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The purpose of this correlational study was to examine the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention plans of 103 tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. The 59-item Faculty Retention Questionnaire was administered online and assessed perceptions of the academic climate defined by six variables (job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-student relationships, role conflict, role clarity, and retention). Demographic characteristics were also measured (e.g., racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status). Likert-type scales, multiple choice, and open-ended questions measured employment values and intent to stay in current position. Of the 725 surveys distributed, 103 were submitted, yielding an overall response rate of 14%.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) framed this study. Correlational results indicated that job satisfaction was significantly related to and highly important to the retention variable. Analysis of variance revealed that U. S. born faculty of color are more likely to be retained than non-U. S. born. Forward multiple regression analysis identified job satisfaction as the sole predictor of retention with job satisfaction only accounting for 23% of variance in retention. Further regression analysis identified social climate, role clarity, and role conflict as factors that best predict job satisfaction. Conclusions from the study raised larger questions regarding job satisfaction: (1) Does job satisfaction mean something different to faculty of color than it does to
mainstream faculty? (2) Do faculty of color perceive job satisfaction as part of their social/cultural experience? (3) Is job satisfaction a part of the dual reality that is inherent in people of color through the identification of being a member of an underrepresented group or by having minority status in America? Responses to these larger questions may be best understood through the recognition and understanding of Critical Race Theory. Findings suggest the importance of providing opportunities for the sharing of subjective cultural worldviews of faculty of color with mainstream faculty with the intent of creating greater understanding, cooperation, and positive relationships, thus serve as a retention strategy. This may provide the opportunity to build an academic climate that supports all faculty. The researcher offers other explanations and suggestions regarding the findings from this study that may be valuable in faculty of color retention.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The recruitment and retention of faculty of color pose a major challenge to many in American higher education. Since the 1960s, efforts to diversify higher education, from the student body to the faculty ranks, were led by the consciousness provided by the Civil Rights movement. When examining the college student population, there has been steady growth in the racial and ethnic diversity in the past few decades. For example, in the early 1970s college student enrollment was 87% White and 13% non-White (Chait & Trower, 2001) changing to 73% White and 27% non-White in 2000 (Snyder & Hoffman, 2000), an increase of 14% non-White students. Consequently, one of the most visible and acknowledged demographic changes in higher education since the 1970s has been the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of college students; yet, this change has not been accompanied by a similarly increasing racial and ethnic diversity of faculty (Antonio, 2002).

In the early 1970s, Whites comprised approximately 95% of all full-time faculty (Chamberlain, 1998). Twenty years later the representation of White faculty had decreased by just 7 percentage points, to 88% (Carter & Wilson, 1997); approximately thirty years later, in early 2000, White faculty comprised 85% (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004). While non-White student enrollment has increased over the past 30 years from 13% in early 1970s to 27% in 2000, non-White faculty has only increased from 5% (Chamberlain, 1998) to 15% in 2001 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004). The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) provides further evidence of the sluggish increase of faculty of color at higher education institutions (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004).
During the 2003-04 school year, the NSOPF (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004) conducted a study that included 1,080 public and private not-for-profit degree-granting postsecondary institutions and a sample of 35,000 faculty and instructional staff. Of the 15%, faculty of color in United States colleges and universities in 2001 was (based on a total excluding persons whose race/ethnicity was unknown): 6% Black; 5 % Asian/Pacific Islanders; 3 % Hispanic; and 0.5 % American Indian/Alaska Native. Nearly half of college faculty (48%) were White males, while 35% were White females. Clearly, male and female faculty of color are underrepresented in the academy. Furthermore, almost half of all Black faculty members teach at historically Black colleges (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). Just as alarming is the fact that most faculty of color are untenured or hold junior faculty positions (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997). For all these reasons, many college and university campuses continue to struggle with developing new approaches and strategies for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty (Aguirre, 2000; Antonio, 2003; Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2004).

One strategy used by many higher education institutions, affirmative action, has failed to produce significant diversity in the faculty. Despite its failure, affirmative action has increasingly come under political attack with court cases and statewide anti-affirmative action initiatives (Tierny & Chung, 2002; Washington & Harvey, 1989). In the face of 30 years of affirmative action, and contrary to public perceptions, the American faculty profiles remain largely White and largely male, especially at preeminent universities (Chait & Trower, 2002).

Chait and Trower (2002) believed that even if the pipeline of faculty of color were largely supplied with underrepresented groups, a fundamental challenge would still linger. The supply would empty into a climate that faculty of color too often experience as non-supporting, uninviting, unwelcoming, unappealing, and, often, invalidating. Because of this
unaccommodating/unwelcoming climate, Chait and Trower (2002) found that many otherwise qualified candidates forgo graduate school altogether, others withdraw midstream from graduate school, and still others - doctorate in hand – opt for alternative careers. In short, Chait and Trower (2002) strongly believe the pipeline leading to a racially diverse faculty in higher education leaks.

As further explained by Chait and Trower (2002), academe has a strong culture. This culture, represented by a set of beliefs and assumptions (often unspoken and unwritten) guide individual and collective behavior that shapes the way institutions of higher education do business. Because strong cultures are not easily changed, adjustments to new external circumstances and priorities such as managing an unaccommodating/unwelcoming culture and climate can, in fact, be quite challenging.

Unwelcoming climates are sometimes described as having a chilly, or even, frigid climate. Research on chilly climates has called attention to incongruent experiences relating to gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, and other types of difference. Improving the climate by addressing issues such as unintentional and unconscious biases against underutilized groups will benefit all members of the organization (Advance Center for Institutional Change, 2003). Because one of the major challenges facing universities in the United States today is this uninviting culture, many have tried to build more welcoming climates on their campuses for faculty of color (Chang, Witt, & Hakuta, 2002; Collins, 1990; Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001; Rosser, 1990).

A vast discrepancy in faculty representation still exists. Increasing the number of underrepresented faculty requires more than just focusing on recruitment efforts. Efforts toward
retaining underrepresented faculty are also important because even the most successful recruitment strategies are futile if faculty are dissatisfied and do not remain at the university.

Tack and Patitu (1992) describe many reasons why faculty of color are dissatisfied with their jobs and look for employment outside academia. These include: feelings of isolation, experiences with prejudice and discrimination, lower professional ranks, lower salaries, and lack of tenured status. Common concerns among faculty of color include their limited opportunities to participate in departmental and institutional decision-making; excessive and *token* committee assignments; limited occasions to assume leadership positions or achieve an institutional presence; research that is trivialized and discounted; lack of mentors; and little guidance about the academic workplace or the tenure process (Aguirre, 2000). Other scholars writing in this area have identified the many distinct problems that faculty of color face and have suggested that these problems arise from subtle discrimination in academic structures (Hall & Sandler, 1982; Hersi, 1993; Sutherland, 1990; Tack & Patitu, 1992).

Faculty are the fundamental resource around which the process and outcomes of postsecondary education revolve. They often determine curriculum content, student performance standards, and the quality of students’ preparation for careers. Faculty members perform research and development work upon which America’s technological and economic advancement depends. Tenured faculty, in particular, have a significant influence on campus culture and climate through their influence on campus policies and classroom experiences (Green, 1989). Through their public service activities, faculty make valuable contributions to society (Cuadraz, 1997).

Faculty of color also have an enormous impact on both educational programs and students (Louque & Quezada, 2004) and can enhance the overall quality of higher education institutions.
Irvine (1992) and Green (1989) support the presence and need of faculty of color because they serve as role models, mentors, advisors, and faculty leaders. Likewise, Louque (1994) found that faculty of color serve as role models and provide encouragement to all students. While more is known about the status of students than about faculty (Altbach & Lomotey, 1991), many outside of the academe also recognize the valuable role faculty of color play at colleges and universities.

In her United States Supreme Court majority opinion regarding affirmative action on college campuses, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor stated, “the skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas and viewpoints” (Cohen & Sterba, 2003). A diverse faculty, accruing to Turner (2002) enhances the educational quality and outcomes for all students, not just minorities. As the Association of American Universities (1997) maintained in a full-page ad in the New York Times, “without racial diversity, the quality and texture of the entire educational experience is diminished”. Since graduates will be entering a diverse world, they will be well served if they are exposed to faculty of diverse cultures using varying research perspectives, teaching methods, and curricula (Piercy, Giddings, Allen, Dixon, Meszaros, & Joest, 2003).

Given the changing demographics of the nation, the need to diversify the faculty is important (Antonio, 2003; Turner, 2002). While it has been projected that student enrollment in higher education will increase, there will be a decline in the availability of faculty, especially those from underrepresented groups (Johnston & Packer, 1987). Faculty of color have an overall positive effect on higher education campuses and its students. Additionally, the quality of instruction is perceived to improve when faculty of color are present (Louque, 2000). Understanding who faculty of color are (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004) and identifying the
characteristics and factors that strengthen institutional climates making them more conducive to the retention of faculty of color is critically important.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this correlational study was to examine the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention plans of 103 tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. Demographic characteristics were divided into background information of the respondent (i.e., ethnic/racial background, institutional information, academic discipline, etc.). The examination of background information was important in identifying characteristics and factors contributing to retention of faculty of color.

The perceptions of the academic climate were measured by a total of five variables; three variables (job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-student relationships) identified in the Academic Setting Evaluation Questionnaire (Fernandez & Mateo, 1993) and two variables (role conflict and role ambiguity) identified in the Role Conflict/Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Both a Likert-type scale and open-ended questions measured employment values and continuation plans, the dependent variable.

Research Questions

1. Do job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-student relationships, role clarity, and role conflict significantly relate to the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

2. Are there significant group differences (racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status) in employment continuation plans of tenured
and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

3. Which factors best predict the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

Theoretical Framework

Critical Race Theory (CRT) framed the research questions of this study. This theoretical framework was developed within the context of the African American experience and designed to assist in the recognition and understanding of the role that race has played in America (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT begins with a number of basic insights. One is that racism is normal, not unusual, in American society. Delgado and Stefancic (2000) explain, “Because racism is an ingrained feature of our landscape, it looks ordinary and natural to persons in the culture” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2000, p. xvi). Specifically, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) claim that there is difficulty when addressing faculty of color issues/concerns without understanding the racial implications that are natural aspects of their everyday experiences. Formal laws and rules can address the more extreme and shocking forms of injustice but can do little about the business-as-usual forms of racism that people of color confront on a daily basis and accounts for isolation and hopelessness (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000).

According to Delgado and Stefancic (2000), CRT developed in the mid-1970s with the early work of those whom were deeply troubled over the slow pace of racial reform in the United States. New approaches were needed to understand and come to grips with the more subtle, but just as deeply entrenched, varieties of racism that characterize our times. CRT offers a useful framework in which to propose innovative strategies and can have profound implications on the retention of faculty of color at colleges and universities in America.
CRT movement is a collection of scholars and activists interested in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power. Offering a new and different way of thinking about race, CRT challenges racial oppression and status quo (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT not only tries to understand the social situation but to change it: setting out not only to ascertain how society organizes itself along racial lines and hierarchies, but also to transform it for the better.

Transformation sometimes takes the form of storytelling in which writers analyze the myths, presuppositions, and receive wisdoms that make up the common culture about race and naturally favors the dominant group at the expense of the minority groups. Storytelling (sharing life narratives) is important because each race has its own origins and ever-evolving history thus no person has a single, easily stated, unitary identity. This concept is called intersectionality; the notion that everyone has overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiances (Delgado & Stepfancic, 2001). For example, a white female may be Jewish, a lesbian, or a single mother. An African-American may be a Democrat, a Republican, or from a rural background. An Asian may be Japanese, working class, or in a wheelchair. Kimberle Crenshaw speaks powerfully to the complexity in comprehending intersectionality:

Discrimination, like traffic through an intersection, may flow in one direction, and it may flow in another. If an accident happens in an intersection, it can be caused by cars traveling from any number of directions and sometimes, from all of them. Similarly, if a Black woman is harmed because she in the intersection, her injury could result from sex discrimination or race discrimination (Neal 2003, p. 127).

Consequently, intersectionality is critically important to understand when listening to the perspectives/narratives of faculty of color.
To better understand CRT, West (2001) and W. E. B. DuBois (1903) offer scholarly insights concerning race in America. Where CRT seeks to transform racial relationships, West (2001) and DuBois (1903) assist in the understanding of the elements that need to be transformed.

West (2001) believes that to engage in a serious discussion of race in America, conversation should begin not with the problems of black people but with the flaws of American society – flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes. West (2001) continues to argue that, “as long as people of color are viewed as a *them* the burden falls on blacks to do all the *cultural* and *moral* work necessary for healthy race relations. The implication is that only certain Americans can define what it means to be American - the rest must simply *fit in*” (pp. 6-7). Like West (2001), DuBois (1903) also explains the fundamental pressures of dealing with race on a daily basis in America, specifically reflecting upon the “insider-outsider” approach.

DuBois (1903) coined the term *double-consciousness* (psychic duality) in 1903 while writing his book, *The Souls of Black Folk*. *Double-consciousness* referred to the reality of being both Black and American. Neither of the two realities would allow the other to exist in “sweet serenity” (Buckery, 2004). This term was an attempt to describe the mental adjustment required to deal with the day-to-day racial inequalities experienced by African Americans living in the United States. DuBois (1903) frames his theory of *double-consciousness*:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, -an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife, -this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. (DuBois, 1903)
DuBois’ theory was developed during an era of American history in which African Americans were not able to assimilate into the dominant culture. Prior to this point in history, African Americans had been stripped culturally. While African Americans were no longer African, there was little done to truly make them feel like American citizens. For African Americans, this sense of homelessness caused identity problems that persist today in the African American community. But DuBois’ response to these circumstances was timeless, because his theory could be applied to other groups trying to assimilate into other societies who experienced similar difficulties (Bockting, 2000; Ridley, 1981; Thomas, 2002; Washington, 1972).

Considering this notion, the terms of a range of double perspective highlights the tension between insider and outsider positions or some variants of the latter such as the outsider within (Lyubansky, 2005; Smith, 2004). Because of race and racism in America, worldviews are shaped distinctively depending on individual experience of racial and cultural difference.

Race matters in America (West, 2001). Race separates (individuals, groups, organizations, cultures) and then exposes people of color to unique social and cultural situations (e.g., language, institutions, music, dress, food, etc.) unlike White America. Out of this experience come shared behaviors, attitudes, values that shape their worldview. Furthermore, not by law, but rather by economic need and/or necessity, the formations of cultural enclaves emerge. Progressively, cultural adaptations occur based on the environment, and the results of these experiences can be seen through segregated schools, hip hop culture, and, even, Ebonics. As a particular worldview develops from this experience, one of life’s realities materializes. The challenge is that one cannot stay in this reality all the time. Life requires worlds to collide. In the workplace, mall, grocery store, bank, school conference, or faculty meeting, realities fuse. Moving in and out of both realities (sometimes several times in a day) can create mental and physical drain (Adell,
1994; DuBois, 1903). Likewise, race matters not only in the formation of these attitudes, values, and beliefs, but also in the interpretation of both personal and professional experiences.

Faculty of color’s ability to negotiate and navigate institutions of higher education is a skill often spoken of but rarely explained. The essential psychological energies, exerted both explicitly and implicitly, required for navigational skill development can be manifested in ways that detract from the tenure process and even cause physical and emotional health problems (Thompson & Dey, 1998). Even more disturbing is the notion that the faculty of color who enter the university searching for validation from White culture or, even more detrimental, unclear as to where their validation comes from, are prone to become attrition statistics.

