

**Civic Engagement, Service-Learning and Faculty Engagement: A Profile of Black Women Faculty**

Katherine I. E. Wheatle

Allison BrckaLorenz

Center for Postsecondary Research  
Indiana University, Bloomington

Paper presented at the 2015 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association  
Chicago, IL

### Abstract

Existent research on African American (or Black) women faculty espouse that they are disproportionately overlooked during the tenure and promotion process, largely due to the academy's over-validation of research activities and undervaluing of service-based and teaching activities. These studies largely utilize qualitative inquiry to develop narratives about the experiences of Black women faculty. The current study seeks to test this narrative quantitatively by using a large-scale sample of faculty engagement survey data to compare Black women faculty encouragement of civic engagement and use of service-learning to their Black male, White female, and White male counterparts. Findings suggest that Black women faculty are more encouraging of civic engagement among their students and include service-learning within their courses than others.

**Civic Engagement, Service-Learning and Faculty Engagement:  
A Profile of Black Women Faculty**

**Introduction**

The examination of the experiences of African American (or Black) women faculty has been a topic of importance by scholars in the field of higher education (Gregory, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Patton & Catching, 2009; Turner, 2002), but remains consistently scarce in mainstream publication. In 2011, Black females represented only 3 percent (or 22,989) of all full-time faculty in postsecondary education in the United States (NCES, 2012). Despite their numerical minority among faculty, an investigation of their current roles within higher education warrants necessary attention.

Research that has been conducted on African American women faculty focuses on issues affecting retention, promotion, tenure and job-satisfaction. These studies largely utilize qualitative inquiry to develop narratives about the experiences of Black women faculty (Thomas & Hollenstead, 2001; Cooper, 2006; Olsen, Maple & Stage, 1995). By illuminating core issues such as the intersection of racism and sexism, these studies contribute to a consistent narrative that Black women faculty's roles, allocation of work time and barriers to tenure lie within their greater involvement in institutional service activities associated with the professoriate rather than research and teaching activities associated with successful tenure and promotion (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999). Olsen, Maple and Stage (1995) further expound, "because of their commitment to the values of community and to the intellectual and social development of their students, female and minority faculty are reported to invest more time and energy in their teaching and to derive more satisfaction from it" (p. 268).

The following study seeks to test this narrative quantitatively by using a large-scale sample of faculty engagement survey data to compare Black women faculty encouragement of civic engagement and use of service-learning in their teaching to their Black male, White female, and White male counterparts.

### **Civic Engagement, Service-Learning & African American Women Faculty**

Evidenced by existent research, civic engagement and service learning have positive impacts on students (Astin, 1996; Astin & Sax, 1999; Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999; Batchelder & Root, 1994; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Collectively, the findings of these studies demonstrate that students who engage in community service, volunteering, and service-learning opportunities have positive outcomes related to retention, express interest in post-baccalaureate education, develop deeper understandings of course content, and aspire to greater commitments towards social justice issues. Participation in service experiences is also associated with other indicators of positive student engagement such as the ability to apply course concepts to real world scenarios, demonstration of critical thinking skills, and earn higher grades (Antonio, Astin & Cress, 2000).

Considering these positive impacts on student outcomes, a broad range of faculty must utilize service-learning as a pedagogical technique and encourage students to participate in other service-related activities so that all students receive the maximum benefits of civic engagement (Antonio, et al., 2000). According to researchers at the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles, 55.5 percent of faculty who responded to a survey on faculty norms declared that instilling in students a commitment to community service as an important goal for undergraduate education (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, & Santos, 2009). In the same study, 87.9 percent of faculty indicated that colleges should encourage students to

participate in community service activities. Yet, far fewer are taking necessary strides to realize these goals for their own students. Recommended by Antonio et al. (2000), faculty, as academic role models, need to “invest their time and talents in developing the courses, teaching the classes, and most importantly, promoting students’ involvement in community service” (p. 375). While they provide insight into realizing the intended end, the authors also acknowledge the challenge of aligning faculty values and rewarding systems with institutional calls to provide a more engaging academic curriculum.

