Uma M. Jayakumar
Tyrone C. Howard
Walter R. Allen
June C. Han

Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction

Despite antidiscrimination legislation and affirmative action, faculty of color[1] remain significantly underrepresented in higher education. When present, they often occupy less prestigious positions and have less than optimal conditions for service in terms of workload and pay (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Allen et al., 2002; Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997; Blackwell, 1981; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). Nationally, faculty of color, including Black/African Americans (6%), Latina/os (4%), Asian Americans (6%), and American Indians (0.5%), make up only 16% of the full-time professoriate (NCES, 2008). Furthermore, only 5.3% of the full professors in the United States are African American, Hispanic, or Native American (Ryu, 2008).

While the numbers of undergraduate and graduate students of color on college campuses have risen over the years, the growth in the numbers of faculty of color has lagged far behind (Antonio, 2003; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). This is unfortunate, as research indicates the presence of faculty of color is strongly tied to successful recruitment and retention for both students and junior faculty of color

Uma M. Jayakumar is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the National Center for Institutional Diversity. Tyrone C. Howard is an Associate Professor of Urban Schooling and Director of Center X at the University of California, Los Angeles. Walter R. Allen is Allan Murray Cartter Professor of Higher Education and Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. June C. Han is a faculty member teaching Biology at Citrus College in Glendora, California.

(Blackwell, 1981; Cheatham & Phelps, 1995; Reyes & Halcón, 1991). Increasing faculty of color in the academy would provide mentors, role models, and a sense of connection that students of color and junior faculty of color often lack on predominantly White campuses. Another compelling reason for securing greater faculty diversity lies in the potential that faculty of color bring toward institutional and societal transformation.

Several scholars have revealed the benefits of a racially diverse faculty for the three missions of the university: research, teaching, and service. Faculty of color take on greater teaching, mentoring, service, and administrative/committee responsibilities than do White faculty (Allen et al., 2000; Astin et al., 1997; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). Knowles and Harleston (1997) report that faculty of color are more likely to use active pedagogical techniques known to improve student learning. Faculty of color also more frequently encourage students to interact with peers from different backgrounds, engage in service-related activities and produce scholarship that addresses issues of race, ethnicity, and gender (Knowles & Harleston, 1997). Thomas (2001) describes tenured faculty of color as agents of social change in predominantly White universities. Antonio (2002) finds that faculty of color are more committed to orienting their work toward service ideals. He asserts that faculty of color, relative to their White counterparts, display higher levels of engagement on factors identified by Boyer (1990) as essential for transforming higher education institutions.

Exacerbating the current underrepresentation of faculty of color are disturbingly low rates of retention. Higher percentages of faculty of color report intentions to leave the academy (American Indian/Alaskan Native–13%, Asian or Pacific Islander–9%, Black–10%, Latina/o–6%) than their White counterparts (6%) (NCES, 1997). Research demonstrates that job satisfaction, including aspects of morale and sense of community, is strongly related to retention (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002); however, the factors contributing to satisfaction and retention are not well understood. On a national level, in particular, there is little research that simultaneously examines faculty worklife, satisfaction, and intentions to leave the academy (Rosser, 2004). Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) report that the "accumulated (scholarly) work tends to be disjointed" and identify a need to "clarify how perceptions of worklife affect . . . satisfaction, and in turn . . . what contributes to faculty intentions to leave" (p. 519). Furthermore, how these factors differ for faculty of color, who consistently report lower satisfaction compared to White faculty, requires ex-

amination (Astin et al., 1997). This study was born out of an interest in further exploring the influences of institutional and environmental factors on the retention of faculty of color in the academy. It addresses the following research questions:

(1) To what extent are racial climate and faculty job satisfaction related to intentions to leave the academy among faculty of color?
(2) What are the factors related to faculty job satisfaction?
(3) How are these relationships similar and/or different when disaggregating racial groups and in comparison with White faculty?

Literature Review

Faculty of color continue to be underrepresented in graduate and professional schools across the country. Equally concerning is that faculty of color encounter a different set of experiences than their White counterparts in the academy. Too often, these differences translate into disadvantages for faculty of color. Nonetheless, research on faculty retention mostly examines faculty as a whole without disaggregating by race/ethnicity.

In considering faculty generally, several identified factors influence and shape retention outcomes. Most faculty appear to be satisfied with the intellectual aspects of their jobs but are less content with their institutions (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitlaw, 1994). The factors influencing faculty retention include salary (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Smart, 1990; Weiler, 1985), quality of life (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994), time pressure/constraints (Barnes et al., 1998; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994), sense of community (Barnes et al., 1998), gender (Barnes et al., 1998; Smart, 1990), marital status (Allen et al., 2002), institutional leadership and autonomy (Boyer et al., 1994), distribution of resources (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002), and tenure status (Smart, 1990).

In addition to the factors influencing all faculty, faculty of color are subjected to racist ideologies and racially discriminatory behaviors. "Raced" challenges and barriers negatively influence faculty of color specifically. Such challenges include (a) low numbers of minorities in the professoriate and on campus, (b) barriers to tenure and promotion, (c) feelings of "otherness," and (d) experiences of racial and ethnic bias. Given the paucity of research on turnover and attrition for faculty of color (Stanley, 2006), literature addressing the experiences of faculty of color at predominantly White institutions primarily informs this study. While research on faculty retention is considered, the study refrains from using the experiences of Whites as the normative standard. The

study instead is grounded in the distinctive experiences of people of color, particularly with regard to the four challenges mentioned above.

There are two very common explanations offered in the literature for the low number of minorities in the professoriate—shortage of doctoral graduates and institutional racism (Jackson, 1991). Contrary to the former rationale, a report issued by the National Center for Educational Statistics stated that in the last four decades (1976 to 2004), the number of Black graduate students has increased dramatically from 78,000 to 220,000 (KewalRamani, Gilbertson, Fox, & Provasnik, 2007). Nonetheless, as Jackson's (1991) review of the literature indicated,

> Racist perceptions, both in an individual and institutional sense, are still rather dominant, and subsequently have a tendency to not only restrict access for those who possess the requisite credentials but also stifle the professional growth of those already in academia such that they become less visible signs of success. (p. 145)

In turn, there are fewer individuals to help alleviate the isolated conditions of faculty of color presently in the system and to foster an environment that encourages others to pursue a faculty career (Jackson, 1991).

