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ABSTRACT

The recruitment, retention, and promotion of Black women in the academy continue to be a challenge even after numerous policies and programs to rectify historical and social injustices in American society. This study utilized a womanist lens as a framework to conceptualize the interlocking impact of race and gender on the experiences of Black women in higher education. Utilizing a quantitative design, the primary source for the study included data gathered from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) in survey cycles of 1993, 1999, and 2004. The researcher examined the pace at which Black women full-time faculty have advanced during this period compared to White women full-time faculty.

The results of this study revealed very little difference between the two populations in degree attainment, institution type, age, salary, discipline, workload, productivity, and job satisfaction. The greatest differences were found in marital status and perceptions of fairness. The findings from this study contradict the literature that paints a picture of objective inequality, but leave room for further study based upon the uniqueness of the Black woman's experience when placed in the context of race, gender, and class. It is possible that objective equality of status comes at personal sacrifice that
the researcher did not measure or assess. The researcher suggests the study be expanded to include a qualitative segment, which would provide a more holistic picture of the Black woman faculty member.
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Chapter I

Introduction

According to the American Association of Colleges and Universities (2002), “by 2015…80 percent of the anticipated 2.6 million new college students will be African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, or American Indian” (p. 1). College and university students from diverse backgrounds will represent 37 percent of the undergraduate student population (Turner, 2002). As our society becomes more diverse and the demographics of students change, it will be important for colleges and universities to understand, respect, and encourage more diversity in all arenas, but specifically in the professoriate. Turner (2000), reported that a diverse faculty, comprised of multiple perspectives and backgrounds, provides a better education for all students.

The importance of a diverse faculty goes beyond numbers. It is essential in creating an educational environment where students are prepared to be critical thinkers in what Thomas Friedman (2005) referred to as a “flat world” (p. 5).

Legislation and court orders have sought to overturn past injustices through policies and programs such as Affirmative Action, which have opened doors once closed to women and people of color (Collins, et. al, 1998, Garcia, 1997, Valian, 1998). Currently, women are 40 percent of the total full-time faculty population (NCES, 2004). In 2002, the US Department of Education reported that women constituted 37 percent of full-time faculty, which is an increase from the 1970s when women were approximately 23 percent of full-time faculty (Trower & Chait, 2002). Of the 37 percent, 25 percent of women full-time faculty were employed at research universities (U.S. Department of
Education Report, 2002). For faculty of color, the numbers have remained stagnant since 1997 with most of the growth occurring among Asian Americans. In 1997, Black women faculty were 5 percent of all full-time faculty up from 4.4 percent in 1975 (Berry, 2005). Of this percentage of Black women faculty, almost half were employed at historically black colleges and universities (Trower & Chait, 2002).

Women continue to deal with racial and gender discrimination in their professional environment, a reality that shapes their career experiences, opportunities and development (Wilson, 2004). To serve as a learning tool for administrators and policy makers committed to creating a professoriate that better reflects the diversity of the world, this study sought to understand the entry, progression, and status of Black women's participation in the academy as compared to White women for the years 1993, 1999, and 2004.

Statement of the Problem

Scholars have based research on the assumption that women and Blacks can be considered as monolithic groups (Moses, 1989). A 1982 study by Carol Hobson Smith, stated, “...Black women have been all but omitted from consideration as a separate group in studies of faculty in institutions of higher education” (Smith, 1982, p. 318). Since that study, there have been an increasing number of Black women, who both enter the academy and whose career trajectory leads to full professorships and senior-level administrative positions. Dr. Ruth Simmons who became the first Black woman to lead an Ivy League institution, Smith College and now Brown University, and Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson who serves as the President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, a major research university, are examples of the successful outcomes.
The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) has extensive survey data on faculty that could provide answers and provoke new questions to better comprehend what higher education should consider to increase the diversity of the faculty in postsecondary institutions. This study of the career advancement of Black and White women full-time faculty is important for current and future students of higher education who will benefit from an active and significant presence of Black women faculty and administrators who will bring different perspectives, life experiences, and learning opportunities to the university, thereby preparing students for the world they will enter.

Significance of the Study

According to Faivre (2002), some academic scholars do not see the value in engaging in research on issues of race and gender because of the implementation of laws to create opportunities once denied to women and people of color. A recent report in the Chronicle of Higher Education stated that a study by Yale University Graduate Students revealed that Ivy League colleges have done a dismal job with hiring people of color and women (Fogg, 2005). Although some Black women have gained access to comparable positions with Whites, this often does not translate into full equity within the academy. Universities have not been successful in changing the culture and the climate to make campuses more welcoming and hospitable places for women and people of color. The prospect of working in a hostile environment has hindered successful recruitment and retention of women in these positions (Antonio, 2002; Beale, 1995). In order to create a more welcoming environment, colleges, and universities must know the needs and concerns of Black women faculty (Gregory, 1999; Harvey, 1999; Mabokela, 2002;
Moses, 1989). Further focused study will contribute to the understanding of an underrepresented segment of the academy.

This study sought to understand the trends reported by the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data sets for 1993, 1999, and 2004 to examine how degree attainment, tenure status, academic rank, institution type, salary, marital status, discipline, workload, productivity, fairness, and job satisfaction affect the entry, progression, and status of Black and White women full-time faculty. In addition, it will provide the following benefits: 1) Expand the research on Black women full-time faculty, an understudied sub-population; 2) Provide important information for colleges and universities committed to diversifying their faculty and administrative staff; and 3) Provide Black women who aspire to faculty and leadership positions in the academy an understanding of the potential barriers to a successful career in postsecondary institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to examine how high and at what pace Black and White women full-time faculty have advanced in the academy between 1993-2004. It assessed trends for the rate of change of the two populations between the years of 1993-2004 utilizing the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data sets. These data sets were taken from surveys of a large, representative national sample. Previous studies have examined this topic with a qualitative design; therefore, this study provides the foundation for a more norm-based understanding of Black women full-time faculty in the academy.
Research Questions

This study examined the profiles and career advancement of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty as they navigate the academy. The questions that guided this study were as follows:

1: What is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions?

2: In comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women full-time faculty advanced in the academy?

2a: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty earned the highest degree?

2b: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty achieved academic rank?

2c: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty been granted tenure?

2d: In numbers and proportions, at what types of institutions are Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty employed?

2e: What is the mean income for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty when corrected for inflation?
2f: In numbers and proportions, in what disciplines are Black women full-time faculty teaching as compared to White women full-time faculty?

2g: What is the mean time spent on teaching, research, and administration for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty at four-year institutions?

2h: What is the mean total recent publications for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty at four-year institutions?

2i: What is the opinion of whether racial minorities are treated fairly for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

2j: What is the overall job satisfaction for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

3: Is the rate of change equal on the measured variables for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty for the years 1993-2004 in postsecondary institutions?

Operating Definitions

For purposes of this study, the following definitions were crafted by the researcher or provided directly from the Data Analysis System (DAS):

(http://www.nces.ed.gov).

*Academic Career:* the trajectory of opportunity in the academy

*African American/Black:* An individual of African descent (interchangeable)
Age in 2004: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created to report a respondent’s age.”

Any Instructional Duties for Credit: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created to indicate whether respondents had any instructional duties for credit at the institution from which they were sampled during the 2003 Fall Term. The derived variable was created from variables Q1 and Q2. SAS variable Q1 had a value of 1 if the respondent had any instructional duties at this institution (e.g., teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students’ academic activities) and a value of 0 if they did not have any such instructional duties.”

Employed full or part-time at this institution: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created during the 2003 Fall Term, did [institution name] consider you to be employed full time or part time? 1 = Full time 2 = Part time. In 1999, the order of the categories were part time then full time. In 2004, the order of the categories were changed to full time then part time.”

Gender: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created to describe yourself and your opinions about your job. Are you: 1 = Male 2 = Female”

Highest Degree: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created in order to describe the highest degree or award achieved by a respondent. Responses are doctorate, first professional, masters, bachelor’s, less than bachelors.”

Institutional classification, 4-year versus 2-year: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created to reflect the type of institution (2 or 4 year) sampled for NSOPF: 99.”

Institution Type: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created based on the
2000 Institutional Characteristics IPEDS data to indicate the 2000 Carnegie code for the institutions sampled for NSOPF: 04. In this variable, medical schools and medical centers are combined with doctoral institutions."

*Marital Status and Dependents:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, "this derived variable was created by combining current marital status with SAS variable number of dependents. Resulting categories are as follows: 1="Single without dependent children" (includes Single and never married and Separated, divorced, or widowed); 2="Single with dependent children" (includes Single and never married and Separated, divorced, or widowed); 3="Married without dependent children" (includes Living with partner/significant other); 4="Married with dependent children" (includes Living with partner/significant other)."

*Principal Field of Teaching:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, "a derived variable was created to categorize the program area of the respondent's principal field of teaching. The 10 categories in this variable match the general categories used in NSOPF: 88 and NSOPF: 93."

*Race/Ethnicity Recoded:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, "this derived variable was created to categorize individuals into one and only one racial/ethnic category. Respondents were asked to pick one or more race categories to identify themselves. The categories were American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; White."

*Rank:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, "during the 2003 Fall Term, was your academic rank, title, or position at [institution name] ... (If no ranks are designated at your institution, select "Not applicable.") 0 = Not applicable (No
formal ranks are designated at this institution): 1 = Professor; 2 = Associate professor; 3 = Assistant professor; 4 = Instructor; 5 = Lecturer; 6 = Other title (e.g., Administrative, Adjunct, Emeritus, other).

Research: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “for the [number of paid and unpaid] hours per week you worked during the 2003 Fall Term at [institution name] we would like you to allot this time—using percentages—into four broad categories: Instruction with undergraduates, Instruction with graduate and first-professional students, Research, and Other Activities (If you are not sure, give your best estimate. The percentages should sum to 100%. If none for a category, enter "0".) What percentage of your time was spent on...c. Research Activities, other forms of scholarship, or grants at this institution?"

Tenure Status: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “during the 2003 Fall Term at [Institution name], were you ...1 = Tenured; 2 = On tenure track but not tenured; 3 = Not on tenure track; 4 = Not tenured because institution had no tenure system.”

Time actually spent on teaching: As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in teaching during the fall of 1998, percent of time spent teaching undergraduate students and percent of time spent teaching graduate or first-professional students.”

Time actually spent on research: As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to determine the percent of time spent in research/scholarship activities (including research; reviewing or preparing articles..."
or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts; or giving speeches.

*Time actually spent on administration:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to determine the percent of time spent in administration (including departmental or institution-wide meetings or committee work).”

*Total recent publications:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “this derived variable combines the total number of publications over the past two years, whether they were sole responsibility or joint responsibility, including articles published in refereed journals, articles published in non-refereed journals, published reviews of books or chapters in edited volumes and textbooks and reports.”

*Total Income from Institution:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, “this derived variable was created to report a respondent’s total income from their sampled institution during the 2003 calendar year.”

The Black Feminist Thought Framework

“Black women faculties contribute to the social and moral redemption of academic scholarship” (Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989) and this is a group that is often overlooked. “Sexism as a system of domination is institutionalized but it has never determined in an absolute way the fate of all women in this society” (Guy-Sheftall, 1995; hooks, 1981). Most feminist work assumes that all women are oppressed. Studies do
not show the impact of race, religion, class, and sexual orientation, but instead focused more on obtaining equal status with White men in both work and social arenas (Collins, 1990; Guy-Sheftall, 1995; hooks, 1989). Scholars such as bell hooks and Patricia Hill Collins have brought this point to light and developed two schools of thought regarding feminism, which is more inclusive of women from underrepresented groups.

The professional identity and experiences of Black women in higher education can be placed in a theoretical framework of Black Feminist Thought, an extension of critical social theory that shapes understanding of the impact of race, gender, and class on Black women (Crenshaw, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The premise of the theory is the marginalization of Black women. The intersection of race, gender, and class are unique to Black women; therefore, it is most important to understand this segment’s presence in the academy. Understanding the significance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems opens the door to a new paradigm of thought (Collins, 1990; Guy-Sheftall, 1995; hooks, 1989). The theoretical framework refers to the positioning of Black women in the academy as “outsiders within,” which labels their unique experiences, based on the complex intersection of race, class, and gender within higher education (Benjamin, 1997; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989). From this perspective, Black women have gained limited entrance into the academy, where they have previously been excluded, yet they continue to be treated as outsiders through experiences of social and professional alienation, as well as racial and gender discrimination (Benjamin, 1997; Berry & Mizele, 2004; Gregory, 1999; Moses, 1989). The current research study showed there is objective equality and subjective inequality. Objectively, the numbers show parity; however, when Black women have described the institution climate, or work
environment, subjective inequality was found (Bradley, 2005; Garcia, 1997; Gregory, 2001). Therefore, it is important to capture both realities to gain an understanding of how race and gender influences Black women in the academy.