Many studies examining faculty engagement in community service have considered the value of service within the faculty role. These studies consistently suggest that service, in comparison to the production of research and publications, is devalued by academe. For example, findings from Abes, Jackson and Jones (2002) suggest that service and service-learning is more inviting in the social sciences and humanities compared to the physical and biological sciences, and among lower ranked, untenured faculty (i.e., adjunct and assistant professors) compared to tenured faculty. The authors also found that 30 percent of faculty at research universities who used service-learning in their courses disclosed that because they were not rewarded in performance reviews and tenure and promotion decisions for their use of service-learning, they might be deterred from using service-learning in the future (Abes, Jackson & Jones, 2002). In a provocatively titled article, Jaeger and Thornton (2006) found that faculty earned “neither honor nor compensation” when they chose to engage in public service. More specifically, the researchers found that while most faculty respondents reported public service as highly valued by colleagues, department heads, deans and other administrators, only 35 percent perceived public service activities to be valued in promotion and tenure process (p. 352). Their findings reveal contrived messaging for faculty regarding public service: while socially and

verbally touted, public service is not practically supported by research institutions (Jaeger & Thornton, 2006). Findings from a quantitative content analysis of faculty tenure and promotion documents conducted by Glass, Doverneck and Schweitzer (2011) foreshadows the deplorable status of service for tenure-seeking faculty. In their study, Glass et al. (2011) found that while most faculty reported at least one type of publicly engaged instruction, only 10 percent reported using curricular, community-engaged learning. Furthermore, no faculty reported engaging in cocurricular service-learning on their promotion and tenure documents (Glass, Doverneck & Schweitzer, 2011).

Research in the area of faculty socialization provide similar findings. Considerable research and literature has been published about the socialization process for the preparation of future faculty. Gardner and Barnes (2007) describe graduate education as “an integral part of higher education, providing not only the next generation of scholars but also the creation and transmission of knowledge to constituencies both inside and outside of academia” (p. 370). As evidenced by previous research, the socialization process for graduate students of color and women can be a negative one (Felder, Stevenson & Gasman, 2014; Gonzalez, 2006; Minor, 2003; Nettles, 1990). In general, many people of color and women who seek to establish themselves in the academy find that teaching and service activities in which they participate are less valued than activities linked to research (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Davis, 2008; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Several researchers have found that gender and racial disparities exist when examining faculty service activities (Antonio, et al., 2000; Baez, 2000; Eyler, Giles, Stenson & Gray, 2001). For instance, in their analysis of a national sample of full-time undergraduate teaching faculty, Antonio et al. (2000) found that higher proportions of women performed service work, and

women were more likely than men to advise student organizations that did volunteer work, incorporate community service in courses, and 60 percent more likely to endorse community service as a graduation requirement for students. In the same study, the authors found that faculty of color scored higher than their White colleagues in their involvement with student groups that engaged in volunteer activities, supported initiatives that provided services to the community, greater commitment to encouraging an ethic of service in their students, in addition to supporting community service as a graduation requirement. Antonio et al. (2000) saliently expounds, “As long as most service activities are being practiced by marginalized faculty, those activities will remain marginalized in academe” (p. 388). Baez (2000) describes service within the academy, particularly minority-related service, as “institutional abuse of faculty of color” because they are rarely rewarded favorably in the tenure and promotion process for the service they provide their academic communities. Though all participants in this study were faculty of color, all admitted that service was burdensome and the downfall of most faculty of color because they are highly sought after to fulfill service-related needs for their departments and perform race-related service (Baez, 2000).

Existing research about African American women faculty, in particular, explicate a consistent narrative that Black women faculty roles, allocation of work time, and barriers to tenure lie within their greater involvement in institutional service activities associated with the professoriate than research and teaching activities associated with successful tenure and promotion (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999). Griffin and Reddick (2011) suggest that Black women faculty members concurrently pay both a “Black tax” and “gender tax,” in that they are expected to meet with, mentor, and advise more students than their white colleagues, especially undertaking the unbalanced burden of meeting the high needs of students of color.

### **Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to explore the extent to which Black women faculty encourage civic engagement among their students and utilize service-learning within their courses. We aimed to better understand Black women professors by building a profile using faculty engagement data. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do faculty and institution characteristics compare to the overall sample of faculty for Black or African American women?
2. How do various aspects of civic engagement compare for Black or African American women, Black or African American men, White women, and White men?