By listening to faculty of color voices, leaders at higher education institutions can better understand the different histories and experiences that faculty of color have had regarding race in America. Through these different experiences, life stories (narratives) can reconstruct a different reality that is unlike the social world of many of the majority culture. By speaking and writing about them, these words and stories can contribute to a better, fairer world. In addition, minority status, in other words, brings with it a presumed competence to speak about race and racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Communication to White counterparts about matters of race, which the Whites are unlikely to know, can assist if transforming racial relationships is a reality. While CRT seeks to transform racial relationships, establishing opportunities for communication is a great place to begin this transformation (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). CRT offers a useful framework in which to propose innovative strategies and can have profound implications on the retention of faculty of color at colleges and universities in America.
Significance of the Study

Findings from this study present an understanding of the ways in which faculty of color view their work environment as connected to their views of their employment options. Specifically, information is provided on how factors (job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-student relationships, role conflict, and role clarity) relate to decisions by tenured and tenure-track faculty of color in continuing in their current positions at universities in Ohio. These factors and their impacts have enormous consequences on both educational programs and students (Louque & Quezada, 2004).

A diverse faculty enhances the overall quality of higher education institutions (Louque, 2000). Through their influence on campus policies and classroom experiences, faculty of color have an important affect on campus culture and climate (Green, 1989). When faculty of color are present, educational quality and outcomes for all students, not just students of color, is enhanced (Turner, 2002). While faculty of color serve as role models and provide encouragement to all students (Irvine, 1992; Louque, 1994), they also give students the opportunity to learn from individuals who differ from themselves, help them communicate effectively with people of varied background, and assist students in fostering mutual respect and teamwork (Steele, 1992). Additionally, through their public service activities, faculty of color make valuable contributions to society (Cuadraz, 1997).

The skills needed in today’s increasing global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints (Cohen & Sterba, 2003). Since graduates will be entering a diverse world, they will be well served if they are exposed to faculty of diverse cultures using varying research perspectives, teaching methods, and curricula (Pierce, Giddings, Allen, Dixon, Meszaros, & Joest, 2003).
To conclude, the results of this study are intended to inform administrative and faculty leaders as they seek ways (through policies and practices) to strengthen institutional climates to make them more conducive to the retention of faculty of color.

Definitions of Terms

*Continuation/Retention Plans:* faculty intent to stay in current employment position; employment continuation plan.

*Critical Race Theory:* a theoretical framework developed within the context of the African American experience and designed to assist in the recognition and understanding of the role that race has played in America.

*Double-Consciousness:* a simultaneous understanding of dual socio-cultural realities.

*Faculty of Color:* a college or university faculty member who identify as African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, or Multiracial; also referred to as members of underrepresented groups; also referred to as diverse faculty.

*Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs):* colleges/universities founded to serve African Americans who were denied admissions to predominantly white institutions due to race.

*Intersectionality:* the notion that everyone has overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiances; no person has a single, easily stated, unitary identity.

*Narratives:* the sharing of life’s stories through individual perspectives.

*Worldview:* an individual’s experience of racial and cultural difference and is defined by one’s method of construing an event or experience.
Delimitations and Limitations

One delimitation of this study is the restriction of only collecting data from colleges and universities in Ohio. Generalizations to another population can only be accomplished when populations have similar characteristics. Since the accessible population in this study only included faculty from Ohio, generalizability to colleges and universities across the United States decreases.

While this study utilized quantitative research methods, a qualitative component (such as in-depth interviews) could have enhanced the interpretation of the quantitative findings by adding individual perspectives. Survey questionnaire data usually provides only a snapshot rather than the rich context that in-depth interviews can provide (Patten, 1998). In-depth interviews reveal information that is not readily discovered through survey questions.

Another delimitation was using an electronic survey as it may have influence the participation of faculty of color at colleges and universities because of lack of access, comfort, and/or perceived threat to anonymity and confidentiality. And finally, using the term faculty of color instead of using specific racial and ethnic group names may have had a negative effect on the responses of those who dislike the term faculty of color.

A limitation of the study is the level of openness and honesty with which the participants responded to the survey. For example, many times people are swayed by social desirability (Patten, 1998). That is, they tend to give answers that they think are socially acceptable – even if they are not fully accurate. Although making the responses anonymous reduced the effects of social desirability, the need for approval and the desire to seek it is so strong in some people that they may have given socially desirable answers even when their responses were anonymous (Patten, 1998). Furthermore, because there was no opportunity to establish rapport with
respondents, this may have lead to some not exploring their feelings or spending time thinking about topics they may not have seriously considered before.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

The remainder of this dissertation focuses on the review of literature in chapter 2, methodology in chapter 3, results in chapter 4, and discussion in chapter 5.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Although there have been some substantial contributions to the field during the past two decades or so, empirical literature on the retention of faculty of color remains limited. This chapter presents a summary of the literature related to continuation plans for faculty of color and specifically explores the academic climate and culture. The following two areas will be reviewed: retention of faculty and retention of faculty of color (diverse perspectives, job satisfaction, social climate, role conflict and role ambiguity, student role model and mentor, and faculty service).

Retention of Faculty

College and university faculty function in important roles in the instructional, governance, and academic leadership arenas at higher education institutions. As a result, how the perceptions of various aspects of the academic work environment relate to the departure decisions-making process is of primary importance to colleges and universities. While this study examined retention plans of faculty of color, reviewing the research and literature on retention of all faculty is important.

Brown’s (1967) study of supply and demand factors in the academic labor market involved almost 10,000 faculty, characterized them in terms of being mobile, and linked this mobility to professional advancement. Brown’s study resulted in the identification of seven major factors influencing the decisions of faculty to depart: (1) competency of administrators; (2) research facilities and opportunities; (3) teaching loads; (4) salary; (5) courses taught; (6) competency of colleagues; and (7) congeniality of colleagues.

For the purpose of understanding how higher education institutions can retain women faculty members, Wenzel and Hollenshead (1994) studied the attitudes of tenured women faculty who
chose to leave one research university. Results identified negative aspects of the university work environment that influenced the faculty who were interviewed to depart, and included blocked career opportunities, receiving disrespectful treatment, insufficient personal or financial support, salary inequities, and mismatched personal and institutional goals.

Additionally, Smart (1990) created a causal model to investigate faculty turnover comprised of four sets of variables: individual and institutional characteristics, faculty job satisfaction, work environment measures, and intent to leave the current institution. He found that regardless of tenure status, faculty who were most likely to plan to leave the employing institution were those who were younger, were employed at institutions that had experienced decline or were characterized as having autocratic forms of governance, as well as those faculty who had lower levels of career satisfaction. Among tenured faculty, being male, spending more time on research, and having a strong record of scholarly productivity all influenced faculty to leave the employing institution.

Firmly established in the United States is the practice of obtaining student ratings of university faculty (Fernandez & Mateo, 1993). Student ratings have become the most widely used source of information on teaching effectiveness. While student ratings should never be the sole basis for evaluating teaching effectiveness, student appraisals can be invaluable when the questions asked are appropriate (Seldin, 1993). However, there are other studies that are not so positive. Ryan, Anderson, and Birchler (1980) revealed that a policy supporting a student evaluation instrument clearly reduced faculty morale, job satisfaction, and personal confidence in the institutional administration. As a result, student evaluations may be a factor on retention.

In other divisive studies involving student ratings, Aleamoni (1999) noted that conflicting results have been obtained when relating gender of the student and the gender of the instructor to
student evaluations of instruction. Also, in comparing three studies of the same 600 liberal-arts colleges, Seldin (1993) found that the number of institutions using student ratings to evaluate teachers had climbed from 29% to 68% to 86%. Therefore, the collection of student evaluations, at least when used for personnel decisions, may be a factor relating to a faculty member’s decision to stay or leave a university.

Gaining an in-depth understanding of the ways in which faculty view the work environment as connected to their view of their employment options is crucial. Likewise, gaining an in-depth understanding of these views can provide researchers and academic leaders with insights into faculty recruitment and retention issues and strategies. These perceptions can also assist in identifying the implications of faculty continuation decisions for a variety of outcomes, including teaching, research, service, scholarship, and productivity, among many others.

Retention of Faculty of Color

Based on research literature, institutional and organizational sources, and the voices of faculty and administrators, recruitment and retention of faculty of color are major concerns at many colleges and universities around the country. In general, recruiting is much more successful than retaining and promoting faculty of color.

Discussing diversity issues and developing plans rather than taking action and implementing strategies that result in significant outcomes tends to be the norm at institutions of higher education. The following paragraphs will present the experiences and reflect the voices of faculty of color that, many times, are not heard. Often faculty of color feel their work is not valued, which results in early departure decisions on the campuses of higher education institutions in America. Specifically, experiences from American Indians, Southeast Asians, African Americans, and other faculty of color, will be shared.
Diverse Perspectives

American Indians face numerous issues and difficulties at colleges and universities that tend to overshadow the successes. Stein (1994) identified several issues that American Indian faculty face: lack of mentors, lack of being valued or respected, and the lack of opportunities to conduct more research because of an abundance of service and teaching activities. He also found that American Indian faculty felt they had to work twice as hard as non-Indians to be accepted by their colleagues.

Several other recent publications (Aguirre, 2000; Cooper & Stevens, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2000) address these and other issues, such as: social and academic isolation, a “chilly” academic climate, lack of community, a heavy workload, stress, institutional racism, lack of faculty development, feeling unappreciated, and being viewed as a token hire, etc. Many of these issues are similar to those experienced by other faculty of color. The Southeast Asian Americans’ experience contains a slightly different focus than the aforementioned issues.

Nguyen-Lam’s (2002) study contributes Southeast Asian American teachers’ voices, perspectives, and experiences to the national effort to diversify the teaching force that better represent the racial, linguistic make-up of the student population. Focusing on issues of language, culture, and race and their roles in recruiting, preparing, and retaining ethnic and linguistic minority teacher candidates, this study examined Southeast Asian American faculty and teacher candidates from three California State University campuses. With high percentages of Southeast Asian American population on these campuses, surveys and engagement in critical dialogues (e.g. discussions using data from interviews with open-ended questions, observations, documents, and written narratives) were conducted to observe their personal experiences in relation to the institutional practices in dealing with issues of language, culture, and race. A
questionnaire was provided to the participants that included items pertaining to ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, experience with the U.S. School system, decision-making process to enter the teaching profession, and experiences with the institution’s admission and preparations processes. Questionnaire format included both surveyed items and written narratives. Participants who completed the questionnaire self-selected to participate in critical dialogues to further explore institutional barriers related to their linguistic, cultural, and racial backgrounds and identities.

Results of this study showed that issues of language, culture, and race were not adequately or effectively addressed in teacher education programs. The personal experiences of Southeast Asian American teacher candidates and faculty in the programs reflected a discrepancy between the written institutional commitment to diversity and the everyday practices in the recruitment, preparation, and retention process of diverse teacher candidates. A majority of linguistic and ethnic minority teacher candidates struggled with language and cultural barriers with little recognition and support from the program’s administration and faculty. In addition, the study found that critical dialogues as a research method, reveals information that is not readily discovered through survey questionnaires.

Looking specifically at African-American faculty at predominantly white institutions, Moore and Wagstaff (1988) identified five factors associated with the departure decision: (1) perceived racial discrimination; (2) desire to work at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs); (3) difficulty in obtaining tenure and promotion; (4) low priority placed on teaching at higher education institutions; and (5) the expectation to participate in numerous Black activities and groups. While this study was unique in focusing exclusively on African-American faculty at predominantly White institutions, Moore and Wagstaff’s (1988) model did not include certain
background factors that are usually associated with influencing the departure decision; marital status, household responsibilities, and number of dependents. Taking into account demographic information can assist in a better understanding of those factors related to early departure for faculty of color.

Turnover is higher for faculty of color (Thomas & Asunka, 1995), and therefore, the creation of a campus climate where faculty of color feel valued and are successful is essential. Moreover, turnover often reflects badly on an institution. Olmedo (1990) emphasizes that institutions’ commitment to retain diverse faculty must be reflected in programs and initiatives. Similarly, Davis (2002) and Davis (1998) note that the institutions most successful in increasing diversity employ proactive programs that address campus climate and support racial diversity.

**Job Satisfaction**

The critical need to recognize job satisfaction of faculty of color on university campuses is apparent today. The purpose of this section is to provide an understanding of the specific factors that contribute to job satisfaction among faculty of color. Job satisfaction is important when one considers staying or leaving an institution of higher education. Thoughtful consideration about the experiences of diverse faculty may assist the academy in developing supportive strategies that impact retention.

Turner and Myers (2000) concluded that job satisfaction for faculty of color could be articulated into three themes: (1) satisfaction with teaching and working with students; (2) supportive administrative leadership mentoring relationships and collegiality; and (3) interaction with other faculty. A genuine love of teaching and interactions with students were identified as the most satisfying aspects of faculty of colors’ work lives.
Astin, Antonio, Cress, and Astin (1997) revealed areas of high levels of job satisfaction among faculty of color as compared to majority faculty. Most faculty of color cited intellectual challenge as the most important component of job satisfaction. Slightly lower ratings for satisfaction in professional relationship with other faculty emerged in the findings. However, overall job satisfaction is lower for faculty of color and shows a wider range of differences than for White faculty.

Antonio’s (1998) inquiry sheds a bit more light on the specific factors contributing to job satisfaction. In his sample, 82% of the faculty of color ranked developing a meaningful philosophy of life as a very important or essential personal goal as compared to 78% for White faculty. Also, 77% of the faculty of color ranked promoting racial understanding as a second important personal goal compared to only 58% for White faculty. A third important personal goal was helping others in difficulty, ranging from 83% for African American faculty to a low of 66% for White faculty.

Using national data from 1995-96 of 33,986 full-time college faculty, (8.7% whom were faculty of color), Astin, Antonio, Cress, and Astin (1997) revealed that faculty of color have more obstacles to their general satisfaction level than their White counterparts. Being a faculty member of color on campus often adds an element of unnecessary discomfort not experienced by majority faculty. As persons of distinct physical characteristics, faculty of color reported that their scholarly credentials many times are largely ignored in campus scholarly settings while their skin color and other detectable ethnic physical features and behaviors tend to be emphasized over their scholarly achievements (Turner & Myers, 2000). In other words, they felt that others responded to their ethnic or racial attributes rather than seeing them as colleagues and peers.
Another obstacle to faculty of color job satisfaction is the perception of tokenism. Rather than being treated as valued members of the faculty, some have reported being treated as token representatives (Turner & Myers, 2000). Limited opportunities to develop working relationships with majority faculty (Elmore & Blackburn, 1983) and finding little understanding, warmth, and empathy among their colleagues (Harvey & Scott-James, 1985) were mentioned by many faculty of color. In fact, some diverse faculty stated the feelings of social isolation was so strong by White colleagues that they were more comfortable interacting socially with their students of color (who may also feel quite isolated on the campus) (Turner & Myers, 2000). Because of a keen interest in racial or ethnic issues, faculty of color have been frequently stereotyped as ethnic specialists rather than as qualified experts in their disciplines (Garza, 1988). Despite the obstacles, Turner and Myers (2000) found that most faculty of color planned to remain in their chosen profession within the academy.