Bell hooks (1989) discussed the margin and center as the position of Blacks and Whites within American society that places Whites at the core and Blacks on the periphery with limited access to the center. Within this framework, Black women have the ability to move between the core and periphery but are not accepted as part of the established center (hooks, 1989). This idea applies directly to the experiences of Black women faculty who are present within the institution, yet remain socially and professionally alienated. Similarly, Collins (1990) explored the matrix of domination as a structuring of the experiences of multiple oppression endured by Black women based on a unique “intersectionality” of race, class, and gender that also results in a multiple consciousness (Benjamin, 1997; Berry & Mizele, 2004; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1984, 1989).

Black feminist theory argued that Black women are marginalized in their academic careers in ways that are unique to the experiences of other women (Benjamin, 1997; Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989). Instances of professional alienation as well as racial and gender discrimination are frequently downplayed by other academics, while maintaining a prominent negative effect on the overall experiences of these women (Mirza, 1995; Ramey, 1995). According to Guy-Sheftall (1995), a Black woman’s experience with both racial and gender oppression results in needs and barriers that are different from those of both Black men and White women. This study sought to
determine if race influences the relative level and pace at which Black women advance in the academy when compared to White women faculty.

Delimitations of the Study

According to Rudestam and Newton (2001), delimitations refer to those things that are knowingly included or imposed on the study. The study will be restricted to looking at the experiences of Black and White women full-time faculty who have instructional duties for credit in postsecondary institutions. In addition, the data collected only reflects those institutions that participated in the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) surveys for 1993, 1999, and 2004.

Limitations of the Study

According to Rudestam and Newton (2001), limitations refer to those things an investigator cannot control. The main limitation for this study is that the data taken from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) are self-reported. Additionally, utilizing the Data Analysis System (DAS), in the survey cycles there were several instances of inconsistent variable definitions based upon recoding or reclassifications, which made it difficult to be consistent in citing trends (i.e. Carnegie Classifications). The researcher noted this within the analyses section of Chapter 4.

Organization of Study

This study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter has introduced the problem, discussed the significance of this study, defined operational terms, and stated the questions that guided this research. In addition, the theoretical framework, Black
Feminist Thought, was introduced to establish a contextual foundation. Chapter 2 provides a historical and current perspective of the status of Black women in the academy. The literature review examines the systemic barriers that have been thought to influence the career advancement of Black women full-time faculty in the academy.

Chapter 3 describes the research design and methods used to conduct the study. Chapter 4 provides the current profile of Black and White women full-time faculty, an analysis of the data collection and an overall summary of the results. Finally, Chapter 5 summarizes the findings and provides rationale for the importance of the study and the results, implications for higher education, and areas for future research.
Chapter II

Review of the Literature

An extensive review of the literature found that research on issues related to women faculty in higher education is growing as the number of women entering the profession increases. However, fewer studies have focused on the presence and experience of Black women faculty in the academy. Snearle (1997) indicated that Black women are both underrepresented and under-utilized in higher education. The status of women, Black women in particular, is such that scholars presume that the White women's experience is all women's experience (Gregory, 2001; Moses, 1989). Black women deal with interlocking oppressions of race, class, and gender (Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989) unlike White women who tend to view their oppression almost exclusively in terms of gender (Collins, 1998; Gilligan, 1982; Gregory, 1995; Valian, 1998).

Recent research studies have chronicled how to support and advance women in academic careers, and several have provided insight to how institutions can provide flexible options in the workplace (Leslie, 2006; Mason & Goulden, 2004); however, there has been very little systematic study of the sub-population of Black women. In addition, it is not clear from the literature if the same career barriers affect Black women full-time faculty equally as they affect White women full-time faculty. Black women have remained invisible and have not usually been studied as a separate group (Smith, 1982). For this study, Black women are the unit of analysis. This literature review will provide a historical context of Black women in education; look at the impact of Affirmative Action on the current demographic picture of Black women faculty, and review the barriers that
have been cited to inhibit the career advancement of women, and in particular Black women in the academy.

Historically, people of color have been underrepresented in higher education (Astin, 1991; Gregory, 2001; Mabokela, 2002). Therefore, the amount of time it will take to make significant gains will be longer for Black women than for White women. The next section will provide a historical overview of the presence of Black women in education.

History of Black Women in Education

A decade ago, the literature on Black women in higher education concentrated more on the experiences of administrators at community colleges or historically black colleges because there was a critical mass (Gregory, 1995, 2001). Several assumptions can be deduced from the current research literature as to the experiences of Black women in higher education. According to Anna Julia Cooper, “When and where I enter the interests of my race and of my gender come with me” (Battle & Croswell, 2004, p. xiv). Black women were omitted from both Black history and women’s history because they were invisible (Gregory, 2001; Guy-Sheftall, 1982). Therefore, Black women told their own stories to educate themselves and others on the impact of race, gender, and class and to distinguish and validate their experience in society and in the academy (Giddings, 1984; Guy-Sheftall, 1995).

According to Giddings (1984), the first connections between Black women and education can be traced back to slavery when strong and courageous women secretly learned how to read and taught others. Even following slavery, Blacks were still denied opportunities for education. In 1837, Black women enrolled at Oberlin College to pursue
an education to uplift the race (Eisenmann, 1998; Giddings, 1984; Solomon, 1985).

Although Oberlin is credited with being the first to admit and educate Blacks, there were schools in the South founded on the premises of educating Black scholars (Eisenmann, 1998; Giddings, 1984).

Despite barriers, women have always been leaders in equalizing educational opportunities for those who were denied. Several educated Black women transformed education at a critical point in history by establishing their own schools (Giddings, 1984; Guy-Sheftall, 1990). Women such as Anna Julia Cooper, Dr. Mary McCloud Bethune who founded Bethune Cookman Institute, Charlotte Hawkins Brown who founded the Palmer Memorial Institute and Lucy Laney who founded the Haines Normal and Industrial Institution, were the trailblazers and trendsetters for Black women in the academy (Giddings, 1984).

Out of the struggles of the early Civil Rights and Feminist movements, women, and specifically Black women, have persevered, overcoming tremendous barriers. The Black community has placed high value on education as a means to liberation and for achieving full citizenship in the United States (Coleman-Rums, 1989). This strong, persistent commitment has been reflected in Black women's continuing effort to participate in higher education as students, faculty, administrators, and leaders despite the essentially hostile environments they encounter (McCombs, 1989).

The landmark decision of Brown vs. the Board of Education in 1954 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were watershed points in attempts to create more opportunities for women and people of color. Within the last decade, Black women have made great progress within higher education. According to the National Center for Education
Statistics (2004), today Black women comprise 7.5 percent of all full-time faculty. Much of this progress can be attributed to the implementation of Affirmative Action policies and programs. The next section will demonstrate how Affirmative Action has both helped and hindered the presence of women, and specifically Black women in the academy.

The Role of Affirmative Action

According to Wilson (2004), “while the situation for female professors might look dismal at some top universities, women have clearly made advances in higher education” (p. A8). In response to initiatives such as Title IX of The Educational Amendments of 1972, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Pay Act, and the Executive Order 11246, Affirmative Action policies were implemented to provide opportunities to women and people of color (Collins, et. al, 1998). As defined by Bergmann (1996), “Affirmative Action is planning and acting to end the absence of certain kinds of people--those who belong to groups that have been subordinated or left out--from certain schools and jobs” (p. 7). According to Youn (2005), the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, reported that the 172,000 new faculty members hired between 1986 and 1992 (constituting a third of full-time faculty in higher education) are more diverse demographically than the previous generation. Specifically, the data reported an increase in the number of women and people of color.

Although more women and people of color have gained opportunities in the academy through these programs, Collins, et. al. (1998) found it has been a double-edged sword, because once in the positions, the credentials of the individuals tend to be questioned leading to additional pressure and stress. The negative backlash continues to be a concern as Affirmative Action programs are being challenged in the courts as a form
"given the history of this county, it is a virtual certainty that without Affirmative Action,
racial and sexual discrimination would return with a vengeance" (p. 95). Black women
face many barriers to success within academia. The faculty positions have been male
dominated, and the structures and systems have supported the advancement of men but
have historically limited those opportunities for women and people of color (Wilson,
2004). The remaining question is how far have women advanced?

Black Women and Identity

The challenges for Black women are to enter and remain within the university and
perform all their many professional responsibilities without losing their cultural integrity
(McCombs, 1989). Rasool (1995) suggested that self-identity is routinely created and
sustained in the reflexive activities of the individual in such situations. She proposed that
Black women must understand how their social roles have been determined, culturally
and historically, within society and how they as individuals are perceived and
experienced within the academy to establish identity. This process enables women to
maintain the struggle for access and opportunity in higher education while challenging
the barriers that prevent or limit their participation (Snearle, 1997). McCombs (1989)
determined that:

The inclusion of Black women in higher education influences the
operations of the systems and structures of the university. Because of their
inclusion, the history of Black women becomes a part of the developing
history of the university. At the same time, the changing university
influences the expanding opportunities and changing roles of Black
women (p. 128).

To ensure that this experience is positive, it is important to understand factors that
facilitate or hinder Black women’s entry and status within the academy.
Barriers Faced by Black Women Faculty

A number of highly interrelated barriers probably operate at the individual, group, and organizational levels to inhibit the movement of Black women faculty through the academic ranks (Bell & Nkomo, 2002). Black women typically experience lack of support, instability, and isolation within communities of higher education (Pollard, 1990). Their presence, however, is often sustained by a sense of personal and community responsibility and the potential for challenging oppression.

Moses (1989) showed both predominantly White and historically Black institutions as being “chilly climates” for Black women. Her study found resentment toward Black women from both White men and White women in White institutions, which she attributes to their negative reactions to Affirmative Action mandates. Further, Moses (1989) found that Black women and men were perceived or stereotyped as being less qualified and that their White colleagues treated them with disrespect. A challenge often cited is the lack of qualified Black women in the pipeline (Gregory, 1999; Gregory, 2001; Moses, 1989; Trower & Chait, 2002). Furthermore, once in academic positions, Black women tend to be employed in community colleges and in gender-specific disciplines. A study conducted by Kane (1997) revealed that the type of institution where one works could be a barrier to overall career mobility. The next sections will focus on barriers that have been cited as career advancement inhibitors.

Degree Attainment. Affirmative efforts to provide opportunity for Black women faculty in higher education have been designed and implemented to recruit women and people of color into graduate programs. Previously, only a small number of Black women were in
Many women who completed the doctorate chose other forms of employment because they did not perceive higher education to be a viable career choice (Gregory, 1999; Wong, 1983). For many years, degree attainment for women, and specifically for Black women, was low; however, Collins, et. al (1998), found that “the number of women earning doctorates is rising in all fields” (p.46). According to NCES (1996) statistics, women earned 39 percent of all conferred degrees (Collins, 1998).

Collins (1998) found that when reviewing AAUP surveys from 1975, 1985, 1995, and 1996, “the rate of initial hires relative to their numbers has not changed and women’s relative representation in academe is dropping in relation to their increasing availability” (p.47).

More recently, the 2004 National Survey of Earned Doctorates, noted, “A total of 5,066 members of U.S. racial/ethnic minority groups were awarded doctorates, representing 20 percent of the U.S. citizens earning research doctorates in 2004. This number is higher than in 2003, when 4,901 earned doctorates; and the 2004 minority percentage is the highest yet recorded in the Survey of Earned Doctorates” (Hoffer, T.B., et. al, 2005). The report also stated that Blacks earned the most doctorates (1,869) of the five main U.S. minority populations in 2004, followed by Asians (1,449), Hispanics (1,177), American Indians/ Alaska Natives (129), and Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders (59) (Hoffer, T.B., et. al, 2005). The increased number of earned doctorates increases the pipeline of qualified individuals for academic positions.