### **Methods**

#### **Data Source**

The data for this study come from the 2014 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). FSSE was designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement by measuring faculty perceptions and expectations of undergraduate engagement in educationally purposeful activities, the extent to which faculty promote learning and development in their courses, the extent of faculty interaction with students, and how faculty allocate their time. FSSE 2014 was administered to faculty at 143 institutions. In 41% of the faculty contacted responded to the survey. Response rates for individual institutions ranged from 14% to 84% with an average institutional response rate of 48%. Participating institutions are able to add topical modules, short sets of items focused on important issues in undergraduate quality, to the end of the core FSSE instrument. This study additionally uses data from the fourteen institutions that participated in the 2014 administration of the Civic Engagement topical module.

#### **Sample**

The sample for this study consists of responses from over 18,860 faculty members. These faculty held a wide variety of academic disciplinary appointments with the largest representation of faculty in Arts & Humanities fields (23%). Faculty were split fairly equally in the ranks of Full (27%), Associate (24%), and Assistant Professor (24%) and Lecturer/Instructor (25%). Nearly half of faculty identified as either men (48%) or women (47%), and most identified as White (72%). The majority of faculty (78%) were aged between 35 and 64 years old. Four percent (n=505) of the overall sample were Black or African American women, 3% (n=423) were Black or African American men, 46% (n=5696) were White women, and 47% (n=5740) were White men. The majority of respondents (58%) were from Master's colleges and universities, and around two-thirds (62%) were from publicly controlled institutions. Three in five respondents (59%) were from larger institutions (5,000 or greater undergraduate enrollment). For more details about this sample, see Tables 1 and 2. A subset of faculty (n=1,637) at fourteen institutions participated in an extra item set that focused on civic engagement. Six percent of these faculty were Black or African American women, 5% were Black or African American men, 48% were White women, and 41% were White men.

### **Measures**

On the core FSSE instrument, faculty indicate how important it is to them that undergraduates at their institution participate in a community-based project (service-learning) as part of a course as well as about how many of faculty's undergraduate courses have included a community-based project (service-learning). Faculty additionally indicate the extent to which they structure their course so that students learn and develop as informed and active citizens. A full listing of these items can be found in Table 3. Although faculty respond to a wide variety of demographic items, central to this study faculty respond to their racial or ethnic identification

(select all that apply: American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; White; Other; I prefer not to respond) and gender identity (Man, Woman, Another gender identity, I prefer not to respond). Although the majority of comparison in this study focuses on racial/ethnic identification and gender identity, other comparisons are made by the various faculty and institution characteristics in Tables 1 and 2. A subset of faculty responded to an extra item set focused on civic engagement that asks faculty to assess institutional emphasis on conflict resolution skills and examines how often students are encouraged to engage with local/campus and state/national/global issues. A full listing of these items can be found in Table 4.

### **Analyses**

To initially explore the profile of Black or African American women faculty, this study's first research question examines how faculty and institution characteristics compare, as underrepresentation and overrepresentation, for Black or African American women and the overall FSSE survey. To answer this question, faculty and institution characteristics were descriptively compared for Black or African American women and the overall faculty distributions in the 2014 administration of FSSE. To further explore Black or African American women faculty's values, emphases, and perspectives on civic engagement, our second research question explored how various aspects of civic engagement compared for Black or African American women, Black or African American men, White women, and White men. To answer this question, items on the core FSSE survey about faculty value and emphasis on community-based projects (service-learning) and course emphasis on becoming an informed and active citizen were compared using ANOVAs and effect sizes when appropriate for Black or African American women, Black or African American men, White women, and White men.

## Results

### **How do faculty and institution characteristics compare to the overall sample of faculty for Black or African American women?**

Compared to the overall FSSE 2014 sample, Black or African American women are overrepresented in the fields of Education, Health Professions, and Social Service Professions. They are underrepresented in the fields of Arts & Humanities and Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Natural Resources. Black or African American women are approximately proportionally represented in Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Sciences; Social Sciences; Business; Communications, Media, & Public Relations; and Engineering.