Although Turner and Myers (2000) revealed that faculty of color hired in every rank outnumbered those who leave, the ratio of faculty hired to those leaving is fairly equivalent for diverse and White faculty. However, the numbers of hired faculty of color is significantly fewer than White faculty. Turner and Myers (2000) explain, “faculty of color under-representation cannot be blamed on turnover but that it is more likely due to the problem of under-hiring – suggesting that the demand-side effects (such as strong affirmative action efforts) rather than supply-side (such as the absence – or perceived absence - of qualified candidates) have the greatest influence on faculty of color hiring” (p. 135).

Social Climate

Although social climate is a serious issue for all faculty, the implications specific to faculty of color may be even more intense. The reality for many faculty of color in higher education
institutions is that the campus climate is not just “chilly” but can be extremely “cold” at times. Turner and Myers (2000) concluded, “faculty of color in predominantly White institutions continue to experience exclusion, isolation, alienation, and devaluation. The result is an uncomfortable work environment that undermines the productivity and satisfaction of minorities…” (p. 83). The bottom line is that many faculty of color do not feel accepted, valued, supported, or respected in their academic workplace. One suggestion is to confront isolation and build community.

Tippeconnic III and Swisher (2000) believes that strategies to confront social and academic isolation need to be developed and implemented. Some obvious suggestions include hiring faculty of color in clusters or hiring more than one over a short period of time to create a strong internal presence and support system. Hiring should be in the same academic program and, if possible, faculty should be a combination of senior and junior faculty.

Tippeconnic III and Swisher (2000) also suggests that to build community is to facilitate and support connections to other institutions or organizations that have faculty of color. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation supports partnerships that bring faculty and administrators together in joint programs and activities. Faculty of color also get together at annual professional meetings. Connections are invaluable in developing networks, sharing scholarly work, and building support and community across institutions. Travel support, release time, and research funding are often needed to develop these connections for faculty of color.

Guibitosi (1996) agrees with Tippeconnic III and Swisher (2000) as he proposes that academic departments can support building community by: (1) structuring faculty meetings so that there are opportunities for small group interaction; (2) developing departmental faculty forums where presenters are required to conduct and present their research in teams; (3) offering
benefits to team presenters such as travel money; and (4) coordinating team teaching opportunities.

Practicing the technique of coordinated care (Guibitosi, 1996) is another, non-costly and simple way to make a big difference in combating faculty isolation/alienation. Coordinated care could be creating a month-long sign-up sheet where department faculty, staff, and students sign-up for one or two times during the month to acknowledge and support a new faculty member. Coordinated care requires two principles: (1) that “care” is scheduled on a calendar and not left to happen by chance; and (2) that more than one person is responsible to carry it out. Building relationships with students is also an important aspect of job satisfaction and a way to assist faculty of color in feeling better connected to the university.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

A role is most typically defined as a set of expectations about behavior for a position in a social structure. Role theory states that when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent - one kind of role conflict – an individual experiences stress, becomes dissatisfied, and performs less effectively (decreased individual satisfaction and decreased organizational effectiveness) than if the expectations imposed did not conflict (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Role theory likewise states (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964) that role ambiguity – lack of necessary information available to a given organizational position – will result in coping behavior which may take the form of attempts to solve the problem to avoid the sources of stress, or to use defense mechanisms that distort the reality of the situation. Ambiguity should increase the probability that a person will be dissatisfied with the role, will experience anxiety, will distort reality and will perform less effectively. As such, role conflict and ambiguity may be a factor in retention for faculty of color.
Research on role issues of faculty of color began in the 1980s with Payne (1985) who examined the role perceptions of African American faculty in higher education and found no significant differences in faculty of color perceptions of their roles. Swoboda (1990) found opposing results to the Payne study. Faculty of color in Swoboda’s study reported role perceptions to be more stressful due to the extra demands placed on them by their minority status. More recently, Toman (1995) conducted a qualitative study on role perceptions at one community college and found that faculty of color often perceive themselves to be role models for students of color and invest in student progress in ways that exceed the contractual obligations of the institution. The excessive demands were perceived to be necessary and stressful, yet rewarding depending on student success.

Accordingly it is likely that faculty members’ role perceptions affect teaching styles and, consequently, effectiveness of teaching (Sarbin & Allen, 1969). Given the increasing numbers of students of color and women, it is appropriate to explore the perceived professional roles of faculty at institutions of higher education.

According to an extensive study conducted in eight Midwestern states, Turner and Myers (2000) concluded that tenure and promotion might be especially problematic for faculty of color. Many reported being either told outright or indirectly that they did not fit “the profile” (p. 89) when they were not reappointed or denied tenure and promotion. Some faculty also state that after not being reappointed or promoted, they were advised to relocate to other institutions, presumable to institutions of lower status with perceived lower standards where tenure and promotion for faculty from racial or ethnic groups might be more likely.

Faculty role satisfaction is an important dynamic at higher education institutions. Satisfied faculty members provide a source of strength and identity to the college atmosphere. Abraham
(1994) found that instructors with high and medium levels of job satisfaction were more effective than those with low job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was independent of length of service and related solely to an individual’s attitude toward his or her job. Additionally, satisfied faculty perceived their roles as more instrumental in helping students expand their educational goals.

Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) discovered that survey and experimental evidence suggests that role ambiguity, like role conflict, results in undesirable consequences for both organizational members and for organizational performance. Furthermore, role stress may not generate anxiety, when leaving is a possibility or when the individual is able to develop adaptive behaviors. For example, some individuals may view an infraction of the chain of command as stressful and others as an opportunity to gain visibility and recognition. Using role theory as a more useful and meaningful tool in the recruitment and retention of faculty of color is significant. The following subsections discuss two important roles for faculty of color: Student Role Model and Mentor and Faculty Service.

**Student role model and mentor**

The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1993, consisting of responses from more than 25,000 faculty members nationwide (National Center for Education Statistics, 1993) reported the proportion of time spent in various activities across racial groups. Asian Pacific Americans report significantly more time spent in research than any other group. While Whites reported spending significantly more time in scholarship than other minorities, African Americans reported spending significantly more time in service than Whites. Finally, faculty of color reported spending significantly more time in informal contact with students outside the classroom.
Antonio (1998) notes that there is value in faculty of color within higher education institutions, particularly for students, and points to “fairly indisputable reasons and imperatives” (p. 3). Drawing from the literature (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1991; Green, 1989; Washington & Harvey, 1989), Antonio (1998) illustrates three points. First, faculty of color are essential for higher education in that diverse role models are being provided to all students. Second, they assist in providing more effective mentoring for students of color. Third, in a sense of equity and democracy, faculty of color give students of color a greater voice in governance within the respective institutions.

Faculty of color have positive impact on urban students and racially, ethnically and linguistically diverse students. All students, especially students of color, need teachers who not only have substantial knowledge of human development, subject matter content, and effective pedagogy but who also are prepared to address the wide range of diversity in experiences that students bring to the classroom (Darling-Hammond, Dilworth, & Bullmaster, 1997; Irvine, 1992). The diversity of experiences exists not only in learning styles and socio-economic circumstances, but also in personal and collective experiences relating to race, language, and culture. Research conducted in recent years identifies the positive correlation between minority students’ academic achievement and empowerment education by faculty of color who explicitly address issues of racism and oppression in the instructional curriculum and practice (Dilworth, 1992).

Educators must prepare the increasingly diverse and heterogeneous student population for the complexly diverse world that is their future. By creating a working and learning environment that values diversity, all students, faculty, and staff have the right to participate fully in university life. Studies have shown that students are more successful when identification with professors is
present (Steele, 1992; Tinto, 1993). In addition, Steele believes that diverse faculty give students the opportunity to learn from individuals who differ from themselves, helps students communicate effectively with people of varied background, and fosters mutual respect and teamwork.

Several researchers (Louque, 1994; Tack & Patitu, 1992) have cited the importance of faculty of color in increasing the number of faculty and students of color on college campuses. The presence of faculty of color sends a message to students of color that their presence is wanted on campus and that there are prospective mentors and role models for them.

**Faculty service**

Traditional criteria applied in evaluations for promotion and tenure often appear to be neutral, but in practice they can have a disparate effect on faculty of color scholars (Alger, 1998). Springer (2004) notes that sometimes the criteria for promotion and tenure have subtle discrimination built into them. Typically, institutions of higher education expect faculty to excel in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service to be tenured and promoted, with service being the least valued. Unfortunately for faculty of color, service often provides opportunities for community engagement, encounters with diverse population and small, but meaningful recognition. Much time is spent in local schools speaking to clubs and classes, being involved in many community outreach and recruitment efforts, addressing students on campus, and presenting at youth conferences that promote higher education and professional careers. All of this is done in addition to regular service assignments and other responsibilities (Baez, 1999).

Many tenure processes actually punish faculty members for doing too much service (Blackburn & Lawrence II, 1995), which then becomes a conflict of interest for some faculty of color. Service is not just going to meetings but also serves as an opportunity to engage in
political activism on behalf of traditionally marginalized groups (Cuadraz, 1997). At times, faculty of color are the only voices supporting issues of diversity, social justice, and equity in community forums and programs on campus. In order to minimize biases, faculty review committees should be familiar with faculty of color committee workload, outside service to the community, and the different types of minority scholarship service (Alger, 1998).

American Indian faculty feel a strong need to provide service to the community and, at times, to the university. Often they are asked to serve on various institutional committees because of being Indian (Stein, 1994). Many times they agree to serve - develop programs, write proposals, provide training, or conduct evaluations - when it would probably be in one’s best interest to use that time for research. However, providing a voice and support for American Indian students, other American Indian faculty, and American Indian programs (Tippeconnic III & Swisher, 2000) is important. Because most institutions of higher education do not typically value community activities such as these, conducting such service can work against promotion and tenure. Aguirre (2000) reported that faculty of color spend more time than white male faculty on service activities in the academic workplace. The demands and unclear university expectations of service may lead faculty of color to role conflict, which will not help their chances of earning tenure and promotion.

Summary

Understanding the barriers and strategies in strengthening institutional climates are first steps in making them conducive to the retention of faculty of color on college campuses. Colleges and universities that focus simply on increasing the number of faculty of color without recognizing the necessary changes in culture and climate that must occur within the institution will likely experience disappointment. Efforts toward, not only recruiting but retaining underrepresented
faculty are important for the purpose of enhancing the overall quality of higher education institutions (Louque & Quezada, 2004). Becoming aware of the factors and their impact that lead to faculty of color early departure can be addressed through bold new strategies that are comprehensive, synergistic, and systematic (Jones, 2001).

Faculty of color stay where there is intellectual challenge (Astin, Antonio, Cress, and Astin, 1997; Magner, 1999) and where they experience a sense of community (Guibitosi, 1996; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Tippeconnic III & Swisher, 2000). Likewise, professional relationships and interactions with colleagues (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997) and students (Steele, 1992; Tinto, 1993) play a dynamic role in faculty of color retention. Furthermore, faculty of color blossom where the definition of scholarship is sufficiently broad enough to encompass their teaching, service, and scholarship (Alger, 1998; Antonio, 2002; Blackburn & Lawrence II, 1995). Being a faculty member in an institutional climate where they feel they have a voice and a chance to be part of the leadership is a critical aspect of job satisfaction for faculty of color (Turner, 2002).

To conclude, not all faculty of color fit the traditional model of the professor, but may have different strengths and contribute in a variety of ways. Because they may be viewed as different, faculty of color should not be forced to the perimeter of any institution (Thompson & Dey, 1998). Instead, they must be recognized as valuable contributing members. Faculty of color must be welcomed as institutional transformers who are helping to move the academy from its static, traditional norms to new ways and realities that fit students’ and society’s needs.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter reviews the methodology that was used in the study and includes the following sections: research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures used to collect the data, research questions, and data analysis.

Research Design

Correlational research was used in this study to clarify the understanding of important phenomena by identifying relationships among variables. The researcher examined and described relationships that existed among naturally occurring phenomena, without attempt to influence them. This form of descriptive research was selected because it illustrated existing relationship between variables. Specifically, this study described the degree to which various factors relate and predict faculty of color retention.

A survey was used as the data collection method. The main purpose of using a survey was to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of this population (Babbie, 1990). Identifying attributes of a large population from a small group of individuals is advantageous (Babbie, 1990; Fowler, 2002). One of the advantages of using a survey as the preferred type of data collection procedure for this study was because of the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection. Data collection included a Web-based, cross-sectional, self-administered questionnaire that was created and administered online.

Participants

The accessible population for this study included tenured and tenure-track faculty of color in the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences from 11 public universities in Ohio. These two major Colleges were selected for different reasons. First, the College of Education was chosen
because of historic purposes for African-Americans, in particular. More than one-third of Black doctoral students earn their degrees in education. No other ethnic group is as strongly concentrated in one field (Gravois, 2007). Therefore, the researcher assumed that by including this College, the faculty of color numbers would be greater. Secondly, the College of Arts and Sciences was selected because of sheer numbers (the largest college on all 11 campuses) as well as for the diversity of academic disciplines. The researcher did not consider including the entire university as there are some Colleges (e.g., Musical Arts, Health and Human Services, etc.) that have incredibly small numbers of faculty of color thus threatening anonymity and confidentiality.

Of the 725 faculty invited to participate, 103 (14%) completed the survey. The accessible population was obtained with the assistance from the Dean of the College of Education and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at one of the participating universities. The researcher met with each Dean individually to explain the details of the study. Each Dean agreed to assist with the recruiting method explained to them. To begin the process of recruiting faculty of color at each of the 11 universities in the study, the researcher sent the recruiting letter (with survey link enclosed in letter) via email to each Dean. In turn, the two Deans contacted their counterpart at each of the other 10 universities by way of email requesting their assistance in forwarding the survey to the tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at their respective universities. The two Deans also sent the recruiting letter to their respective Colleges. Not only did all 11 universities participate in the study by sending the email to the faculty of color at their respective university, but all except one university sent the survey a second time, as a follow-up three weeks after the original distribution. Electronic addresses of the Deans were obtained from Ohio College Association Administrative Directory and the Internet.
Instrumentation

The Faculty Retention Questionnaire (FRQ) (Appendix A) was designed specifically for this study and was administered online. This instrument had four parts: (1) Part 1 measured job satisfaction, social climate, and faculty/student relationships; (2) Part 2 measured role conflict and role clarity; (3) Part 3 addressed employment values and intentions to stay in a current position; and (4) Part 4 requested demographic information. The researcher assembled this instrument from two previously developed instruments. The Academic Setting Evaluation Questionnaire (Fernandez & Matteo, 1993) was reflected in Part one. The Role Conflict/Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) was reflected in Part two. The five factors identified within these two instruments represent current retention issues for faculty of color. Permission to use the questionnaires for this study was obtained from both instrument developers.

Validity was established for the FRQ through consultation with five content experts as well as three structure experts. Content validity verified that the items in the instrument make up was a representative sample of the applicable universe of content (Kerlinger, 1986). The content experts were knowledgeable in the area of retention. The survey structure experts were knowledgeable about survey development and appropriateness of instrument format. Specifically, they examined content appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and language clarity. Revisions to the FRQ were made accordingly. Subsequently, content-related evidence was gathered through the administration of the FRQ to a pilot group of faculty of color.

