2007) and Premeaux and Mondy (2002b) argue that this possibility of lifetime employment is indeed critical in attracting, training, and retaining the American professoriate.

There are a number of barriers that academicians face in regard to the tenure process. Tenure, in its current form, is a political system that, according to Fenelon (2003), encourages and supports a hierarchy of racism and oppression. Hearn and Anderson (2002) point out that the very nature of faculty promotion and tenure is subject to the relationships and culture of the specific academic department. These authors claim that the decision to grant tenure breaks down to conflicts over individual personality, individual goals, culture, and interest. At many colleges and universities women and people of color often describe the process of achieving tenure as hazing (Stanley, 2006a).

The structure for tenure, according to Sample (2008) is based on male-dominated cultural and masculine norms that do not account for women's attitudes, cultural perspectives, or position in society. In 1999 only 18% of women in the professoriate held tenure compared to 38% of men (Sample, 2008). Jackson (2008) surmised that due to the gap between female and male faculty, women are more likely to report negative experiences with the tenure and promotion process. Xu (2008) associated the gap in gender norms with resulting high turnover rate among female faculty. The study

proposed that men and women have differing teaching styles, varying research interests, and separate goals for professional development. However, many male faculty members associate these different professional styles with biases that negatively affect female faculty (Xu, 2008). For example, women have speculated that in many cases their research is devalued by male professors and is considered feminist. Based on the depreciation of women's research, many female faculty members express apprehension about the tenure structure itself (Sample, 2008). Winkeler (2000) acknowledged that while faculty achievement is presumed to be measured in research and publication, the high turnover rate among female faculty is due to both poor teaching performance and low levels of research productivity. A number of studies (Duch et al., 2012; Sabharwal, 2013) confirm that women publish less than men; however, Jackson (2008) and Xu (2008) respond that teacher performance is interrelated to the burdensome teaching overload and obligation to committee work that female faculty face— which may impact productivity. Moreover, these authors point out that the research activity is not low; rather, it is a lack of understanding multicultural education that prohibits acceptance of female research topics.

<div align="center">Theoretical Framework</div>

Introduction

Throughout the literature and various anecdotal articles there are many scholars who say that racism is the major barrier causing a lack of faculty tenure and promotion for minorities. However, this paper seeks to reject the notion of overt racism as the barrier. Instead, there is an argument that the major barrier that prohibits women and faculty of color is a lack of cultural synchronization and positionality. In order to best

address this framework it is important to define racism. Political psychologists define

racism as a failure to merge traditional values, which affects people of color negatively

(Wood, 1994). However, this issue of tenure and promotion among women and people of

color is much deeper than merging values; it can be argued that the process of promoting

women and faculty of color is more about an appreciation and acceptance that every

culture has educational significance and is critical to the academic process (Banks, 1993;

Irvine, 1990). Multiple studies (Banks, 1993; Delpit, 1991; Irvine, 1990) reject the idea

that racism is the perpetrator that causes the lack of faculty tenure and promotion among

women and people of color; rather, it is a lack of understanding cultural norms and the

position of those norms as they relate to faculty development. There are two distinct

theoretical bases for this argument that might suggest there is a need for faculty members

to understand cultural dynamics as a part of the tenure process. These include Cultural

Synchronization as outlined by Jacqueline Jordan Irvine in her 1990 book, *Black Students*

and School Failure, and the concept of Positionality as explained by Banks' (1993)

theory regarding multicultural education. From these models, one may surmise that low

levels of tenure and promotion among faculty of color and women is largely due to a dis-

synchronization of culture between those who have earned tenure in the majority culture

and those who have not in the minority culture. Moreover, some might propose that an

increase in professional mentoring may increase tenure and promotion because it

increases a dialogue and understanding of the two disconnected cultures. Likewise, the

concept of positionality can explain that one's position in society has a significant impact

on educational delivery in that positionality seeks to explain why, minorities and

particularly women, have been marginalized in the professoriate. Moreover, these

theoretical bases can provide a framework for new ways to increase faculty development among women and people of color.

Cultural Synchronization

Studying African American children in the K12 school setting, Irvine (1990) researched the cultural effect on the educational process; she outlines that African Americans and Caucasians have different cultural norms, which restricts the educational and promotional process for minorities. She reports that there are unstated norms that hinder the education process between African American children and teachers who are Caucasian, specifically, whereas there is a major disconnect that results in the children of color being punished. However, in the same setting Caucasian children most often understand the unspoken norms and are rewarded for their behavior. As a result of the unspoken cultural norms that the majority culture shares, students of color are viewed as militant, disrespectful, and, ultimately, not a good fit for the educational institution. It is important to note that during this entire process the students of color may be confused and perplexed because they are often acting within their own cultural norms. While Irvine's framework was developed for the K12 setting, this study will apply her theoretical model to help explain the experiences of faculty of color within the university culture as related to faculty advancement. Moreover, this framework as it relates to children of color in the school system parallels the experiences faculty of color and must be discussed further to highlight its significance.

Irvine's (1990) book is one of the first to examine people of color and the failure of an academic entity. Prior to her work scholars studied the behavior of the students and their failures. In essence, Irvine points out that students of color are not

failing but, instead, the schools are failing to understand students of color. She postulates that academic institutions have an obligation to understand, embrace, and teach the various cultural norms so that students achieve and the school, therefore, will be effective or successful. Her argument parallels the current issue raised with faculty of color where academic administrators and superior faculty argue that people of color are simply unable to achieve tenure because they are not capable. Irvine (1990) argues that if the cultural norms were taken into account or if the majority culture communicated the unspoken norms then people of color would achieve at an equal rate as their Caucasian counterparts.

The concept of Cultural Synchronization is based in anthropological and historical research that explains that people of color have their own distinct cultural norms based in language, beliefs, attitudes, and ancestry (Irvine, 1990). For many years people believed that minorities did not have their own culture; rather, they were borrowers of the majority culture; however, this is incorrect. Herskovits (1958) found that people of color have their own culture and rarely make attempts to model a dominant culture. More specifically, he found that attempts by people of color to model a dominant culture were inconsistent with the minority cultural values. Moreover, Irvine (1990) summarizes that to be successful, people of color must operate in three quandaries simultaneously, also known as the triple-quandary, which are their base culture, mainstream or dominant culture, and the oppressed culture. This issue is not racially based; rather, it is culturally charged by a series of cultural misunderstandings that are scripted and hidden.

Synchronization Explained

The lack of Cultural Synchronization is a problem, as it results in a deeper disconnect in communication that erodes the learning or promotion processes for minorities. Irvine (1990) points out that cultural misunderstanding between the majority culture and people of color leads to great conflict, distrust, hostility, and eventually attrition. In each circumstance, the majority culture is in power and the minorities are vying for power through academic progression. Additionally, the conflict deepens due to cultural inversion and cultural aversion. Cultural inversion is the idea that the behaviors of the majority culture are inappropriate for people of color to assume; for many children of color this is considered acting "white." Many times, adults simply resist mimicking these characteristics (Irvine, 1990). Cultural aversion is the failure of the majority culture or those in power to accept, appreciate, and discuss issues pertaining to diversity, ethnicity, culture, equity, or social justice. This concept has been explained as the color-blind approach, where faculty say, there is no racial issue. We are all color blind here (Irvine, 1990). Instead this approach of cultural aversion shows the majority culture's lack of awareness and discomfort in accepting the idea that culture has a place in academia (Banks, 1993). Due to the lack of synchronization of cultures, successful people of color must learn the concept of code switching before they write or speak in a setting within the majority culture, which may lead to problems for people of color in the area of cognition, processing information, and perceiving (Irvine, 1990). It is clear that when people of color engage with the majority culture in an academic setting, the rules are different than with cultural peers. For people of color these rules may be difficult to identify and adapt (Peters, 1981). This issue of Cultural Synchronization extends beyond

physical boundaries and comes to bear on the cognitive achievements of minorities. There is some evidence that the cognitive functioning of Caucasians and minorities may differ. For example, a study by Pasteur and Toldson (1982) found that people of color tend to function from the right brain, which focuses on the intuitive, non-verbal, creative, artistic, and expressive behaviors, whereas Caucasians tend to function from the left brain, which focuses on the logical, mathematical, and sequential. Moreover, argue Pasteur and Toldson (1982), people of color have a field-dependent dominant cognitive approach unlike their majority or Caucasian counterparts who operate from a field-independent approach. Field-dependent individuals tend to be more global in their thinking to take on an interrelated approach to problem solving. In contrast, field-independent individuals tend to isolate themselves from the elements to solve problems. To expand on this point, it is important to use the example of research. People of color, particularly African Americans, tend to do research that involves African American issues. For instance, an African American faculty member who is male may opt to research incarceration rates of black males to address social inequities in his local community. Being that African Americans tend to be field-dependent it is paramount that they are interrelated with their research; this is a cultural norm. In contrast, Caucasian American faculty may find it more compelling to facilitate research in which they are isolated from the issue. Therefore, the framework of Cultural Synchronization would allow for the majority culture to accept that people of color may find it culturally inappropriate to separate themselves personally from their research topic and agendas. It is absolutely critical that Cultural Synchronization be addressed and implemented within academia.

Lacking Cultural Synchronization

Based on Irvine's (1990) model one can speculate that the lack of Cultural Synchronization may contribute to a decline in people of color as faculty. Yet the majority population (i.e., those in power) may fail to understand that one's culture and gender have a profound impact on academic delivery (Banks, 1993; Irvine, 1990). Due to the lack of Cultural Synchronization, Irvine suggests that faculty of color may become an endangered species among academic institutions. Moreover, the failure of academic institutions to address cultural norms has significant negative repercussions on the recruitment and retention of people of color among the faculty ranks. Furthermore, in a strong statement by Irvine (1990), administrators as well as the majority culture must admit that institutions have failed at retaining people of color and accept that various cultural norms have a significant impact on academic progress.

Many people of color enter the faculty ranks as a method to give back to the community and serve those like themselves (Stanley, 2006b; Wulff et al., 2004). Additionally, people of color perceive that entering the faculty ranks will allow them to enter the middle class (Irvine, 1990). However, people of color are migrating away from faculty positions, as they no longer believe that serving as educators is psychologically rewarding (Irvine, 1990). In order to change this, it may prove critical that scholars begin to redirect their attention to multicultural education as a method to ensure both student and faculty development.

Positionality

Banks (1993), in writing about multicultural education, uses feminist theory to explain the idea that one's culture, and in this case, gender may be critical to teaching and

learning in the academy. Multiculturalists propose that women have been marginalized in

the academy; however, studies have shown that women play a critical role in the

transmission of knowledge (Butler & Walter, 1991). The concept of positionality asserts

that gender, race, class, and other elements of one's identity are relational markers instead

of simple qualities (Banks, 1993). The point that positionality seeks to explain is that

knowledge is expressly valid when it includes information about the instructor's position

in relation to the content (Banks, 1993; Maher & Tetreault, 1993). Positionality then, can

be used to provide a theoretical explanation of gender inequities regarding tenure and

promotion.