According to Trower and Chait (2002), “despite earning doctorates at ever-increasing numbers, many women and minorities are eschewing academic careers all together or exiting the academy prior to tenure, making the decision because both groups..."
experience social isolation, a chilly climate, bias, and hostility” (p.9). The next sections will explore promotion and tenure, institutional climate, and institution type as potential professional barriers for career advancement.

Promotion and Tenure. Research studies examining the academic careers of faculty typically focus on research and publication, tenure, and promotion. Faculty career lines, regardless of race or gender, have been well documented, and research suggests that there are universal standards applied to academic appointments (Thomas & Hollenshead, 2003; Trower & Chait, 2002). There is a well-established career process for advancing through the academy with different criteria and emphasis placed on teaching, research, and service based on type of institution.

Studies by Gregory (1999), Collins, (1998), Thomas and Hollenshead (2003), and Turner and Meyers (2000), demonstrated that women and people of color experience discrimination in acquiring the prerequisites for promotion and tenure. This can be problematic for women who find it difficult to devote significant time to research while balancing other priorities and demands on their time (Bernard, 1964; Collins, et. al, 1998). In addition, women and people of color tend to focus their research on issues surrounding gender and race (Collins, et. al, 1998; Gregory, 1995) which are often not viewed as credible to disciplinary journals (Collins, et. al, 1998). “The community of the tenured must include the full diversity of those best qualified to pursue this search and Affirmative Action as a concept represents an acknowledgment of that broader social contract” (Boulding, 1983, p. 27). Therefore, a clear understanding of the expectations for scholarly work is critical for advancing in the academy.
According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), 85 percent of colleges and universities use a tenure system to reward and promote faculty for research, scholarship, and service to the academy (AAUP, 1977). Although tenure is a widely accepted system, there is a belief among some scholars that the decision to award tenure is one of exclusion and is a challenge for many Black women faculty at doctoral universities (Blackwell, 1987; Gregory, 1999, Trower & Chait, 2002).

Previous studies by Bradley (2005), and Bentley and Blackburn (1992), and Turner and Meyers (2002), suggested that women’s absence in the tenured ranks is due to their relatively recent entry into the workforce. However, a study by Goulden (2003) compared the advancement of male and female faculty at research universities and found that “for each year after securing a tenure-track job, male assistant professors are 23 percent more likely than their female counterparts to earn tenure. And for each year after earning tenure, male professors are 35 percent more likely than their female colleagues to be named full professors” (Wilson, 2004, p. A8). These findings are the basis for the discontent among women and people of color as they come to understand and experience inequalities in progressing when compared to men. As with Goulden’s study and others, women are clustered together as a monolithic group; no comparison examined potential differences for women of color.

Related to inequities in tenure and promotion, “the tenure timeline, almost evenly, coincides with the pressures associated with starting a family and establishing financial stability” (Trower & Chait, 2002, p. 10). In light of these of factors, ensuring that women are afforded the tools necessary to be successful through the provision of support systems could lead to better gender and racial representation within the professoriate.
Marriage and Family. Although not cited in the literature as a specific barrier for Black women, balancing marriage and family is a barrier for women in academic careers (Leslie, 2006; Mason & Goulden, 2004). In a study by Mason and Goulden (2002) entitled, “Do Babies Matter?” the authors found that having children does matter for those in academic careers. In a follow-up study in 2004, Mason and Goulden examined how having children could influence the academic career. They concluded “married with children is the success formula for men, but the opposite is true for women, for whom there is a serious baby gap” (www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004).

The NSOPF: 04 data reported that Black women full-time faculty are more single with or without dependents (49%) when compared to White women full-time faculty who are single with or without dependents (29%). Most of the research studies examining the impact of marriage and family on academic careers does not look specifically at Black women. Based upon the NSOPF data, it could be presumed that Black women faculty would be more likely to succeed in the academy than White women because they are not married (Leslie, 2006). Currently, there is little literature to determine if marital status is a barrier that particularly affects the advancement of Black women full-time faculty, which poses a need for further research.

Discipline. “Across all fields, women are earning 45 percent of all PhDs, [but] most of the new hires at research universities are in male-dominated fields, where the proportion of women earning degrees is much lower” (Wilson, 2004). A study by the University of California system (Wilson, 2004) found that the fields where women are earning the most
doctorates are in the “social sciences, humanities, and the arts” (p. A8). Again, most of the literature does not look specifically at the impact of certain disciplines on Black women faculty advancing in the academy with the exception of the segmentation of teaching in disciplines such as Ethnic and Black studies. Further research is needed to determine if segmentation is a career barrier.

**Institution Climate.** According to a study by Mabokela (2003), one of the reasons for the small number of women in the academy is the institutional climate and culture of colleges and universities. Harvey (1991) defined campus climate as “the culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that make up campus life, and the degree to which the climate is hospitable determines the ‘comfort factor’ for African Americans and other non-White persons on campus” (p. 128). According to Bradley (2005), “Black women faculty are unappreciated in the classroom. Although all women faculty face unfair treatment, recent studies show that White American college students perceive Black women professors to be incompetent and feel at liberty to challenge their authority” (p. 521). This and other common experiences such as academic isolation, institutional racism and sexism, and racial stagnation are salient issues for Black women faculty and (hooks, 1984, 1989) have potentially become career barriers (Gregory, 1999; Moses, 1989; Williams, 1992). In a study conducted by Turner (2002), she concluded, “a healthy, supportive, rewarding, inclusive environment is good for everyone” (p. 86). It is important that underrepresented group members at all levels—faculty, staff, and student—feel comfortable and welcomed on campus.
For example, Moses (1989) found that women are often “outsiders” within their departments, are not readily asked to collaborate in research projects, and are relegated to serve on numerous committees, while also serving as advisor to Black students who seek counsel from a role model. Acquirre (2000) and Turner and Meyers (2000) found there to be a lack of respect and support for black women’s research and scholarship. Their peers have lower expectations, and they feel under scrutiny while having to work twice as hard to be perceived as legitimate. In addition, Bradley (2005) found that there are subtle realities of workforce racism and sexism that Black women face as they attempt to gain acceptance and respect from colleagues, which is often a barrier in the tenure process (p. 520). An example would include a finding from Thomas and Hollenshead (2003) where Black women faculty reported that department colleagues suggested that they alter their research interests and scholarship to be a better fit within the department.

Moses (1989) stated “The leadership, advocacy, and career satisfaction Black women faculty strive for are affected in subtle ways by a sometimes chilly and unwelcoming climate” (Moses in Battle & Doswell, 2004, p. 52). According to sociologist, Patricia Hill Collins, when Black women are not able to fit in or find it difficult, they may be experiencing “outsider-within status” (Bell & Nkomo, 2001, p. 129). “Outsider-within status exists when one is located on the boundary between two groups’ statuses—one with potential power and the other with little power (Bell & Nkomo, 2001, p. 129). The women are there physically, but do not feel fully accepted. One aspect of alienation, discussed by Kanter (1993), is tokenism.

Because of being the only Black or woman, the “token” label is given to the woman by colleagues (Acquirre, 2001; Antonio, 2002; Berry & Mizele, 2004).
Colleagues perceive that the Black woman is in the job because of the institution’s desire to fulfill Affirmative Action requirements. Acquirre (2001) noted:

Black women are at once more visible and equally isolated due to racial and gender differences. The token woman often finds herself in situations where she is made aware of her unique status as the only Black female present, yet feels compelled to behave as though these differences do not exist. (p. 33)

These situations create barriers to inclusion through biased recruitment and expectations for retention. “Black women are placed in a position of double-jeopardy based on racial and gender oppression, one that still persists in the academy—a place where well-intentioned people confuse tokenism for diversity” (Gregory, 2001, p. 4).

Isolation is another challenge that Black women, especially faculty, encounter in higher education. Sandler (1986) found that, “isolation is an especially pertinent issue for minority women, who often suffer extreme isolation because of their miniscule numbers in higher education” (p. 193). Their status in higher education is a reflection of their status in society as they are often overlooked, isolated, and their contributions to the academy are not valued. According to Owens (2004), “Structural change, a change in institutional culture, is necessary to create an environment which both reflects and supports diversity on many levels” (Owens, in Battle & Doswell, 2004, p. 79).

Institution type. For over three decades, the Carnegie Classification has been the leading framework for describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education (Clark, 1987). Based upon this differential ranking of prestigious research universities to open access community colleges, Clark (1987) described this academic hierarchical structure in two categories—“small worlds and different worlds.” The small worlds are defined by the
institution setting, and the different worlds are defined by disciplinary differences (Clark, 1987).

Race and gender intersect with academic hierarchy to reinforce inequality (Guillory, 2001; Wilson, 2004). Even with the increase in the number of women at research universities, “Still, the more prestigious the institution, the fewer women it has” (Wilson, 2004, p. A8) and Youn (2005) found that “for faculty members, it is more vital to secure an appointment in a prestigious institution than it is to secure a higher wage” (Youn, 2005, p. 1). According to Wilson (2004), “the core problem facing women who want to advance in academe appears to be at research universities” (p. A8).

Women and people of color have more often been concentrated in community colleges and historically black colleges, which are not included in the top levels of the hierarchy (Gregory, 2001). Wilson reported, “The higher up the academic-prestige ladder a university is, the fewer women it usually has in tenured faculty positions” (Wilson, 2004, p. A8). In addition, once an individual is employed at a certain type of institution, it becomes difficult to gain opportunities within institutions with more prestige (Gregory, 1999; Guillory, 2001; Turner & Meyers, 2000; Wilson, 2004). Community colleges, comprehensive universities, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have been gateways for women and continue to be the places where most women, specifically Black and White women faculty are employed. Current and past inequities make it difficult for women and people of color to be offered employment at institutions with higher prestige and upward mobility is difficult unless one can do research (Blackwell, 1981; Gregory, 2001).
Commitment and concerted efforts are needed to address the barriers faced by women and specifically Black women faculty to increase representation, and career advancement opportunities for Black women faculty.

Summary

There is no consensus as to why women have not made equal progress (Wilson, 2005) within the academy. In the review of literature, there were conflicting views reported about the progress of Black women in the academy. Ng (1997) stressed that whether we belong to minority groups or not, educators must "break the conspiracy of silence that has ensured the perpetuation of racism, sexism, and other forms of marginalization and exclusion in the university" (p. 367). Black women in the academy face numerous challenges but seek open access to professional opportunities in higher education.

Currently, the literature does not adequately address the evolving role of Black women in higher education. As a result, there are few recommendations and resources to help institutions be supportive and aware of the needs of Black women faculty. In When and Where I Enter, Giddings quotes Mary McCloud Bethune.... “Most people think I am a dreamer...through dreams many things have come true. I am interested in women and I believe in their possibilities. We need vision for larger things, for the unfolding and reviewing of worthwhile issues” (Giddings, p. 214).

The literature has not provided a clear picture of how Black women as a separate group are impacted by many of the cited barriers for all women, and more research is needed. The focus of this study was to paint a portrait of Black women full-time faculty as a population when compared to White women full-time faculty by examining the
differences in the entry and progression through the examination of degree attainment, tenure, academic rank, institution type, salary, discipline, marital status, workload, productivity, fairness, and satisfaction. The results of this study opened the doors to areas where future research is needed. Chapter 3 describes the research design and methods used to conduct the study.
Chapter III

Methods

Research Design and Method

This study explored the entry, progression, and advancement of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions. This chapter provides an overview of the data and methods used to answer the research questions posed for the study: 1) What is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?; 2) In comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women full-time faculty advanced in the academy?; and 3) Is the rate of change in academy presence equal for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty for the period of 1993 and 2004? The data were gathered from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) sponsored by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The survey was first administered in 1988 and followed in five-year cycles to include 1993, 1999, and 2004. The sample for this study was women faculty employed full-time who had instructional duties for credit.