Those doctorates of color who do enter the professoriate often face structural barriers when it comes to promotion and tenure. Indeed, successful promotion and tenure has been one of the most contentious issues facing faculty of color and is also a major factor involved in retention. Baez (1998) qualitatively examined the experiences of faculty of color in the promotion and tenure process. Study participants discussed the role of individual and institutional racism in shaping their promotion and tenure process. Although faculty of color were often promised institutional acceptance of alternative research methods and action-oriented scholarship before entering academic positions, their research was not rewarded during tenure review as it often did not conform to traditional notions of valued research.

Other scholars suggest that faculty socialization into the academy, including whether they receive mentoring from senior faculty, remains one of the more important factors in the successful promotion and tenure of any faculty member. More specifically, acculturation to how individuals balance the demands of research, scholarship, and teaching is often required for continual promotion. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) found inadequate anticipatory socialization to be an obstacle that particularly affects the promotion of faculty of color. They defined anticipatory socialization as the opportunities prospective faculty members have as

graduate students to be introduced to the roles and expectations of the professoriate. Faculty of color socialization has also been examined with regards to mentoring experiences.

Drawing from personal experience and the narratives of other Black faculty at predominantly White institutions, Sutherland (1990) explained how a lack of mentoring for junior African American faculty often leaves these scholars "responsible for their own intellectual development and academic success" (p. 19). This intellectual isolation adversely affects research accomplishments and contributes to African American faculty having "little or no access to information on the informal processes to upward advancement" (p. 20). Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, and Reed (1989) argued that lack of mentoring relationships with senior faculty and networking opportunities are major factors in the attrition of women and faculty of color. Gender differences persist when considering faculty of color alone, with women of color being less satisfied and less clear about tenure expectations than their male counterparts (Trower & Bleak, 2004).

Adding to these challenges is the hostile racial campus climate encountered by many faculty of color, which results in feelings of alienation and otherness. Based on qualitative data collected from 64 faculty of color and quantitative analyses of national data (including data from the 1990 Census and the National Research Council Survey of Doctorates), Turner, Myers, and Creswell (1999) explored minority underrepresentation at seven institutions in the Midwest. Participants of their study reported several issues of racial/ethnic bias contributing to what the authors refer to as a "chilly climate" problem at their institutions. Being denied tenure or overlooked for promotion, being held to standards higher than those for White faculty, being a "token" faculty member, and being expected to handle minority affairs were common occurrences that characterized negative climate. As a result, participants felt isolated, lacked information about tenure and promotion, found their work environments unsupportive and struggled with gender bias, language barriers, lack of mentorship, and lack of support from superiors.

Exploring the powerful effects of racial and ethnic bias, Villalpando and Delgado Bernal (2002) probed the pernicious influence of racism in higher education by providing a critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. Their analysis of thirty-year national trends data provided an overview of the persistent stratification of faculty of color by institutional type, academic department, and academic rank. Villalpando and Delgado Bernal (2002) found that faculty of color are most underrepresented at private four-year institutions and at

selective institutions, while concurrently overrepresented in the lower academic ranks and less prestigious academic fields. Additionally, the authors reported dissaggregated trends on representation for the different racial groups and, in doing so, uncovered interesting nuances. For example, Asian American faculty accounted for two of the three percentage point improvement in the representation of faculty of color at the full professor rank from 1972 to 1989. Their descriptive data indicated that faculty of color as a group, compared to White faculty, were as productive in research and publications, and spent more time preparing for and teaching courses and advising/counseling students. However, despite these valuable attributes, faculty of color and women of color achieved success in the academy at lower rates than White colleagues and remained disproportionately overrepresented in less prestigious academic departments, ranks, and institutions. Villalpando and Delgado Bernal (2002) attributed these barriers to higher education's racialized structures and practices that undergird institutional racism within the academy.

Sutherland (1990) also called race and racism into question for the retention of faculty of color, asserting that "structural arrangements and socio-psychological conditions create disharmonious relationships between professors of color and the White academic institution" (p. 17). These conditions lead to an environment in which faculty of color experience discomfort and dissatisfaction. Allen et al.'s (2002) study found differences (although not always statistically significant) in levels of satisfaction among faculty by race. Whereas 37% of the White faculty indicated the highest level of satisfaction with their institution, only 23% of African American faculty were equally as satisfied. They reported that Black female faculty expressed the greatest overall dissatisfaction with their institutions. Black women were also most dissatisfied with their salaries (60% compared to 44% Black men and White women, and 37% White men).

Similarly, in a more recent study, Ponjuan (2006) examined the job satisfaction of Black and Latina/o faculty at higher education institutions relative to their White counterparts. Ponjuan's (2006) national study of job satisfaction in doctoral institutions utilized the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Survey, the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty–Institutional Survey, and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. His analysis employed hierarchical linear modeling multilevel statistics. Contrary to Allen et al. (2002), Ponjuan (2006) reported that Latina/o faculty members had significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than White faculty, whereas African Americans had comparable levels of satisfaction to Whites. Both Allen

et al. (2002) and Ponjuan (2006) highlighted the importance of disaggregating racial groups when examining the experiences of faculty of color.

While the aforementioned scholarship focuses on attrition, much can also be learned by examining factors that positively contribute to faculty persistence. In Turner et al.'s (1999) work, faculty who persist cited (a) satisfaction with teaching, (b) supportive administrative leadership, (c) a sense of accomplishment, (d) mentor relationships, (e) collegiality, and (f) interaction with other faculty of color as positive retaining factors. The connection between satisfaction and persistence was also made evident in Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) work. Their quantitative examination involved ten public institutions and over 1,500 participants. The researchers concluded that faculty morale, a multidimensional construct which included levels of well-being, loyalty, and quality of work, positively affected retention. However, their work did not specifically focus on the experiences of faculty of color.

Research indicates that faculty of color experience more hostile work environments, less support for their teaching and research, and greater feelings of isolation (Allen et al., 2002; Barnett, Gibson, & Black, 2003; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Griffin, 2008; Suh, 2008). Furthermore, the path to successful promotion and tenure is a more challenging task for faculty of color (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). In light of these differential experiences, this study employs a conceptual lens that recognizes the role of race and racism in the U.S., and seeks to offer a comprehensive exploration of the factors associated with retention and satisfaction of faculty of color that remain in the academy.