The pilot group consisted of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color from four different Colleges (Business Administration, Health and Human Services, Musical Arts, and Technology) at a four-year predominantly White public university in Ohio. They were sent the online pilot
participant information and consent with survey link (Appendix C) on October 28, 2006. Names and email addresses of these faculty members were received via a request to the Provost’s office at the university. While 30 faculty of color were the accessible population, 12 submitted their survey. At the conclusion of instrument administration, one-on-one meetings occurred with pilot group participants to assist with further validity of the instrument. The researcher provided a $10.00 gift card upon receipt of both submission of survey and an individual meeting with the researcher with comments/suggestions regarding the survey (appropriateness, meaningfulness, language, clarity, etc). Follow-up meetings with eight of the pilot group faculty members provided further insight into instrument development. Based on all comments gathered, revisions were made to the FRQ in preparation for administration to the accessible population in the study. The Director of the Office of Institutional Research assisted with the planning and accountability of the online survey.

Part One of the FRQ

The first part of the FRQ contained 31 items adapted from the Academic Setting Evaluation Questionnaire (ASEQ) (Fernandez & Matteo, 1993) and applied a 7-point Likert scale with 1 as the lowest level of agreement and 7 as the highest level of agreement. Originally, the ASEQ contained 69 items and was validated with 800 university professors. Factor analysis yielded six factors (dissatisfaction with the institution, social climate, student/faculty relationship, performance of center services, teaching autonomy, and faculty selection and evaluation) and a theta coefficient of 0.98 was obtained. A total of 655 faculty members of the University of Oviedo (northern Spain) took part in the second replication study to analyze the formal properties of the questionnaire. The mean age was 38.5 years, with 120 women and 383 men;
152 faculty members did not give details of their gender. The second version contained 59 items. For this study, the researcher utilized 31 items based on the first three factors.

The 31-item ASEQ assessed faculty satisfaction with the work environment, social climate, and relationships with students. On the FRQ, items 1a, b, c, d, f, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t, v, and w measured job satisfaction. Items 1e, g, h, z, and ae measured the intradepartmental social climate, and items 1u, x, y, aa, ab, ac, and ad measured relationships with students. Fernandez and Matteo (1993) calculated the Cronbach alpha coefficients for reliability. They were 0.89 for job satisfaction and social climate and 0.87 for relationship with student. The total reliability was 0.90.

Part Two of the FRQ

The second part contained 14 items adapted from the Role Conflict/Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (RC/RAQ) (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) and applied a 7-point Likert scale with 1 as definitely not true of my job and 7 as extremely true of my job. The RC/RAQ scale was designed to measure the role ambiguity and role conflict of individuals in an organization. Role ambiguity is defined as the extent to which an individual is unclear about the role expectations of others, as well as the degree of uncertainty associated with one’s role performance. Often noted in the literature, role ambiguity leads to role conflict. Role conflict is the degree to which expectations of a role are incompatible, or incongruent, with the reality of the role. This incompatibility may be due to conflicts between organizational demands and one’s own values, problems of personal resource allocation, or conflict between obligations to several different people.

The RC/RAQ originally consisted of 30 items, 15 measured role conflict and 15 measured role ambiguity. Factor analysis reduced the number of items to 14; 8 items measure role conflict
and 6 items measure role ambiguity. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) calculated the Cronbach alpha coefficients for reliability; role conflict was 0.88 and role ambiguity was 0.73. On the FRQ, items 2b, d, f, g, i, k, l, and n measured role conflict and items 2a, c, e, h, j, and m measured role ambiguity. Since the items that measured role ambiguity were worded in way that a higher ambiguity score indicated a degree of certainty or predictability of the outcome or responses to one’s behavior and clarity of behavioral requirements (see Chapter IV, Table 8), the researcher used the word clarity rather than ambiguity throughout this study to indicate the higher score obtained for that factor. To simplify, a high score obtained for this factor indicates role clarity, whereas a low score indicates role ambiguity.

Part Three of the FRQ

The third part of the FRQ utilized multiple-choice and open-ended responses developed by the researcher to gather both quantitative and qualitative information. There were four (4) items that measured employment values and intention to stay in current position. The first item measured job satisfaction and applied a 5-point Likert scale with 1 as extremely dissatisfied with current position and 5 as extremely satisfied with current position. The second and third items were two (2) open-ended questions (or select from a list) and asked: (1) rank order the top three factors that have the most important impact on intention to continue working in current position; and (2) rank order the top three factors that have the most important impact on intention to leave current position. The researcher provided examples of reasons for staying and leaving, accordingly. The fourth item asked the likelihood of the individual continuing employment in their current position in each of the following time frames: a. 1 year; b. 2-3 years; c. 4-6 years; and d. over 6 years. Each response applied a 5-point Likert scale with 1 as strong likelihood of leaving and 5 as strong likelihood of staying in current position.
Part Four of the FRQ

The fourth part of the instrument requested demographic information that served as independent variables. Demographic information was collected so that the researcher could best portray the sample to the reader. Demographic items on the FRQ included racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with or without children, and tenure status. This section included 10 items measured by placing a mark in the appropriate response or using a drop box. The researcher was sensitive to the number of items listed as well as to the phrasing of demographic data requested, as respondents tend to view multiple demographic items on surveys as being intrusive into their privacy. The researcher only asked about demographics that were specifically related to the topic studied.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to beginning the study the researcher submitted an application to and received permission from the Bowling Green State University (BGSU) Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB). During the middle of January 2007, the Faculty Retention Questionnaire was sent electronically to 22 Deans at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities. The Deans, in turn, forwarded the survey to the tenured and tenure-track faculty of color in their respective College via email. After three weeks, 65 participants had responded to the survey. To obtain a higher response rate, the researcher sent a follow-up email reminder and a second copy of the survey instrument to the Deans requesting that it be sent to the faculty of color again. At the end of three weeks, total number of 103 individuals participated in the study representing approximately 14% of the eligible 725 participants.
Data for this study were collected through electronic submissions beginning January 31, 2007. Specifically, an electronic message (recruiting letter with survey link) including four paragraphs of specific information were sent to all faculty of color in the accessible population. Paragraph one included the researcher’s name, role, institution, and the name and purpose of the research project as well as explained how information was obtained about the participant. The second paragraph confirmed anonymity and confidentiality of their responses, benefits of participating, and date for survey to be completed. Paragraph three included information regarding participant withdrawal, follow-up messages, data security, and how to request a summary of the results of the study. The final paragraph provided contact information and a thank you for those who were able to participate. The survey link was at the bottom of the letter.

The FRQ was designed to be completed in 15 minutes or less. Approximately three weeks after original distribution of the survey, a follow-up e-mail was sent to all faculty of color at the 11 universities, except one (university Dean did not want to send a follow-up), thanking those who had submitted the survey and requesting that if they had not already, to please consider completing and submitting the survey. The e-mail also reminded recipients why the research was important and how their responses could assist in improving university climates for faculty of color. While a copy of the FRQ appears in Appendix A, a copy of the electronic recruiting letter and survey link appears in the Appendix B.

The data collection step in this study serves as a measure to score the completed survey and produce statistical reports and analysis of the results. The results of the study appear in Chapter 4.
Research Questions

1. Do job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-students relationship, role clarity, and role conflict significantly relate to the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

2. Are there significant group differences (racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status) in employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

3. Which factors best predict the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

Data Analysis Procedures

There are several issues related to the quality of data that needed to be considered prior to the actual statistical analysis. Thus, the researcher screened the data. In examining accuracy of the data, the researcher printed the entire data set and proofread again the actual data. Using frequency distributions and descriptive statistics was helpful in this process. Assessing the means and standard deviations (for plausibility) was beneficial. Next, the researcher looked for missing data and outliers. Factors were then created to represent the constructs of job satisfaction, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, role conflict, and retention. All factors, with the exception of retention, represented overall means of related items. The retention variable was weighted to account for time duration. The formula, Retention = 33a + 2(33b) + 3(33c) + 4(33d), was used to calculate the retention scores. Although the researcher used the term factor (composition of items/variable) throughout this study, these factors were not
generated from factor analysis. Descriptive data of the sample relative to response frequency, mean, and standard deviation was calculated for all survey items and each factor. The following paragraph reflects the statistical tests used in response to each research question.

For research question one, a Pearson correlation matrix was generated that examined the relationship among job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-students relationship, role clarity, role conflict, and retention with the level of significance established at the .05 level or less. In response to research question two, t-tests for independent means and several ANOVAs were calculated to examine group differences in employment continuation plans with respect to racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status. Finally, for research question three a multiple regression analysis was applied which determined the factors that best predicted retention. The following chapter provides statistical reports and analysis of these results.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention plans of 103 tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. This chapter presents the statistical results based on the data collected from the Faculty Retention Questionnaire (FRQ). This instrument solicited feedback to questions on job satisfaction, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, role conflict, retention, and demographic information. Findings regarding these topics are presented in this chapter.

The results are presented for each research question. First, demographic characteristics of the sample are presented. Descriptive data of the sample relative to response frequency and descriptive statistics of the factors are illustrated. Second, a correlation comparing the factors and employment continuation plans are presented. Third, results of several ANOVAs and t-tests of independent samples are illustrated to examine significant group differences in the continuation plans of faculty of color. Finally, multiple regression results are presented to examine the factors that best predict employment continuation plans of faculty of color.

Characteristics of Sample

The participants for this research were tenured and tenure-track faculty of color from 11 public universities in Ohio in the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences. Fifty-three (52%) participants from four-year public universities under 20,000 students and 49 (48%) participants from four-year public universities over 20,000 students responded to the survey. There were 65 participants (71.4%) from the College of Arts and Sciences and 26 (28.6%) participants from the Colleges of Education. Of the participants, 48 participants (47.5%) were
female and 53 participants (52.5%) were male with 0% identifying as transgender/transsexual. While 93 participants (93.9%) were heterosexual, 4 participants (4%) identified as gay/lesbian and 2 participants (2%) as bisexual.

In Table 1, demographic data on racial/ethnic background illustrates that largest groups participating in this study were 35 African-Americans/Blacks (38%) and 35 Asian Americans/Asians/Pacific Islanders (38%). These two groups represented 76% of the participant responses. Fifty-two participants (52%) were born in the United States while 48 participants (48%) were born outside of the United States.

Table 1

Demographic Information on Racial/Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Hawaiian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two largest groups accounting for age were the 30-39 years category (N=31) and the 50-59 years category (N=31) together representing 61% of the participants (see Table 2). Closely following these two groups was the 40-49 years category with 27 participants (26.7%).

Table 2

Demographic Information on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and Over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents information concerning marital status; 57 participants (56.4%) were married and 22 participants (21.8%) were single. Twelve (11.9%) of the 103 participants were divorced. In addition, 64 participants (64%) have children while 36 participants (36%) do not have children.

Table 3

Demographic Information on Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a Partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 illustrates the tenure status of the 103 participants. Fifty-four participants (54.5%) were tenured, 12 participants (12.1%) were in their tenure-track first year, and only 5 participants (5.1%) in each of the tenure-track fourth, fifth, and sixth year responded to the survey.

Table 4

Demographic Information on Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 1st Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 2nd Year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 3rd Year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 4th Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 5th Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track 6th Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FRQ measured job satisfaction (19 items), social climate (5 items), and student relationships (7 items) and applied a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 as the lowest level of agreement and 7 as the highest level of agreement. In addition, the FRQ measured role clarity (6 items) and role conflict (8 items) and applied a 7-point Likert-type scale with 1 as definitely not true of my job and 7 as extremely true of my job. Summary of participant responses to job satisfaction questions in Table 5 illustrates that over 60% of the participant responses either very strongly agreed, strongly agreed, or agreed to 4 of the 19 questions: (1) “the physical conditions in my work environment are satisfactory”; (2) “the process/system for faculty appointment is appropriate”; (3) “the university encourages my improvement as a teacher”; and (4) “there are clear expectations about my role as a professor that allows me to fulfill my teaching responsibilities”. However, Table 5 also illustrates that approximately 60% of the participant responded negatively (with very strongly disagreed, strongly disagreed, disagreed, or neutral) to 6 of the 19 questions: (1) “my university provides opportunities for the publication of my works”; (2) “I am fairly compensated for my work as university professor”; (3) “my university has prepared me to adequately carry out my duties as a researcher”; (4) “I have adequate time to be able to perform my research tasks”; (5) “my university promotes my research activity”; and (6) “the university’s support is appropriate to carry out my role as a teacher and researcher”.
### Table 5

**Summary of Participant Responses to Job Satisfaction 1 Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Physical conditions</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Funding opportunities</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Publication opportunities</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Fair compensation</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i</td>
<td>Appointment process/system</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j</td>
<td>Annual review process</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k</td>
<td>Clear criteria for research</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1l</td>
<td>Faculty expectations</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>Public appreciation</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n</td>
<td>Improvement as teacher</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1o</td>
<td>Tenure and promo process</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>Research preparation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1q</td>
<td>Teaching expectations</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r</td>
<td>Research expectations</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>Problem resolution</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1t</td>
<td>Research tasks</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td>Research promo</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1w</td>
<td>Role as teacher and researcher</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 103. VSD = Very Strongly Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, VSA = Very Strongly Disagree.*
Summary of responses to the social climate questions (see Table 6) illustrate that over 65% of the participants responded positively (very strongly agreed, strongly agreed, or agreed) to 1 of the 5 items: “I feel I have the support of my colleagues in the activities I conduct as a professor”. Over 75% of the participant responded negatively (very strongly disagreed, strongly disagreed, disagreed, or neutral) to the statement: “The department faculty work together in the planning and implementation of research”, with almost 30% of participants selecting “neutral” as a response.

Table 6

Summary of Participant Responses to Social Climate Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Collegial support as professor</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g</td>
<td>Academic communication</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>Personal/human relations among colleagues</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1z</td>
<td>Department faculty working together in research</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ae</td>
<td>Collegial support of individual’s research</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 103. VSD = Very Strongly Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, VSA = Very Strongly Disagree.
Summary of responses to the student relationships questions in Table 7 illustrates that over 75% of the participants responded positively (very strongly agreed, strongly agreed, or agreed) to all 7 items with 94% agreement to question 1ab: “I modify my teaching style to meet the needs of the students in class”. As illustrated in Table 7, the mean for each of the student relationships items is over 5.

Table 7

Summary of Participant Responses to Student Relationships Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1u</td>
<td>Students interest in course</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x</td>
<td>Designated time periods for students</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y</td>
<td>Student feedback for teaching</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1aa</td>
<td>Annual student feedback for planning/revisions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ab</td>
<td>Modify teaching style</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ac</td>
<td>Student’s course demands and assignments</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ad</td>
<td>Student evaluations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 103. VSD = Very Strongly Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, VSA = Very Strongly Disagree.

Table 8 illustrates the summary of responses to the role clarity questions. Over 60% of participants responded positively (extremely true of my job, true of my job, or somewhat true of
my job) to all 6 of the items. Only 2% of the participants responded negatively (definitely not true of my job, not true of my job, or somewhat not true of my job) to the question, “I know what my responsibilities are”.

Table 8

**Summary of Participant Responses to Role Clarity Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Clear, planned goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Divide time properly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Know responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td>Know what is expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j</td>
<td>Certain about authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>Receive clear direction for job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DNT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>SNT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 103. DNT = Definitely Not True of my Job, NT = Not True, SNT = Somewhat Not True, N = Neutral, ST = Somewhat True, T = True, ET = Extremely True.

In the summary of responses to the role conflict questions (see Table 9), only 1 of the 8 items illustrate that over 50% of participants responded positively (extremely true of my job, true of my job, or somewhat true of my job) to the question, “I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently”. Over 50% of participants responded negatively (definitely not true of my job, not true of my job, somewhat not true of my job) to only 1 of the 8 items to the question, “I receive assignments without resources and material to complete them”.