National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) survey was created to provide a profile of the professoriate. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) included three components: an institution survey, a department chairperson survey, and a faculty survey. Specifically, the institution survey requested data on numbers of faculty, tenure status of faculty, recruitment, and retention of faculty, tenure
procedures, and an overview of faculty benefits. The department chairperson survey requested departmental faculty demographics and the same information requested in the institution survey, but specific to the department. Finally, the faculty survey requested demographic information, personal and professional credentials, discipline, employment history, rank and tenure status, and this information was also requested on an individual basis. The institution and faculty surveys were used in the 1988, 1993, 1999, and 2004 studies, while the department chairperson survey was only used in the first study of faculty in 1988. The NSOPF data were appropriate to address the research questions because of the large representative sample and high response rate.

Sample Design

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, (NCES), in 2004 35,000 faculty and instructional staff, representing 1,080 public and private institutions were surveyed in 2004. The response rate was reported to be 93 percent. In 1993, unlike NSOPF-88, which was limited to instructional faculty, the faculty universe was expanded to include all who were designated as faculty, whether or not their responsibilities included for credit instruction. Under this definition, researchers, administrators, and other institutional staff who held faculty positions, but who had no instructional duties, were included in the sample. Instructional staff without faculty status were included. The faculty sample was 29,764 representing 974 public and private institutions. The response rate was reported to be 87 percent.

A two-stage stratified, clustered probability design was used to select the samples. Institutions were selected using stratified sampling with probabilities proportionate to the number of faculty. Based upon small numbers, Black, Hispanic, Asian American,
American Indians, and women were over sampled to include adequate representation in the final samples.

The sample for this study was full-time women faculty who had instructional duties for credit. To create subsets for samples when formulating tables in the Data Analysis System (DAS), the researcher filtered for gender, any instructional duties for credit, and employment status (full-time). Black women faculty were selected for comparison to White women faculty. Filtering was used to eliminate men, part-time faculty, institution type, and individuals with faculty titles but with no teaching responsibilities. This chapter will provide an overview of the data analysis methods.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were obtained from the publicly accessible Data Analysis System (DAS) for the years of 1993, 1999, and 2004. DAS allowed the researcher to create tables with the available data or to access pre-created tables. The data included the percentages, means, and standard deviations of multiple variables covering the broad areas of: (1) background and demographics, (2) employment status, (3) institution type, and (4) time allocations. The variables used for this study are: (1) highest degree, collapsed; (2) tenure status; (3) rank; (4) 1994 Carnegie Classification (10-Category); (5) total income from institution; (6) age; (7) marital status; (8) discipline; (9) time spent on teaching; (10) time spent on research; (11) time spent on administration; (12) total recent career publications; (13) opinion: racial minorities are treated fairly; and (14) overall job satisfaction.

There are NSOPF datasets for each of the five-year cycles. The researcher extracted the data from 1993 and 2004 and used the results to create a descriptive profile.
of Black and White full-time women faculty at these two different points in time. For the variable measuring workload and productivity, the researcher chose to use data sets from NSOPF: 99 because there was no comparable variable in NSOPF: 04 for time spent on administration. In addition, the researcher made the choice to combine the categories of research and doctoral universities when looking at institution type because the NSOPF: 04 data for the 1994 Carnegie Classifications was not consistent to separate research universities and doctoral universities (Leslie, 2006).

The comparative data were presented through table creation in the Data Analysis System (DAS). The data were presented as frequencies, percentages, means, and averages. To determine the statistical significance of differences in frequencies or percentages between Black and White women full-time faculty, the researcher used a nonparametric chi-square test. The researcher used t-tests to examine the statistical differences between means for age, salary, workload, and productivity.

**Data Collection**

Data were extracted from the NSOPF: 93, NSOPF: 99 and NSOPF: 04 faculty questionnaires. By utilizing the Data Analysis system, this study examined the profiles, career advancement experiences of full-time Black women as compared to full-time White women faculty as to how high and at what pace the populations progressed in the academy between 1993 and 2004. The questions and process that guided data collection were as follows:

**Research Question 1:** What is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?
The question was answered utilizing a filter for gender and full-time employment status, and any instructional duties for credit. To show the comparison numbers and proportions, the independent variable of race/ethnicity was the row category and the dependent variables were used as column categories: highest degree collapsed, tenure, rank, institution type using Carnegie Classification (10-category), 1994, total income from institution, marital status, age in 2004, and principal field of teaching. In addition, the means of percent of time on teaching, percent of time on research, percent of time on administration, mean recent total publications, job satisfaction, and fairness were used.

Research Question 2: In comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women full-time faculty advanced in the academy?

Question 2a: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty earned the highest degree?

To answer question 2a, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF data sets for 1993 and 2004 by filtering for full-time employment, gender, and any instructional duties for credit. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable highest degree achieved was used for the column category.

Question 2b: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty achieved academic rank?

The categorical responses to survey item provided for the following:

Rank: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “during the 2003 Fall Term,
what was your academic rank, title, or position at [institution name] ... (If no ranks are designated at your institution, select "Not applicable") 0 = Not applicable (No formal ranks are designated at this institution): 1 = Professor; 2 = Associate professor; 3 = Assistant professor; 4 = Instructor; 5 = Lecturer; 6 = Other title (e.g., Administrative, Adjunct, Emeritus, other).

To answer question 2b, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 2004. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable rank was used for the column category.

Question 2c: In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty been granted tenure?

The categorical responses to survey item provided for the following responses:

Tenure Status: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “during the 2003 Fall Term at [institution name], were you ...1 = Tenured; 2 = On tenure track but not tenured; 3 = Not on tenure track; 4 = Not tenured because institution had no tenure system.”

To answer question 2b, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 2004 by filtering for full-time employment, gender, and any instructional duties for credit. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable tenure status was used for the column category.
Question 2d: In numbers and proportions, at what types of institutions are Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty employed?

The categorical responses to survey item provided for the following:

Institution Type: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “variable created based on the 2000 Institutional Characteristics IPEDS data to indicate the 1994 Carnegie code for the institutions sampled for NSOPF: 04. In this variable, medical schools and medical centers are combined with doctoral institutions.”

To answer question 2d, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 2004. Based upon inconsistencies between ‘93 and ‘04 data the researcher chose to combine research and doctoral universities for the analyses. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable Carnegie Classification (10-category), 1994 was used for the column category.

Question 2e: What is the mean compensation for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty when corrected for inflation?

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

Total Income from Institution: As defined for the Data Analysis System, “this derived variable was created to report a respondent's total income from their sampled institution during the 2003 calendar year.”

To answer question 2e, the researcher extracted information from the
NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 2004. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable total income from institution was used for the column category.

To adjust for inflation in the comparison and analyses for 1993 and 2004, the researcher used the Inflation Calculator (www.westegg.com).

**Question 2f:** In numbers and proportions, in what disciplines are Black women full-time faculty teaching as compared to White women full-time faculty?

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Principal Field of Teaching:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to categorize the program area of the respondent's principal field of teaching. The 10 categories in this variable match the general categories used in NSOPF: 88 and NSOPF: 93.”

To answer question 2f, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 2004. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable principal field of teaching was used for the column category.

**Question 2g:** What is the mean time spent on teaching, research, and administration for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Time actually spent on teaching:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived
variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in teaching during the fall of 1998, percent of time spent teaching undergraduate students and percent of time spent teaching graduate or first-professional students.”

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Time actually spent on research:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to determine the percent of time spent in research/scholarship activities (including research; reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts; or giving speeches).”

The categorical responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Time actually spent on administration:* As defined by the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to determine the percent of time spent in administration (including departmental or institution-wide meetings or committee work).”

The categorical responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Institutional classification, 4-year versus 2-year:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to reflect the type of institution (2 or 4 year) sampled for NSOPF: 99.”

To answer question 2g, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 1999 by filtering for *full-time employment, gender, and any instructional duties for credit, and institutional classification, 4-year versus 2-year.* The
researcher chose to filter for institutional classification to focus the analyses. In addition, the NSOPF: 99 data set were used to answer this question because the NSOPF: 04 data set had no comparable measure for *time spent on administration*. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable *race/ethnicity* was used for the row category and the variables *time actually spent on teaching, time actually spent on research, and time actually spent on administration* were used for the column categories.

**Question 2h:** What is the mean total recent publication for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

*Total recent publications:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable combines the total number of publications over the past two years, whether they were sole responsibility or joint responsibility, including articles published in refereed journals, articles published in non-refereed journals, published reviews of books or chapters in edited volumes and textbooks and reported.”

The responses to survey item provided the following:

*Institutional classification, 4-year versus 2-year:* As defined for the Data Analysis System, “a derived variable was created to reflect the type of institution (2 or 4 year) sampled for NSOPF: 99.”

To answer question 2h, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 1993 and 1999 by filtering for *full-time employment, gender, and any instructional duties for credit, and institutional classification, 4-year versus 2-year*. The researcher chose to filter for institutional NSOPF: 04 because there was no comparable
variable for time spent on administration in NSOPF: 04. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable total recent publication was used for the column categories.

Question 2i: What is the opinion of whether racial minorities are treated fairly for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

To answer question 2i, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 2004 by filtering for full-time employment, gender, and any instructional duties for credit. To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable opinion: racial minorities are treated fairly was used for the column categories.

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

Opinion: Racial minorities treated fairly: As defined for the Data Analysis System (DAS), a derived variable with following responses: “do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly, disagree that at [institution name]...faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly-1 = Strongly agree, 2=somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree.

Question 2j: What is the overall job satisfaction for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?

To answer question 2j, the researcher extracted information from the NSOPF datasets for 2004 by filtering for full-time employment, gender, and any instructional


To set up comparisons between Black women and White women, the variable race/ethnicity was used for the row category and the variable satisfaction with job overall was used for the column categories.

The responses to survey item provided for the following:

_Satisfaction with job overall:_ As defined for the Data Analysis System (DAS), “with regard to your job at [institution name], would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with... Your job at this institution, overall 1 = Very satisfied, 2 = Somewhat satisfied, 3 = Somewhat dissatisfied, 4 = Very dissatisfied.

Research Question 3: Is the rate of change for the measured variables equal for full-time Black women faculty as compared to White women faculty for the years 1993-2004?

Utilizing the NSOPF data from years 1993, 1999, and 2004, the following variables were used to measure the rate of change for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women faculty: 1) highest degree achieved; 2) tenure 3) rank; 4) institution type; 5) total income from institution; 6) discipline; and 7) workload and productivity. The rates of change were calculated for the sub-questions of Question 2. A summary of the changes answered this question.

_Analysis_

According to Gall, et.al (2003), “a test of statistical significance is done to determine whether the null hypothesis can be rejected” (p. 136). To obtain the levels of statistical significance, a nonparametric Chi-Square Test was used. The chi square is a
test of statistical significance for bivariate tabular analysis. The bivariate tabular analysis looks at the intersection of the dependent and independent variables, and attempts to establish if a relationship exists. The researcher chose to use actual numbers when running the Chi-square test instead of the percentages. A notation is included in each table in Chapter 4 to reflect this decision.

To obtain the levels of statistical significance for the means of salary, age, workload, and productivity a t-test was used. The t-test assesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other. This analysis is appropriate when comparing the means of two groups. The Data Analysis System (DAS) provided a t-statistic tool for calculation by which the researcher was able to input the parameter estimates and standard deviations from the population groups for the means of age, salary, workload, and productivity. The difference in independent estimates was found to be statistically significant at the p<.05 level if the t-value was greater than 1.96. The t-test tool may be found at: http://nces.ed.gov/dasol/help/ttest.asp.

Summary

This exploratory study utilized the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data sets from 1993 and 2004 to examine if there are differences between Black and White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions. Using the NSOPF data sets allowed the researcher to extract and analyze data from a national sample and to paint a comprehensive picture of the comparative status of Black and White women in the academy at two different points in time.

Chapter 4 provides the current profile of Black and White women full-time faculty, an analysis of the data collection and an overall summary of the results. Finally,
Chapter 5 summarizes the findings and provides rationale for the importance of the study and the results, suggests implications for higher education and areas for future research.
Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine how Black and White women full-time faculty navigate and advance in the academy. The researcher used degree attainment, tenure, academic rank, institution type, salary, marital status, discipline, age, workload, productivity, job satisfaction, and fairness as key measures on which to compare the two populations' entry, progress, and status in full-time faculty positions. The questions the researcher addressed are as follows: (1) what is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions; (2) in comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women full-time faculty advanced in the academy? and (3) is the rate of change equal for the measured variables for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty between the years of 1993 and 2004?