The existing literature is rich with qualitative narratives and descriptive qualitative analyses that identify various barriers (e.g., social isolation, lower salaries, lower academic rank, discrimination) facing faculty of color. However, whether and how these factors relate to intentions to leave academia remain understudied. This investigation offers a distinct perspective that employs blocked hierarchical regression analyses to examine on a national level links among racial climate, job satisfaction, and intentions to leave the academy. Additionally, while scholarship on faculty of color sometimes examines racial/ethnic groups separately (e.g., Allen et al., 2002; Ponjuan, 2006) and, in other instances, combines all minority faculty together (e.g., Astin et al., 1997; Turner, 2003), research has not empirically evaluated what is lost or gained in examining faculty of color as a collective versus differentiating racial/ethnic categories. This study sheds light on the implications of the construction of racial/ethnic categories in research. White faculty are also examined in the analysis as a distinct racial category.

Theoretical Framework: Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) within education is an evolving methodological, conceptual, and theoretical construct that attempts to disrupt race and racism in education (Solórzano, 1998). Critical race theory provides an interpretive framework for theorizing about race and its intersectionality with other forms of subordination and domination (e.g., gender, social class, nativity). Originally developed and applied in the area of legal studies (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Delgado, 1995), CRT has been extended to the field of educational studies (Tate, 1997; Yosso, 2006). As an orienting lens, critical race theory challenges the dominant ideologies that call for objectivity and neutrality in educational research. CRT posits how notions of neutrality typically serve to camouflage the interests and ideology of dominant groups in the U.S. and argues that they should be challenged and dismantled (Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999; Smith-Maddox & Solórzano, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). It enables scholars to ask the important question of what racism has to do with inequities in education in unique ways.

Scholars have argued racism is deeply rooted in American society; therefore, any discussion of diversity in higher education must be situated within the context of racism's proliferation in the history of this nation (Allen et. al., 2002; Bonilla-Silva, 2001; Brown et al., 2005; Feagin, 2006; Hale, 2004). A central feature of critical race theory as originated in legal studies is the recognition of the permanence and pervasiveness of race and racism in U.S. society (Bell, 1993). Such acknowledgement is essential in analyzing how structural barriers impede the success of faculty of color and for moving the discussion beyond a simple matter of underrepresentation in the pipeline (Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). In this study, CRT was particularly useful for interpreting and drawing conclusions from the study results. While the research literature reviewed offers insight into the experiences and challenges faced by faculty of color, questions about the extent to which these experiences, perceptions, and environmental factors relate to faculty intentions to leave the academy remain unexplored.

Research Methodology

Data Source

Data for this study are from a 2001 national survey of teaching faculty collected as part of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program

(CIRP), sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). The survey collects demographic and biographical information and focuses on faculty procedures, practices, professional priorities, opinions, perceptions of the institution, and satisfaction ratings (see Lindholm, Astin, Sax, & Korn [2002] for a description of the sampling procedures). Additionally, some institutional variables were drawn from the Integrative Postsecondary Education Database System (IPEDS).

The faculty survey was administered at 416 colleges and universities nationwide (Lindholm et al., 2002) and had a 41% response rate. There are 338 four-year institutions and 78 two-year institutions represented in the dataset. Of the four-year colleges and universities, 120 are public institutions while the remaining 218 are private.

In this study, *faculty member* is defined as any full-time employee of an accredited college or university whose reported principal activities were teaching and research (those who identified their principle activity as administrative, serving clients and patients, or activities other than teaching and research were deleted from the sample). Historically Black Colleges and Universities were deleted from this analysis due to the major qualitative differences between these institutions and predominantly White institutions, particularly in terms of the experiences of faculty of color.

The main analyses for this study were based on a subsample of all faculty of color within the entire surveyed sample, which included African Americans, American Indian/Alaskan Natives, Latina/os, and Asian/Asian Americans. After deleting institutions with fewer than five faculty of color respondents and also eliminating missing cases on the dependent variable, the dataset included 37,582 faculty from 358 institutions. Within the subsample of faculty of color ($n = 4,131$), analyses were conducted on 942 faculty who identified as Black/African American, 1,630 Asian/Asian American faculty, and 1,097 Latina/o faculty to capture if and what differences might have been missed by grouping faculty of color together. Separate analyses were not conducted on American Indian/Alaskan Native faculty due to small sample size. The final racial subgroup analyzed was White faculty ($n = 33,451$). Although faculty of color comprise only 11% of our sample, this number is close to their true proportion (16%) in the professoriate nationally. A noteworthy limitation of the study sample is that it does not include faculty who actually left the academy. Therefore, the results should be understood as a conservative estimate of the potential impact of any particular factor.

Variables

The main dependent variable used to explore faculty retention was based on answers to two questions on the 2001 Faculty Survey: "During the last two years, have you considered leaving the academy for another job?" (scaled "yes" or "no") and "If you were to begin your career again, would you still want to be a college professor?" (five-point scale from "definitely yes" to "definitely no"). Research indicates a positive, significant relationship between faculty intentions to leave the academy and actual leaving behavior (Bluedorn, 1982; Lee & Mowday, 1987). Scores on the two variables were added together to construct the retention dependent variable (see Appendix A for factor analysis). An increase in this variable indicates a greater likelihood of staying in the academy. The second dependent variable, job satisfaction, was a factorial composite measure of four separate items assessing respondents' satisfaction with salary and fringe benefits, opportunity for scholarly pursuit, teaching load, and overall job satisfaction (four-point scale from "not satisfied" to "very satisfied").

A key variable in our examination and as identified in the existing literature was an institutional index of racial climate. This index was created by first constructing an individual level variable, which gauges the influence of racial climate on the experiences of faculty of color. Individual faculty perceptions of the racial climate were composed of five items from the 2001 Faculty Survey (see Appendix B). Construction of this composite variable was guided by the theoretical conceptualization of racial climate articulated by Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, and Allen (1999). According to Hurtado and her colleagues, the institutional context for racial climate contains four dimensions: (1) historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion, (2) structural diversity, (3) psychological climate of perceptions and attitudes between and among groups, and (4) behavioral climate. The five items comprising the racial climate composite variable reflected the range of these dimensions (see Table 1). As with the outcome variables, the racial climate measure was reverse coded so that an increase in the variable indicates a more positive racial climate, and a decrease indicates a more negative climate. The racial climate index was then created by taking the aggregate of faculty of color's perceptions of racial climate at each institution.