Black or African American women are very noticeably underrepresented as Full Professors and overrepresented as Assistant Professors. They are approximately proportionally represented in other ranks: Associate Professors and full- and part-time Instructors and Lecturers. This disparity in rank may be complicated by Black and African American women's tendency to be younger, overrepresented in the 35-44 age category. Black or African American women were also noticeably overrepresented in having smaller course loads (0-3 courses) and underrepresented in having larger course loads (8 or more courses).

Respondents that identified as Black or African American women were overrepresented at bachelor's-granting colleges and master's-granting colleges and universities. They were also overrepresented at privately controlled institutions. Although Black or African American women respondents were overrepresented at large-sized institutions (5,000-9,999 undergraduate enrollment), they were underrepresented at very-large-sized institutions (10,000 or more undergraduate enrollment). They were approximately proportionally represented at smaller institutions.

**How do various aspects of civic engagement compare for Black or African American women, Black or African American men, White women, and White men?**

Means and standard deviations for items about faculty value of service learning, faculty inclusion of service-learning in their courses, and faculty emphasis on being an informed and active citizen can be found in Table 3. Focusing on the differences between Black or African American women and the other racial/ethnic and gender identities, many statistically significant differences were found—all results reported here are statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). Black or African American women believe it is more important that undergraduates at their institution participate in a community-based project (service-learning) as part of a course more than Black or African American men ( $d=.26$ ), White women ( $d=.52$ ), and White men ( $d=.97$ ). Black or African American women have more of their courses include a community-based project than Black or African American men ( $d=.18$ ), White women ( $d=.23$ ), and White men ( $d=.45$ ). Black or African American women also structure their courses so that students learn and develop as informed and active citizens more than White men ( $d=.47$ ) or White women ( $d=.65$ ).

Means and standard deviations for the Civic Engagement topical modules items can be found in Table 4. Again focusing on the differences between Black or African American women and the other racial/ethnic and gender identities, many statistically significant differences were found. Black or African American women felt that their institutions more substantially emphasized helping people resolve their disagreements with each other more than White women ( $d=.49$ ) and White men ( $d=.45$ ). The remaining differences were on items that asked faculty during the current school year, whether course-related or not, how much have they encouraged students to get involved in local/campus or state/national/global issues from a variety of perspectives. Black or African American women more frequently encourage the students they

teach or advise to inform themselves about local or campus issues than White men ( $d=.42$ ); to discuss local or campus issues with others than White men ( $d=.52$ ); to raise awareness about local or campus issues than White men ( $d=.58$ ); to ask others to address local or campus issues than White women ( $d=.33$ ) and White men ( $d=.62$ ); and to organize others to work on local or campus issues than White men ( $d=.50$ ). Black or African American women more frequently encourage the students they teach or advise to ask others to address state, national, or global issues than White women ( $d=.35$ ) and White men ( $d=.59$ ) and to organize others to work on state, national, or global issues White women ( $d=.36$ ) and White men ( $d=.55$ ).

### **Discussion**

Findings from this study are consistent with those of qualitative studies by Antonio et al. (2000), Baez (2000) and Turner (2002). Black women faculty, as supporters of civic engagement and service-learning for their undergraduates, promote a critical message necessary for the development of the holistic student. As our findings suggest, however, Black women faculty undertake the necessary work to transform their current curricula and teaching strategies more than their colleagues of other raced and gendered intersecting identities. Results signify that faculty who identified as Black/African American women within our study value service-learning more than their colleagues. Subsequently, members of this faculty subgroup also structure more of their courses to include service-learning than all of their peers. African American women professors reported structuring their courses so that students learn and develop as informed and active citizens. Furthermore, they encourage their students to become more informed about local, state and global issues, raise awareness among their peers about local and campus issues, and organize others to work on such issues than their White peers, particularly

White men. Black men professors seem to encourage civic engagement on par with their female colleagues, especially regarding local and campus issues.

Demographic characteristics of Black women faculty provide some insight to understanding our findings. African American women within our sample were overrepresented in service-related fields, i.e. Education, Health Professions and Social Service Professions. Though we are limited in the inferences we can draw from simple descriptive statistics, existing literature detailing the limitations of service-learning as a pedagogical technique includes its concentrated applicability in “soft disciplines” (i.e., education, social work, health professions) yet incompatibility in the “hard disciplines” (i.e., physical and biological sciences, math, engineering, computer science, business) (Abes, et al., 2002; Butin, 2006). Overall, faculty in service-related fields, they may be better positioned to incorporate service-learning opportunities into their courses. Thus, the higher proportion of Black women faculty in the sample in these fields may have led to the reporting higher rates of structuring their courses to include service-learning. Nevertheless, Butin (2006) explains “irrespective of disciplinary and epistemological differences, the vast majority of faculty in higher education see themselves as embodying the normative (read: non service-learning-oriented) model of teaching and learning” (p. 481). Future analyses should further disaggregate data to detect differences across service-related and non-service-related fields.