This study used the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The study gathered survey data from a nationally representative sample of faculty representing both two- and four-year public and private institutions. The first survey was conducted in 1988 and was followed by others in 1993, 1999, and 2004. The objective of this study was to ascertain the rate of change in the representation and advancement of Black and White women full-time faculty between the period of 1993 and 2004.

Data were extracted from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) surveys for the years 1993, 1999, and 2004. In the analysis, the data are presented as percentages and means using tables created from the Data Analysis System (DAS).
calculates proper standard errors and weighted sample sizes for these estimates. If the number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases), the DAS prints the message "low-N" instead of the estimate.

This chapter is structured in the following way: (1) current profile of women full-time faculty using data from the NSOPF: 04; (2) findings from analyses used to answer research questions using data from NSOPF: 93, NSOPF: 99, and NSOPF: 04; and (3) the summary of results.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were obtained from the publicly accessible Data Analysis System (DAS) for the years of 1993 and 2004. DAS allows the researcher to create tables with the available data or access pre-created tables. The data included the percentages, means, and standard deviations of multiple variables covering the broad areas of: (1) background and demographics, (2) employment status, (3) institution type, and (4) time allocations. The variables used for this analysis are: (1) highest degree, collapsed, (2) tenure status, (3) rank, (4) 1994 Carnegie Classification (10-Category), (5) total income from institution, (6) age, (7) marital status, (8) discipline, (9) time spent on teaching, (10) time spent on research, (11) time spent on administration, (12) total recent career publications, (13) opinion: racial minorities treated fairly, and (14) overall job satisfaction. There are NSOPF datasets for each of the five-year cycles. The researcher extracted data from NSOPF: 93 and NSOPF: 04 and used the results to create a descriptive picture of full-time Black and White women faculty. The comparative data are presented through table creation in the Data Analysis System (DAS). The data are presented as percentages, means, and averages. Because the NSOPF datasets are samples...
that are an estimate of the weighted population, the data were presented by frequency of occurrence. To determine the statistical significance of difference between Black and White women full-time faculty, the researcher used a nonparametric chi-square test. In addition, a t-test was used to contrast the means of age, salary, workload, and productivity.

Current Profile of Black and White Women Full-Time Faculty

The first question was; what is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions? In addition, in what ways are they alike and different with respect to age, principal field of teaching (discipline), family (marital status), workload, productivity, fairness, and job satisfaction? The academic profession has until recently been dominated by white males. The advancement of women has been very dramatic in the last 20 years, to the point where a majority of all new hires in the last 5 years have been women (Leslie, 2006). With these changes, we are not as clear regarding the progress of women of color. The researcher chose to set the study in a context of race and gender, with particular focus on Black women.
According to NSOPF: 04, full-time women faculty with instructional duties (N=235,900) comprised 38 percent of all total full-time faculty (N=619,830). Eighty-one percent of all women faculty are White and 7.5 percent are Black, 6.7 percent are Asian American, 3.8 percent are Hispanics, and 1.3 percent are American Indian. Table 1 shows the population increase by ethnic group between 1993 and 2004. All groups have seen an increase in total population numbers; however, the percentages do show a more proportionately diverse distribution in 2004 than in 1993.

Table 1. Total population of women full-time faculty by ethnic group (1993, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15,820</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>150,320</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>190,380</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>175,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>235,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Highest Degree

Table 2 shows that 52.6 percent of all Black women hold the doctorate as the highest degree, 8.3 percent hold a first professional as the highest degree, 32.7 percent hold the masters as the highest degree, 5.3 percent hold the bachelors as the highest degree, and .3 percent holds the associates as the highest degree. Of all full-time White women faculty, 49.4 percent hold the doctorate as the highest degree, 5.6 percent hold the first professional as the highest degree, 38.8 percent hold the masters as the highest degree, 4.8 percent hold the bachelors as the highest degree, and 1.1 percent holds the associates as the highest degree. The Chi Square for this distribution is 266.9 and is significant because \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001. Black women are more likely to have advanced degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>First Professional</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Less than Bachelors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9321</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>5784</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>(52.6%)</td>
<td>(8.3 %)</td>
<td>(32.7 %)</td>
<td>(5.3 %)</td>
<td>(.32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94048</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>73846</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>170083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td>(49.4 %)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(38.8%)</td>
<td>(4.8 %)</td>
<td>(1.1 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103369</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>79630</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>185486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 4
Chi-square = 266.99
Obtained \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentage in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
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**Academic Rank**

Table 3 shows that 12.7 percent of all Black full-time women faculty hold the rank of full professor, 18.5 percent the rank of associate professor, 32.9 percent the rank of assistant professor, 21.1 percent the rank of instructor, and 3.7 percent are at the rank of lecturer. Among full-time White women faculty, 20.2 percent hold the rank of full professor, 21.6 percent hold the rank of associate professor, 26.7 percent hold the rank of assistant professor, 17.3 percent hold the rank of instructor, and 4.9 percent are at the rank of lecturer. The Chi Square for this distribution is 883.6 and is significant because \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001. Based upon Table 3, White women full-time faculty are more likely to occupy higher academic rank positions than Black women full-time faculty who occupy more of the lower academic rank positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>5746</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>(12.7%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(32.9%)</td>
<td>(21.1%)</td>
<td>(3.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36875</td>
<td>39435</td>
<td>48910</td>
<td>31680</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>157796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td>(20.2%)</td>
<td>(21.6%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(17.3%)</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39093</td>
<td>42660</td>
<td>54656</td>
<td>35355</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>172725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 4
Chi-square = 883.64
Obtained \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentages in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Tenure Status

Table 4 shows that of all full-time Black women faculty, 61 percent are tenured or in tenure-eligible positions. At almost the same proportion, of all full-time White women faculty, 62 percent are tenured or in tenure-eligible positions. Of all Black women faculty, 29 percent are not in tenure-eligible positions, 10.4 percent are in institutions with no tenure systems; 26.9 percent of all White women faculty are not in tenure-eligible positions, and 10.9 percent are in institutions with no tenure system. The Chi Square for this distribution is 17365.5 and is significant because $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001. Black women are less tenured but more likely to be in tenure-track positions.

Table 4. Women Full-time Faculty with Tenure Status by Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Not On Tenure</th>
<th>No Tenure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6028</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>5125</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>17709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>(34.0%)</td>
<td>(26.6%)</td>
<td>(28.9%)</td>
<td>(10.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76285</td>
<td>42302</td>
<td>51136</td>
<td>20656</td>
<td>144379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td>(40.1%)</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
<td>(26.9%)</td>
<td>(10.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82313</td>
<td>47020</td>
<td>56261</td>
<td>22494</td>
<td>208088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 3
Chi-square = 17365.5
Obtained $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentages in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Institution Type

The data in Table 5 show that of all full-time Black women faculty, 29.7 percent are employed at research/doctoral institutions, 29.8 percent at comprehensives, 10.6 percent at liberal arts, and 25.5 percent at public associates. Of all white women full-time faculty, 33.5 percent are employed at research/doctoral institutions, 25.1 percent at comprehensives, 10.2 percent at liberal arts, and 24.9 percent at public associates. The Chi Square for this distribution is 1997.24 and is significant because \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001. White women faculty are employed more at research/doctoral universities, whereas Black women faculty are employed in higher proportions at comprehensives and public associates.

Table 5. Women Full-time Faculty by Institution Type and Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research/Doctoral</th>
<th>Comprehensives</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Public Associates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>5274</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4511</td>
<td>15691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.7%)</td>
<td>(29.8%)</td>
<td>(10.6%)</td>
<td>(25.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63625</td>
<td>53136</td>
<td>21272</td>
<td>51973</td>
<td>190006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.5%)</td>
<td>(25.1%)</td>
<td>(10.2%)</td>
<td>(24.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67659</td>
<td>58410</td>
<td>23144</td>
<td>56484</td>
<td>205697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 4
Chi-square = 1997.24
Obtained \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentages in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Principal Field of Teaching

In Table 6, the analysis by principal field of teaching shows that Black women in order of frequency teach in the health sciences at 17.1 percent, 16.8 percent in “other programs,” 15.6 percent in social sciences, 13.8 percent in natural sciences, 13.5 percent in humanities, and 13.2 percent in education. They teach in smaller proportions in business at 4.6 percent, fine arts at 3.9 percent, agriculture at 1.5 percent, and engineering at .22 percent. Similarly, White women teach 19.8 percent in the health sciences, 15.4 percent in humanities, 14.8 percent in natural sciences, 12.6 percent in other programs, 11.6 percent in education, and 10 percent in social sciences. As with the Black women, the White women teach the least in fine arts at 7.4 percent, business at 5.7 percent, engineering at .86 percent and in agriculture at 2 percent. The Chi Square for this distribution is 1245.3 and is significant because $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001. Black and White women faculty teach more in health sciences and natural/social sciences and less in the fields of engineering, business, and fine arts. Black women are virtually absent from engineering and overrepresented in “all other programs,” social sciences, and education.
## Table 6. Women Full-time Faculty by Principal Field of Teaching by Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>All Other Programs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>257 (1.45%)</td>
<td>811 (4.58%)</td>
<td>2343 (13.23%)</td>
<td>39 (0.22%)</td>
<td>691 (3.9%)</td>
<td>3021 (17.06%)</td>
<td>2386 (13.47%)</td>
<td>2437 (13.76%)</td>
<td>2757 (15.57%)</td>
<td>2972 (16.78%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3731 (1.96%)</td>
<td>10813 (5.68%)</td>
<td>22084 (11.6%)</td>
<td>1637 (0.86%)</td>
<td>14069 (7.39%)</td>
<td>37600 (19.75%)</td>
<td>29337 (15.41%)</td>
<td>23138 (14.78%)</td>
<td>19095 (10.03%)</td>
<td>23911 (12.56%)</td>
<td>185415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3988</td>
<td>11624</td>
<td>24427</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>14760</td>
<td>40621</td>
<td>31723</td>
<td>25575</td>
<td>21852</td>
<td>26883</td>
<td>203129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 9
Chi-square = 1245.4
Obtained $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentages in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Age

The average age for Black women full-time faculty is 46.8 as compared to 48.7 for White women full-time faculty. The t-value is 2.72 and because it is greater than 1.96 it is statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. White women faculty are older and Black women faculty are younger.

Table 7. Mean Age of Women Full-time Faculty by Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>17,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>190,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-value = 2.72 and is statistically significant at $p \leq 0.05$.
If $t$ is greater than 1.96, it is significant at $p \leq 0.05$
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Marital Status

In reporting marital status, 49 percent of all Black women faculty are single with or without dependents, and 51 percent are married with or without dependents. Of all White women faculty, 29 percent are single with or without dependents and 71 percent are married with or without dependents. There are enormous differences by race for this variable. The Chi Square is 3115.46, which means the distribution is significant because $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001. There is a statistical difference in marital status. Black women full-time faculty are far more likely to be single and White women full-time faculty are far more likely to be married. This result will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Table 8. Women Full-time Faculty by Marital Status by Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single No Dependents</th>
<th>Single With Dependents</th>
<th>Married No Dependents</th>
<th>Married With Dependents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6156</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>17709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>(34.8%)</td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>(28.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41579</td>
<td>14164</td>
<td>64120</td>
<td>70517</td>
<td>190380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td>(21.8%)</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
<td>(33.7%)</td>
<td>(37.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47735</td>
<td>16707</td>
<td>68030</td>
<td>75617</td>
<td>208089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 3
Chi-square = 3115.46
Obtained $p$ is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant. Percentages in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Salary

Compensation has long been a comparative factor in academia. This study showed that the average total income from the institution for Black and White women full-time faculty is almost equal, Black women earned $66,119.23 and White women earned $66,686.21. The t-value is .32 and because it is not greater than 1.96 it is not statistically significant at the p< .05 level. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean salaries of Black and White women full-time faculty either absolutely or when adjusted for inflation.