Other independent variables were based on the literature and included background characteristics, institutional characteristics, college environments and experiences, and faculty beliefs, values, and attitudes. In creating the regression model for analyses, a few variables were omitted to avoid problems with multicolinearity. Omissions were made where

TABLE 1

List of Items That Make Up the Racial Climate Variable under the Corresponding Dimension of Racial Climate Each Reflects

Individual Psychological
Faculty of color are treated fairly here
During the last two years subtle discrimination has been a source of stress

Individual Behavioral
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here

Structural Representation
This institution should hire more faculty of color

Structural Legacy of Inclusion or Exclusion
Racial and Ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum

variables were highly correlated and where there was no strong theoretical justification for including both highly correlated variables in the model. See Appendix B for a list of variables and indices, including a detailed explanation of the variables omitted.

Analysis

Cross-tabulation analyses were used to explore the relationships between faculty intent to leave the academy and racial/ethnic identity, overall job satisfaction, and racial climate. We utilized hierarchical blocked regression analysis to explore the factors associated with intentions to leave the academy and overall job satisfaction for faculty of color. This methodology observes changes in the predictive effects of the other variables (those already in the model as well as the "potential" effects of those not yet entered). Thus, changes in standardized beta coefficients can be compared on a block-by-block basis.

Hierarchical blocked regression analyses were then conducted on the faculty of color subsample, with each block of independent variables included in hypothesized temporal order. The three blocks included background characteristics, institutional characteristics, and environment or experiences. Because the survey items were administered at only one time point, it is difficult to determine the causal relationship among some variables.

Nonetheless, the first two blocks of variables include those characteristics of the individual faculty member or institution that are fixed or defined as the faculty member enters the academy, while the third block consists of activities and behaviors that faculty members experience over time while at the institution.

To further investigate differences between groups within the faculty of color umbrella category, the variables remaining in the stepwise regression results for faculty of color were then regressed (using the force enter function) on Black, Asian, and Latina/o faculty separately (note: other groups were omitted due to small sample size). The purpose of disaggregating faculty of color was to capture differences often lost when grouping all non-White faculty together. These same variables were also regressed onto a comparison sample of White faculty.

Preliminary Findings

Previous research indicates that an institution's racial climate impacts the quality of life and experiences of people of color in the academy (Hurtado et al., 1999). Many of the hindrances described by faculty of color as contributing to a hostile racial climate involve feeling that issues pertaining to ethnic and racial diversity are marginalized, encountering a dearth of faculty and students of color in their respective departments, and experiencing a lack of support and encouragement for their research, especially if that work is concerned with issues of diversity and equity. Because of the import of racial climate in past scholarship and its conceptual relevance to our research aims, our preliminary analysis focused on how climate issues affect retention.

Cross-tabulations revealed that more faculty of color who perceived a hostile racial climate[2] (44%) indicated a desire to leave compared to those who perceived a moderate/mild (30%) or a benign racial climate (27%). This is cause for concern, given that nearly three-fourths rated the climate at their institution to be moderately to highly negative. On a positive note, however, of the faculty who reported a high level of satisfaction, an overwhelming majority (70%) had not thought about leaving the academy. This preliminary finding suggests retention rates might be improved by increasing overall job satisfaction. Clearly, it is important to better understand factors associated with job satisfaction and faculty attrition and how these issues play out within the context of faculty members' perceptions of institutional racial climate.

Disaggregating faculty of color revealed that American Indians (44%) more often reported an intention to leave the academy, followed by African American (39%), Latina/o (36%) and Asian American faculty (27%). The differences remind us of the immense variation between (and within) racial/ethnic categories and the need to study groups individually.

Results and Findings

Study results are first presented for faculty of color in the aggregate and subsequently, disaggregated by race for both dependent variables

(i.e., retention and satisfaction). Finally, for the purpose of having a comparison group and to acknowledge the racialized nature of being labeled "White" in the United States, results are also presented for White faculty.

Retention for Faculty of Color (in the aggregate)

While background characteristics seem to have a small effect on retention for faculty of color, the quality of experiences once the individual arrives at an institution have the greatest impact on retention (see Table 2). Faculty of color who are married (final $\beta = 0.05$), those with higher base salaries (final $\beta = 0.07$), and those at the higher academic ranks (final $\beta = 0.04$) have a greater likelihood of staying in the academy compared to their respective counterparts. In terms of institutional characteristics, private institutions are doing a better job of retaining faculty of color. We also find that negative racial climate is not detrimental to retention for faculty of color considered as an aggregate. The racial climate variable initially has a highly significant simple correlation of 0.07 ($p \leq 0.001$) with the outcome measure of retention. However, climate

TABLE 2

Factors Associated with Retention†

	Final ß Coefficients				
Variables	Faculty of Color (*n* = 4,131)	Black (*n* = 942)	Asian Americans (*n* = 1,630)	Latina/o (*n* = 1,097)	White (*n* = 33,451)
Block 1: Background characteristics					
Marital Status	0.05 ***	0.07 *	0.05 *	0.04 *	0.03 ***
Gender	x	x	−0.06 *	x	−0.01 *
Block 2: Institutional characteristics/status					
Base salary	0.07 ***	x	0.10 **	0.11 **	0.11 **
Academic rank	0.04 *	0.09 *	x	x	0.04 ***
Institutional control: private	0.05 **	0.07 *	x	x	0.03 ***
Racial climate: benign	x	x	x	x	−0.05 ***
Carnegie Research 1	x	x	x	x	−0.06 ***
Block 3: Environment/experiences					
Satisfaction	0.27 ***	00.25 ***	00.29 ***	0.29 ***	0.31 ***
Research valued	0.09 ***	x	00.10 ***	0.04 ***	0.12 ***
Autonomy & independence	0.07 ***	0.13 ***	x	x	0.07 ***
Review/Promotion process	−0.09 ***	−0.09 **	−0.11 ***	−0.11 ***	−0.07 ***
Advising students	x	x	0.06 **	x	0.02 ***

*** $p < 0.001$,   ** $p < 0.01$,   * $p < 0.05$
† An increase in Retention variable indicates the more favorable outcome (i.e., staying in the academy)
x Final ß not significant

becomes insignificant when other institutional characteristics, such as private university and Carnegie Research I university, are held constant.