Table 9

*Summary of Participant Responses to Role Conflict Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Do things in a way not chosen</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Assignments without assistance</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>Disregard rule or policy to carry out assignment</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>Work with groups who operate quite differently</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td>Incompatible requests from two or more</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k</td>
<td>Do things accepted by one and not others</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>Assignments without resources and materials</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2n</td>
<td>Work on unnecessary things</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 103. DNT = Definitely Not True of my Job, NT = Not True, SNT = Somewhat Not True, N = Neutral, ST = Somewhat True, T = True, ET = Extremely True.

On the Faculty Retention Questionnaire, there were also four items that measured employment values and intention to stay in current position. A Likert-type scale, multiple-
choice, and open-ended responses were developed by the researcher to gather both quantitative and qualitative information.

The first item measured job satisfaction by asking *What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?* and applied a 5-point Likert-type scale with 1 as extremely dissatisfied with my current position and 5 as extremely satisfied with current position. Summary of responses from participants showed that 37 (37%) identified extremely dissatisfied, dissatisfied, or neutral while 50 (50%) of the participant responses identified satisfied. Thirteen (13%) respondents were extremely satisfied.

The next two items of the Faculty Retention Questionnaire incorporated open-ended questions (or select from a list) asking: (1) rank order the top three factors that have the most important impact on intention to continue working in current position; and (2) rank order the top three factors that have the most important impact on intention to leave current position. The researcher provided examples of reasons for staying and leaving, accordingly. Table 10 shows that participants identified job satisfaction, salary, and positive social/cultural climate as the top three reasons for staying. Forty-three (41.7%) respondents identified job satisfaction as their number one reason to stay while 22 (21.4%) respondents identified salary as their second reason for staying. Participants identified salary, isolation, and experiences with prejudice and discrimination as the top three reasons for leaving their current position (see Table 11). Twenty-seven (26.2%) respondents identified salary as their number one reason for leaving while 20 (19.4%) respondents identified isolation as their second reason for leaving.
Table 10

Summary of Participant Responses to the Top 3 Reasons for Staying Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging-University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging-Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social/Cultural Climate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Racial Climate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Summary of Participant Responses to the Top 3 Reasons for Leaving Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having a Mentor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with Prejudice and</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Confusion/Ambiguity/Conflict</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcoming Culture–University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcoming Culture-Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Guidance about Tenure Process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa, Work Permit, Green Card-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth item on the Faculty Retention Questionnaire asked for the likelihood of the individual continuing employment in their current position. Each response applied a 5-point Likert-type scale with 1 as strong likelihood of leaving and 5 as strong likelihood of staying in
current position. In Table 12, descriptive statistics for each participant were calculated and presented in each of the following time frames: (1) 1 year; (2) 2-3 years; (3) 4-6 years; and (4) over 6 years. Approximately 88% of participant responses identified strong likelihood of staying or likely to stay in year 1, while 9% identified strong likelihood of leaving or likely to leave. However, as years increased in the position, the intention of staying decreased. Participant responses for likelihood of staying over six years reveals that approximately 34% of participant responses were identified as strong likelihood of staying or likely to stay, 34% were unsure, while 31% of the participants identified strong likelihood of leaving or likely to leave. The mean, median, and mode decreased as years in the position increased.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>SLL</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>SLS</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=103. SLL = Strong Likelihood of Leaving, LL = Likely to Leave, U = Unsure, LS = Likely to Stay, SLS = Strong Likelihood of Staying.

Research Question One

Do job satisfaction, social climate, faculty-student relationships, role ambiguity, and role conflict significantly relate to the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

Respondents were asked questions relating to these factors in Part One, Two, and Three of the Faculty Retention Questionnaire: Part One measured job satisfaction, social climate, and student relationships; Part Two measured role conflict and role clarity; and Part Three measured
job satisfaction 2 and retention. Six of the factors (all except retention) used a Likert-type scale from one to seven (except job satisfaction 2’s scale was one to five). Because of the multiple response options representing the likelihood of staying question (see Table 12 and Appendix A - items 33a, 33b, 33c, and 33d), the retention factor was weighted to account for time duration. Many respondents left items blank if they had indicated they would already have left. As a result, retention scores ranged from 1-50 based on the likelihood of staying, leaving, and unsure. The formula, Retention = 33a + 2(33b) + 3(33c) + 4(33d), was used to calculate the retention scores. Therefore, a high score indicates strong likelihood of staying in the current position for an extended duration; whereas, a low score indicates the likelihood of leaving soon. Descriptive data of the sample relative to response mean and standard deviation of each of the factors and retention are illustrated in Table 13. Results reflected student relationships with the highest mean (5.53) closely followed by role clarity (5.04).

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics of Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Items # 1a, b, c, d, f, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t, v, w</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Item # 3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Items # 1e, g, h, z, ae</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Items # 1u, x, y, aa, ab, ac, ad</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Items # 2a, c, e, h, j, m</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Items # 2b, d, f, g, i, k, l, n</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>Retention = 33a + 2(33b) + 3(33c) + 4(33d)</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was calculated to determine the degree of relationship that exists between the dependent variable of retention and the many factors. If two of the factors are highly related, a coefficient somewhat close to +1.00 or -1.00 will be obtained. The closer the score is to plus or minus one, the greater the relationship (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). While statistical significance ($p < .05$ or $p < .01$) is critical in evaluating generalizability, evaluating the practical significance (magnitude of importance) is not necessarily the same. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) suggest the following when interpreting the correlation coefficients ($r$) for importance of the magnitude of a relationship: (1) .00-.40 is of little practical importance; (2) .41-.60 is of practical and theoretical use; and (3) .61-.80 is of very high practical importance.

Table 14 presents correlation coefficients for each of the factors and retention. When examining relationship between each of the six factors and retention, job satisfaction 2 ($r = .513$) is highly related and has high practical importance. Its coefficient of determination ($r^2 = .26$) indicates a moderate effect. While social climate ($r = .342$) and job satisfaction 1 ($r = .334$) are related to retention ($p < .01$) and generalizable to the population, there is only moderate importance to the retention variable. All of the other factors were of little practical importance. While role conflict showed a negative correlation with the retention variable ($r = -.303$), it is important to note that a higher role conflict score indicates lesser disagreement. An examination of correlations among the factors showed the following: job satisfaction 1 and social climate ($r = .777$, $r^2 = .60$), job satisfaction 1 and job satisfaction 2 ($r = .722$, $r^2 = .52$), and job satisfaction 2 and social climate ($r = .633$, $r^2 = .40$) had very high practical importance and were statistically significant ($p < .01$).
Table 14

Correlation Coefficients of Factors with Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction 1</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction 2</th>
<th>Social Climate</th>
<th>Student Relations</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>.722**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud Relations</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.518**</td>
<td>-.540**</td>
<td>-.344**</td>
<td>-.226*</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>-.303**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

Research Question Two

Are there significant group differences (racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status) in employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

The fourth part of the Faculty Retention Questionnaire requested demographic information that served as independent variables. Demographic items on the instrument included racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with or without children, and tenure status. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between racial/ethnic background, age, marital status, and tenure status on each independent and dependent factor. Table 15 presents ANOVA results for group differences of racial/ethnic background, age, and marital status for factors. Differences by racial/ethnic background and age
for each factor as well as retention were not significant (see Table 15). There were significant differences between marital status and social climate \((p < .01)\). The descriptive statistical data for these two factors (marital status and social climate) are presented in Table 16.

Table 15

*Analysis of Variance for Group Differences of Racial/Ethnic Background, Age, and Marital Status for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Background</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p < .01\)*.

Table 16 illustrates the descriptive statistics for social climate by marital status, including the number, means, and standard deviations for each of the marital status categories. Post hoc results using Scheffe’s test showed that the groups of divorced and widowed were significantly different with respect to social climate. Summary of responses from participants showed the mean for divorce as positive (5.13) while the mean for the widowed as negative (2.33). Percentage of variance or eta squared \((\eta^2)\) was calculated as a measure of effect size for this significant result. Effect size \((\eta^2 = .132)\) for marital status with respect to social climate is weak.
Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for Social Climate Factor by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a Partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 17, the tenured and tenure-track respondents were divided into three groups with respect to years in their position. Group one were the tenured participants. Group two represented those non-tenured and in the early tenure track (1-3 years) while group three were the later tenure track (4-6 years). An ANOVA for group differences was conducted for tenure status with significant differences in tenure status and social climate and role conflict. Significant differences were found within tenure status with respect to social climate (p < .01), student relationships (p < .05), and role conflict (p < .01). The early tenure track (M = 4.87, SD = 1.04) were more positive than the later tenure track (M = 3.69, SD = 1.24) with social climate; the early tenure track (M = 5.84, SD = .75) were more positive than the tenured (M = 5.37, SD = .75) with student relationships; and tenured (M = 3.94, SD = 1.29) had more role conflict than early tenure track (M = 3.07, SD = 1.27). Effect size, partial eta squared, was calculated for each significant result. Effect size with respect to marital status (9.5%, $\eta^2 = .095$), student relationships (7.7%, $\eta^2 = .077$), and role conflict (9.4%, $\eta^2 = .094$) are rather weak.
Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Group Differences in Tenure Status for Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Tenured (n=54)</th>
<th>Non-Tenured (1-3 yrs) (n=29)</th>
<th>Non-Tenured (4-6 yrs) (n=15)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>27.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-tests were calculated (Tables 18-22) to determine group difference for country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, gender, and with/without children on each independent and dependent factor. Table 18 illustrates the results of U. S. born versus non-U. S. born groups. For country of origin, significant group differences were found in job satisfaction 2 (p < .05) and retention (p < .05). Descriptive data shows that those U. S. born are more likely to stay in their current position (M = 32.73, SD = 14.31) than non-U. S. born (M = 26.15, SD = 13.29). Also, significant difference exists between these two groups with respect to job satisfaction. U. S. born (M = 3.74, SD = 1.07) was more positive than non-U. S. born (M = 3.31, SD = .99). Cohen’s D was calculated as a measure of effect size. Effect size with respect to job satisfaction (46%) was moderate.
Table 18

*T-Test Results for Group Differences in Country of Origin for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Born</th>
<th>Non-U.S. Born</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

In calculating *t*-tests for institution type (see Table 19), no significant differences were found between universities under 20,000 students and those over 20,000 students for any of the factors.

Table 19

*T-Test Results for Group Differences in Institution Type for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 represents the results of the *t*-tests calculated by academic disciplines. No significant differences were found between College of Education respondents and College of Arts & Sciences respondents for any of the factors.
Table 20

*T-Test Results for Group Differences in Academic Discipline for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group difference by gender was calculated using $t$-tests of independent samples for each factor and retention. Table 21 shows group differences for gender in respect to student relationships ($p < .05$). Females were more positive about student relationships than their male counterparts. Cohen’s D (45.7%) indicates a moderate effect size.

Table 21

*T-Test Results for Group Differences in Gender for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$.

$T$-tests were also calculated to determine group difference for faculty with or without children with respect to all factors and retention. Table 22 shows significant group differences for job satisfaction 1 ($p < .01$) role conflict ($p < .01$) and in student relationships ($p < .05$). Those without children ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.01$) are more positive than those with children ($M = 4.16$, $SD$
= .94) in respect to job satisfaction 1 as well as student relationships (without children – \( M = 5.74, SD = .74 \) and with children – \( M = 5.41, SD = .75 \)). Respondents with children (\( M = 3.98, SD = 1.25 \)) have more role conflict than those without children (\( M = 3.19, SD = 1.30 \)). Cohen’s \( D \) indicates moderate effect size for the variable of having children with respect to job satisfaction 1 (57%), student relationships (44%), and role conflict (63%).

Table 22

*T-Test Results for Group Differences in Having Children for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=64)</td>
<td>(n=35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Climate</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relationships</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

Research Question Three

Which factors best predict the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?

Forward multiple regression was utilized to determine which factors (job satisfaction 1, job satisfaction 2, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, role conflict, gender, country of origin, with/without children, and tenure status) best predict retention. A significant model was generated and only included job satisfaction 2 (item number three on the Faculty Retention Questionnaire), *What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?* The model accounts
for 23% of variance in retention. Regression results show that Job Satisfaction 2 significantly predicts retention; \( R^2 = .243, R^2_{adj} = .234, F(1,90) = 28.84, p < .0001. \)

Since job satisfaction 2 was the only variable utilized in the model predicting retention, the researcher conducted an exploratory analysis to examine which factors best predict job satisfaction 2. Forward multiple regression was also used for this analysis and resulted in a three variable model. A summary of the regression coefficients is presented in Table 23 and indicates that three of the variables (social climate, role clarity, and role conflict) significantly contributed to the model. The model accounts for 53% of variance in job satisfaction 2. Regression results indicate that the overall model significantly predicts job satisfaction 2; \( R^2 = .542, R^2_{adj} = .526, F(3, 88) = 34.65, p < .0001. \)

Table 23

**Model Summary to Predict Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2_{adj} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social climate</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social climate, role clarity</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Climate, role clarity, role conflict</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention plans of 103 tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. To answer the three research questions, several statistical tests were utilized. First, correlation coefficients were calculated to determine significant relationships between the independent variables (job satisfaction 1, job satisfaction 2, social climate, student relationships, role conflict, and role clarity) and the dependent variable (retention). Second, ANOVAs and t-tests were
conducted using demographic information (racial/ethnic background, age, sexual orientation, marital status, tenure status, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, gender, and with/without children) to examine group differences. Finally, forward multiple regression was used to determine which factors best predict retention for faculty of color. The following represents responses to each research question.

When examining relationships between the six factors and retention, job satisfaction 2 was significantly related to and highly important to the retention variable, while social climate and job satisfaction 1 was significantly related and of moderate importance. The other three factors (student relationships, role clarity, and role conflict) were of little practical significance to the retention variable. However, commanding evidence suggests very strong relationships exist among three of the factors: job satisfaction 1, job satisfaction 2, and social climate. Not only do these three factors reflect statistical significance, but there is exceptionally high practical importance as well.

Significant group difference existed in five (marital status, tenure status, country of origin, gender, and with/without children) of the ten demographic items. For country of origin, significant group differences were found in retention ($p < .05$) and job satisfaction 2 ($p < .05$). Descriptive data showed that those U. S. born are more likely to stay in their current position than non-U. S. born. Differences by tenure status and the respondents’ with/without children for three of the six factors were significant. Two of the three factors for both groups were role conflict and student relationships. Also for the student relationships factor, significant differences were found in gender.

The factor that best predicts retention for faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio is job satisfaction 2, a single item on the FRQ that asked the question,
What is your level of satisfaction in your current position? Although all of the other factors (job satisfaction 1, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, and role conflict) elicited responses via 45 items on the Faculty Retention Questionnaire (job satisfaction 1 had the most with 19 items), this question was the only predictor of retention. To further support the importance of job satisfaction for faculty of color, almost 50% of the respondents identified job satisfaction as their number one reason for staying in their current position when asked to list their top three reasons.