A Deeper Review of Positionality

        Positionality, is the idea that mainstream education does not account for gender

or cultural differences among women and minorities. This theoretical framework

postulates that there are two competing thoughts regarding the construction and

dissemination of knowledge. There is the Western approach and the multicultural

approach to educating students. The Western approach is more traditional; however, it

does not account for how gender, race, culture, or class impacts learning. This traditional

approach to teaching and learning caters to the majority culture. The problem with this

approach is that it often places women and minorities in an inferior subgroup (Banks,

1993). In contrast, many scholars argue that multicultural education is more effective, as

it provides an opportunity for instructors and students to participate in the learning

process (Banks, 1993). Code (1991) asserts that education is socially constructed;

therefore, teaching a subject from the position of one's gender is more appropriate than a

traditional method. Moreover, it has been documented that personal, social, and cultural

factors greatly impact the formation of knowledge (Banks, 1993). Scholars who support the concept of positionality agree that this framework provides a meaningful theory that gender is critical to the success of instructors (Banks, 1993). While the concept of positionality challenges traditional mainstream education, it establishes a strong argument for increasing the presence of women in higher education.

Positionality allows recognition of personal cultures, biases, assumptions, and perspectives as they pertain to gender and culture. Ladner (1973) points out that multicultural education and positionality reduce stereotypes, helping diminish misconceptions about women and, ultimately, helping to increase the achievement among students (Banks, 1993). Simply put, positionality provides a richer examination of social reality for learning that celebrates gender, culture, and class (Merton, 1972). Banks (1993) also argues that varied approaches to learning and knowledge will increase gender equity in the academy more so than do traditional approaches. He delineates four types of knowledge: personal/cultural knowledge, popular knowledge, mainstream/academic knowledge, and transformative knowledge, and he suggests that the inclusion of these approaches to knowledge will impact institutional knowledge in ways that embrace gender. It is important to point out that the current mainstream culture addresses one social norm as a dominant culture; however, positionality challenges the dominant culture to include women as leaders, culture as critical, and class as essential. This approach to teaching and learning reduces the barriers of gender while including traditional knowledge.

Summary

In summary, there is a perspective that women and people of color are isolated, marginalized, and deeply criticized by the senior Caucasian male faculty in the professoriate. Moreover, women and minorities in academia have made sharp claims that they are, indeed, barred from advancement opportunities within the faculty ranks. For example, researchers (Allen et al., 2000; Irvine, 1990; Smith et al., 2002; Xu, 2008) explain that the tenure structure favors Caucasian male faculty over women as well as other racial and ethnic minorities, reducing the available pipeline for minority professors. While there is vast qualitative literature that supports such claims, there is little empirical data that can quantify and validate the reported challenges that women and faculty of color face among the professoriate. To that end there is also little quantitative data that seeks to provide measurable possibilities to address the systemic reports of sexism and racism that are said to exist with academia. Yet there are numerous similarities between the reported feelings of new faculty and those ideals and challenges of women and people of color holistically.

For example, many have written about the importance of the socialization process for new faculty. Trower (2009) writes that faculty socialization allows professors to learn the appropriate university values and priorities. It is critical, according to Ross (2006), for new faculty members to learn who and how to align themselves with colleagues as a priority; Ross goes on to say that creating a cast of supporting colleagues is a major facilitator for later promotion and tenure. Faculty socialization, according to Trower (2009) and Bauer et al. (2007), is a process by which new faculty members, outsiders, transition from being outsiders to insiders. This transition is how new faculty members

acquire organizational knowledge, professional skill sets, and clear expectations about the position (Bauer et al., 2007). Experiencing this process reduces institutional uncertainty and attrition among new professors and fosters the three major areas of faculty development: job expectations and roles, collegiality and knowledge, and institutional values (Trower, 2009). This nexus for new faculty may be the barrier experienced by underrepresented academics that creates the chilly climate for female faculty and professors of color, yet it has not been empirically studied through the lens of mentorship, faculty socialization, attitudes toward research or teaching, and research productivity as it relates to race and gender in regard to professorial advancement.

The literature concludes that there are fewer professional mentoring and networking opportunities for women and minority faculty members, which has a negative impact on faculty socialization. Moreover, one's positionality and socialization have the potential to become a barrier for faculty success and advancement—which inhibits faculty orientation and research productivity and, ultimate, faculty advancement. Perhaps because of these barriers, women and faculty of color receive promotion at lower rates than Caucasian males and, therefore, continue to be underrepresented among the American professoriate. This study seeks to quantify the reported challenges that underrepresented faculty face in the academy. Further, through the reports of college and university faculty, women and people of color describe their individual experiences related to mentoring, faculty socialization, research/teaching, and research productivity as uncomfortable or inappropriate. Although differential hiring of minority faculty was not tested in this study, the findings from this study will be beneficial in helping women and people of color achieve tenure, this study will outline recommendations that may serve as

a viable solution to support the transition, engagement, and retention of those faculty members who are currently underrepresented in America's colleges and universities.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study examined whether race and gender are related to variables that have

been shown to impact faculty promotion and tenure. Chapter III illustrates the design and

analysis that was used for this study. It describes how the participants were selected, the

instrument that was used to collect data from the participants, and the statistical tests used

to analyze the data. The dependent variables in this study focus on four constructs that

measure faculty attitudes toward promotion and tenure: mentorship, faculty socialization,

teaching and research, and productivity. These constructs measured attitude toward

mentoring (Mentorship), attitude towards faculty socialization in the specific department

(Socialization), and attitude toward teaching and research (Teaching/Research), as well as

the self-reported scholarly activity (Productivity), i.e., the number of peer-reviewed

articles published, presentations, submissions, books, and average hours weekly spent

conducting research over a twelve-month period. The independent variables used in this

study are race, gender, or the combination (interaction) of race and gender so as to

understand if people of color and women believe they have the same opportunities for

mentorship and access to socialization as Caucasian males, as well as the same interest

level for teaching/research and scholarly activity as Caucasian males among the

American professoriate.

Research Questions

RQ1: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a

difference in mentorship opportunities? (a) Does race make a statistically

significant difference in reported mentorship opportunities? (b) Does gender make

a statistically significant difference in mentorship opportunities? (c) Is there a
statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to mentorship
opportunities?

RQ2: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a
difference in faculty socialization? (a) Does race make a statistically significant
difference in faculty socialization? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant
difference in faculty socialization? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction
of race and gender with regard to faculty socialization?

RQ3: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a
difference in research productivity? (a) Does race make a statistically significant
difference in reported research productivity? (b) Does gender make a statistically
significant difference in reported research productivity? (c) Is there a statistically
significant interaction of race and gender with regard to research productivity?

Participants

In the United States there are six basic classifications to which all colleges and
universities are categorized; these classifications are established by the Carnegie
Foundation (2010). The classifications are associate colleges, doctorate-granting
universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, tribal colleges,
and special focus institutions. All participants in this study were selected from only the
following classifications: doctorate-granting universities, master's colleges and
universities, and baccalaureate colleges, as these institutions host the majority of tenure-
track faculty. There was an attempt to make the sample representative of the American

professoriate for those faculty members employed at or above the rank of assistant professor to include associate professors, full professors, and professor emeriti.

The final sample included 650 participants of all races and ethnicities, including but not limited to Black or African Americans, American Indians or Native Americans, Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders, Hispanic Americans, Latino/a Americans, Mexican Americans, and White or Caucasian Americans, as well as both males and females who were employed at the appropriate academic rank across various colleges and universities in the United States.

The sample represented all major institutional types as defined by the 2010 Basic Carnegie Classification to include doctorate-granting universities, master's colleges and universities, and baccalaureate colleges. The participants included faculty employed at both public and private institutions nationwide. The participants were selected from each of the four major geographic regions of the United States as outlined by the U.S. Census Bureau (2012). These regions are the Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. After selecting the institution, the faculty directory was used to email each participant. Each participant was sent an electronic questionnaire via email that was approved by the Institutional Review Board at The University of Southern Mississippi.

<center>Instrumentation</center>

The Instrument: The instrument was designed by the researcher to capture demographic data including information regarding institutional type, rank, race, gender, age, years of service, and education level. This questionnaire comprised 45 items in an agreement scale designed to measure attitude(s) toward faculty promotion and tenure based on the review of current literature.

The Promotion & Tenure Questionnaire, 2013 (PTQ). The PTQ (Appendix A) is a questionnaire that has been developed specifically for this study. It is divided into five sections, designed to measure four constructs: Mentorship, Faculty Socialization, Teaching/Research, and Research Productivity—the final section addresses demographic data. The instrument consists of 32 items designed to examine faculty attitudes toward mentoring, faculty socialization, teaching and research, and research productivity. In addition to the 32 items on the questionnaire there are 13 statements designed to collect demographic data.

This instrument was pilot tested to identify and clarify confusing items and followed up by Cronbach's alpha to test internal consistency. An expert panel of tenured and tenure-track professors piloted the instrument to ensure content validity. Of the sample of 35 faculty members selected to participate in the pilot study, 26 questionnaires were completed and submitted. The data analysis for the pilot study was based on the 25 questionnaires that were returned; as one was excluded because it was incomplete. The data were collected via the Qualtrics Survey Software that projected a 74% response rate for the pilot test. Cronbach's alpha yielded that the questionnaire produced reliable scores. The Mentorship construct consisted of 6 items ($\alpha = .74$), the Faculty Socialization construct consisted of 12 items ($\alpha = .93$), the Teaching/Research construct consisted of 8 items ($\alpha = .78$).

Procedure

The research was approved by the Institutional Review Board(s) at The University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix B) and Columbus State University (Appendix C) to conduct this study. After completing the pilot study the instrument was

administered live via the Qualtrics Survey Software. Institutions within this study were randomly selected based on their respective Carnegie Classification and geographical location. The researcher aimed to select a proportionately equal number of colleges and universities that reflected each of the four major geographic regions. The participants represented 75 colleges and universities and more than 300 individual academic departments, schools, and colleges of study throughout the United States, including each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The participants were selected from reviewing college, university, and faculty professional websites. The researcher sent 34,925 emails to individual faculty members and invited them to participate in this study. However, there was no way to determine which or how many of the email addresses were valid. A follow-up email was sent to participants two weeks after the initial questionnaires had been distributed. The participants were randomly selected based on a matrix that examines employment status, rank, research productivity, years of service, institutional type, and documented coursework. This information was gathered and reviewed from the faculty curriculum vitae or biography, which was posted on the institution website(s). Prior to participating in this study each participant was provided with a statement of informed consent and cover letter (Appendix A), which was included in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were administered and maintained via the Qualtrics Survey Software. All data collected were stored in an electronic password secured data-warehouse. Only the researcher and select committee members had access to the data. Three years after completion of this study all data collected will be electronically destroyed.