Our findings show that the stress and anxiety induced by the review and promotion process make it more difficult to remain in the academy (final $\beta = -0.09$). The data suggest that such pressures are most prevalent at Research I universities, as the strong negative relationship between review/promotion and retention drops from a beta of -0.16 to a beta of -0.09 (β at steps 2 and 3) after the institutional characteristics (e.g., Carnegie classification status) are controlled. Interestingly, while tenure increases likelihood of retention, presumably by decreasing pressures associated with advancement on the promotion ladder), the data reveal that tenure does not completely eliminate the negative effects of a hostile racial climate. This finding suggests that faculty of color at higher academic ranks are more likely to be retained (final $\beta = 0.04$) because they have learned to cope with, have become less vulnerable to, or have developed resistance to hostile racial climates.

Understanding factors associated with overall satisfaction may provide additional insight into retention issues, given the strong relationship (final $\beta = 0.27$) between overall satisfaction and retention. Another critical factor in retaining faculty of color is a sense that one's work is valued by others in the department; this is highly correlated with retention after controlling for overall satisfaction. In other words, even when faculty of color are not satisfied with their jobs overall, they are likely to be retained if they perceive their scholarship to be valued by departmental colleagues, or if they are given autonomy and independence.

Satisfaction for Faculty of Color (in the aggregate)

Table 3 presents the factors related to overall job satisfaction for the various samples. For the aggregate faculty of color group, autonomy and independence had the strongest relationship with overall job satisfaction (final $\beta = 0.36$), followed by having one's research valued by colleagues in the department (final $\beta = 0.27$). Again, like with retention, faculty of color who were the most stressed in the review and promotion process were the least satisfied with everyday worklife. Interestingly, although faculty of color at the higher ranks were less likely to leave the academy, they tended also to have lower overall job satisfaction (final $\beta = -0.05$). Although salary is often linked with rank, faculty of color were consistently more likely to report greater overall job satisfaction when they had higher base salaries irrespective of academic ranking.

The second block, institutional characteristics/status, account for 4% of the variance in the satisfaction outcome variable. In this block, we find satisfaction is greater when the racial climate is welcoming (final

TABLE 3

Factors Associated with Overall Job Satisfaction

	Final ß Coefficients				
Variables	Faculty of Color (*n* = 4,131)	Black (*n* = 942)	Asian Americans (*n* = 1,630)	Latina/o (*n* = 1,097)	White (*n* = 33,451)
Block 1: Background characteristics					
Marital Status	x	x	x	x	0.02 ***
Gender	x	x	x	x	x
Citizenship status	0.03 *	0.03 *	x	x	0.02 ***
Block 2: Institutional characteristics/status					
Base salary	0.05 *	0.05 *	x	x	0.10 ***
Academic rank	−0.05 **	−0.05 **	−0.08 *	x	−0.10 ***
Institutional control: private	x	x	x	x	0.01
Racial climate	0.04 *	0.06 *	x	0.10 **	0.03 ***
Institutional selectivity	0.07 ***	0.07 ***	0.10 ***	x	0.04 ***
Carnegie Research 1	−0.07 ***	−0.07 ***	x	x	−0.05 ***
Diversity of student body	x	x	x	x	x
Block 3: Environment/experiences					
Autonomy & independence	0.36 ***	0.36 ***	0.38 ***	0.37 ***	0.35 ***
Research valued by department	0.27 ***	0.27 ***	0.27 ***	0.25 ***	0.27 ***
Review/Promotion process	−0.14 ***	−0.14 ***	−0.16 ***	−0.09 **	−0.13 ***
Taught ethnic/women's studies	x	x	x	x	−0.01 *
Team-taught course	x	x	x	x	0.02 *

*** $p < 0.001$,　　**$p < 0.01$,　　*$p < 0.05$
x Final ß coefficient was *not* significant

$\beta = 0.04$) and at higher selectivity (or prestige) institutions (final $\beta = -0.07$). However, it appears faculty of color at Research I universities tend to be less satisfied (final $\beta = -0.07$). It is likely the pressure to publish at these institutions is intense and the reward structure does not acknowledge their other contributions. The negative influence of the tenure and review process (final $\beta = -0.14$) speaks to this interpretation. Such a rationale is further supported by the positive association between institutional selectivity and job satisfaction, suggesting the Research I university negative effect cannot be attributed to institutional prestige.

Retention for Faculty of Color (disaggregated by race)

Disaggregating results for the three faculty of color racial groups—Black, Asian, Latina/o—reveals noteworthy differences and provides a more nuanced picture of these faculty members' experiences (see Table 2). Autonomy and independence seem to play a highly significant role in

determining retention for Black faculty (final $\beta = 0.13$), while the autonomy and independence variable does not maintain a significant relationship with retention by the final betas for Latina/o and Asian faculty. Similarly, having one's research valued by individuals in one's department has a strong association with retention for Asian faculty, while it is overshadowed by other factors for the other two groups. One plausible explanation is that Black faculty, who research has shown are most likely to have their work scrutinized and devalued, are able to resist such barriers and persist in light of them so long as they have the autonomy to do the work they value. Stress from the promotion process consistently has a negative association with retention for all faculty of color subgroups.

The positive relationships between academic rank and retention observed, when considering faculty of color as a group, does not hold true across racial categories. Before accounting for experiences and environments, Asian faculty appear less likely to leave the academy as they reach the higher academic ranks (β at step 2 = 0.06). However, after taking institutional environments and experiences into consideration, Black faculty are the only group for which an increase in personal status on the promotion ladder is accompanied by greater retention. When Black faculty of color reach the higher academic ranks, they are most likely to persist in the face of negative experiences within the institutional environment.