Since job satisfaction 2 was the sole predictor of retention, the researcher further examined the predictors for job satisfaction 2. By using the responses for the question, What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?, as the dependent variable, additional statistical analysis for predicting job satisfaction 2 was conducted. Results reflected that social climate, role clarity, and role conflict significantly predicts job satisfaction, which in turn, had a strong link to retention. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for further study in the field of education and leadership studies.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Findings from this study provide an understanding of the ways in which tenured and tenure-track faculty of color view their work environment as related to views of their employment options. Specifically, this research examined the degree to which six factors (job satisfaction 1, job satisfaction 2, social climate, student relationships, role conflict, and role clarity) relate to faculty of color decisions regarding continuation plans in their current positions at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. Results of this study can help inform administrative and faculty leaders as they seek ways to strengthen institutional climates to make them more conducive to the retention of faculty of color.

This final chapter is organized into three sections. The first section presents a review of the study and a discussion of the results as they relate to the research questions. The second section provides the conclusions regarding the statistical and practical results of this study, while the third section discusses recommendations for further research and practice in the field of higher education and leadership studies.

Discussion

This section presents a review of the study and a discussion of the results as they relate to each research questions. The focus is related to the following: discussion of factors relating to retention, discussion of demographic group difference for retention, discussion of factors predicting retention, and a discussion of the theoretical framework in relation to faculty of color retention.
Review of the Study

The recruitment and retention of faculty of color at American higher education institutions is one of the greatest challenges facing 21st century educational leaders. Since the 1960s, the status of faculty of color has been of great concern at colleges and universities. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty provides evidence of a slow increase of faculty of color at colleges and universities over the past several years (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004). In the face of 30 years of Affirmative Action, and contrary to public perceptions, the American faculty profiles remain largely White and largely male (Chait & Trower, 2002). Chait and Trower (2002) further believe that even if higher education institutions were inundated with underrepresented faculty, a fundamental challenge would still linger: an unwelcoming, unappealing, and, often, invalidating climate. Within these types of non-supporting environments, turnover is higher for faculty of color (Thomas & Asunka, 1995). Therefore, the creation of more welcoming climates where faculty of color feel valued and are successful is important to examine (Chang, Witt, & Hakuta, 2002; Collins, 1990; Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001; Rosser, 1990).

To address these issues and the implications for faculty vitality, this study examined the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention of 103 tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at 11 four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio. This sample of 103 faculty represents approximately 14% of the accessible population of 725. The majority of the participants in this study were African-Americans (38.0%) and Asian-Americans (38.0%) followed by Latinos (17.4%), Multiracial (4.3%) and Native Americans (2.2%). Fifty-two participants (52.0%) were born in the United States while 48 participants (48.0%) were born outside of the United States. A breakdown of gender yielded
53 (52.5%) males and 48 (47.5%) females with 0% identifying as transgender/transsexual.

While 93 participants (93.9%) were heterosexual, 4 participants (4.0%) identified as gay/lesbian and 2 participants (2.0%) identified as bisexual.

The two largest groups accounting for age were the 30-39 years category (N=31) and the 50-59 years category (N=31) while the 40-49 years category (N=27) closely followed these two groups. Only 2 (2%) of those under 30 years old participated in the study. Further demographic information showed declining numbers as 54 respondents (54.5%) were tenured, 12 respondents (12.1%) were in their tenure-track first year, and only 5 respondents (5.1%) were in each of the tenure-track fourth, fifth, and sixth years. Fifty-seven respondents (56.4%) were married and 22 (21.8%) were single while 12 (11.9%) were divorced. In addition, 64 participants (64.0%) have children and 36 (36.0%) do not have children.

The five-part, 59-item instrument (Faculty Retention Questionnaire) used Likert-type scales, multiple choice, and open-ended questions that measured employment values and intent to stay in current position. Two of the four parts of the Faculty Retention Questionnaire (FRQ) measured the perceptions of the academic climate defined by six variables:

1. **Job satisfaction 1** – 19 items measured faculty satisfaction with higher education institutions (role as teacher and researcher, tenure/promotion and annual review processes, funding and publication opportunities, physical conditions at work, and academic environment).

2. **Job satisfaction 2** – one item asked and measured, “What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?” (applied a Likert-type scale with 1 as extremely dissatisfied with current position and 5 as extremely satisfied with current position).
3. **Social climate** – 5 items measured faculty intradepartmental relationships (collegial relationships, working together, and support).

4. **Student relationships** – 7 items measured faculty relationships with students (feedback for teaching improvement, learning styles, course demands/assignments, individual meetings, and evaluations).

5. **Role conflict** – 8 items measured the degree to which expectations of faculty role are incompatible and/or incongruent, with the reality of a role (conflicts between organizational demands and faculty’s values, problems of personal resource allocation, obligations to a variety of people).

6. **Role clarity** – 6 items measured the extent to which faculty was clear about the role expectations of others, as well as the degree of certainty associated with one’s role performance (planned goal and objectives, expectations, clear direction for job, time management, and authority).

In part three of the FRQ, respondents were asked to rank order the top three reasons for continuing to work in their current positions and the top three reasons for leaving their current positions. In part four, participants responded to the likelihood of staying in their current positions and was measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale with 1 as the lowest level of leaving and 5 as the highest level of staying. The final section of the FRQ asked respondents 10 demographic items that were divided into background characteristics (i.e., ethnic/racial background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status). The following discussion addresses the statistical and practical results of each research question.
Discussion of Factors Relating to Retention

The first research question examined, “Do job satisfaction, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, and role conflict significantly relate to the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year, predominantly White public universities in Ohio?” Through calculating the Pearson Correlation Coefficient with each of the six factors and retention, results showed that there was a significant relationship \((p < .01)\) and high magnitude of importance \((r = .513)\) between job satisfaction 2 and the retention variable. While social climate and job satisfaction 1 were significantly \((p < .01)\) related to the retention variable, both were of moderate importance. The other three factors (student relationships, role clarity, and role conflict) were of little practical importance to the retention variable. Although student relationships and role clarity were of little practical importance to the retention variable, participants were extremely positive regarding student relationships and role clarity, with the response mean highest for student relationships (5.53), closely followed by role clarity (5.04).

In support of this finding, Turner and Myers (2000) also found that student relationships are important to faculty of color in the workplace. They concluded that job satisfaction for faculty of color could be articulated into three themes: (1) satisfaction with teaching and working with students; (2) supportive administrative leadership mentoring relationships and collegiality; and (3) interaction with other faculty. Further, a genuine love of teaching and interactions with students were identified as the most satisfying aspects of the work lives of faculty of color. In fact, some diverse faculty stated the feelings of social isolation were so strong by White colleagues that they were more comfortable interacting socially with their students of color (Turner & Myers, 2000). Likewise, Abraham (1994) supports the importance of role clarity. He found that faculty role satisfaction is an important dynamic at higher education institutions.
Satisfied faculty members provide a source of strength and identity to the college atmosphere. While it is clear that job satisfaction is highly related and important to retention, student relationships and role clarity are also key factors for faculty of color in sustaining a positive academic climate. The researcher speculates that faculty of color may be more comfortable with their roles as they relate to students.

The results of this study indicated that job satisfaction significantly related to retention; however, there is evidence that suggests that faculty of color describe job satisfaction in a variety of ways. Therefore, exploring the term *job satisfaction* has tremendous value. For example, in this study, when respondents were asked to rank order their top three reasons for staying in their current positions, 43 identified job satisfaction as their number one reason. Upon further examination of this question, 79 respondents listed job satisfaction within their top three reasons to stay. While there were not specific factors defining job satisfaction within this particular question, Astin, Antonio, Cress, and Astin (1997) support this finding regarding the variety of ways faculty of color may define job satisfaction. These researchers revealed that most faculty of color cited intellectual challenge as the most important component of job satisfaction. Slightly lower ratings for satisfaction in professional relationships with other faculty emerged in their findings. However, overall job satisfaction was lower for faculty of color and showed a wider range of differences than for White faculty. Since job satisfaction is highly related to retention, investigating the factors related to why job satisfaction is lower for faculty of color is worthy of further exploration.

When examining reasons for early departure, the summary of faculty of color responses from this study regarding the top three reasons for leaving their current position, 36 participants identified race issues (isolation, experiences with prejudice and discrimination, and unwelcoming
culture/university) as their number one reason for leaving. In addition, 93 respondents identified race issues (isolation, experiences with prejudice and discrimination, and unwelcoming culture/university) within their top three reasons to leave. Reflected in Antonio’s (1998) study was a similar finding. While faculty of color ranked developing a meaningful philosophy of life as very important or an essential personal goal, they also ranked promoting racial understanding as a second important personal goal. West (2001) would argue that while faculty of color want others to better understand their perspectives, most times the burden falls on them to do all the cultural and moral work necessary for healthy race relations and a more productive environment.

When working to improve the climate at universities for faculty of color, recognizing the significant relationship between job satisfaction and retention of faculty of color is critical. Furthermore, understanding the factors that define job satisfaction for faculty of color is also necessary for successful retention of faculty of color.

Discussion of Demographic Group Difference for Retention

The second research question examined, “Are there significant group differences (racial/ethnic background, gender, age, sexual orientation, country of origin, institution type, academic discipline, marital status, with/without children, and tenure status) in employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year, predominantly White public universities in Ohio?” Demographic differences in each factor and retention were statistically analyzed. Significant group differences were found within five of the ten demographic variables: marital status, tenure status, country of origin, gender, and those with or without children. However, the only significant difference with respect to retention was country of origin. Descriptive data showed that those U. S. born faculty of color are more likely to be retained (\(M = 32.73, SD = 14.31\)) than non-U. S. born (\(M = 26.16, SD = 13.29\)). Because this
research notes a dearth of literature based on faculty of color demographic characteristics relating to country of origin, the researcher will offer discussion based on the qualitative data gathered from participants in the pilot study (refer to Chapter III).

In the pilot study, non-U. S. born faculty of color presented insights as well as challenges that could lead to the early departure of non-U. S. born faculty of color. The first insight for the researcher was the notion that non-U. S. born faculty appeared to view the terms *university environment* and the *community environment* interchangeably or synonymously. For example, if treatment was positive on campus for them then, of course, treatment regarding the community was positive. However, if they had uncomfortable/unwelcoming experiences in the community or, even, where they live, then likewise this carries over to the campus. This may be due to some form of infusion between both their personal and professional experiences in America. It seems that this may be one of the reasons why complimentary relations between the community and the university are important.

The second discovery also dealt with semantics. The terms *cultural climate* and *social climate* appeared to be synonymous. In other words, non-U. S. born faculty had difficulty separating the term *social climate* from the larger cultural context in which *social climate* is embedded. Their identity seems so tied up in who they were as cultural beings that they viewed the social environment from a distinctly cultural framework. Therefore, when non-U. S. born faculty used the term *cultural climate*, many times this reference referred to both their social and cultural experiences. Also coming from another country, the two terms may, indeed, be one.

The final insight gained from non-U. S. born faculty of color, and by far one of their greatest challenges was related to visas, green cards, and work permit related issues. Many times, the bureaucracy related to this process is so burdensome that early departure from their faculty
positions is merely the inability to receive approval to remain in the U. S. because of nonnegotiable deadlines. In asking if there were possible solutions, a suggestion included that university administrators could be of greater assistance in resolving those issues by understanding and expediting this cumbersome process.

Because job satisfaction has been a strong theme for faculty of color throughout this study, it is also important to note that a significant difference existed between the U. S. born and non-U. S. born with respect to job satisfaction. U. S. born faculty of color ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.07$) are more satisfied with one’s current position than non-U. S. born ($M = 3.31, SD = .99$). Perhaps this is due to a combination of issues. While not related to retention, there were several other significant group differences. One example of group differences regarding tenure status follows.

With regard to tenure status faculty, the tenured and tenure-track respondents were divided into three groups with respect to years in position: (1) tenured; (2) early years, 1-3 year(s) in tenure-track; and (3) later years, 4-6 years in tenure track. Significant differences were found with respect to social climate, student relationships, and role conflict within the tenure status variable. The early non-tenured were more positive with respect to social climate than the later non-tenured. In addition, the early non-tenured were more positive with respect to student relationships than the tenured. Just as important, the tenured faculty have more role conflict than early non-tenured faculty.

A finding one might surmise is that tenured faculty of color have more role conflict than tenure-track faculty of color. Also revealed in this study is that as years in the position increased for tenured faculty of color, the intent of leaving increased as well. A study at the Oregon University System (2005) echoes this finding. For example, there has been a rise in the proportion of departing senior faculty who leave before reaching 20 years of service. From
1992-2000 (eight years), 35% of senior faculty who left the system did so before attaining 20 years of service. In the following three years, that proportion had increased to 47%—nearly half of all leavers (Oregon State Board of Higher Education, 2005). The researcher believes that, perhaps, the intent to leave as years continue is, in part, a result of role conflict.

A study by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) reflected a similar finding suggesting that role conflict results in undesirable consequences for both organizational members and for organizational performance. Role conflict produces increased stress and dissatisfaction leading to a reduction in workplace productivity.

The impact of conflict in the workplace for faculty of color is decreased individual satisfaction and decreased organizational effectiveness. The researcher believes that this finding makes it reasonable to conclude that role conflict negatively impacts both the individuals and the institutional stakeholders (i.e., students, parents, faculty, staff, Board of Trustees, alumni, etc.). Understanding the significance of demographic group differences in the workplace for faculty of color should not be underestimated.

**Discussion of Factors Predicting Retention**

The third research question examined, “Which factors best predict the employment continuation plans of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public universities in Ohio?” The factor that best predicts retention for faculty of color at four-year predominantly White public Ohio universities is job satisfaction 2. Job satisfaction 2 was a single item on the Faculty Retention Questionnaire (FRQ) that asked *What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?* (applied a 5-point Likert-type scale with 1 as extremely dissatisfied with current position and 5 as extremely satisfied with current position). While all of the other factors (job satisfaction 1, social climate, student relationships, role clarity, and role
conflict) elicited responses via 45 items on the FRQ (job satisfaction 1 had the most with 19 items), this one item/question was the only significant predictor of retention. Since job satisfaction 2 was the sole predictor and accounted for 23% of the variance in retention, the researcher conducted further analysis to examine the factors that best predict job satisfaction 2. Findings indicated that three of the factors (social climate, role clarity, and role conflict) predicted and accounted for 53% of the variance in job satisfaction 2.

To summarize, job satisfaction 2 was a strong predictor of retention. Likewise, social climate, role clarity, and role conflict were especially strong predictors of job satisfaction 2. Therefore, there are critical linkages between social climate, role clarity, and role conflict to the retention of faculty of color.

While results of this study clearly identify job satisfaction 2 as a predictor of retention, determining the specific factors that define “job satisfaction” for faculty of color is still quite challenging. For example, the researcher made an assumption that job satisfaction 1, consisting of 19 items on the survey instrument, would have accurately addressed the breadth and depth of job satisfaction. The fact that job satisfaction 2 (the single item question on the survey What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?) predicts retention while the 19 items (job satisfaction 1) did not, calls into question the perceptions of job satisfaction for faculty of color. This larger question leaves one wondering if job satisfaction means something different to faculty of color than to mainstream faculty working at colleges and universities. In further analysis of this larger question, the researcher closely examined the job satisfaction 1 items.

The 19 items representing job satisfaction 1 focused on the work and academic environment (role as teacher, researcher, tenure and annual review processes, and specific tasks). While there was some satisfaction in the academic environment for faculty of color that included these tasks,
most viewed the workplace far beyond these tasks and found greater satisfaction in the social climate factor, such as developing and maintaining relationships and by having open communication channels with colleagues. This finding was revealed when investigating the social climate factor (one of the factors that predicted job satisfaction 2) from the FRQ.