Research Design

This study examined faculty attitudes toward mentorship opportunities, faculty socialization, teaching and research, and their productivity in the context of race and gender or the combination of race and gender to help provide insight on the promotion and tenure process for people of color and women in the professoriate. This study focused on the three specific research questions noted in Chapter I. Therefore the dependent variables are mentorship, faculty socialization, teaching and research, and research productivity, whereas race, gender, or the combination of race and gender are the independent variables. These variables were collected only once through the electronic questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The data in this study were analyzed by two statistical tests; Research Question One on mentorship opportunities and Research Question Two regarding faculty socialization were analyzed with a two-way ANOVA. Research Question Three observed actual self-reported data regarding productivity; therefore, this question was analyzed with a two-way MANOVA. For both the two-way ANOVA and two-way MANOVA, the statistical significance level, alpha, for this study was established at .05.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapter III provided a foundation and direction for the statistical tests and

research methods for this study. Chapter IV will discuss the data collected in this study,

the results and statistical analysis that were conducted. The purpose of this study was to

examine if there was a statistically significant difference in mentorship opportunities,

faculty socialization, and research productivity across race and gender or the combination

of race and gender in regard to the American professoriate. This study also observed

faculty attitudes toward teaching and research among faculty to provide an overview of

where faculty in general placed the highest emphasis. The population in this study

consisted of tenured and tenure-track faculty at accredited colleges and universities

throughout the United States who were employed at the rank of assistant professor,

associate professor, full professor, or professor emeritus. The participants in this study

were employed at baccalaureate-granting institutions, master's degree-granting

institutions, and doctorate-granting institutions. The sample included faculty employed at

small/liberal arts institutions, medium size colleges and universities, as well as large

research institutions, including both public and private post-secondary institutions. There

were a total of 650 questionnaires returned. There were 122 of the questionnaires with at

least 90% missing data and were, therefore, excluded from analysis. Final sample size

was 528; the data was collected via Qualtrics Survey Software, which calculated a 73%

response rate based on emails received by potential participants.

Chapter IV is divided into three sections; the first section will provide

demographic information regarding the faculty who participated in the study. Section two

describes the descriptive statistics from the data collected based upon the responses to the questionnaires, and the third section will conclude with an overview of the statistical test and results used to address each of the three major research questions in this study.

Demographic Data

The participants were asked to provide general demographic information on their gender, race, faculty rank, institutional type, tenure status, whether the institution of employment was public or private, highest degree completed, majority student population served or historically served at their campus of employment, if he/she had a mentor their first year as a professor, and whether they currently have a mentor. The demographic data for the 528 participants can be found in Tables 2 and 3.

Of those who reported gender, a slight majority of the participants were female (45%). While the percentages for many of the minority groups represented in this study were greater or equal to the national percentages in the American professoriate, the percentages were too low for some groups to allow valid statistical analysis. Along the category of race/ethnicity, this study included Caucasians or White Americans, African Americans or Blacks, Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders, Hispanic Americans, Latino Americans, Mexican Americans, American Immigrants or Non-resident Aliens, and other. The categories of Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders, Hispanic Americans, Latino Americans, Mexican Americans, American Immigrants or Non-resident Alien, and other were collapsed into one category titled "Other" as noted in Table 2. Over 65% of the participants in this study were Caucasians or White Americans.

The majority of the participants were employed at the rank of assistant professor, 45% of the participants were tenured professors. As noted in Table 2, the large majority

of participants were employed at doctoral-granting (63%) public institutions (57%) that

were predominately white (68%). The vast majority of the participants in this study held

a Doctor of Philosophy degree or Ph.D. (78%). Finally, as noted in Table 3, the large

majority of professors who participated in this study do not currently have a faculty

mentor (60%) and nearly half of the participants report not receiving mentorship during

their first year as a professor (48%). Of those who did have a faculty mentor their first

year, 30% report that their mentor was assigned to them from within their own

department.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentages for Faculty Demographics (N = 534)

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Gender		
Males	216	40.4%
Females	239	44.8%
Missing	79	14.8%
Race/ Ethnicity		
African American/Black	39	7.3%
White American/Caucasian	345	64.6%
Other	74	13.9%
Missing	76	14.2%
Rank		
Assistant Professor	194	36.3%

Table 2 (continued).

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Associate Professor	165	30.9%
Full Professor	90	16.9%
Professor Emeritus	4	0.7%
Other	6	1.1%
Missing	75	14%
Status		
Tenure-Track	200	37.5%
Tenured	239	44.8%
Previously Tenure-Track	3	0.6%
Missing	75	14.0%
Institutional Type by Classification		
Doctoral Granting University	334	62.5%
Masters Granting Coll. or Univ.	75	14.0%
Bachelors Granting College	51	9.6%
Other	1	0.2%
Public v. Private		
Public Institutions	305	57.2%
Private Institutions	151	28.3%
Institutional Type by Population		

Table 2 (continued).

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Predominately White	362	67.8%
Historically Black	9	1.7%
Hispanic Serving	31	5.8%
Other	57	10.7%
Highest Degree Obtained		
Ed.D.	16	3.0%
Ph.D.	417	78.1%
J.D.	6	1.1%
Other Doctorate	5	0.9%
Master's Degree	16	3.0%
Bachelor's Degree	1	0.2%

Table 3 ($N = 534$)

Frequency and Percentages for Mentorship

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Mentored as a First Year Professor		
Yes	207	38.8%
No	255	47.8%

Table 3 (continued).

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Faculty that are Currently Mentored		
Yes	144	27.0%
No	318	59.6%

Descriptive Statistics

The instrument that was used in this study is titled the *Promotion & Tenure Questionnaire, 2013* (PTQ). This instrument consisted of 32 items designed to examine faculty attitudes toward mentoring, faculty socialization, and research productivity. In addition to the 32 items on the questionnaire, there are 13 statements designed to collect demographic data. The 32 questions were arranged in a Likert-agreement scale to measure faculty attitudes in regard to mentorship opportunities, faculty socialization, attitude toward teaching/research, and research productivity. The Likert scale was a 5-point agreement scale anchored in the following manner: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Somewhat Agree, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree.

Construct I, Mentoring, had six questions (items 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6). These items pertained to the faculty members' beliefs or attitudes about whether mentoring was important for promotion or tenure, how mentorship should be provided, whether or not there was a formal mentoring program at their institution, and if they believed having a mentor would be beneficial. In addition, items 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 directly addressed the question as to whether or not professors had a mentor during their first year as a faculty member and if the participants currently have a faculty mentor.

On average, faculty had high levels of agreement that mentoring was an important aspect for faculty and necessary for advancement (M = 3.81, SD = .70). For example, as reflected in Table 4, the majority of faculty report that mentoring is important for attaining tenure (M = 4.16, SD = .89). Additionally, the participants report that having a faculty mentor is beneficial for new professors (M = 4.01, SD = .94). Yet a number of faculty indicated that they somewhat agree that there is a formal faculty mentoring program at their respective institutions (M = 3.11, SD = 1.43). Finally, within the construct for Mentorship, the participants report that mentoring is important for faculty promotion (M = 3.96, SD = .97).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Mentorship (N = 528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.1. Important for tenure	4.16	.89
4.5 Mentor beneficial for new faculty	4.01	.94
4.6. Mentor important for promotion	3.96	.97
4.3. Select my own mentor is important	3.63	.96
4.2. Assigned mentor is important	3.31	1.11
4.4. Mentoring program at my institution	3.11	1.43
Mentoring Subscale Average	3.81	.70

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

Construct II, Faculty Socialization, has 12 questions (items 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, and 5.12), which are related to faculty members' attitudes or

beliefs that socialization was important for promotion and tenure. Additionally, these items examined faculty attitudes toward socialization, including peer to peer encouragement, professional support, access to senior faculty, multicultural awareness of colleagues, and work environment, as well as departmental collaboration and collegiality.

Participants scored collaboration lowest among all factors, indicating that faculty somewhat agree that there is a strong sense of collaboration within their respective departments (M = 3.00; SD = 1.17). Likewise, faculty scored encouragement from department colleagues as the highest factor in this subscale (M = 3.77; SD = 1.07), meaning that there may be a link between faculty retention and encouragement from faculty within the same department. Interestingly, the participants in this construct associated positive attitudes with encouragement from colleagues and department administration (M = 3.72, SD = 1.07), but indicated somewhat lower scores for department collaboration and collegiality.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Faculty Socialization (N = 528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
5.1. Encouragement from colleagues	3.77	1.07
5.2. Encouragement from department	3.72	1.07
5.6. Chair, multicultural awareness	3.70	1.18
5.3. Easy to talk tenure w/ colleagues	3.59	1.08
5.4. Senior faculty accessible	3.58	1.14
5.10. Positive environment	3.47	1.19

Table 5 (continued).

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
5.9. Strong sense of collegiality	3.43	1.22
5.5. Colleagues, multicultural awareness	3.40	1.14
5.12. Receive resources from my chair	3.39	1.18
5.7. I often feel isolation*	3.36	1.29
5.11. Recognized for my contributions	3.27	1.19
5.8. Strong sense of collaboration	3.00	1.17
Socialization Subscale Average	3.47	.89

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree; * indicates item was reverse coded in SPSS

Construct III, Teaching/Research has 8 questions (items 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6,

7.7, and 7.8), which observe faculty attitudes toward teaching and research. Additionally,

these eight questions were used to study if faculty believed their research was valued by

their colleagues and chair and whether the faculty held an understanding of the

expectations for promotion. Last and critically important, this construct examined if

faculty were more interested in teaching or in conducting research.