The racial climate of an institution did not appear to deter Black, Asian, and Latina/o faculty from persisting, when considering the groups separately. Although there was a significant positive simple correlation between racial climate and retention for all three groups, the influence of racial climate became insignificant as other institutional characteristics were taken into consideration. The Carnegie Research I variable was insignificant for retention outcomes from step 1 through the final step of the regression equations for all three groups.

Although small, there was a positive association (final $\beta = 0.06$) between advising students and retention for Asian faculty not present in the other two groups. This effect was washed out when grouping all faculty of color together.

Satisfaction for Faculty of Color (disaggregated by race)

Black (final $\beta = 0.07$) and Asian (final $\beta = 0.10$) faculty were both much more likely to be satisfied with their careers when employed at more selective institutions (see Tables 3). This relationship did not emerge for Latina/o faculty. Regarding overall job satisfaction, all three groups were similarly affected by autonomy and independence, the perceived value of their research to colleagues within their department, and the review and promotion process.

In contrast, the three groups seemed to be affected differently by racial climate with regard to job satisfaction. Results indicate that the negative effect of a hostile racial climate is most pronounced for Black and Latina/o faculty. Racial climate begins with a strong correlation for Black faculty and Latina/o faculty (simple $r = 0.22$, for both), remaining significant throughout (final β of 0.06 and 0.10, respectively). The simple correlation between racial climate and satisfaction for Asian faculty (simple $r = 0.13$) indicates a higher level of satisfaction when the climate is benign; however, it seems that other factors account for the benefit of a positive racial climate. For Asian faculty, racial climate drops out of the equation when institutional characteristics are entered. The influence of several of these key variables in our model is also summarized in Table 4 across racial groups, including White faculty.

Retention and Job Satisfaction for White Faculty

We find that White faculty and faculty of color are influenced in similar ways by various institutional and experiential factors. As shown in Table 2, retention for White faculty is also associated with salary (final β = 0.11). Moreover, retention and satisfaction (see Table 2 and 3) are benefited by greater autonomy, having one's research valued in the department, and are impeded by stress resulting from the promotion process. As for Asian faculty, it appears that advising students has a positive association with retention (final β = 0.02) for White faculty.

TABLE 4

Standardized Beta Coefficients for Key Variable in Retention and Satisfaction Regressions by Race

Variables	Faculty of Color (n = 4,131)		Black (n = 942)		Latina/o (n = 1,097)		Asian Americans (n = 1,630)		White (n = 33,451)	
	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
Gender: female	(—)	(—)	x	(—)	(—)	x	—	x	—	(—)
Base salary	+	+	x	+	+	(+)	+	(+)	+	+
Academic rank	(+)	—	+	—	(+)	x	(+)	—	+	—
Racial climate*	(+)	+	x	+	(+)	+	x	(+)	—	+
Research valued	+	+	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Autonomy	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	(+)	+	+	+
Review/Promotion	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

R = retention, S = Satisfaction
X = no significant ß
+ = positive final ß
— = negative final ß
(+) = started positive but dropped out of the equation by the final step
(—) = started negative but dropped out of the equation by the final step

While several factors impacting retention were consistent across all groups, there was one striking difference in the results for White faculty. The data indicate that White faculty retention is greater where racial climate is more negative (final $\beta = -0.05$). Similar to results for faculty of color, institutional characteristics or status adds to the predictive power of the equation; in the experiences of White faculty, institutional characteristics account for 2% of the variance in faculty persistence. In other words, part of the reason for the differences in retention rates among faculty can be explained by the characteristics of their home institutions. Thus, it is noteworthy that a negative racial climate may actually benefit White faculty in determining retention outcomes.

Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications

So often we discuss disadvantage and underrepresentation without mentioning their corollaries—privilege and overrepresentation. Mocking this normative social failure to acknowledge systematic advantages afforded to the dominant racial group, Tim Wise (2005) has pointed out that there cannot be an "up" without a "down," an "in" without an "out," a "bottom" without a "top." Several studies have explored the challenges and barriers facing faculty of color in the academy, as this study set out to do, while hardly acknowledging the privileges afforded to White faculty in the process. As such, the discussion must be expanded to include and place greater emphasis on how White faculty benefit from institutional racism irrespective of whether they are consciously aware of or actively support racist attitudes/practices/policies (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Chesler & Crowfoot, 2000). In this study, the notion of privilege is most prominently reflected in the relationship between racial climate with both retention and satisfaction across different groups. Results from this national study of full-time faculty indicate that not only does a negative racial climate impede job satisfaction for faculty of color, but conversely, a negative racial climate is also associated with greater retention for White faculty. Together, these finding highlight the notion that racial hierarchy and advantage can be perpetuated without malicious intent.

Although the needs of faculty of color and White faculty differ in significant ways, they are in many respects fundamentally similar. The results indicate that while the impact of racial climate on retention and satisfaction is different, faculty of color and White faculty both benefit from higher salaries, greater autonomy and independence, and having one's research valued by colleagues, but are deterred by the promotion process (see Table 4). However, in keeping with a critical race theory framework, we recognize that while these values are held in common

regardless of race, they are expressed and experienced by faculty of color and White faculty in profoundly different ways. The disparity in retention rates for faculty of color and White faculty, therefore, may be a function of having the privilege to define what is valued and how excellence is measured. For instance, White faculty have the advantage of being defined and evaluated as autonomous individuals; meanwhile, faculty of color often experience the pressure of knowing that one's victories and failures will be taken to represent one's entire racial/ethnic category (Turner et al., 1999). It is well documented in the literature that faculty of color are more likely to pursue research related to issues of race and gender inequities and social justice. White faculty, who have historically dominated the power brokers of higher education institutions, are more likely to fit into and perpetuate previously defined research agendas and values. Relative to non-White faculty, they tend to produce scholarship on topics solicited by top tier journals and reach wider audiences of concern in the process. Research indicates for many faculty of color, the standards required for tenure proceed down one path, while their personal interests and agendas may follow another. Subsequently, as discussed previously, faculty of color are forced to find ways to straddle both successfully, lest they get pushed out of the academy.