Consistent with data described in Turner (2000), African American women faculty in our study were underrepresented at the rank of Full Professor and disproportionately overrepresented at the rank of Assistant Professor. Cooper (2006) reports lower tenure rates for African American women faculty in tenure-track positions, aligning with our observation of high number of Black women occupying junior ranks compared to their peers. Coupled with Black women’s

reports of support, encouragement and use of service-learning and civic engagement, our results provide evidence to support previously published trends and experiences regarding the promotion and tenure of Black women faculty. Our results suggest that these trends remain intact and may be interconnected with their service-related activities. However, given that Black women faculty in our study tended to be younger, the introduction of new women entering the professoriate potentially signals hope that ranking disparities could decrease in the future. Future research should continue to investigate retention, tenure and promotion rates of Black women in the academic ranks, especially correlations between service-related and teaching and tenure status.

### **Conclusion**

Civic engagement and service-learning are valuable opportunities to increase student engagement and fulfill the democratic mission of higher education. Proponents of service-learning, particularly Black women academicians, dedicate substantial amounts of time to incorporating service opportunities into their courses and encouraging their students pursue other occasions raise awareness of local, national and global issues amongst their peers. Unfortunately, such advocacy is not regarded as highly during the tenure and promotion process. Turner (2002) asserts that service, whether constructed into course curriculum or encouraged, must be validated within the academy instead of discouraging faculty women of color from engaging in service-based activities (p. 84). The misalignment of civic-oriented, student-centered pedagogy and faculty rewarding processes places African American women faculty at a consistent disadvantage on the road to tenure and promotion. The findings of this study call to question the commitments, motivations and contributions of their raced and gendered colleagues

toward elevating the social consciousness of undergraduates through civic engagement and service-learning. Black women within the academy cannot undertake the burden alone.

### References

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 5 – 17.
- Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373 – 397.
- Astin, A. W. (1996). The role of service in higher education. *About Campus*, 1(1), 14 – 19.
- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1999, May/June). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development* 39(3), 251 – 263.
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education* 22(2), 187 – 202.
- Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., & Cress, C. M. (1997). *Faculty motivations for integrating service learning*. Report to the Corporation for National Service (RAND subcontract). Higher Education Research Institute: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. XXI* (pp. 397 – 456). New York, NY: Springer.
- Batchelder, T. H., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 341 – 355.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39, 363 – 391.
- Bok, D., & Newman, F. (1992). Making a difference: Students and community service. *Change*, 24(4), 44 – 50.
- Butin, D.W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 473 – 498.
- Cooper, T. L. (2006). *The sista' network: African-American women faculty successfully negotiating the road to tenure*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4), 549 – 574.
- Davis, D. J. (2008). Mentorship and the socialization of underrepresented minorities into the professoriate: Examining varied influences. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(3), 278 – 293.