Table 9. Mean Salary of Women Full-Time Faculty (2004) by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Mean Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$66,119.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$66,686.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-value = .32 and is not statistically significant at the p<.05.
If t is greater than 1.96, it is significant at p<.05
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Workload and Productivity

In Table 10, workload and productivity for Black and White women full-time faculty teaching at four-year institutions are defined by the mean time spent on teaching, research, administration (committees), and recent total publications (completed within the last two years) for the years 1993 and 1999. The NSOPF: 99 data is being used because there was no comparable variable for time spent on administration in NSOPF: 04. In 1999, Black women full-time faculty spent an average of 57.4 percent of their time on teaching, 11.6 percent of time on research, and 12.7 percent of time on administration.

In comparison, White women full-time faculty spent 56.1 percent of their time on teaching, 14.1 percent of time on research, and 15.1 percent of time on administration. When looking at publications and scholarly works completed within the last two years, Black women full-time faculty had an average of 6.4 publications and White women full-time faculty had an average of 6.9 total publications.

To test for significance, a t-test was used to calculate the variables of teaching, research, administration, and recent total publications. For teaching, the t-value is 0.6 and is not statistically significant at the p≤.05 level because it is not greater than 1.96, and, for administration the t-value is 0.84 and is not statistically significant at the p≤.05 level because it is not greater than 1.96. However, for time spent on research, the t-value is 2.32 and is statistically significant at the p≤.05 level because it is greater than 1.96. For recent total publications, the t-value is 0.45 and is not statistically significant at the p≤.05 level because it is not greater than 1.96. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean time spent on teaching and administration for Black women full-time faculty and White women full-time faculty. There is a statistically significant difference
between the mean time spent on research when comparing Black women full-time faculty with White women full-time faculty. Although Black women faculty are spending less time on research, they have narrowed the gap of total recent publications when compared to White women full-time faculty.

Table 10. *Mean Workload and Productivity of Women Full-time Faculty by Race (1999)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time on Teaching</th>
<th>Time on Research</th>
<th>Time on Administration</th>
<th>Recent Total Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black N=17,710</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White N=190,380</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-values</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If *t* is greater than 1.96, it is significant at *p*≤.05
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
**Fairness**

The researcher chose to examine the opinions of Black and White women full-time faculty as to whether racial minorities were treated fairly because the results of this study implied a greater degree of objective equality than the literature implied. Table 11 shows that Black women full-time faculty reported “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” at 70 percent that racial minorities are treated fairly. They reported opinions of “somewhat disagree” or “strongly disagree” at 30 percent. White women full-time faculty reported opinions of “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” at 88 percent and “somewhat disagree” or “strongly disagree” at 12 percent. The Chi-square for this distribution is 15.51 and is significant because \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.01. Although Black women have seen gains in the academy, there is a significant difference in their opinions of fair treatment for racial minorities. Black women faculty perceive treatment of racial minorities as less fair.

Table 11. *Opinion: Racial Minorities Treated Fairly for Women Full-time Faculty by Race (2004)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,1710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>199.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 3
Chi-square = 15.51
Obtained \( p \) is less than or equal to 0.001.
The distribution is significant.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Satisfaction

In examining satisfaction, Table 12 shows that Black women full-time faculty reported to be somewhat or very satisfied with their job overall at 84 percent and somewhat or very dissatisfied at 16 percent. On the other hand, White women full-time faculty reported to be somewhat or very satisfied with their job overall at 89 percent and somewhat or very dissatisfied with their job overall at 11 percent. The Chi Square is 1.60, which means the distribution is not significant at the \( p \leq .05 \) level because Chi Square is not greater than or equal to 7.82. There is no statistical difference in job satisfaction. Both Black and White women faculty are satisfied overall with their jobs.

Table 12. Job Satisfaction for Women Full-time Faculty by Race (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=190,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 3
Chi-square = 1.60
For significance at the .05 level, chi-square should be greater than or equal to 7.82. The distribution is not significant.
Source: Based on data from NCES, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
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In summation, Black women full-time faculty are more likely than Whites to have terminal degrees, there are proportionately more Black women in tenure-eligible positions; the fastest growth for Black women is at the assistant professor rank; and Black women full-time faculty are employed in higher proportions at comprehensive universities and community colleges versus research/doctoral universities. Both Black and White women full-time faculty teach more in the fields of health sciences, social/natural sciences, and education and teach the least in the fields of fine arts, engineering and agriculture but Black women are especially underrepresented in engineering and fine arts, and overrepresented in “other” fields, social sciences, and education. The mean salaries are at parity either absolutely or when adjusted for inflation, and Black women full-time faculty are younger and less likely to be married than White women full-time faculty.

Finally, there is no difference between the mean time spent on teaching and administration for Black women full-time faculty and White women full-time faculty; but Black women spend less time on research. Black women faculty perceive less fair treatment of racial minorities, but both populations are satisfied overall with their jobs.

Advancement

The second research question asked how Black women full-time faculty advance in the academy in comparison to White women full-time faculty. To answer this question, the variables of highest degree, tenure status, academic rank, institution type, salary, discipline, workload, and productivity were analyzed for Black and White women full-time faculty for the years 1993, 1999, and 2004. There are ten sub-questions for research
question 2. They are: 1) In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty earned the highest degree?; 2) In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty been granted tenure?; 3) In what numbers and proportions have Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty achieved academic rank?; 4) In numbers and proportions, at what types of institutions are Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty employed?; 5) What is the mean income for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty when corrected for inflation?; (6) In numbers and proportions, in what disciplines are Black women full-time faculty teaching as compared to White women full-time faculty? (7) What is the mean of time spent on teaching, research, and administration for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in four-year institutions? (8) What is the mean total recent publications for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in four-year institutions? (9) What is the opinion of whether racial minorities are treated fairly for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty? and 10) What is the overall job satisfaction for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?
**Highest Degree**

According to Gregory (1999, 2001), although more Black women are earning doctorates, there are fewer choosing academic employment, and “many of those who do enter the academy eventually leave to pursue careers in business, industry, and the professions” (p. 124). In Table 13, the 1993 data show that of all Black women full-time faculty, 43.9 percent held the terminal degree of doctorate or first professional, 48.8 percent the master’s degree, 5.5 percent the bachelor’s degree, and 1.8 percent less than a bachelor’s degree as the highest degree achieved. A slightly higher proportion of all White women full-time faculty (1993), 49.5 percent held the terminal degree of doctorate or first professional, 44.4 percent the master’s degree, 5.2 percent the bachelor’s degree; and .9 percent less than a bachelor’s degree as the highest degree achieved.

For the 2004 data, of all Black women full-time faculty, 60.9 percent held the terminal degree of doctorate or first professional, which is a 39 percent increase over the 43.9 percent in 1993. Further, of all Black women full-time faculty, 32.7 percent held the masters degree; 5.3 the bachelors degree; and .3 percent less than a bachelors degree as the highest degree achieved. In 2004, of all White women full-time faculty, 55 percent held the terminal degree of doctorate or first professional, which is a 10 percent increase over the 49.5 percent in 1993. Additionally, 38.8 percent held the master’s degree, 4.8 the bachelor’s degree, and 1.1 percent less than a bachelor’s degree as the highest degree achieved. The researcher found growth and change for both Black and White women concerning degree attainment, but Black women have outpaced White women in earning the doctorate between the years of 1993 and 2004.
Table 13. *Percentage of Women Full-time Faculty by Race and Highest Degree Held between the years of 1993 and 2004.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>N=12,920</td>
<td>N=149,740</td>
<td>N=17,710</td>
<td>N=190,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>(4735)</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>(62,232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Professional</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>(927)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>(1183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>(5999)</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>(66,499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>(779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>(1303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>(9321)</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>(94,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Professional</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>(10,566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>(5784)</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>(73,886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>(946)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>(9195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>(495)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES, 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Actual Number in Parentheses.
Institution Type

For purposes of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), institution type was defined by the 1994 Carnegie Classification system. Gregory (2001) stated, “it has been well documented that women are more likely to be at less prestigious institutions—those that do not grant doctorate degrees—and to hold non-tenure track positions” (p.128).

As shown in Table 14, in 1993, of all Black women faculty, 28 percent were employed at research/doctoral universities, 24.5 percent at comprehensives, 6.3 percent employed at liberal arts colleges, and 31.2 percent were employed at two-year institutions. Comparatively, in 2004, of all Black women faculty, 29.7 percent were employed at research/doctoral universities, 29.8 percent at comprehensives, 10.6 percent at liberal arts, and 25.5 percent at two-year colleges. In 1993, of all White women faculty, 34.3 percent were employed at research/doctoral universities, 23.3 percent at comprehensives, 8.5 percent at liberal arts, and 27.9 percent at two-year universities.

Relatively, in 2004, of all White women faculty, 33.5 percent were employed at research/doctoral universities, 25.1 percent at comprehensives, 10.2 percent at liberal arts, and 24.9 percent at two-year universities. Overall, in total numbers, Black women increased 36 percent from 1993 (12,950) to 2004 (17,710). In addition, the percentage of Black and White women have increased at comprehensives and liberal arts, and decreased at community colleges. The greatest gain for both groups over the eleven-year period is in comprehensive universities and liberal arts institutions.
Table 14. Percentage of Women Full-time Faculty by Race and Institution Type between the years of 1993 and 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28% (3707)</td>
<td>24.5% (3178)</td>
<td>6.3% (821)</td>
<td>31.2% (4039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34.3% (51,604)</td>
<td>23.3% (34,979)</td>
<td>8.5% (12,732)</td>
<td>27.9% (41,239)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29.7% (4034)</td>
<td>29.8% (5274)</td>
<td>10.6% (1872)</td>
<td>25.5% (4511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23.1% (63,625)</td>
<td>25.1% (53,136)</td>
<td>10.2% (19,400)</td>
<td>24.9% (47,462)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Actual Number in Parentheses.
Concerning academic rank, the study found that in 2004 of all Black and White full-time women faculty, the largest proportions are at the assistant professor level with 32.9 percent and 26.7 percent respectively. Of all White full-time women faculty, 20.2 percent hold full professor rank and 21.6 percent hold associate professor rank. Of all Black women full-time faculty, 12.8 percent hold full professor rank and 18.5 percent hold associate professor rank. In actual numbers, the rate at which Black women full-time faculty are entering assistant professor positions are much higher than that for White women full-time faculty; however the rates by which White women full-time faculty are being promoted to associate and full professor is higher than that for Black women full-time faculty when comparing for the years 1993-2004.

In 1993 (Table 15), 14 percent of all Black women full-time faculty were full professors as compared to 15.7 percent of all White women full-time faculty. In 2004, the proportion of all Black women faculty at full professor rank decreased to 12.8 percent and White women faculty increased to 20.2 percent. The rate decreased because the total number of women increased. For Black women full-time faculty, the numbers have changed in all ranks, but the fastest growth occurred at the assistant professor level.
Table 15. Percentage of Women Full-time Faculty by Race and Academic Rank between the years of 1993 and 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1808)</td>
<td>(2802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=12,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23,525)</td>
<td>(31,191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=150,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2218)</td>
<td>(3225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=17,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36,875)</td>
<td>(39,435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=182,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Actual Number in Parentheses.
Tenure

Menges and Exum (1983) state, “Sustaining a career in academe requires more than securing a position; it requires surviving promotion and tenure, which usually determine who will remain and who will leave the academy” (p. 128). Upon first examination of the percentages, one could assume from the data that Black women full-time faculty are losing ground in gaining tenure or in earning full professor rank because the proportions decrease between 1993 and 2004. In 2004 (Table 16), there is an increase in the total number of Black women faculty in tenured positions (683). There has also been an increase in total numbers for White women faculty in tenured positions (16,389) and in tenure-track positions (4,627).

Table 16. Percentage of Women Full-time Faculty by Race and Tenure Status between the years of 1993 and 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993 Tenured</th>
<th>On tenure track</th>
<th>Not on tenure track</th>
<th>No tenure system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4943)</td>
<td>(4035)</td>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>(673)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59,896)</td>
<td>(37,675)</td>
<td>(23,195)</td>
<td>(10,736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6028)</td>
<td>(4718)</td>
<td>(5125)</td>
<td>(1838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(76,285)</td>
<td>(42,302)</td>
<td>(51,136)</td>
<td>(20,656)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Actual Number in Parentheses.
Principle Field of Teaching

In examining the rate of change for principle field of teaching, the study found that in 1993, Black women full-time faculty taught in the health sciences at 21.5 percent, education at 16.1 percent, social sciences at 14.4 percent, all other programs at 13.1 percent, and in humanities at 12.2 percent. They taught the least in business at 6.9 percent, fine arts at 4.8 percent, agriculture at 1.5 percent, and engineering at 1.4 percent. For all White women full-time faculty, in 1993 they taught in the health sciences at 23.6 percent, humanities at 17.8 percent, natural sciences at 12.2 percent, all other programs at 11.1 percent, and education at 10.5 percent. They taught the least in business at 7.4 percent, fine arts at 6.4 percent, agriculture at 1.6 percent, and engineering at .65 percent.