Table 6 reflects that faculty as a group were more interested in conducting

research than teaching, as faculty scored slightly higher on conducting research (M =

4.47, SD = .81) than on teaching (M = 4.21, SD = .84). Faculty data for this construct

indicates that both teaching and research are of great interest to the faculty (M = 3.78, SD

= .63). As noted in Table 6, data suggest that faculty as a group somewhat agree that

publication expectations are clear (M = 3.53; SD = 1.14). Table 7 projects that females

scored slightly higher than males in regard to understanding clear expectations both for publication (M = 3.63, SD = 1.08 versus M = 3.39, SD = 1.97) and for promotion (M = 3.97; SD= .91versus M= 3.82; SD= 1.00), respectively. Table 8 indicates that African American faculty scored lower than the other racial/ethnic categories as to having clear expectations for publication. Table 8 also projects that White Americans, Caucasians, scored more positively than any other racial/ethnic group on the items of research valued by colleagues and having clear publication expectations. Overall, most participants in this study indicated that they do not meet regularly with their department chair to discuss job expectations (M = 2.96; SD = 1.20). However, most participants positively associated an interest in research (M = 4.46; SD = .81).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Teaching/Research, Overall Combined (N = 528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
7.3. Interested in conducting research	4.47	.81
7.4. Excited about research	4.46	.81
7.5. Excited about teaching	4.21	.84
7.6. Expectations for promotion	3.91	.94
7.2. Research valued by chair	3.67	1.14
7.7. Publication expectations are clear	3.53	1.14
7.1. Research valued by colleagues	3.47	1.12
7.8. Regularly meet with chair	2.96	1.20
Teaching/ Research Average	3.78	.63

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Teaching/Research, Means (Gender), (SD), (N = 528)

Item	Females		Males	
7.1. Research valued by colleagues	3.48	(1.11)	3.44	(1.17)
7.2. Research valued by chair	3.78	(1.10)	3.54	(1.19)
7.3. Interested in conducting research	4.49	(.77)	4.46	(.79)
7.4. Excited about research	4.49	(.77)	4.42	(.85)
7.5. Excited about teaching	4.26	(.83)	4.14	(.84)
7.6. Expectations for promotion	3.97	(.90)	3.82	(1.00)
7.7. Publication expectations are clear	3.63	(1.08)	3.39	(1.19)
7.8. Regularly meet with chair	2.97	(1.19)	2.93	(1.20)
Teaching/Research Average	3.78	(.63)	3.78	(.63)

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Teaching/Research, Means (Race/Ethnicity), (SD), (N=528)

Item	Caucasians		African Americans		Other	
7.1. Research valued by colleagues	3.56	(1.07)	3.03	(1.40)	3.30	(1.12)
7.2. Research valued by chair	3.76	(1.09)	3.39	(1.42)	3.47	(1.16)
7.3. Interested in conducting research	4.43	(.82)	4.55	(.68)	4.59	(.61)
7.4. Excited about research	4.40	(.87)	4.63	(.54)	4.61	(.61)

Table 8 (continued).

Item	Caucasians		African Americans		Other	
7.5. Excited about teaching	4.23	(.84)	4.21	(.81)	4.14	(.86)
7.6. Expectations for promotion	3.93	(.95)	3.71	(.89)	3.91	(.94)
7.7. Publication expectations are clear	3.63	(1.12)	3.00	(1.17)	3.38	(1.16)
7.8. Regularly meet with chair	2.96	(1.20)	2.72	(1.19)	3.06	(1.18)
Teaching/Research Average	3.78	(.63)	3.78	(.63)	3.78	(.63)

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

The Research Productivity construct has six questions (items 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, and 8.6), which pertain to the amount of scholarly activity that a faculty member reported producing over the course of 12 months. This construct, which shows self-reported data, specifically examined the number of peer-reviewed articles, number of peer-reviewed presentations, average number of hours weekly conducting research, number of books published, number of articles as lead author, and the number of peer-reviewed article submissions over the course of 12 months.

Data in this construct indicate that on average faculty publish nearly four peer-reviewed articles annually ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 3.19$). Additionally, these data show that on average faculty spend 14 hours per week conducting research ($M = 13.56$, $SD = 7.16$). Finally, this subscale indicates that book publication ranks fairly low in research productivity among the faculty ($M = 1.46$, $SD = 1.57$). In comparing Tables 10 and 11 the data indicates that professors are more likely to produce a peer-reviewed presentation than a peer-reviewed article. More specifically, Table 11 reveals that Caucasian American males have the fewest peer-reviewed presentations ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 3.32$)

compared to African American males (M = 4.62, SD = 5.06) and other ethnic males (M = 4.70, SD = 5.07). Last and significantly important, as listed in Table 10, these data indicate that African American males scored lowest on peer-reviewed publications (M= 2.92, SD= 2.14) than any other category across race and gender. Additionally, Table 12 shows that African American females spend the fewest hours on research (M = 10.20, S = 7.79) compared to the overall statistic (M = 13.56, S = 7.16).

Across race/ethnicity it appears the majority of academics, in this study, are clustered at the ranks of Assistant/Associate professor. However, the study reveals that those who identify as other racial and ethnic minorities appear to have the smallest percentage of full professors. Table 14 shows that African Americans had the fewest number of participants as well as the smallest sample size who are employed at the rank of full professor. The small numbers may attribute to the lack of productivity and isolation reported by African Americans. For example, African American females reported the smallest number of all full professors in this study; Tables 11 and 12 show they lagged behind all other females in hours spent on research and productivity (i.e., peer-reviewed publications).

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Research Productivity Subscale, Overall Combined. (N = 528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
8.1. Peer-reviewed articles published	3.70	3.19
8.2. Peer-reviewed presentations	4.20	4.33

Table 9 (continued).

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
8.3. Hours spent on research, weekly	13.56	7.16
8.4. Books published	1.46	1.57
8.5. Articles published, lead author	4.04	4.57
8.6. Peer-reviewed submissions	6.03	5.44

*Denotes actual numbers from participants self-reported data

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics: Number of Peer-Reviewed Articles Published by Gender & Race

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American (n = 13)	2.92	2.14
Caucasian/White American (n = 169)	3.50	2.73
Other Race/Ethnicity Males (n = 33)	4.64	3.90
Total Males (n = 215)	3.64	2.93
Females		
African American (n = 26)	3.08	4.25
Caucasian/White American (n = 171)	3.84	3.52
Other Races/Ethnicity (n = 41)	4.02	2.29
Total Females (n = 238)	3.79	3.43

*Denotes actual numbers from participants self-reported data

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics: Number of Peer-Reviewed Presentations by Gender & Race

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American (n = 13)	4.62	5.06
Caucasian/White American (n = 169)	3.46	3.32
Other Race/Ethnicity Males (n = 33)	4.70	5.07
Total Males (n = 215)	3.73	3.78
Females		
African American (n = 26)	4.00	4.22
Caucasian/White American (n = 171)	4.68	4.88
Other Races/Ethnicity (n = 41)	4.90	4.80
Total Females (n = 238)	4.64	4.78

*Denotes actual numbers from participants self-reported data

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics: Hours Spent on Research by Gender & Race

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American (n = 13)	13.23	7.22
Caucasian/White American (n = 169)	14.22	7.30
Other Race/Ethnicity Males (n = 33)	15.24	7.13

Table 12 (continued).

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Total Males (n = 215)	14.32	7.25
Females		
African American (n = 26)	10.20	7.79
Caucasian/White American (n = 171)	12.73	6.82
Other Races/Ethnicity (n = 41)	15.02	6.73
Total Females (n = 238)	12.86	7.00

*Denotes actual numbers from participants self-reported data

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics: Number of Articles Submitted by Gender & Race

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American (n = 13)	5.30	5.84
Caucasian/White American (n = 169)	6.02	5.33
Other Race/Ethnicity Males (n = 33)	6.06	5.74
Total Males (n = 215)	6.07	5.41
Females		
African American (n = 26)	4.68	5.63
Caucasian/White American (n = 171)	6.22	5.89

Table 13 (continued).

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Other Races/Ethnicity (n = 41)	6.00	3.57
Total Females (n = 238)	6.02	5.53

*Denotes actual numbers from participants self-reported data

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Rank & Race, (percentage), (N = 528)

Item	Caucasian		African Americans		Other	
Assistant Professor	138	(40%)	14	(36%)	42	(28%)
Associate Professor	127	(36%)	17	(44%)	21	(14%)
Full Professor	70	(20%)	7	(18%)	13	(9%)

Statistical Tests

The variables studied were the constructs of Mentorship, Faculty Socialization, Teaching/Research, and Research Productivity across race, gender, or the combination of race and gender, including faculty at the ranks of assistant professors, associate professors, full professors, and professor emeriti. A two-way ANOVA and two-way MANOVA were used to investigate faculty attitudes within the constructs of Mentorship, Faculty Socialization, Teaching/Research, and Research Productivity to examine how these variables might impact faculty promotion and tenure for women and minorities in the American professoriate. The data were analyzed in order based on the following research questions:

RQ1: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a difference in mentorship opportunities? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in reported mentorship opportunities? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in mentorship opportunities? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to mentorship opportunities?

RQ2: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to faculty socialization?

RQ3: Does race, gender, or the combination of race and gender make a difference in research productivity? (a) Does race make a statistically significant difference in reported research productivity? (b) Does gender make a statistically significant difference in reported research productivity? (c) Is there a statistically significant interaction of race and gender with regard to research productivity?

A two-way ANOVA was used to address the first research question regarding race and gender and mentorship opportunities. For this question, the dependent variable was mentorship opportunities and the independent variables were race, gender, or the combination of race and gender. There was no significant main effect for race/ethnicity $F(2, 446) = 1.852$, $p. = .158$. Similarly, there was no significant interaction of race/ethnicity and gender $F(2,446) = .218$, $p. = .804$. However, there was a significant main effect for gender $F(1,446) = 4.601$, $p. = .032$. This statistical test shows that women

report fewer opportunities for mentorship than males do among the professoriate (M =

3.89, SD = .67) versus (M = 3.71, SD = .71).

Table 15

Means for Mentorship by Gender & Race (N = 528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American	3.74	.94
Caucasian/White American	3.70	.67
Other Race/Ethnicity	3.82	.83
Total Males	3.72	.71
Females		
African American	4.02	.59
Caucasian/White American	3.84	.67
Other Races/Ethnicity	4.03	.67
Total Females	3.89	.67

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

A two-way ANOVA was used to address the second research question regarding

race, gender, and faculty socialization. For this question, the dependent variable was

faculty socialization and the independent variables were race, gender, or the combination

of race and gender. The results indicated that there was no main effect for gender and

faculty socialization $F(1, 44) = .142, p. = .706$. Similarly, there was no significant

interaction with the combination of race/ethnicity and gender $F(2,448) = .830, p. = .437$.

However, there was a significant main effect in regard to race/ethnicity and faculty

socialization, $F(2, 448) = 3.754$, $p. = .024$. Therefore, this statistical analysis reveals that professors of color, African Americans (M = 3.20, SD = 1.09) and other ethnic minorities (M= 3.37, SD= .91), do not report the same access to or level of faculty socialization as Caucasian faculty (M = 3.5, SD = .87) within the professoriate.