While there is great value in looking at faculty of color in the aggregate, given the common experience of otherness, we gain a deeper understanding of the needs of specific groups by viewing them separately. For example, the racial climate variable drops out of the faculty of color regression equation at step 3, indicating that the positive association between racial climate and retention can be explained by the ways in which scholarship is evaluated, the autonomy and independence an individual enjoys, and the review and promotion process. However, disaggregating the faculty of color category reveals a lasting negative impact of a hostile racial climate on job satisfaction for Black and Latina/o faculty that goes beyond autonomy, appreciation afforded in research endeavors, and the promotion process. This does not appear to be the case for Asian faculty. Thus, when grouping faculty of color together, there is a danger of overlooking the unique circumstances and needs of specific groups.

This study sheds light on complex factors contributing to faculty of color satisfaction and retention—both in the aggregate and disaggregated for Blacks, Asians, and Latina/os. Among the key factors identified are perceptions of campus racial climate, autonomy and independence, review and promotion process, and having one's research valued by colleagues in the department. The literature has tied these issues to racial inequity in the academy. Nonetheless, it must be noted our results

remain a conservative estimate of the negative impact of racial climate on faculty experiences. Rather than indicating a negative racial climate is not detrimental to the retention of faculty of color, our findings suggest faculty of color who remained in the academy have found ways to deal with (perhaps through transformative resistance[3]) the oppressive space a hostile climate can create. What is not accounted for are the experiences of those faculty of color who have already left the academy, quite possibly due to issues resulting from a hostile racial climate. Future studies should also examine the factors leading to the attrition of faculty of color.

   The present findings, however, reveal how faculty of color may overcome a negative racial climate and also suggest tangible steps to be taken by institutional leaders concerned with improving faculty of color retention. For instance, the negative impact of the promotion and tenure process on retention and job satisfaction for faculty of color and White faculty speaks to the need to reform the traditional reward structure of the academy. A starting point may be to reexamine the value placed on mainstream journals and traditional forms of research in the promotion process. Considering how autonomy and feeling that one's research is valued are key factors to retaining faculty, a new look at what constitutes valuable research is needed. Furthermore, the involvement of faculty of color in evaluating such research and rethinking the promotion and tenure process are essential if efforts to recruit, retain and support faculty of color are to lead to substantive change. While institutional transformation is a slow and difficult process, the alternatives of failing to retain faculty of color and preserving a hostile racial climate are far more detrimental. Understanding the factors involved in broaching such change is the first step in the process of achieving greater equity in our society.

Construction of Factors for Analyses

Component	Factor Loadings
Job Satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.72$)	
How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job:	
Salary and fringe benefits	0.70
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	0.78
Teaching load	0.71
Overall job satisfaction	0.76
Racial Climate ($\alpha = 0.68$)	
Agreement with the following statements:	
This institution should hire more faculty of color*	0.68
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here*	0.68
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum*	0.65
Faculty of color are treated fairly here	0.72
Extent to which the following has been a source of stress in the last two years:	
Subtle discrimination*	0.68

*This item was reverse coded so that a higher score indicated a positive racial climate.

APPENDIX B

Description of Variables and Measures

Variables	Scale
Dependent Variables	
Retention	An index of two variables was created to measure faculty retention. Because there were only two variables specifically related to faculty intentions to leave the academy in the 2001 faculty survey, a factor could not be created. The first item asked respondents: "During the last two years, have you considered leaving the academy for another job?" This item is dichotomous: 1=no, 2=yes. The second question asked: "If you were to begin your career again, would you still want to be a college professor?" The second variable is measured on a five-point scale: 1=definitely yes, 2=probably yes, 3=not sure, 4=probably no, 5=definitely no. The retention outcome variable was reverse coded so that a higher score indicates a likelihood of staying in the academy.
Job satisfaction	A composite measure of four variables that assess respondents' satisfaction with the following: salary and fringe benefits, opportunity for scholarly pursuit, teaching load, overall job satisfaction. The four variables are measured separately on a four-point scale: 1=not satisfied, 4=very satisfied

APPENDIX B (*Continued*)

Description of Variables and Measures

Variables	Scale
Independent Variables	
Faculty background characteristics	
Gender: female	1=no, 2=yes
Marital status	1=single (including divorced or widowed), 2=married
Citizenship status*	1=not a U.S. citizen, 2=U.S. citizen
Institutional Characteristics/Status	
Base salary	Respondents are asked to provide the dollar value of their base institutional salary, rounded to the nearest $1,000.
Academic rank	1=Instructor/lecturer, 2=Assistant Professor, 3=Associate Professor, 4=Professor
Private university	1=no, 2=yes
Institutional selectivity*	Range: 400 to 1600
Carnegie Classified Research I Institution	1=no, 2=yes
Racial Climate Index	An institutional aggregate of an individual level composite measure. The composite variable is composed of five variables that assess faculty perceptions their institutional context for diversity (e.g., numeric diversity, race-relations, curricular inclusion, and differential treatment). More specifically, four of the five survey items asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with each of the following statements: Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum, This institution should hire more faculty of color, There is a lot of campus racial conflict here, Faculty of color are treated fairly here. The four variables are measured separately on a four-point scale: 1=disagree strongly to 4=agree strongly. The fifth item in the composite asked respondents to indicate the extent to which subtle discrimination has been a source of stress during the last two years. This item was based on a three-point scale: 1=not at all; 3=frequently. The racial climate measure was reverse coded so that an increase in the variable indicates a more positive racial climate. The institution level variable is the sum of the composite scores of all faculty of color within each institution.
Institutional environment/experiences	
Overall satisfaction rating**	1=not satisfied, 4=very satisfied
Research valued by department	My research is valued by faculty in my department: 1=disagree strongly, 4=agree strongly
Autonomy and independence***	1=not satisfied, 4=very satisfied
Review/promotion process	Source of stress during the last two years: 1=not at all, 2=extensive
Advising students	Hours per week: 1= none, 2=1 to 4, 3=5 to 8, 4=9 to 12, 5=13 to 16, 6=17 to 20, 7=21 to 34, 8=35 to 44, 9=45 +
Taught ethnic/women's studies course	1=no, 2=yes
Team taught a course	1=no, 2=yes

APPENDIX B (*Continued*)

Description of Variables and Measures

===

Variables omitted from regression model

The following variables were omitted from the regression model, before analysis, because they were highly correlated (Pearson correlation above an absolute value of 0.35) with other variables in the model: age, tenure status, faculty scholarly productivity, department values my teaching, satisfaction with professional relationships with faculty, hours spent per week on committee work and meetings, institutional selectivity.