From 1993-2004, the greatest change between the two populations occurred for Black women full-time faculty teaching in education. In 1993, of all Black women full-time faculty, 16.1 percent were teaching in education and in 2004, there were 13.2 percent teaching in education. The other changes were seen in a larger percentage of Black women teaching in “all other programs” in 2004 versus 1993. One explanation for this may be the integration of Ethnic and Women’s’ studies as interdisciplinary programs. According to the Data Analysis System, interdisciplinary programs are included in the category of “all other programs.” There are proportionately fewer Black women full-time faculty teaching in the field of education and more teaching in “all other programs.”
Table 17. Percentage of Women Full-time Faculty by Race and Principle Field of Teaching between the years of 1993 and 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Home Econ</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>All Other Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.47%)</td>
<td>(6.89%)</td>
<td>(10.14%)</td>
<td>(1.37%)</td>
<td>(4.85%)</td>
<td>(21.5%)</td>
<td>(12.22%)</td>
<td>(8.08%)</td>
<td>(14.41%)</td>
<td>(13.07%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>10880</td>
<td>15518</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>9187</td>
<td>34776</td>
<td>26074</td>
<td>17947</td>
<td>13250</td>
<td>16328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.57%)</td>
<td>(7.39%)</td>
<td>(10.54%)</td>
<td>(0.65%)</td>
<td>(6.24%)</td>
<td>(23.62%)</td>
<td>(17.71%)</td>
<td>(12.19%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(11.09%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Home Econ</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>All Other Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.45%)</td>
<td>(4.58%)</td>
<td>(13.23%)</td>
<td>(0.22%)</td>
<td>(3.9%)</td>
<td>(17.06%)</td>
<td>(13.47%)</td>
<td>(13.76%)</td>
<td>(15.57%)</td>
<td>(16.78%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3731</td>
<td>10813</td>
<td>22084</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>14069</td>
<td>37600</td>
<td>29337</td>
<td>23138</td>
<td>19095</td>
<td>23911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.96%)</td>
<td>(5.68%)</td>
<td>(11.6%)</td>
<td>(0.86%)</td>
<td>(7.39%)</td>
<td>(19.75%)</td>
<td>(15.41%)</td>
<td>(14.78%)</td>
<td>(10.03%)</td>
<td>(12.56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Actual Number in Parentheses.
According to Gregory (2001), women and minority faculty are consistently paid less than white males at every rank. In addition, a study by Nettles and Perna (1995) found there were differences in salary and rank by gender and race while controlling for education, experience, and principal field of teaching. Overall, they found significant differences between male and female salaries, and slight differences between racial/ethnic groups, but they did not report how these variables specifically affect Black women.

Table 18 shows that the difference in mean total income for Black ($41,296.10) and White ($41,871.31) women in 1993 was $575.21. In 2004, both groups’ average income had increased. Black women earned an average salary of $66,119.23 and White women earned an average salary of $66,686.21, a difference of $566.98. The researcher adjusted salary data for inflation with the Inflation Calculator. The Inflation calculator was retrieved from http://www.westegg.com/inflation/.

The Inflation Calculator provides adjustments according to the Consumer Price Index, from 1800 to 2005. The 1993 salary was placed in the calculator, the initial year was entered as 1993, and the final year was entered as 2004. With this done, the adjusted salaries were a reflection of the change corrected for inflation over the eleven-year period. The inflation-adjusted comparison showed that both Black women and White women faculty fared better than what was attributable to inflation, and parity remained. The difference between the two means on the same inflation-adjusted scale was $575.00 in 1993 and $736.41 in 2004. The actual difference of $566.98 in 2004 is barely more than half the inflation-adjusted difference meaning that the gap has narrowed. Table 19
displays mean salary by academic rank. The t-test found there to be no statistical difference (p≥.05) level based upon rank because none of the t-values are greater than 1.96. There is no statistical difference in salary by academic rank.

Table 18. Mean Total Income from Institution for Full-time Women Faculty by Race between the years of 1993 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993 Mean Total Income from Institution</th>
<th>2004 Mean Total Income from Institution</th>
<th>1993 Mean Total Income Adjusted for Inflation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$41,296.10 (N=12,920)</td>
<td>$66,119.23 (N=17,710)</td>
<td>$52,869.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$41,871.31 (N=149,740)</td>
<td>$66,686.21 (N=190,380)</td>
<td>$53,605.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$575.21</td>
<td>$566.98</td>
<td>$736.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Source: Inflation Calculator: http: www.westegg.com

Table 19. Mean Salary for Full-time Women Faculty by Academic Rank and Race for 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$74,288.99 (N=17,710)</td>
<td>$67,084.16 (2,220)</td>
<td>$60,203.15 (5,750)</td>
<td>$51,145.83 (n)</td>
<td>Low n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$80,737.41 (190,380)</td>
<td>$67,211.59 (36,880)</td>
<td>$56,327.52 (39,430)</td>
<td>$46,627.61 (48,920)</td>
<td>$44,261.00 (31,670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| t-values | -.98 | -0.04 | 1.09 | 1.81 |

All t-values are t≤1.96 at p≤.05 level. There is no significant difference. Actual numbers in parentheses.
Source: Based on data from NCES 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.
Workload and Productivity

In Table 20, workload and productivity for Black and White women full-time faculty teaching at four-year institutions is defined by the mean time spent on teaching, research, administration, and recent total publications (completed within the last two years) for the years 1993 and 1999.

Counter to what the literature stated, in 1999, Black women faculty were spending more time on teaching and less time on administration. However, the percentage of time spent on research is lower (11.6%) when compared to White women faculty (14.1%). As noted in the earlier section on institution type (Table 5), Black women faculty are more likely to be employed in comprehensive universities and community colleges where teaching is a higher priority than research. However, Black women full-time faculty are narrowing the gap with recent total publications (6.4) when compared to White women full-time faculty (6.9). Between 1993 and 2004, both populations have increased the time spent on teaching, decreased time spent on research and decreased time spent on administration; however, Black and White women faculty increased the total recent publications while spending less time on research.
Table 20. *Mean Workload and Productivity by Race for years 1993 and 1999*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Recent Career Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Spent on Teaching</td>
<td>Time Spent on Research</td>
<td>Time Spent on Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=12,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=149,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=10,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=125,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data from NCES 1993, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.

Note: N is based on Four-Year Institution populations.
Rate of Change

The third research question asked whether the rate of change was equal for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty for the period 1993-2004. This question was answered within eight of the ten sub-questions of Question 2 on advancement. In summation, the variables where the percentages of change were positive or equal for Black women full-time faculty were in degree attainment, age, salary, workload, and productivity. From 1993-2004, the total number of Black women who held the doctorate as the highest degree nearly doubled (4,735 in 1993 and 9,321 in 2004) and also increased with the total number of White women faculty who held the doctorate as the highest degree (62,232 in 1993 and 94,105 in 2004). The mean salaries of Black and White women full-time faculty have remained close during this period and have outpaced the inflation-adjusted salaries (Table 18).

When examining workload and productivity, the percentage of change shows that Black women faculty have been channeled more toward teaching and less towards research during this period. It is a positive change that less time has been spent on committees; however, adding more time to teaching and not to research could be problematic for opportunities for upward mobility based upon the correlation of productivity with advancement in academia. Although Black women faculty spent less time on research in 1999 versus 1993, they have narrowed the gap in total recent publications to almost parity with White women faculty (Table 19).

The variables that changed in a negative direction are academic rank and tenure status. Overall, the actual numbers of Black and White women full-time faculty have increased between the period of 1993 and 2004 and more of the recent hires have been
women (Leslie, 2006). However, more of the total number of Black women faculty are entering at the lower ranks, which would result in a lower percentage of Black women who are tenured and who are employed at the associate or full professor ranks.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess how Black and White women full-time faculty navigate and advance in the academy. The questions were as follows: (1) what is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty in postsecondary institutions? (2) in comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women faculty advanced in the academy? and (3) is the rate of change equal for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty for the years 1993-2004?

According to the literature, women are making progress in the academy, but studies have indicated that Black women in particular have not fared as well as White women. The results of this study comparing Black and White women full-time faculty substantiate the finding that there is little difference between Black and White women full-time faculty on degree attainment, promotion and tenure, institution type, and salary. The analyses of the data reveal that Black women are not doing worse than White women are doing once they have entered the academy. For example, the total number of all full-time women faculty increased from 175,600 in 1993 to 235,900 in 2004. Specifically, Black women have increased from 12,950 in 1993 to 17,710 in 2004, which is a 37 percent increase, and White women have increased from 150,320 in 1993 to 190,380 in 2004, which is a 27 percent increase (Table 1).
Also, Black women faculty have earned the doctorate at a higher rate, in absolute numbers more are entering into tenured and tenure track positions, and the mean salaries for Black women faculty have remained close to parity with salaries of White women faculty. Both Black and White women faculty are employed more at comprehensive universities and community colleges rather than research and doctoral universities. There is a statistically significant difference between the mean time spent on research when comparing Black women full-time faculty with White women full-time faculty. Although Black women faculty are spending less time on research, they have narrowed the gap of total recent publications when compared to White women full-time faculty.

When looking at how high and at what pace the two populations have advanced in the academy, it can be concluded that the presence of Black women full-time faculty has increased at a much faster pace than White women full-time faculty. In addition, although Black and White women faculty are not equal on all measures, if the trends remain constant and improve, there is a positive outlook for increasing the diversity of the professoriate at all levels.
Chapter V
Summary and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to look at how Black and White women full-time faculty in the academy compare with regard to degree attainment, tenure, academic rank, institution type, salary, marital status, workload, productivity, job satisfaction, and fairness. The study's principal questions were as follows: 1) what is the current census of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty?; 2) in comparison to White women full-time faculty, how have Black women full-time faculty advanced in the academy?; and 3) is the rate of change equal for Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty for the years 1993-2004 in postsecondary institutions? Utilizing the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey data were gathered from a nationally representative sample of faculty at both two- and four-year public and private institutions.

The last decade has seen a greater presence of Black women participants in American higher education at all levels (Aquirre, 2000; Bradley, 2005; Gregory, 2001). Notwithstanding personal and professional barriers, they have made gains and advances in the academy (Gregory, 2001). Although Affirmative Action continues to receive negative backlash (Collins, et. al, 1998; Garcia, 1997; Valian, 1998), the increased numbers of women and specifically, Black women currently represented in the academy demonstrates that the policies and programs have opened some originally closed doors. This final chapter will integrate the analyses into a context of previous research to
determine how this study has added to the body of knowledge about Black women faculty. The researcher’s overall findings are as follows:

(1) The proportion of Black women full-time faculty earning the doctorate as the highest degree has seen a significant gain between 1993 and 2004 signaling an increase in the pipeline of individuals eligible for academic careers. This expanded opportunity has also yielded more Black women in tenure-track positions;

(2) The numbers of Black women full-time faculty have increased in all academic rank levels, however, the fastest growth is at the assistant professor rank;

(3) Black women full-time faculty are employed in higher proportions at comprehensive universities and community colleges versus research/doctoral universities and this segmentation could limit the possibilities for career advancement because teaching is a higher priority than research and publication in comprehensives and community colleges;

(4) Both Black and White women full-time faculty teach more in the fields of health sciences, social/natural sciences, and education and teach the least in the fields of engineering and agriculture;

(5) There is no statistically significant difference between the mean salaries of Black and White women full-time faculty either absolutely or when adjusted for inflation;

(6) Black women full-time faculty are younger and less likely to be married than White women full-time faculty;

(7) There is no statistically significant difference between the mean time spent on teaching and administration for Black women full-time faculty and White women full-time faculty;
(8) There is a statistically significant difference between the mean time spent on research when comparing Black women full-time faculty with White women full-time faculty. Although Black women faculty are spending less time on research, they have narrowed the gap of total recent publications when compared to White women full-time faculty;

(9) There is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of Black women full-time faculty as compared to White women full-time faculty on whether racial minorities are treated fairly. Black women believe treatment is less fair; and

(10) There is no statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction of Black and White women full-time faculty.