Table 16

Means for Faculty Socialization by Gender & Race (N=528)

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Males		
African American	3.28	1.16
Caucasian/White American	3.48	.92
Other Race/Ethnicity	3.36	1.02
Total Males	3.45	.95
Females		
African American	3.16	1.07
Caucasian/White American	3.59	.81
Other Races/Ethnicity	3.21	.87
Total Females	3.48	.87

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Somewhat Agree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

A two-way MANOVA was used to address the third research question, which relates to whether race, gender, or a combination of race and gender make a difference in research productivity. This construct examined the level of scholarly activity over a 12-month period to determine research productivity. This particular question had six dependent variables, which included number of peer-reviewed articles published, number

of peer-reviewed presentations, number of average weekly hours spent on research, number of books published, number of articles published as lead author, and the number of peer-reviewed submissions. A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of race, gender, or the combination of race and gender on faculty productivity over a 12-month period. MANOVA results indicate that gender ($V = .007$, $F(6, 430) = .51$, $p. = .798$) and race/ethnicity ($V = .038$, $F(12, 862) = 1.38$, $p. = .171$) and the interaction of race and gender ($V = .022$, $F(12, 862) = .81$, $p. = .642$) did not significantly relate to faculty productivity. Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 demonstrate the means for faculty productivity across gender and race.

Summary

The data analysis presented in this chapter indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference in mentorship opportunities in regard to race or the combination of race and gender. The data also indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in gender or the combination of race and gender in regard to faculty socialization. However, the data analysis provides significant findings that there is a difference in mentorship opportunities in regard to gender. Additionally, the statistical tests revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization in regard to race/ethnicity. Finally, in regard to research productivity there was no statistical significant difference in regard to race, gender, or the combination of race and gender. How these results may influence faculty promotion and tenure will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of mentorship, faculty socialization, and research productivity on tenure and promotion to determine if there was a significant difference in the faculty experience among people of color, women, and Caucasian males that might help to explain the differing rates of promotion and tenure across the American professoriate. A review of the literature suggests that there are fewer minorities and women among the tenured ranks of the professoriate. The literature indicates that professors of color and female faculty do not receive the same access to mentorship as Caucasian males. Additionally, throughout the literature minorities and women across the faculty lines report they do not have the same kinds of access to socialization within the faculty as Caucasian males, which oftentimes results in a sense of professional isolation for minorities and women. Further insight from the literature points out that faculty of color and women in the professoriate do not have the same level of scholarly activity or research productivity as Caucasian males. The literature indicates that female faculty and professors of color lack mentorship opportunities, faculty socialization, and research productivity, which are said to be reasons for the high attrition rates for women and minorities among the professoriate. Chapter V will discuss the conclusions drawn from the data as it pertains to the research findings, limitations, recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.

Conclusion and Discussion

In an effort to expand the current literature on faculty promotion and tenure as it pertains to race and gender, this study sought to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the experiences among women, people of color, and Caucasian

males in the American professoriate, as these differences may provide additional insight into a method of reducing the gap between women and minorities among the academic ranks. The researcher collected data from 528 faculty of all academic ranks to include assistant professors, associate professors, full professors, and professor emeriti at both public and private institutions throughout the United States. The variables studied were Mentorship, Faculty Socialization, and Research Productivity as well as how faculty attitudes and beliefs may vary based on race, gender, or the combination of race and gender. A two-way ANOVA and two-way MANOVA were used to investigate faculty attitudes across the three variables as they may ultimately pertain to faculty promotion and tenure.

The major findings of this study indicate that there were no significant interactions due to a combination of race and gender in any of the constructs. Further analyses did show that faculty attitudes differed with regard to race/ethnicity on particular constructs; these statistical tests also revealed significant differences on specific variables in regard to gender.

Mentorship

To explore in Research Question One, tests were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in mentorship opportunities by race, gender, or the combination of race and gender. The mentorship construct examines factors to include faculty attitudes toward mentoring and its importance for achieving tenure, if mentoring was beneficial for faculty, if mentorship assignment or selection was important for faculty, and whether mentorship was important for tenure. Additionally, this construct

examined whether or not faculty had a mentor currently or during their first year as a professor.

On average, faculty in this study responded highest to the question regarding mentorship as important for attaining tenure and lowest on the factor regarding having a formal mentoring program at their institution. The data revealed that faculty reported that having a mentor was important for attaining tenure; moreover, faculty agreed that having a mentor was important for promotion. However, most participants in this study did not have a faculty mentor as a new professor or currently. On the subject of race and gender in regard to mentorship, the statistical test conducted uncovered no differences based on the combination of race and gender or race alone; however, there was a statistically significant difference in gender. The findings indicate that women have less access to mentorship than men in the professoriate. These findings do support claims throughout the literature that women have fewer opportunities for mentorship than men within the professoriate, which could directly impact faculty promotion and tenure. Winkeler (2000) found that women are not integrated into their academic departments the same as men, which creates inequitable work environments. Xu's (2008) study suggests that tenure is a system of networks and relationships to which women are denied access and, in turn, tenure. To that end, Xu argues that mentoring will allow access and may increase faculty retention among women in the professoriate. Research findings from the current study show that mentoring is viewed as important and, in fact, may be a critically important strategy for engaging and increasing female faculty in the American professoriate.

Faculty Socialization

To explore Research Question Two, tests were conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization across race, gender, or the combination of race and gender in regard to the American professoriate. Faculty members were given 12 questions related to their experience socializing as a professor, specifically in regard to their academic department. These 12 questions asked about faculty-to-faculty interactions regarding encouragement from colleagues or department, access to senior faculty, the ease with which they could discuss tenure within their department, perceived multicultural awareness of colleagues, isolation, collegiality, collaboration, and support.

Results indicated a statistically significant difference in faculty socialization across race/ethnicity. Closer examination of this variable indicates that White or Caucasian faculty score higher on nearly all aspects of faculty socialization, demonstrating that Caucasian faculty report more social activity at work than some faculty of color. For example, descriptive data indicates that African American faculty scored significantly lower in the area of faculty collaboration and collegiality in comparison to Caucasian faculty. These data support claims throughout the literature that African Americans within the faculty do not have the same access to socialization as White or Caucasian faculty. Researchers (Allen et al., 2000; Brayboy, 2003; Stanley, 2006b) believe that the major disparity in regard to faculty socialization across race negatively impacts promotion and tenure for faculty of color. Moreover, in this study African American females consistently reported a level of disagreement that they worked in a collaborative and collegial environment. A comparison of descriptive data revealed

that African American females scored lower in regard to faculty socialization, specifically in the area of collaboration and collegiality, than all other females in the study. These results seem to align with conclusions drawn by Seifert and Umbach (2008), Stanley (2006a), and Winkeler (2000), in which they suggest that African American females and other female faculty of color have the most difficulty engaging in faculty socialization, as they feel excluded. These claims and data are consistent in regard to the attitudes of faculty toward collaboration and collegiality. The data collected revealed that African Americans and other ethnic minorities scored lower on factors relating to collaboration and collegiality. These data may serve to support the literature in that professors of color do not have access to social networks at the same level as White or Caucasian faculty (Herzig, 2004). Moreover, these data support claims by researchers (Herzig, 2004; Sample, 2008) that faculty of color often feel excluded from professorial networks that lead to opportunities for promotion.

There are two unexpected conclusions drawn from the results of these research questions. First, an analysis of descriptive data revealed that Caucasian female faculty reported a slightly higher mean of social activity than Caucasian male faculty. Closer investigation of the data indicated that Caucasian female faculty and Caucasian male faculty engage in faculty collaboration and collegiality at similar levels. These findings are inconsistent with the data in regard to overall female faculty. The literature suggests that nearly all women lack access to social networks at levels consistent with men (Perna, 2005); however, this study revealed barriers to faculty socialization as something reported by mostly women of color in the professoriate. Second, descriptive data analysis revealed that Caucasian female faculty reported the highest level of agreement of

working in a positive environment than all other women and minorities; therefore, these data show that Caucasian female faculty reported similar experiences in regard to working in a "positive environment" to those of Caucasian male faculty within the professoriate. These findings are also inconsistent with the review of literature, in that researchers indicate that women faculty have inequitable work experiences when compared to Caucasian male faculty (Perna, 2005; Winkler, 2000; Xu, 2008) and while this may be indeed true for other minorities, the study concludes that this is not the case for Caucasian female faculty. These new data indicate that in many experiences Caucasian female faculty members integrate socially among the professoriate the same as Caucasian males.

Research Productivity

To explore Research Question Three, tests were conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in race, gender, or the combination of race and gender in regard to research productivity. This question was analyzed in two ways; first, the researcher provided questions to faculty to examine attitudes toward research and teaching; these questions included whether faculty believed their research was valued, faculty interests in and level of excitement for teaching and research, whether faculty understood the job expectations for promotion and publication, and last whether the faculty members regularly met with their chairs to discuss job functions. The second part of this construct analyzed self-reported data regarding faculty productivity. The participants were given a matrix of questions to determine how many peer-reviewed articles, books, presentations, and submissions they published over the course of 12 months. Additionally, this question asked faculty to report the average number of hours

they spent conducting research over the past 12 months. Results indicated that there were no significant differences based on race, gender, or the combination of race and gender in regard to research productivity. While there were no significant differences, the data analysis provided a few interesting facts in regard to faculty productivity.

Descriptive data indicated that African Americans demonstrated the fewest hours in regard to conducting research. African American men report they spend 13 hours per week conducting research, while other racial or ethnic minority males report 15 hours and Caucasian males report 14 hours per week. Likewise, among women, African American females report spending 10 hours per week conducting research, while Caucasian females report nearly 13 hours and women who identify as "other" racial/ethnic minorities report spending more than 15 hours per week conducting research. These findings are not entirely consistent with the literature. Researchers suggest that women and faculty of color spend fewer hours on research than Caucasian male faculty (Cropsey et al., 2007). This study reveals that this claim only holds true for African American faculty. Moreover, these data point out that other racial/ethnic minorities not only spend more hours conducting research, but are also are more productive than Caucasian males in other areas of scholarship. Additionally, the faculty participants in this study who identified as "other" racial/ethnic minorities demonstrated higher levels of research activity than Caucasian males. For example, this study revealed that those who identified as "other" racial/ethnic minorities score higher on the number of peer-reviewed publications in comparison to Caucasian male faculty. Furthermore, faculty who identified as "other" racial/ethnic minorities either scored similarly or above Caucasian

male faculty in the area of peer-reviewed presentations. African American faculty, however, seemed to lag behind in nearly every category of research productivity.