The only two variables that exhibited a high correlation with one another but were still both included were academic rank and salary. Unlike tenure, and academic rank (also highly correlated), which arguably measure the same conceptual construct, we believed (based on the literature review) both academic rank and salary could not be omitted without losing something of theoretical value. Institutional selectivity was only entered in the second regression. Note that the difference in variables across the two regression models reflects differences with regard to which variables entered the analysis in the initial stepwise regression on the faculty of color subsample.

*This variable was only included in the second regression model, which employed the satisfaction dependent variable.
**This variable was *not* regressed on the satisfaction dependent variable.
***This satisfaction rating did not load with the other satisfaction variables in the factor analysis for the Job satisfaction dependent variable and was therefore included as a separate variable in the analysis.

Footnotes

[1] For the purposes of this study the term *faculty of color* refers to all non-White faculty. Additionally, the terms *African American* and *Black* are used interchangeably, given that they are not differentiated in the survey questionnaire.

[2] The unit of analysis for this measure is the individual faculty member, as opposed to an institutional aggregate measure of racial climate used in the multivariate analysis.

[3] A behavioral response to oppressive conditions that involves an awareness and critique of social oppression, and motivation to strive for individual and social change (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

References

Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The Black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*, 112–127.

Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., Bonous-Hammarth, M., & Stassen, M. (2002). Outsiders within: Race, gender, and faculty status in U.S. higher education. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 189–220). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(5), 482–602.

Antonio, A. L. (2003). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe, 6*, 14–17.

Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., Cress, C. M., & Astin, A. W. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professorate, 1995–1996*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.

Baez, B. (1998). *Negotiating and resisting racism: How faculty of color construct promotion and tenure.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED430420).

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

Barnett, E., Gibson, M., & Black, P. (2003). Proactive steps to successfully recruit, retain, and mentor minority educators. *Issue in Education*, *10*, 3, 18–28.

Bell, D. (1993). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.

Blackwell, J. E. (1981). *Mainstreaming outsiders: The production of Black professionals.* Bayside, NY: General Hall.

Bluedorn, A. (1982). The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, I*, 75–128.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-Civil Rights era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitlaw, M. (1994). *The academic profession: An international perspective.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown, M. K., Carnoy, M., Currie, E., Duster, T., Oppenheimer, D. B., Schultz, M. M., & Wellman, D. (2005). *Whitewashing race: The myth of a color-blind society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cheatham, H. E., & Phelps, C. E. (1995). Promoting the development of graduate students of color. In A. S. Pruitt-Logan and P. D. Issac, (Eds.), Student services for the changing graduate student population (pp. 91–99). *New Directions for Student Services*, No. 72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chesler, M. A., & Crowfoot, J. (2000). An organizational analysis of racism in higher education. In M. C. Brown (Ed.). *Organizational governance in higher education* (pp. 436–469). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.) (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New Press.

Delgado, R. (Ed.) (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 169–180.

Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic racism: A theory of oppression*. New York: Routledge.

Griffin, K. A. (2008). *Can reaching back push you forward?: A mixed methods exploration of Black faculty and their relationships with students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hale, F. W. (2004). *What makes racial diversity work in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Harvey, W. B. (2001). *Minorities in higher education, 2000–2001*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Jackson, K. W. (1991). Black faculty in academia. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 135–148). Albany: State University New York Press.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1994). A university's faculty: Predicating those who will stay and those who leave. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, *10*(1), 71–84.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 518–542.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness": Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, *21*(4), 315–342.

KewalRamani, A., Gilbertson, L., Fox, M., & Provasnik, S. (2007). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic minorities* (NCES 2001-039). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Knowles, M. F., & Harleston, B. W. (1997). *Achieving diversity in the professoriate: Challenges and opportunities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Lee, T. W., & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers' and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, *30*, 721–743.

Lindholm, JA. (2002). *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2001–2002 HERI Faculty Survey.* Los Angeles: University of California-Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1997). *Digest of education statistics 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Educational Statistics (2008). *Digest of educational statistics 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Parker, L., Deyhle, D., & Villenas, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ponjuan, L. (2006). A national study of job satisfaction of faculty of color in doctoral institutions. *Journal of the Professoriate, 1*, 45–70.

Rausch, D. K., Ortiz, B. P., Douthitt, R. A., & Reed, L. L. (1989). The academic revolving door: Why do women get caught? *CUPA journal*, *40*(1), 1–16.

Reyes, M. D. L., & Halcón, J. J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano Academics. In P. A. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 167–186). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*, 3, 285–309.

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

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, *31*, 405–424.

Smith-Maddox, R., & Solórzano, D. G. (2002). Using critical race theory, Paulo Freire's problem-posing method, and case study research to confront race and racism in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 66–84.

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 121–136.

Solórzano, D., & Yosso, T. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counterstorytelling, Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*(4), 471–495.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*(4), 701–736.

Suh, S. A. (2008). *The significance of race for Asian Americans: Access, rewards, and workplace experiences of academics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Sutherland, M. E. (1990). Black faculty in white academia: The fit is an uneasy one. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, *14*(1), 17–23.

Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, *22*, 195–247.

Thomas, G. (2001). The dual role of scholar and change agent. In R. O. Mabokela & A. L. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*, 6. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Tierney, W. G. (1999). Models of minority college-going and retention: Cultural integrity versus cultural suicide. *Journal of Negro Education*, *68*, 80–91.

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

Trower, C. A., & Bleak, J. L. (2004). *Study of New Scholars. Gender: Statistical Report [Universities].* Cambridge, MA: Harvard School of Education

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

Turner, C. S., Myers, S. L., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(1), 27–59.

Villalpando, O., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 243–269). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Weiler, W. C. (1985). Why do faculty members leave a university. *Research in Higher Education*, *23*, 3, 270–279.

Wilber, K. (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*. New York: Random House.

Wise, T. (2005, February 18). *White like me: Reflections on race from a privileged son*. Speech presented to Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, CA.

Yosso, T. J. (2006). *Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline*. New York: Routledge.