When examining the social climate factor (intra-department relationships and support with faculty), the summary of responses to the social climate questions revealed that over 75% of the participants responded negatively (very strongly disagreed, strongly disagreed, disagreed, or neutral) to the statement: “The department faculty work together in the planning and implementation of research.” Once again, faculty of color are seeking opportunities for inclusion in the life of their departments. A study involving Iowa State University supports this finding and university leaders have responded to this challenge by sponsoring and coordinating a series of events (Faculty Fellowship Program, Faculty Professional Development Assignments, Instructional Development Grants, and Mentoring Program) aimed at developing staff and faculty and making them feel more involved in university life (Hanover Research, 2006).

Elmore and Blackburn (1983) also support this finding as they noted that there were limited opportunities in the academic workplace to develop the working relationships that faculty of color would like to have with majority faculty. Another study (Harvey & Scott-James, 1985) echoed the importance of a positive social climate. Harvey and Scott-James (1985) found that when there was little understanding, warmth, and empathy among their colleagues, many faculty of color sensed a lack of collegiality. In addition, Bonner (2004) also supports this finding as he found five themes shared by faculty of color at predominantly White institutions that relate specifically to the critical nature of relationships with faculty members within the department. Faculty of color regularly feel that they are: (1) proving self over and over (competence); (2)
providing the entertainment (perceptions of mainstream faculty regarding not only for faculty of
color to convey academic content to students but to do so with the notion of entertaining them as
well, must flash and dash students with media and Power Point lest to be viewed as lazy and
incompetent); (3) being kept out of the loop (professional networks); (4) playing two roles
(living in two worlds, double consciousness); and (5) feeling unwelcome (academic environment
with colleagues).

Results of this research provide evidence that faculty of color at predominantly White
universities may be more focused on, and find more importance in, building collegial
relationships/support, developing academic communication networks, and collaborating on
scholarly work and other activities that reach beyond daily tasks and procedures than mainstream
faculty. Essential ingredients involved in improving the climate at universities for faculty of
color retention, seems to be job satisfaction, social climate, role clarity, and less role conflict. If
attempts are not made to more clearly understand this higher education sector, other negative
consequences can occur.

Faculty of color responses from this study revealed that the top three reasons for leaving their
current positions, 36 (34.9%) participants identified race issues (isolation, experiences with
prejudice and discrimination, and unwelcoming culture/university) as their number one reason
for leaving while 93 (90.1%) respondents identified race issues (isolation, experiences with
prejudice and discrimination, and unwelcoming culture/university) within the their top three
reasons to leave. Turner and Myers (2000) agree with some elements of this finding. They
concluded, “faculty of color in predominantly White institutions continue to experience
exclusion, isolation, alienation, and devaluation. The result is an uncomfortable work
environment that undermines the productivity and satisfaction of minorities…” (p. 83). The
bottom line is that many faculty of color do not feel accepted, valued, supported, or respected in their academic workplaces.

Unwelcoming climates are sometimes described as having a chilly, or even, frigid climate. Research on chilly climates has called attention to incongruent experiences relating to gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, and other types of difference. Improving the climate by addressing issues such as unintentional and unconscious biases against underutilized groups will benefit all members of the organization (Advance Center for Institutional Change, 2003). Consequently, the researcher believes that the importance of building collegial support, relationships, and networks for faculty of color may assist in alleviating discomfort and increasing productivity in the workplace while successfully retaining faculty of color.

While building strong collegial relationships in the workplace is not always achievable, social and academic isolation of faculty of color can be an unintended outcome within faculty departments. The researcher believes that the isolation experienced by faculty of color could be addressed by providing opportunities for mainstream faculty to move beyond tolerance and, in turn, build meaningful relationships through discussions of racism and through understanding narratives (perceptions) of faculty of color. The comprehension of these narratives could possibly be a key ingredient in better understanding some of the factors associated with job satisfaction for faculty of color. Perhaps job satisfaction for faculty of color is, indeed, embedded in a set of social experiences and expectations related to racial differentiation in America. One possible means to explain this phenomenon is through Critical Race Theory (CRT), the theoretical framework for this study.
Discussion of the Theoretical Framework Relating to Retention

CRT implies that people of color have different experiences (life stories) that are not those of the dominant/mainstream group (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). In other words, what events and phenomena mean within one culture could mean something different to the larger society because of the difference in socio-cultural experiences. For example, police presence in the African American community is often associated with harassment and antagonism because of documented cases of racial profiling and police brutality. The well-publicized Rodney King incident is a case in point. In contrast, in White communities without a history of such incidents, a uniformed officer usually represents safety, security, and protection. These experiences (myths and wisdoms that make up the common culture about race) understood in mainstream groups are not, typically, the same for minority groups. Some refer to this as having different worldviews.

An individual’s worldview is based on the individual’s experience of cultural difference and is defined by one’s method of constructing an event or experience. This is further explained by DuBois’ (1903) term *double consciousness*. He describes *double consciousness* as the mental adjustment required to deal with the day-to-day racial inequalities experienced by people of color living in the United States. While on the exterior there is an appearance that everything is acceptable when in reality, internally things are not tolerable. The different realities suggested by CRT and DuBois (1903) are manifested in narratives, which express the subjective world of outsider groups (Adell, 1994; Buckery, 2004; Lyubansky, 2005; Smith, 2004; Thomas, 2002; Washington, 1972).

In the current study, job satisfaction appears to mean something different to faculty of color than it does to mainstream faculty. Opportunities for faculty of color discussions and explanations of narratives with mainstream faculty might help to shed light on these different
social worlds. The understanding of these narratives, in turn, may help to build relationships and understanding by creating an academic climate that supports all faculty.

Conclusions

Four conclusions can be drawn from this study regarding retention of faculty of color: (1) job satisfaction predicts retention; (2) social climate, role clarity, and role conflict predicts job satisfaction and are critical linkages to retention; (3) U. S. born faculty of color are more likely to be retained than non-U. S. born; and (4) faculty of color working at colleges and universities may perceive job satisfaction different from mainstream faculty. The conclusions regarding the results of this study are further discussed.

While job satisfaction predicts retention, determining the specific factors that best describe job satisfaction through faculty of color’s point of view is complex. This study found that social climate, role clarity, and role conflict predict job satisfaction, therefore, in essence, has strong ties to retention. Several researchers (Bonner, 2004; Harvey & Scott-James, 1985; Elmore & Blackburn, 1983; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) support this claim. Other researchers (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997; Antonio, 1998) not only support this finding, but have noted other critical factors (i.e., intellectual challenge, meaningful philosophy of life, etc.) associated with job satisfaction for faculty of color as well. Yet, the challenge still remains in determining which factors best predict retention for faculty of color in higher education institutions. Taking into account the findings from this study may assist in a better understanding of job satisfaction as it relates to faculty of color staying or leaving their current positions. The researcher offers explanations and suggestions regarding the findings from this study that may be valuable in faculty of color retention.
This study found that over 75% of the faculty of color listed job satisfaction within their top three reasons to stay while over 90% of the faculty of color identified race issues (isolation, experiences with prejudice and discrimination, and unwelcoming culture/university) within the their top three reasons to leave. Furthermore, role conflict for tenured faculty of color could be an influential reason for early departure.

This study also examined demographic group differences and found the only significant difference with respect to retention was for country of origin. While the literature on this topic is lean, the researcher conducted individual interviews with non-U. S. born faculty of color and found possible explanations for this difference. Much of the difference seemed to be attributable to two specific issues: semantics and work authorization. Semantic issues appeared to relate to differences between their home country culture and language vs. mainstream U. S. culture. The work documentation carries numerous concerns for non-U. S. born faculty of color as this process is mandated for non-U. S. citizen employees. While these findings may suggest reasons for early departure, the researcher advocates the following ideas.

Critically important for higher education administrators are first recognizing that current issues exist for faculty of color as it relates to campus climates and culture. Just as important is the acceptance that these concerns need to be addressed. Furthermore, building structures for collegial relationships/support and making role expectations clear are vital. In addition, increasing cultural competence and developing academic communication networks can assist with work documentation bureaucracy for non-U. S. faculty of color.

For faculty colleagues, collaborating on scholarly work and valuing student relationships may assist in addressing faculty of color concerns by alleviating discomfort and increasing productivity in the workplace. In addition, developing cultural competence for faculty might
assist in, not only a better understanding of the issues for faculty of color, but also in developing an appreciation of the educational value for retaining them. These suggestions, along with a comprehensive university retention strategic plan, speak to both faculty of color reasons to stay while, possibly, improving the workplace for all faculty.

The conclusions from this study raise larger questions: Does job satisfaction mean something different to faculty of color than it does to mainstream faculty? Do faculty of color perceive job satisfaction as a part of their social/cultural experiences? Is job satisfaction a part of the dual reality that is inherent in people of color through the identification of being a member of an underrepresented group or by having a minority status in America?

Responses to these questions may be best understood through the recognition and understanding of Critical Race Theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001); worldviews are shaped distinctly by individual experiences of racial and cultural differences. Understanding the tension between the insider and outsider positions in the context of power, race, and racism in America may, specifically, provide insightful answers (Adell, 1994; Bockting, 2000; Buckery, 2004; DuBois, 1903; Lyubansky, 2005; Ridley, 1981; Smith, 2004; Thomas, 2002; Washington, 1972).

West (2001) claims that mainstream Americans define what it means to be American; the rest must fit in. Based on this reasoning, if job satisfaction is determined by mainstream America, it could be that faculty of color are not fitting in so well. Perhaps providing opportunities for faculty to discuss the topics of power, race, and racism, as well as offering other meaningful professional development opportunities is essential in improving the climate for faculty of color.

Prior to this study, the researcher wanted to identify the critical factors that predict retention for faculty of color at higher education institutions. While there is no one factor that was clearly identified, these findings may suggest the importance of providing opportunities for the sharing
of subjective cultural worldviews (narratives) of faculty of color with mainstream faculty with the intent of creating greater understanding, cooperation, and positive relationship building within departments. As one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more sophisticated, one’s competence in intercultural relationships is strengthened as well (Karim, 2003). Developing cultural competence seems fundamental in creating a more welcoming, inviting, and validating climate at higher education institutions while effectively increasing faculty of color retention.

Recommendations

Findings from this study present an understanding of how faculty of color perceive their work environments in relation to decisions regarding staying and leaving in their current tenured or tenure-track positions at colleges and universities in Ohio. The results of this study are intended to benefit higher education institutions by informing administrators and faculty leaders as they seek ways to strengthen institutional climates to make them more conducive to faculty of color retention. Specific strategies presented in this chapter are designed to assist higher education leaders in the transformation of the academy to better support and sustain faculty of color. This chapter concludes with further recommendations for research related in this area of study.

Recommendations for Practices and Policies in Higher Education

Inherent in this discussion concerning the retention of faculty of color is that “it is the responsibility of the institutions to eradicate the elements of sexism and racism that are imbedded in their norms and values and that contribute to the current barriers to tenure and promotion for women and minority faculty” (Cooper & Stevens, 2002, p. 9). While the existing research gap limits our understanding of faculty of color, there are additional obstacles that need to be addressed if the goal is to attract and retain the best and brightest in making the academy a more
equitable and appealing place to work for faculty of color. Leaders must understand the critical distinction between merely having diversity in the workplace and developing the organizational capacity to leverage diversity as a resource (Cox, 2001).

*Transforming higher education leadership*

As leaders develop organizational capacity in leveraging diversity on university campuses, policy development must occur. The development of policy around the topic of faculty of color retention is the most effective way to make the academic environment more conducive to retaining faculty of color. The policy should develop at the highest level of the university: the President and the Board of Trustees. Their job is to set the direction and priorities of the university. This can be accomplished through resolutions, strategic planning, and specific goal setting to clearly explain to the university community the educational value of diversity in higher education. For example, the Board of Trustees at one mid-size university in Ohio has approved and adopted a resolution that clearly establishes diversity as a major priority of the university. The expectation is that all operating units of the university will include these principals of diversity in their departmental planning documents. After adoption of the resolution, the principals are integrated into the performance reviews of the department members. Also important, this same university has a recruitment and retention plan for faculty of color as a part of their university-wide strategic plan. If policies, strategic plans, and other important tactics that support diversity initiatives do not begin at the level of the President, then chances are slim for organizational transformation to occur.

If the policy does not develop at the level of the President and Board of Trustees, then strategies and practices need to be developed by department leaders so the diversity goals can
still be accomplished. Three specific strategies are presented that can assist higher education leaders in transforming the academy to better support faculty of color retention.

The first strategy calls for assisting faculty in understanding the process of organizational change because diversity and inclusion require change. Since change is a process, not an event, the leader’s job is not so much managing the day-to-day operations but rather guiding the department through constant change. In essence, the leader’s primary job is creating stability in the midst of change (Calabrese, 2002). In other words, in creating a more welcoming and equitable campus climate for faculty of color, the leader can expect opposition to this outcome. However, the leader must find ways to address this opposition. Calabrese’s (2002) strategies to overcoming resistance to change can serve as guidelines as faculty embrace such changes.

One effective way to get faculty to agree to change is to involve those that will be most affected by the change. Administrative leaders should involve both mainstream faculty and faculty of color to discuss current issues for faculty of color with the intent for them to also be the solution-seekers. Once solutions are in draft form, sharing them with all faculty in the organization for comments is important in building capacity around effective change, even when the comments are less than positive.

The second important strategy in creating a more inclusive environment for faculty of color is for the leader to be able to conceptualize and articulate the reason for the change. Concisely and clearly explaining to all faculty the educational value for retaining faculty of color is imperative. Focusing on what is to be gained for all fosters agreement on what otherwise might be divisive. Once the practice or policy has been established and approved, the leader is responsible for the monitoring. Getting faculty to adhere to the change when new policies and practices are developed and implemented is challenging. Delegating some of the responsibility of the follow-
up and accountability for the policies/practices to faculty not only assists in a better understanding of the issues first hand, but also assists in building interdependency within the department.

When creating a more welcoming and equitable campus climate for faculty of color, the third strategy encourages the establishment of ongoing meaningful professional development opportunities. Professional development designed to facilitate the development of greater intercultural sensitivity among faculty, staff, and students is fundamental. Educational leaders need to carefully examine their worldviews to determine whether or not unintentional and subtle biases are promoted. Therefore, leaders not only need to continue with their own professional development in the area of diversity, but also must provide meaningful diversity professional development opportunities for all faculty. In the following paragraphs, the first suggestion is for leader professional development while the second is intended for faculty professional development.

Karim (2003) offers the Intercultural Consciousness Progression Model (ICPM) as a framework for leader professional development. Particularly for academic and administrative leaders, this framework is used for understanding how people make sense of the world and engage, accordingly, in leadership at different levels of intercultural consciousness. The ICPM consists of eight culture-general skill areas and is designed to assist leaders to better understand the cognitive, affective, and behavioral skill sets that enhance leaders’ efficacy in intercultural contexts. The eight skills are: (1) cognitive complexity and critical thinking; (2) perspective multidimensionality; (3) interpretative multiplicity; (4) contextual analysis; (5) affective resilience; (6) tolerance for ambiguity; (7) identity integration; and (8) cultural empathy.
Using this framework for understanding the increasingly complex cognitive structures of faculty of color, leaders can develop intercultural skills and gain insight into intercultural situations that may generate answers to addressing difficult climate and cultural issues at universities. Although leaders may already possess and use these skills generally, they might not use them in intercultural-specific contexts. When using this framework, the most important point is that intercultural consciousness is a state of mind that requires a holistic view of one’s cognitions, beliefs, behaviors, and emotion. Extensive self-reflection and critical self-analysis is crucial and necessary as the leader goes beyond mere recognition and knowledge of cultural differences and language. Additionally, intentional inquiry and comprehension of the lived experience and worldview of the other is imperative. Intercultural consciousness requires the leader to be patient, tolerant of uncertainty, creative, and flexible in behaviors and thought. As one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more sophisticated, one’s competence in intercultural relationships is strengthened (Karim, 2003).