Moreover, data analysis revealed that faculty of color are interested in conducting research at or near the same levels as Caucasian male faculty. These findings do not support the literature, which indicated that minority faculty are more interested in teaching than research (Brayboy, 2003). These data conclude that there is no significant difference in attitude toward teaching and research across race and gender. However, there are a few key findings of note. For example, overall minority faculty demonstrated a slightly higher interest in conducting research than Caucasian male faculty; this also is inconsistent with the literature. Previous studies (Allen et al., 2000; Lucas & Murry, 2002) concluded that research presents a barrier for women and faculty of color. However, this study presents new data which indicate that female faculty and professors of color have a high interest in conducting research. Moreover, this study also shows that Caucasian male and female professors conduct research at equal levels.

<center>Recommendations for Policy and Practice</center>

Faculty attrition is a serious problem, but it can be avoided (Cropsey et al., 2008). Understanding this attrition problem in terms of academic engagement and/or social integration can be important for female professors and faculty of color. Scholars conclude that this kind of attrition prevents an academic pipeline of success for both current and future women and minorities in the professoriate (Allen et al., 2000; Irvine, 1990; Smith et al., 2002; Xu, 2008). Specific recommendations from the findings of this study may be used by academic administrators and faculty to address the attrition issue.

One important finding from this study indicates that mentorship is viewed as paramount for promotion and tenure; additionally, these findings indicate that women have significantly different experiences than male professors in regard to mentorship. Female faculty may therefore have a greater need for mentorship within the professoriate. Moreover, nearly all faculty indicated that mentorship was important and, in fact, may be critical for tenure and promotion. It is recommended that academic administrators, department chairs, and academics alike use these findings to develop specific mentoring programs for female faculty that may allow opportunities for women to access senior faculty for mentorship.

Another important finding from this study is that people of color do not have the same level of socialization activity as Caucasian males in the professoriate. It is recommended that academic administrators and department chairs initiate intentional programs to increase faculty socialization. Faculty of color, specifically, indicated a lack of opportunities for collaboration; therefore, it is recommended that department chairs create more opportunities for faculty collaboration and collegiality, as this may improve faculty socialization. It is also recommended that faculty seek opportunities for socialization on campus, as these activities/programs may assist them in improving collaboration and collegiality among their peers. Finally, it may be beneficial for senior faculty to reach out to new faculty to serve as informal mentors, as their experience can be invaluable for supporting new professors during their transition into the faculty.

The data indicates that African Americans lag behind all other minorities and Caucasian male faculty in terms of research productivity. Therefore, it is recommended that academic administrators and department chairs develop programs to support and

assist these faculty members with research initiatives as needed. It may be important for academic administrators to develop training programs for all faculty members who have difficulty conducting research.

Finally, research (Menges & Exum, 1983; Trower, 2009) shows that female faculty and professors of color are clustered at the lowest academic ranks. The current study supports this claim in that the majority of underrepresented faculty members who participated in this study were employed at the rank of assistant/associate professor; this may be due to a lack of mentorship and socialization as the literature indicates. It may be critically important for institutions to increase mentorship and socialization programs aimed at faculty of color and female professors that may ease the transition into faculty and, in turn, support the promotion and tenure process for those who are underrepresented at the rank of full professor.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

This study had several limitations; however, the biggest challenge was identifying a racially diverse sample. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics (2011b) and numerous researchers (Allen et al., 2000; Anders, 2004; Cole & Barber, 2003) suggest that people of color are scarce among the tenured ranks of the professoriate. While this may be a limitation, it is also one of the reasons for this study, which was to examine race and faculty promotion. Another limitation appeared to be getting faculty to return the instrument, as there were nearly 100 faculty members who received the instrument but failed to complete it. While the overall percentages of each racial and ethnic minority in this study were equal or greater to the national population, this study could be more impactful if a larger number of racial and ethnic minorities participated in

the study. A larger sample size from each racial and ethnic category may produce significantly different, results particularly in the research productivity construct. The data collection was solely done electronically, which may have limited the findings for this study; therefore, the researcher would like to expand this research beyond online surveys to include focus groups and face-to-face interviews.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

While there is an abundance of research regarding barriers and facilitators facing female and minority faculty members, there appears to be limited quantitative data that seeks to support the existing qualitative reports. While this study found both inconsistencies and consistencies with the literature, it would be appropriate to further investigate this topic. Given the political and budgetary challenges facing higher education and faculty, there is much room for additional research in this area.

While there is a significant difference in mentorship with regard to gender, it may be important to break down the various specific racial/ethnic categories to determine if there is a relationship between a particular racial or ethnic gender to determine if significant differences occur. To that end, studies involving larger samples from each demographic to include institutional type may produce more impactful findings in regard to better professional practice in the academy.

Again, it appears throughout this study that African American professors face the greatest challenges. It might add to this research to focus solely on the facilitators and barriers facing African American faculty. There were fewer African American participants as compared to Caucasians in the study; however, increasing the sample size and extending this study to focus on the research productivity of African American

faculty may provide important data in regard to closing the attrition gap and increasing the academic pipeline for faculty of color. This study concludes that African Americans in the professoriate are the least productive and have the least information about faculty promotion when compared to all other racial/ethnic categories.

Summary

Choosing to leave the faculty is a serious problem that can have lasting effects on students, faculty, the institution, and the overall community. In recent years, there has been more attention given to the issues of race, gender, and the faculty as more and more women and people of color earn doctorate degrees. Currently, there seem to be very few institutional-wide methods, nationally, to increase support for faculty and decrease the attrition problem. Based on the literature we know that faculty attrition has negative implications for female undergraduates and students of color. We also know that the attrition of underrepresented professors presents barriers and challenges for future racial and ethnic minorities who seek academic positions. Based on the data presented in this study we now know that mentorship and faculty socialization can have a substantial effect on faculty experiences, which, when tied to the literature, may be a reason for the vast number of women and minorities who leave the professoriate. The literature is replete with stories indicating that women do not have the same level of social engagement as Caucasian male faculty and that faculty of color simply lack the appropriate types of professional mentorship—or mentorship at the same levels as Caucasian male faculty. This study confirms in part that these stories are indeed accurate, yet there has been little done in recent years to improve this professorial plight

of attrition. In short, academic administrators and faculty must work together to establish the resources needed to address these issues.

When faculty socialization and mentorship are inefficient, the academic experiences of those underrepresented are often exacerbated into a complex web of stress, strain, and anxiety, which may lead to high levels of attrition. Moreover, these feelings of anxiety give way to a new term for college professors—"at-risk faculty." There are certainly those professors who lack the needed social networks and mentorship to compete at the highest levels for promotion and tenure. Indeed, it is a competition in that only those who have the best access to mentorship, social networks, and those who can produce the most appropriate levels of research are promoted and achieve tenure. This study confirms that socialization and mentorship are just as critical as research productivity.

The literature review and findings for this study emphasize the importance of understanding academic and social integration for American faculty. As noted, a lack of mentorship, socialization, and productivity has negative implications that may lead to faculty attrition. The literature is in finding that consistent that people of color and women leave the faculty at much higher rates and more often than Caucasian male faculty. To that end, one solution to prevent this kind of departure may be to increase opportunities for mentorship that may lead to more socialization, which may, in turn, produce more faculty collaboration. This kind of faculty engagement may, indeed, reduce the attrition problem. In short, it appears that mentorship and socialization are the connective lynch-pins for faculty success and retention.

The information in the study may demonstrate the importance of implementing institution-wide programs to assist with faculty integration to support mentorship opportunities, socialization, and research productivity. It is anticipated that the information provided in this study will add to the current literature on faculty retention and engagement that will lead to an increase in people of color and women among the upper ranks of the American professoriate. This study provides clear evidence that mentorship opportunities and socialization have true implications for faculty of color and female faculty in the American professoriate.

APPENDIX A

PROMOTION & TENURE QUESTIONNAIRE (PTQ) (2013)

Dear Potential Participant,

We would like to ask you to participate in a study to gather data concerning the opinions of faculty with respect to promotion and tenure. Participating in the study will afford you the opportunity to reflect on your own views with the respect to the American professoriate. The study has the potential to affect educational practice and thereby may be of benefit to academics and higher education administrators as well as society at large. Participation in this study involves minimal risk; if you experience any negative or upsetting feelings please feel free to discontinue.   The attached questionnaire covers 5 issues related to faculty promotion and tenure as well as basic demographic information. Completion of the questionnaire should take no more than 10-15 minutes. All data collected will be anonymous. Please do not put your name or any other identifying information on the questionnaire. Any information inadvertently obtained during the course of this study will remain completely confidential. Participation in this project is completely voluntary. Please feel free to decline participation or discontinue participation at any point without concern over penalty, prejudice, or any other negative consequence. Data will be aggregated and summary reports will be submitted by the researchers for a dissertation at The University of Southern Mississippi and may be published or presented. Upon completion of data compilation, all questionnaires will be destroyed. If you have any questions please feel free to contact James Bridgeforth at james.bridgeforth@eagles.usm.edu. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Kyna Shelley at kyna.shelley@eagles.edu.   This project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.   By completing and submitting the attached questionnaire the respondent gives permission for this anonymous and confidential data to be used for the purposed described above. Thank you for your consideration.

James S. Bridgeforth, M.Ed
Principle Investigator

The Promotion & Tenure Questionnaire (2013)

Section I: Demographic Data

Sector One: Please indicate which best describes you.

1.1.   Gender: I am:
1.2.   Race/Ethnicity: I identify as:

Sector Two: Please indicated which best describes you.

2.1. Rank: My current title is:
2.2. Tenure Status: I am currently:
2.3. Years of professional experience as a full-time faculty

Sector Three: Please indicate which best describes your current institution of employment.

3.1. Institution size: Large Public/Private, Mid-size Public/Private, Small Public/Private, other
3.2. I would describe my institution as: Doctoral, Masters, Bachelors, other
3.3. Institutional Type: PWI, HBCU, HSI, other
3.4. This highest degree I have completed is:

Section II: Mentorship

Sector 4: For the following, please indicate the degree to which you agree with statement or choose the item that best describes you. Each item is anchors in the following manner: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= somewhat agree, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree.

4.1. Receiving quality mentoring is important for attaining tenure.
4.2. Having a mentor specifically assigned to me is important.
4.3. Having the opportunity to select my own mentor is important to me.
4.4. There is a formal faculty mentoring program at my institution available for new faculty.
4.5. Having a formal faculty mentor would be beneficial for new faculty.
4.6. Having a mentor is important for faculty promotion.

Section III: Faculty Socialization

Sector 5: For the following, please indicate the degree to which you agree with statement or choose the item that best describes you. Each item is anchors in the following manner: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= somewhat agree, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree.

5.1. I receive professional encouragement from my department colleagues.
5.2. I receive professional encouragement from my department.
5.3. It is easy to talk to colleagues in my department about tenure expectations.
5.4. Senior faculty in my department are readily accessible to discuss faculty issues.
5.5. My department colleagues demonstrate multicultural awareness.
5.6. My department chair demonstrate multicultural awareness.
5.7. I often feel isolated in my department.
5.8. There is a strong sense of collaboration in my department.
5.9. There is a strong sense of collegiality in my department.
5.10. There is a positive work environment within my department.
5.11. I am often recognized for my contributions to my department.
5.12. I receive adequate resources from my department chair to support my professional activities.