Rate of Change

The central question in this study examined whether there was a difference in how high and at what pace Black and White women full-time faculty have advanced in the academy. The results of the study indicated that there is very little difference in the progression and status of the two groups. Although there is not full equity because Blacks and Whites are not equal in all respects, there is a degree of parity that shows equal opportunity among all of the measured variables.

Although the results of this study show that a degree of parity has been reached in objective numbers, there is still a feeling of subjective inequality. A number of research studies (Collins, 1990; Gregory, 1999; hooks, 1989) have reported that the intersection of race and gender plays a pivotal role in the career advancement of Black women in the academy. They also assert that because of the Black woman's double-
minority status, White women have had an easier time with professional socialization than Black women have (Clark & Corcoran, 1986).

These findings indicate that aggressive recruitment programs and Affirmative Action policies have worked in granting more women and people of color opportunities in the academy. It might also suggest that race does not carry as much weight as gender in determining how high and at what pace a woman will advance. Race, however, may play a role in the pre-entry into the academy and upward mobility into senior-level administrative positions.

Implications for Higher Education

Taken together, this study provided an overview of the experience of Black women faculty, a sub-population in the academy that has been understudied. The results of this study call into question previous research that suggested Black women full-time faculty are not as successful in the academy as White women full-time faculty. The results of the current study in combination with other research provide the following as implications for higher education.

Impact of Affirmative Action

One way to account for the increased presence and opportunity for women and specifically, Black women is to look at the impact of Affirmative Action programs and policies. The total number of Black and White women in full-time faculty positions has increased from 1993-2004 (Table 1). The aggressive recruitment efforts established by graduate programs to enroll more women and people of color has contributed to the increased number of individuals eligible for academic careers (Cheatham & Phelps, 1995). The impact of Affirmative Action programs is difficult to measure (Valian,
1998); therefore, these policies cannot be considered the sole reason for the increased presence of women and people of color in the academy. Because universities that receive federal funding must have Affirmative Action programs, this can be one of many contributing factors to the increased numbers (Valian, 1998).

The commitment to diversity by university leadership and the ability of leaders to articulate the importance of enhancing the campus climate and experience is important (Collins, 1998; Valian, 1998). Because Affirmative Action is currently under attack by those who believe that the program is a form of reverse discrimination (Collins, et. al., 1998), it will be important for higher education leaders who understand the benefits of such programs to be supportive of retaining the recruitment efforts. According to Valian (1998), “without affirmative action, then, institutional commitments to increasing the representation of women and improving women’s internal progress might never have come about” (p. 281).

Fairness and Satisfaction

The results of this study found a statistically significant difference in the opinion of Black and White women full-time faculty about whether racial minorities are treated fairly. Black women full-time faculty “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” at 70 percent that racial minorities are treated fairly. They “somewhat” or “strongly disagree” at 30 percent. White women full-time faculty reported opinions of “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” at 88 percent and “somewhat disagree” or “strongly disagree” at 12 percent. Acquirre (2001) found that when comparing women of color with White women faculty, women of color are less satisfied with performance evaluations, promotion opportunities, and collegial relations, which suggests more specific grounds for their
opinions regarding fair treatment. The perception held by Black women faculty is that racial minorities are less fairly treated in colleges and universities.

Institution Climate

“There are norms which undercut efforts at diversity: hierarchy of disciplines, gender-race based stereotypes, single-minded devotion to professional pursuits, and the relative value assigned to various elements of faculty work...” (Trower & Chait, 2002, p.9). The “chilly climate” that was discussed in Chapter 2 (Moses, 1989; Turner & Meyers, 2000), is thought to impede progression in the academy for women and people of color.

Sandler (1986) found that women experience alienation, isolation, tokenism, and lack of respect from students and colleagues. It is important for institutions committed to creating a welcoming and supportive environment for women and underrepresented groups to understand that often Black women faculty feel invisible in their work environments, because they face both racial and gender discrimination (Collins, 1990; Gregory, 1999; Moses, 1989).

Based upon the Black Feminist Thought theoretical framework, the intersection of race, gender, and class are the impetus for the stress felt by some Black women in the academy (Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989). This study did not look at gender and class; however, when examining the influence of race, there were differences found in marital status, academic rank, tenure status, and fairness. There was a statistically significant difference between Black and White women faculty on the variable measuring fairness. Even though Black women have had objective and subjective success, they continue to feel unfair treatment and until this changes, achieving full equity will be difficult.
Creating a welcoming and supportive environment for women and underrepresented groups would be good practice for university leaders. If such an environment does not exist, the diversity of the faculty may be impacted. To eliminate the “chilly climate” for women and people of color, universities can establish and clearly articulate objective recruitment and promotion procedures to avoid subjective judgments on performance evaluations, provide mentors for new faculty to assist with understanding the “rules of the game”, and create an accountability system that regularly monitors work climates. These efforts will help to dismantle any overt and subtle barriers that may exist to inhibit career progression and advancement for women and people of color.

Segmentation by Institution Type

Black women faculty are acquiring jobs; however, there appear to be a disproportionate number tracking to comprehensive universities and community colleges (Table 5) which is a form of segmentation in the academy (Conterras, 1997; Gregory, 1999). The opportunities are good for women at these institutions, but for those who seek upward mobility there must be a focus on research and publication. Because teaching is a higher priority in comprehensive universities and community colleges and because teaching loads are heavier in this sector than at research and doctoral universities, the relative proportion of time faculty spend on research may be lower, and that becomes a career barrier.

As cited by Gregory (1995), Guillory (2001), Turner and Meyers (2000), and Wilson (2004), once a certain type of institution employs an individual, it is difficult to gain opportunities within institutions with more prestige. The results of this study found that research/doctoral universities employ 29.7 percent of all Black women full-time
faculty. In comparison, comprehensive universities and community colleges employ 55.3 percent of all Black women full-time faculty. To have a better distribution of Black women scholars across institution types, more research is needed to determine why relatively fewer Black women are employed as faculty in research/doctoral universities. There are several possible reasons to explain the lower numbers of Black women at research universities. First, the perception of a "chilly climate" could keep women and people of color from considering faculty positions in research universities because they choose not to place high priority on research and productivity and would rather dedicate more time to teaching. Secondly, for some women the time needed to be a productive researcher is not worth the personal sacrifice of not having a family and children (Valian, 1998).

Marital Status

The findings from numerous studies have shown that marriage and children have a negative influence on the research and productivity of women (Collins, et.al., 1998; Leslie, 2006; Mason & Goulden, 2002; Valian, 1998). The Mason and Goulden studies (2002, 2004) found that the timing of children influenced the tenure rates for women. As an example, for women who choose to have children before completing the terminal degree, achieving tenure becomes a barrier. Overall, the study concluded that a woman is more likely to receive tenure if she is not married and has no children.

The results of this study show the greatest statistical difference between Black and White women full-time faculty is in marital status. Black women are disproportionately more single (49.2%), than married (60.9 %) and White women are more married (70.7%) than single (29.2%). A study by Leslie (2006), found that women who are single and
have no dependents tend to be more successful in advancing through academic careers. Women spend less time on research and publication when married, caring for children, or in performing other "family" roles (Leslie, 2006). A key point to note here is that because Black women faculty are more single; they may be better positioned to navigate the academy with fewer barriers. It may also be presumed that some Black women faculty have made the choice or personal sacrifice not to engage in a committed relationship in order to be more marketable and successful in advancing their academic careers. This is important as more institutions are looking to provide flexible, yet fair employment options to better facilitate the recruitment and retention of women faculty (Leslie, 2006; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004). This is an important pipeline question. If women have to make this sacrifice to achieve equal success at research universities, they will be more likely to elect to work in other types of institutions or altogether avoid academic careers.

Workload and Productivity

The results of this study found no statistically significant difference between Black and White women full-time faculty in the percentage of time spent on teaching or time spent on administration. This is another inconsistency with the literature that reported that Black women faculty spend more time serving on committees than White women faculty (Frierson, 1996; Gregory, 2001; Moses, 1989). There was a statistically significant difference found between the populations on the percentage of time spent on research as the data showed that Black women spend less time on research than White women do (Table 10). This may be explained by the different distributions across institutional types as more Black women faculty are in comprehensive universities and
community colleges. For this reason, it is important not to make an assumption that Black women faculty are engaged in less time on research than White women faculty when controlling for institution type. To further substantiate this point, this study found that although Black women faculty are spending less time on research, they have narrowed the gap with White women faculty for total recent publications (Table 10).

Marital status, workload, and productivity are factors that will continue to be important in the recruitment and retention of women faculty. Leslie (2006) reported, “newer hires are, and will continue to be, far more female than even before (Just over half- 50.3 % of all faculty hired in the 5 years preceding 2004 were female. Ten years earlier, 45.6% of recent hires were female)” (p.5). Because more women are entering the academy, it will be important for higher education practitioners to keep flexible options for employment at the forefront of discussion so that men and women who are interested in academic careers will not leave the academy.

Conclusion

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the demographics of the students attending college are changing quickly; therefore, it will be important to have a diverse faculty at all institution types and at all levels of academia to provide role models and support for students in their varied stages of development. The more that is known about the entry, progression, and status of underrepresented populations, the better-equipped institutions will be for responding to the changing demographics of society.

Future Research Directions

There are a number of implications for further research generated by this study. The goal of this study was to capture the experiences of an often understudied population,
Black women full-time faculty. However, the researcher found additional areas of study that would contribute to the body of knowledge regarding women faculty. The following are recommendations for future research:

1. There are certain perceptions and experiences that cannot be measured by objective numbers. Acknowledging that most of the previous studies have been subjective and qualitative in design, taking the results from this study, and expanding the research to add a qualitative component would provide a more holistic understanding of the experiences of Black women full-time faculty when compared to White women full-time faculty;

2. Asian Americans are the fastest growing population within the academy. A study similar to this with Asian American women as the unit of study would provide new and critical information to higher education practitioners and policy makers to ensure that campuses are welcoming environments for all people. In addition, this will provide a better understanding of how ethnicity may be associated with career progression;

3. Utilizing the most recent data sets from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), compare the entry, progression, and advancement for full-time Black women and men full-time faculty by institution type; and

4. The number of Black women in the academy has grown. Women who are not in the academy but aspire to be should be included in research and analysis. Giving attention to this segment of the population will provide information on the experiences and obstacles that may inhibit or facilitate a successful journey in academia.
Summary

Olsen and Maple (1993) stated, “Programs and policies designed to advance women in higher education must be based on academic information about the obstacles they face and the satisfaction that sustain their development. Inaccurate assumptions about women in higher education may be as damaging to them as discrimination and insensitivity” (p. 35). Previous studies have noted certain challenges faced by Black women faculty such as lack of mentoring (Gregory, 1999; Moses, 1989); and exclusion from networking opportunities (Shorter & Gooden, 2002); factors which were not included in this study.

Many findings of this study were inconsistent with the literature, and this study opened the door to enhancing and developing a more comprehensive look at Black women faculty in the academy. Overall, many researchers affirmed that the experiences of Black women in the academy are different from the experiences of White women and the results of this study raised at least the possibility of subjective or perceived inequalities and barriers. The subjective deprivation women feel, as opposed to the objective equality this study found, needs to be accounted for through rigorous qualitative inquiry.

This study found considerable evidence that opportunities for Black women faculty have expanded, but the data suggested continued segmentation by type of institution and discipline. The question remains as to whether Black women feel they have to sacrifice marriage and family in order to have an academic career. In addition, whether segmentation, marriage, and family may be affecting the overall career
opportunities for Black faculty in general or for individual Black women remain to studied further.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2006</td>
<td>The College of William and Mary</td>
<td>Williamsburg, Virginia</td>
<td>Doctor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1999</td>
<td>The College of William and Mary</td>
<td>Williamsburg, Virginia</td>
<td>Master of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1990</td>
<td>Presbyterian College</td>
<td>Clinton, South Carolina</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birthdate: March 8, 1968

Birthplace: Greenwood, South Carolina