In improving the academic climate, providing a retreat to better understand faculty of color experiences would be a meaningful professional development opportunity for faculty. This is a powerful first step in developing faculty cultural competence. A panel discussion with faculty of color sharing their life stories (narratives) with mainstream faculty with the intent of creating greater cooperation and positive relationship building within the department is a viable option. Retreats could also provide opportunities to discuss racism and other topics that present faculty perspectives that are different from the dominant group viewpoints. Informal and brown bag luncheons on topics related to the academic interests of faculty should create opportunities for interaction. Because understanding diversity is a developmental process, the creation of
ongoing, meaningful professional development opportunities throughout the year for faculty is extremely important.

These three strategies work best when embedded in teamwork, recognition of key milestones, and contributions of faculty. Fostering collaboration and creating positive interactions among all faculty is the conduit in achieving extraordinary accomplishments for all faculty in the workplace.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

When considering the findings of this study, offering recommendations for future research as well as recognizing the delimitations and limitations of the research design is important. Future research should continue to examine ways to more accurately define the factors related to job satisfaction from faculty of color perspectives. One suggestion includes a follow-up study using Path Analysis to examine effects of social climate, role conflict, and role clarity on job satisfaction on retention. Using an instrument or questions that more accurately reflect the breadth and depth of their views of job satisfaction can be of great assistance in not only identifying specific factors that can improve the academic and social climate for faculty of color on campuses, but can also assist in planning and implementation of retention strategies.

The addition of a qualitative component to this research would enhance the interpretation of the quantitative findings by adding individual perspectives. Having the opportunity for follow-up interviews with the researcher, subjective cultural views could better explain those factors that best describe job satisfaction in the workplace for faculty of color. Additionally, replication of this study with tenured and tenure-track mainstream faculty could better delineate between factors specifically relating to faculty of color retention from those factors that best relate to mainstream faculty retention.
Since there were group differences for some of the demographic variables in this study, a closer examination of some of these variables, such as marital status, age, and having children is important, especially when considering their value in the tenure process as well as in developing retention strategies for faculty of color. Last but not least, because some colleges and universities spend concerted efforts only on the successful recruitment strategies of faculty of color, continued studies on retention of faculty of color must coincide because even the most successful recruiting strategies are futile if faculty are not satisfied and do not remain at the university.

One delimitation in this study is that the faculty of color who participated in this study may not be representative of all faculty of color across the country. Since all of the respondents in this study were from one state, replication of this study with faculty of color from other states would be helpful in establishing confidence in applying the results to other faculty of color in general.

Another delimitation was using the term faculty of color. This term has historically been accepted by some of the faculty representing different racial and ethnic backgrounds, while some groups retaliate against the term. One of the main reasons the researcher selected the term was to capture the essence of the academic climate for faculty in underrepresented groups that might reveal different needs based on ethnic or racial background. As reflected in the results, there were no group differences within racial/ethnic background in relation to the six factors and to retention. Thus, for this study an assumption can be made that each of the backgrounds, while different, has in common a history of American life and identity to a degree that has not been fully recognized.
As a limitation to this study, there were confidentiality and anonymity concerns for faculty of color filling out surveys whether paper-and-pencil or online. Perhaps the concern is based on the lower number of tenured and tenure-track at individual institutions, therefore making it potentially easier to identify an individual. While anonymity and confidentiality were clearly addressed in multiple ways as a part of the survey instrument, four extensive e-mails were sent to the researcher with multiple researcher responses inquiring about both anonymity and confidentiality.

To conclude, there is a call for more studies of faculty of color in American colleges and universities. While it has been projected that student enrollment in higher education will increase, there will be a decline in the availability of faculty, especially those from underrepresented groups (Johnston & Packer, 1987). Faculty of color have an overall positive effect on higher education campuses and their students as well as the quality of instruction is perceived to improve when faculty of color are present (Louque, 2000). Despite the obstacles faculty of color face on a daily basis, many plan to remain in their chosen profession within the academy (Turner & Myers, 2000), but the question lingers, remain at what cost.

With the combination of limited knowledge about underrepresented faculty in higher education and the projected shortage in faculty of color availability, more studies on this topic are essential.
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APPENDIX A

Faculty Retention Questionnaire

This survey measures the perceptions of academic climate factors held by faculty of color at four-year, predominantly white public higher education institutions in Ohio. By completing this survey, you are providing consent to participate in this study and understand that individual and institution names will not be revealed in any publications or presentations that disseminate the results of this study. For each item, you will be asked to provide information regarding your professional experiences and personal background. Please select responses that accurately describe you and your experiences as faculty of color. Approximate time for completion is 10-15 minutes.

Part 1 of 4: Academic Setting

1 = Very Strongly Disagree 5 = Agree
2 = Strongly Disagree 6 = Strongly Agree
3 = Disagree 7 = Very Strongly Agree
4 = Neutral

Q1 Please indicate your agreement with the following 31 statements.

1a. The physical conditions in my work environment are satisfactory.

1b. There are financial opportunities available to me to conduct my research.

1c. My university provides opportunities for the publication of my works.

1d. I am fairly compensated for my work as a university professor.

1e. I feel I have the support of my colleagues in the activities I conduct as a professor.

1f. The academic environment promotes my professional work.

1g. There is adequate academic communication among faculty members in my department/program.
1h. The personal/human relations among my colleagues support my academic/professional performance.

1i. The process/system for faculty appointment is appropriate.

1j. The annual review process for faculty activity is appropriate.

1k. There are clear criteria for the evaluation of my research activities.

1l. There is agreement between my expectations of what a faculty member should be and what a professor actually is.

1m. The public appreciates the work performed by university professors.

1n. The university encourages my improvement as a teacher.

1o. The process/system for faculty tenure and promotion is appropriate.

1p. My university has prepared me to adequately carry out my duties as a researcher.

1q. There are clear expectations about my role as a professor that allows me to fulfill my teaching responsibilities.

1r. There are clear expectations about my role as a professor that allows me to fulfill my work as a researcher.

1s. There are, within my university, avenues for resolving the problems and concerns related to my role as a professor.

1t. I have adequate time to be able to perform my research tasks.

1u. My students express interest in the course content that I teach.

1v. The university promotes my research activity.

1w. The university’s support is appropriate to carry out my role as a teacher and researcher.

1x. Designated time periods throughout the semester are available for students to address their concerns to me.
1y. Student feedback is taken into account for the improvement of my teaching.

1z. The department faculty work together in the planning and implementation of research.

1aa. On an annual basis, I take students’ feedback in planning/revising my teaching approach.

1ab. I modify my teaching style to meet the needs of the students in class.

1ac. Students’ class work demands and level of difficulty are reflected in the nature of my assignments.

1ad. The students have opportunity to evaluate the quality of teaching of each professor.

1ae. The colleagues in my department/program support my research.

Part 2 of 4: Your Role

1 = Definitely Not True of my Job 5 = Somewhat True of my Job
2 = Not True of my Job 6 = True of my Job
3 = Somewhat Not True of my Job 7 = Extremely True of my Job
4 = Neutral

Q 2 Please indicate your agreement with the following 14 statements.

2a. I have clear, planned goals and objectives for my job.

2b. I am required to do things in a certain way that I would not choose.

2c. I know I have divided my time properly.

2d. I receive assignments without the assistance to complete them.

2e. I know what my responsibilities are.

2f. I sometimes have to disregard a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.

2g. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.

2h. I know exactly what is expected of me.

2i. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

2j. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
2k. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not by others.

2l. I receive assignments without adequate resources and materials to complete them.

2m. I receive clear direction for performing my job responsibilities.

2n. I often work on unnecessary things.

Part 3 of 4: Employment Values

Q3 What is your level of satisfaction in your current position?

1 = Extremely Dissatisfied
2 = Dissatisfied
3 = Neutral
4 = Satisfied
5 = Extremely Satisfied

Please rank order the top 3 factors that you believe have the most significant impact on your intention to continue working in your current position (with 1 indicating your top factor.)

Q4 Salary
Q5 Mentoring
Q6 Job Satisfaction
Q7 Sense of belonging in the University
Q8 Sense of belonging in the Community
Q9 Positive Social/Cultural Climate
Q10 Positive Racial Climate
Q11 Family support
Q12 Other Factor 1
Q13 Other Factor 2
Q14 Other Factor 3
Please rank order the top 3 factors that you believe have the most significant impact on your intention to leave your current position (with 1 indicating your top factor.)

Q18 Salary
Q19 Not having a mentor
Q20 Isolation
Q21 Experiences with prejudice & discrimination
Q22 Role confusion/ambiguity/conflict
Q23 Unwelcoming culture at the University
Q24 Unwelcoming culture in the Community
Q25 Little guidance about tenure process
Q26 Visa, Work Permit, Green Card related issues
Q27 Other Factor 1
Q28 Other Factor 2
Q29 Other Factor 3

Q33 Within each time frame, what is the likelihood of you staying in your current position?

1 = Strong Likelihood of Leaving
2 = Likelihood of Leaving
3 = Unsure
4 = Likely to Stay
5 = Strong Likelihood of Staying

a. 1 year
b. 2-3 years
c. 4-6 years
d. Over 6 years
Part 4 of 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please select the appropriate response(s) for each question. Please select responses that most accurately describe you.

Q34 Racial/ethnic background (drop box):
___ African American/Black
___ Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander
___ Latino/Hispanic
___ Native American/Hawaiian/Alaska Native
___ Biracial/Multiracial

Q35 Gender:
___ Female
___ Male
___ Transgender/Transsexual

Q36 Age:
___ Under 30
___ 30-39
___ 40-49
___ 50-59
___ Over 60

Q37 Sexual Orientation:
___ Heterosexual
___ Gay/Lesbian
___ Bisexual

Q38 Country of Origin:
___ U.S. Born
___ Born Outside U.S.

Q39 Institution type:
___ 4-yr Public Institution – under 20,000 students
___ 4-yr Public Institution – over 20,000 students

Q40 Academic Discipline:
___ College of Arts & Science
___ College of Education

Q41 Marital status:
___ Single
___ Married
___ Living with a Partner
___ Divorced
___ Widowed
Q42 Children:
___ Yes
___ No

Q43 Faculty Status:
___ Tenured
___ Tenure-track (drop box)
   ___ Year 1
   ___ Year 2
   ___ Year 3
   ___ Year 4
   ___ Year 5
   ___ Year 6

Thank you for completing the survey! Please be sure to click the “submit” button.
APPENDIX B

Introduction to Study and Consent

Bowling Green State University

Dear Faculty Member:

Greetings! My name is Paula Whetsel-Ribeau and I am a doctoral student at Bowling Green State University. I seek your participation in a research project that examines the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color in Ohio’s Colleges of Education and Arts & Sciences. The Deans of Education and Arts & Science in Ohio were contacted via e-mail requesting assistance to forward this electronic survey to the faculty of color in their respective colleges. I retrieved the Deans’ electronic addresses from the Ohio College Association Administrative Directory and the Internet.

I have developed an electronic survey that should require no more than 10-15 minutes of your time (see link below). Your individual responses will remain confidential. By completing this survey, you are providing consent to participate in this study. Please be aware that individual and institution names will not be revealed in any publication or presentation that disseminates results of this study. In addition, each individual participant benefits by having an opportunity to reflect on how views of the work environment can impact employment continuation plans. The results of this study also benefit institutions by informing administrators and faculty leaders as they seek ways to strengthen institutional climates to make them more conducive to retaining faculty of color. Please consider assisting me by completing the survey no later than Monday, February 19, 2007.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary; there are no anticipated risks to you or your institution. You may choose to withdraw your participation in the study at any time. Follow-up messages will be sent in approximately two weeks after initial distribution of the survey. Data will be stored in a secured, password-protected file and will be destroyed after dissertation completion. Results of the study will be available from me for a period of up to two years after participation in the study.

If you have any questions or comments about the study, please feel free to contact me at pwhetse@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at Bowling Green State University, 419-372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu if any problems or concerns arise during the course of the study.

A profound thanks for those who are able to assist me with this study.
Best Regards,

Paula Whetsel-Ribeau  
Doctoral Candidate  
Educational Administration and Leadership Studies  
Bowling Green State University

Survey Directions:

Click on the link below to access the survey. When you have completed the survey, remember to click the SUBMIT button.

http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/IR/facret/facret.htm

Approved–BGSU HSRB  
Project ID H07D076GE7  
Effective 10/27/06  
Expires 10/16/07
APPENDIX C
Pilot Participant Information and Consent

Subject: Faculty of Color Retention Survey

Dear BGSU Faculty Member:

Greetings! My name is Paula Whetsel-Ribeau and I am a doctoral student at Bowling Green State University (BGSU). To further establish content validity and reliability of the survey used in my study, I am requesting your participation in a pilot study that examines the relationships between demographic characteristics, academic climate perceptions, and retention of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color in Ohio. This pilot study will play an important role in preparation for a larger study across a number of Colleges and Universities in Ohio. In order to conduct this pilot, I obtained your name, ethnicity, and college from the BGSU Provost’s office.

Because you are a group of respondents who are similar as possible to my study respondents, I request that you complete the electronic survey and subsequently make written comments/suggestions related to content appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, language, clarity, format, etc. The survey itself should require no more than 10-15 minutes of your time (see link below). Additional time may be necessary to offer comments. While your responses will not be anonymous, your identity will remain confidential. I will not identify you in any publications/presentations. Data will be stored in a secured, password-protected file and will be destroyed after dissertation completion. By completing this survey, you are providing consent to participate in this pilot study. Please consider assisting me by completing and submitting the survey (press SUBMIT after completing electronic survey) AND written comments to me at 305 Saddlemire Building, BGSU, no later than Monday, Nov 6, 2006.

To express my sincere appreciation, I will provide a $10.00 gift card to the BGSU Bowen-Thompson Student Union upon receipt of both submission of survey and comments. Potential benefits of participating in this study include each individual having an opportunity to reflect on how views of the work environment can impact continuation plans. The results of the study also benefit institutions by informing administrators and faculty leaders as they seek ways to strengthen institutional climates to make them more conducive to retaining faculty of color.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary; there are no anticipated risks to you or your institution. You may choose to withdraw your participation in the study at any time.

If you have any questions or comments about the study, please feel free to contact me at pwhetse@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at Bowling Green State University, 419-372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu if any problems or concerns arise during the course of the study.
A profound thanks for those who are able to assist me with this study.

Best Regards,

Paula Whetsel-Ribeau
Doctoral Candidate
Educational Administration and Leadership Studies
Bowling Green State University

Survey Directions:

Click on the link below to access the survey. When you have completed the survey, remember to click the SUBMIT button.

http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/IR/facret/facret.htm

Approved–BGSU HSRB
Project ID H07D076GE7
Effective 10/27/06
Expires 10/16/07