Sector 6: For the following, please indicate the degree to which you agree with statement or choose the item that best describes you. 1- yes or 2- no.

6.1. As a first year professor, I had a faculty mentor: yes or no
6.2. My faculty-mentor was: assigned (1), self-selected (2), other (3)
6.3. My faculty-mentor was: in my department, outside my department, at another institution.
6.4. I currently have a faculty-mentor: yes or no

Section IV: Teaching/Research

Sector 7: For the following, please indicate the degree to which you agree with statement or choose the item that best describes you. Each item is anchors in the following manner: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= somewhat agree, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree.

7.1. My research is valued by my department colleagues.
7.2. My research is valued by my department chair.
7.3. I am highly interested in conducting research.
7.4. I am excited about research.
7.5. I am excited about teaching.
7.6. I understand expectations for promotion.
7.7. Research and publication expectations are clear in my department.
7.8. I meet with my department chair regularly to discuss job expectations.

Section V

Sector 8: For the following, please report the number of peer-reviewed articles, number of peer-reviewed presentation, number of hours spent conducting research, number of books published, number of articles served as lead author, and number of peer-reviewed submissions over the past 12 months in the designated section.

8.1. Number of peer-reviewed articles published.
8.2. Number of peer-reviewed presentations.
8.3. Number of hours spent on average per week conducting research.
8.4. Number of books published.
8.5. Number of articles served as lead author on peer-reviewed publications.
8.6. Number of peer-reviewed article submissions.

APPENDIX B

IRB APPROVAL LETTERS

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION
The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional
Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26,
111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university
guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:
☐ The risks to subjects are minimized.
☐ The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
☐ The selection of subjects is equitable.
☐ Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
☐ Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the
data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
☐ Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and
to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
☐ Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
☐ Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to
subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event.
This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
☐ If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.

Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.
PROTOCOL NUMBER: **13070301**
PROJECT TITLE: **Race, Gender and Faculty Advancement at American Colleges
and Universities**
PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation**
RESEARCHER(S): **James Bridgeforth**
COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education and Psychology**
DEPARTMENT: **Educational Studies and Research**
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: **N/A**
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: **Exempt Approval**
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: **07/10/2013 to 07/09/2014**
Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX C

This research was approved by the IRB at Columbus State University

Institutional Review Board

Columbus State University

Date: 08/28/2013

Protocol Number: 13070301

Protocol Title: Race, Gender, & Faculty Advancement at American Colleges and
Universities

Principal Investigator: James Bridgeforth

Co-Principal Investigator: Kyna Shelley

Dear James Bridgeforth:

A representative of the Columbus State University (CSU) Institutional Reviewed Board
has reviewed your human research proposal identified above. The project has been
previously approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Southern
Mississippi and classified as exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b) of the federal regulations.
As such, permission to conduct the research project at CSU as outlined in the application
is granted for one (1) year from the date of this letter.

Please note any changes to the protocol must be submitted in writing to the IRB before
implementing the change(s). Any adverse events, unexpected problems, and/or incidents
that involve risks to participants and/or others must be reported to the Office of Academic
Affairs at (706) 568-2061. If you have further questions, please feel free to contact the
IRB.

REFERENCES:

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Alexander, R., & Moore, S. (2008). The benefits, challenges, and strategies of African American faculty teaching at predominately white institutions. *Journal of African American Studies, 12*(1), 4-18. doi: 10.1007/s12111-007-9028-z

Allen, W., Epps, E., Guillory, E., Suh, S., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The black Academic: Faculty status among African American in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 112-117.

Allison, D.C. (2008). Free to be me? black professors, white institutions. *Journal of Black Studies,38*(4), 641-662.

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). Promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty: What can higher education unions do. Retrieved Jan. 25, 2014. http://www.aft.orgpdfs/highered/facultydiversity0310.pdf.

American Association of University Professors. (2011). retrieved October, 10, 2011. http://www.aaup.org .

Amey, M. J. (1992, October). Institutional market places and faculty attrition: The realities for professors at one research university. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Minneapolis, MN.

Anders, S. M. (2004). Why the academic pipeline leaks: Fewer men than women perceive barriers to becoming professors. *Sex Roles, 51*, 511-515.

Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education,* (September/October), 582-602.

Association for the Study of Higher. (2008). Faculty appointments, *Higher Education Report,34*(3), 55-72.

August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 177-192.

Austin, A. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. Tierney (Eds.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(5), 4-14.

Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of a job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(4), 457-469.

Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 707-721.

Beoku-Betts, J. (2004). African women pursuing graduate studies in the sciences: gender, Racism, bias, and third world marginality. *NWSA Journal, 16*(1), 116-135.

Bess, J. L., & Webster, D. S. (1991). *Foundation of Higher Education,* 2nd Edition*, ASHE Reader Series.* Needham, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Bland, C., Center, B., Finstad, D., Risbey, K., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 89-123.

Bland, C., Center, B., Finstad, D., Risbey, K., & Staples, J. (2005). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty department research productivity. *Academic Medicine, 80*(3), 225-237.

Bland, C., Seaquist, E., Pacala, J., Center, B. & Finstad, D. (2002). One school's strategy to access and improve the vitality of its faculty. *Academic Medicine, 77*(5), 368-376.

Bower, B. L. (2002). Campus life for faculty of color: Still strangers after all these years? *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 79-87.

Boykin, A.W. (1986). *The triple quandary and the schooling of Afro-American children.* In U. Neisser (Eds.), The school achievement of minority children pp. 57-92. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brayboy, B. M. (2003). The implementation of diversity in predominantly white colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*(1), 72-86.

Brown, P. Q. (1999). Salaries and tenure of full-time instructional faculty on 9-and 10-month contracts. *U.S. Department of Education Publications, August,* 425-682.

Buch, K., Huet, Y., Rorrer, A., & Roberson, L. (2011). Removing the barriers to full professor: A mentoring program for associate professors. *Change, 43*(6), 38-45.

Burden, J. W., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S. R. (2005). Perceptions of African American faculty in kinesiology-based programs at predominantly White American institutions of higher education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76,* 224–237. doi: 432EAC10308E50AF7885

Butler, J. E. & Walter, J. C. (1991). *Transforming the curriculum: Ethic studies and women studies.* Albany, NY: State University New York Press.

Cariaga-Lo, L., Dawkins, P.W., Enger, R., Schotter, A., & Spence, C. (2010). Supporting the development of the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(2), 19-22.

Carnegie Foundation. (2010). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Retrieved September 15, 2011. http://classifications.carnegie foundation.org/.

Chang, A., Welton, A. D, Martinez, M. A., & Cortez, L. (2013). Becoming academicians: An ethnographic analysis of the figured worlds of racially underrepresented female faculty. *Negro Educational Review, 64*, 97-118.

Coats, L. (2000). Interpersonal behavior and the community college department chairperson. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24,* 773-783.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cole, S., & Barber, E. (2003). *Increasing faculty diversity: occupational choices of high achieving minority students.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cornelius, L. J., Moore, S. E., & Gray, M. (1997). The abcs of tenure: What all African-American faculty should know. *The Western Journal of Black Studies, 21*(3), 150–155.

Cropsey, K., Masho, S., Shiang, R., Sikka, V., Kornstein, S., & Hampton, C. (2008). Why do faculty leave? Reasons for attrition of women and minority faculty from medical schools: four-year results. *Journal of Women's Health, 17*(7), 1111-1113. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2007.0582.

Cross, T., & Slater, R. (2002). A short list of colleges and universities that are taking measures to increase their number of Black faculty. *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 36*, 99–103.

Darden, J. T., Kamel, S. M. & Jackson, A. J. (1998). Black faculty in predominantly white U.S. Institutions of higher education: The influence of black student enrollment. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 31*, 6-18.

Dee, J. R. (2004). Turnover intent in an urban community college: Strategies for faculty retention. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 28*, 593-607. doi:10.1080/10668920490467242

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Delpit, L. D. (1991). A conversation with Lisa Delpit. *Language Arts, 68*, 541-547.

Diggs, G. A, Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored faces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review,41*, 312-333. doi: 10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y

Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experience of recently minted Ph.Ds. *Journal of Blacks Studies, 34(1), 112-17.*

Donovan, J. (2006). *Feminist theory*: *The intellectual traditions of American feminist,* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing.

Duch, J., Zeng, X. T., Sales-Pardo, M., Radicchi, F., Otis, S., Woodruff, T. K., & Nunes Amaral, L. A. (2012). The possible role of resource requirements and academic career-choice risk on gender differences in publication rate and impact. *PLoS ONE, 7*(12), 1-11. DOI: 10.137

Elmore, C., & Blackburn, R. D. (1983). Black and white faculty in white research universities. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*, 1-15.

Farmby, K. (2007). Expanding the pipeline: Explorations on diversifying the professoriate. *Journal of Public Affairs, 13*(1), 115-132.

Fenelon, J. (2003). Race, research, and tenure: Institutional credibility and the incorporation of African, Latino, and American Indian faculty. *Journal of Black Studies, 34(1), 87-100.*

Fogg, P. (2006). Young Ph.D.'s say collegiality matter more than salary. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, A1*, A11-A12.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's Strategic imperative.* San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Greene, H. C., O'Connor, K. A., Good, A. J., Ledford, C. C., Peel, B. B., & Zhang, G. (2008). Building a support system toward tenure: Challenges and needs of tenure-track faculty in colleges of education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(4), 429-447.

Gregory, S. T. (2001). Black women in the academy: Challenges and opportunities. *The Journal of Negro Education, 70*(3), 124-138.

Hambright, W.G. & Diamantes, T. (2004). An analysis of the experiences of a first-year tenure-track faculty member. *Education, 124*, 3.

Hearn, J. C., & Anderson, M. S. (2002). Conflict in academic departments: An analysis of disputes over faculty promotion and tenure. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(5), 503-529.

Heller, M. P., & Sindelar, N.W. (1991). *Developing an effective teacher mentor program*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Herskovits, M. J. (1958). *The myth of the negro past*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Herzig, A. (2004). Becoming mathematicians: Women and students of color choosing and leaving doctoral mathematics. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(2), 171-214.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1999). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-99 faculty surveys*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles.

Irvine, J. (1990). *Black Students and School Failure: Policies, Practices, and Prescriptions*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Jackson, J. (2007). *A systematic analysis of the African American educational pipeline to research, policy, and practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Jackson, L. (2008). Reflections on obstacles and opportunities: Suggestions for the improving the retention of female faculty. *Women's Studies in Communication, 31*(2), 226-232.

Jacobs, J. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum, 19*(1), 3-27.

Jayakumar, U., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(5), 538-563.

Ladner, J. A. (1973). *The death of white sociology*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Latif, L. E. (1998). Lifetime tenure: A working alternative. *Selections, 15*, 1-6.

Lee, J. (2012). Does universalism hold in academia? *The Journal of the Professoriate, 6*
(1), 48-66.

Lee, S. (2002). Do Asian American faculty face a glass ceiling in higher education?
American Educational Research Journal, 39(3), 695-724.

Li-Ping Tang, T., & Chamberlain, M. (2003). Effects of rank, tenure, length of service,
and institution on faculty attitudes toward research and teaching: The case of
regional state universities. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*(2),103-110.

Lucas, C., & Murry, W., Jr. (2002). *New faculty: A practical guide for academic
beginners*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Lynch, D. S. (eds). (1997). *Mary Wollstonecraft: A vindication of the rights of women,*
(3rd Ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. (1993). Frames of positionality: Constructing
meaningful dialogues about gender and race. *Anthropological Quarterly, 66*(3),
118-126.

Mahtani, M. (2004). Mapping race and gender in the academy: The experiences of
women of colour faculty and graduate students in Britain, the U.S. and Canada.
Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 28(1), 91-99.

Markie, P. (1994). *A professor's duties: Ethical issues in college teaching*. Lanham,
CA: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

McGowan, J. M. (2000). African-American faculty classroom teaching experiences in predominately white colleges and universities. *Multicultural Education, 8*(2), 19-22.

McGrath, D. & Seymour, E. (1996). Pockets of connect: Creating a sense of community at a large urban community college. *Metropolitan Universities, 7*(2), 61-73.

Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to progress of women and minority faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 54(*2), 123-144.

Merriam-Webster (2011). Retrieved October 21, 2011. www.merriam-webster.com/.

Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78*, 9-47.

Milano, B. (2005). The Ph.D. project: Filling the academic pipeline with minority professors. *The Diversity Factor, 13*(3), 30.

Modica, J. L., & Mamiseishvili, K. (2010). Black faculty at research universities: Has significant process occurred? *The Negro Educational Review, 61*(1-4), 107-122.

Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., & Alexander, A. (2008). Gender Equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on Politics, 6*(2), 215-233.

Myers, S. L., Jr., & Turner, C. S. (2004). The effects of Ph.D. supply on minority faculty representation. *The American Economic Review, 94*(2), 296-301.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *1999 national study of postsecondary faculty, data analysis system*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). Fast facts. Retrieved September

15, 2011. www.nces.ed.gov.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010a). Average salary of full-time

instructional faculty on 9-month contracts in degree-granting institutions by

academic rank, control and type of institution, and sex: Selected years, 1970-71

through 2009-10. Retrieved October 8, 2011. www.nces.ed.gov.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010b). Full-time instructional faculty in

in degree-granting institutions: Fall 2005, fall 2007, and fall 2009. Retrieved

October 8, 2011. www.nces.ed.gov.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010c). Doctor's degrees conferred by

Degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, and sex of student: Selected years,

1976-77 through 2008-09. Retrieved October 8, 2011. www.nces.ed.gov

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010d). Unemployment rate of persons

 16 years old and over, by age, sex, race/ethnicity, and educational attainment:

2007, 2008 and 2009. Retrieved October 8, 2011. www.nces.ed.gov.

Nivet, M., Taylor, V. S., Butts, G. C., Strelnick, H. A., Herbert-Carter, J., Fry-Johnson,

Y., Smith, Q. T., Rust, G., Kondwani, K. (2008). Diversity in academic medicine,

no.1: Case for minority faculty today. *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine, 75*(6),

491-498. doi: 10.1002/msj.20080

Number of blacks completing doctoral degrees decline for the first time in seven

years. (2003, Winter). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 38*, 6-9.

Retrieved March 10, 2011. www.jstor.org/stable/3134166.

Once again, a decline in doctoral degree awards to African Americans. (2008, Winter). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 58,* 6-9. Retrieved March 10, 2011. www.jstor.org/stable/25073803.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers

Pasteur, A., & Toldson, I. (1982). *The roots of soul: The psychology of black expressiveness*. New York, NY: Anchor Press.

Patitu, C. L., & Hinton, K.G.(2003). The experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed? *New Directions for Student Services, 104*, 79-93.

Pearce II, J. A. (2013). Two takes on tenure. *BizEd, 12*(5), 30-33.

Perna, P. W. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contributions of family times. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(3), 277-287. doi: 10.1007/s11162-004-1641-2

Peters, M. F. (1981). Making it black family style: *Building on the strengths of the black family*. In N. Stinnett, J. DeFrain, K. King, P. Knab & G. Rowe (Eds.), Family strengths three: Roots of well-being (pp.73-91). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Piercy, F., Giddings, V., Allen, K., Dixon, B., Merzaros, P., & Joest, K. (2005). Improving campus climate to support faculty diversity and retention: A pilot program for new faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*(1), 53-66. doi: 10.1007/s10755-005-3297-z

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *Journal of Higher Education, 82*(3), 319-346.

Premeaux, S. R., & Mondy, R. W. (1997). Tenure: Tenured versus non-tenured faculty perspectives. *Journal of Education for Business, 72*, 349-353.

Premeaux, S. R., & Mondy, R. W. (2002a). Perspectives on tenure: Tenure versus non-tenured tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(6), 335-339.

Premeaux, S. R., & Mondy, R. W. (2002b). Tenure's impact: Male versus female *viewpoints. College Teaching, 50*(4), 154-157.

Rice, R., Sorcinelli, M., & Austin, A. (2000). *Heading new voices*: *Academic careers for a new generation*. Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education.

Roach, R. (2004). The great divide. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 21*(1), 22-25.

Ross, A. (2006). Learning to play the game. In C. Stanley (Ed.), *Faculty of color*: *Teaching at predominately white universities* (pp. 263-282). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co. Inc.

Rosser, J. V., (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3).

Rybarczyk, B., Lera, L., Lund, P. K., Whittington, D., & Dykstra, L. (2011). Postdoctoral training aligned with the academic professoriate. *BioScience, 61*(9), 699-705.doi: 10.1525/bio.2011.61.9.8

Ryu, M. (2008). *Minorities in Higher Education 2008*: 23rd status report. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Sabharwal, M. (2013). Productivity and leadership patterns of female faculty members in public administration. *The Journal of Public Affairs Education, 19*(1): 73-96.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 234–279.

Sample, J. (2008). Female faculty: Challenges and choices in the United States and *beyond. New Directions for Higher Education, 143,* 55-61. doi: 10.1002/he.313

Santo, S., Engstrom, M. E., Reetz, L., Schweinle, W., & Reed, K. (2009). Faculty productivity barrier and supports at a school of education. *Innovative Higher Education, 34, 117-129.*

Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R.(2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and *universities. Teaching, 52*(1), 21-24.

Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of demonstrated characteristics and disciplinary context on dimension of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *49*(4), 357-381.

Smith, W., Altbach, P., & Lomotey, K. (2002). *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century.* Albany: NY State University of New York Press.

Smith, Z. (2000, June 21). Study cites drop in tenured faculty. *University Wire.* p.2

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and response. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New directions for teaching and learning,* (Vol. 48, pp. 27-37), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*, 474-479.

Stanley, C. (2006a). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominately white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(4), 701-736.

Stanley, C. (2006b). *Faculty of color: Teaching at predominately white universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Status of black faculty at the flagship state universities. (1996). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education,12*, 14-16.

Stewart, P. (2012). The uphill climb. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 29*(11), 16-17.

Szybinski, D., & Jordan, T. (2010). Navigating the future of the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 4-6

Taylor, O., Apprey, C., Hill, G., McGrann, L., & Wang, J. (2010). Diversifying the faculty. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 15-18.

Thompson, C. Q. (2008). Recruitment, retention, and mentoring faculty of color: The chronicle continues. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *143*, 47-54.

Tien, F. F. (2000). To what degree does the desire for promotion motivate faculty to perform research? Testing the expectancy theory. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(6), 723-752.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Trower, C. A., (2009). Toward a greater understanding of the tenure track for minorities. Change, *41*(5), 38-45.

Trower, C. A. (2010). A new generation of faculty: Similar core values in a different *world. Peer Review, 12*(3), 27-30.

Turner, C. (2003). Incorporation and marginalization in the academy: From border toward center for faculty of color? *Journal of Black Studies, 34*(1), 112-125.

Turner, C. S., Myers, S. C., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70(1), 27-55.*

Umbach, P. D. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(3), 317-345. doi: 10.1007/s11162-005-9391-3.

Umbach, P. D, & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(2), 153-184.doi: 10.1007/s1162-004-1598-1.

U. S. Census Bureau (2012). Census Regions and Divisions of the United States www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/pdfs/reference/us_regdiv.pdf. Retrieved July 13, 2012.

U. S. Census Bureau (2011). Educational attainment. Retrieved October 8, 2011. www.census.ed.gov.

Valian, V. (2004). Beyond gender: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *NWSA Journal, 16*(2), 207-220.

Vesilind, P. (2000). *So you want to be a professor?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

   Publications.

Waldman, J. C., Kelly, F., Arora, S., & Smith, H. L. (2004). The shocking cost of

   turnover in healthcare. *Health Care Manage Review,* 29, 2-7.

West, M. S. (1995). Frozen in time. *Academe, 81,* 26-9.

Winkeler, J. (2000). Faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion. *Professional*

   Geographer, 52(4), 737-750.

Wong, E. Y., Bigby, J., Kleinpeter, M., Mitchell, J., Camacho, D., Dan, A., & Sarto, G.

   (2001). Promoting the advancement of minority women faculty in academic

   medicine: The national centers of excellence in womens' health. *Journal of*

   Based Womens' Health & Gender-Medicine, 10(6), 541-550.

Wood, J. (1994). Is symbolic racism racism? A review informed by intergroup behavior.

   Political Psychology, 15,(4), 673–686.

Wulff, D., Austin, A., & Associates. (2004). *The path to the professoriate: Strategies for*

   enriching the preparation of future faculty. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

   Publishing.

Xu, Y. J. (2007). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in*

   Higher Education,49, 40-61. doi: 10.101007/s11162-007-9062-7.

Xu, Y. J. (2008). Gender disparity is STEM discrepancies: A study of faculty attrition

   and turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(7)*, 607-624.*

   doi: 10.1007/s11162-008-9097-4

Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, J. (2004). Examining the influences of faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus nontenured faculty at research universities using NSOFF-99. *Research in Higher Education,45* (2), 139-176.