- DeAngelo, L., Hurtado, S., Pryor, J. H., Kelly, K. R., & Santos, J. L. (2009). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2007 – 2008 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D., Stenson, C., & Gray, C. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993 – 2000*. Washington, DC: Learn and Serve America National Service Learning Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <http://www.servicelearning.org>.
- Felder, P. P., Stevenson, H. C., & Gasman, M. (2014). Understanding race in doctoral student socialization. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 21 – 42.
- Fitzgerald, G. A. (2012). Engaging faculty in community engagement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(2), 101 – 106.
- Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 369 – 387.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(1), 7 – 29.
- Gonzalez, J. C. (2006). Academic socialization experiences of Latina doctoral students: A qualitative understanding of support systems that aid and challenges that hinder the process. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 5(4), 347 – 365.
- Gregory, S. T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124 – 138.
- Griffin, K. A., & Reddick, R. J. (2011). Surveillance and sacrifice: Gender differences in the mentoring patterns of black professors at predominantly white research universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20(10), 1 – 26.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy*, 20(2), 345 – 366.
- McPherson, M. S., & Schapiro, M. O. (1999). Tenure issues in higher education. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 85 – 98.
- Minor, J. T. (2003). For better or for worse: Improving advising relationships between faculty and graduate students. In A. L. Green & L. V. Scott (Eds.), *Journey to the Ph.D.: How to navigate the process as African Americans* (pp. 255 – 269). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved on July 12, 2014 from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13\\_315.20.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_315.20.asp).
- Nettles, M. T. (1990). Success in doctoral programs: Experiences of minority and white students. *American Journal of Education*, 98(4), 494 – 522.
- Olsen, D., Maple, S. A., & Stage, F. K. (1995). Women and minority faculty job satisfaction: Professional role interests, professional satisfaction, and institutional fit. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(3), 267 – 293.
- Patitu, C. L., & Hinton, K. G. (2003). The experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed? *New Directions for Student Services*, 2003(104), 79 – 93.
- Patton, L. D., & Catching, C. (2009). ‘Teaching while Black’: Narratives of African American student affairs faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(6), 713 – 728.
- Thomas, G. D., & Hollenshead, C. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of Black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 166 – 175.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoades, R. A. (1994). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of higher education*, 73(1), 74 – 93

**Table 1. Select Faculty Characteristics**

		<b>Black Women</b>	<b>Black Men</b>	<b>White Women</b>	<b>White Men</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Faculty Characteristics (%)</b>						
<b>Academic Discipline</b>	Arts & Humanities	11.6	17.0	23.5	24.1	23.4
	Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	4.4	7.9	6.5	8.3	7.4
	Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science	4.8	14.6	7.2	15.2	11.2
	Social Sciences	13.4	14.1	11.4	11.8	12.0
	Business	7.0	10.3	6.5	11.3	9.3
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	4.6	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.6
	Education	18.8	9.6	14.2	7.2	10.2
	Engineering	1.0	6.2	1.2	5.0	3.6
	Health Professions	19.2	3.6	16.3	4.6	9.5
	Social Service Professions	8.0	5.7	2.7	3.1	3.0
	Other disciplines	7.0	7.9	6.8	5.9	6.8
	<b>Rank</b>	Full Professor	15.4	27.3	20.8	34.2
Associate Professor		22.2	27.3	23.2	24.3	24.2
Assistant Professor		32.3	25.8	24.8	20.4	23.5
Full-time Lecturer/Instructor		16.1	10.7	16.1	10.2	12.6
Part-time Lecturer/Instructor		14.0	8.9	15.2	10.9	12.8
<b>Age</b>	34 or younger	9.0	6.8	13.2	9.8	11.2
	35-44	29.8	20.4	23.4	22.1	24.0
	45-54	24.6	24.1	26.7	25.7	26.5
	55-64	29.0	31.4	28.6	28.1	27.5
	65 or older	7.6	17.3	8.2	14.4	10.7
<b>Course Load</b>	0-3 courses	34.5	27.0	26.7	23.8	25.2
	4-5 courses	27.3	29.6	26.2	25.6	26.0
	6-7 courses	20.5	21.7	22.4	23.3	23.0
	8 or more courses	17.7	21.7	24.7	27.4	25.8
<b>Gender Identity</b>	Man					48.1
	Woman					46.7
	Another gender identity					.1
	I prefer not to respond					5.2
<b>Racial/Ethnic Identification</b>	Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander					4.8
	Black or African American					5.9
	Hispanic or Latino					2.8
	White					71.9
	American Indian, Alaska Native, Other, Multiracial					4.8
	I prefer not to respond					9.8

**Table 2. Select Institution Characteristics**

		Black Women	Black Men	White Women	White Men	Overall
<b>Institution Characteristics (%)</b>						
<b>Carnegie Classification</b>	Doctoral Universities	16.2	21.0	16.8	20.5	19.1
	Master's Colleges and Universities	53.5	53.4	61.7	54.9	58.1
	Baccalaureate Colleges	23.8	22.2	15.7	19.9	16.4
	Other	6.5	3.3	5.8	4.7	6.4
<b>Control</b>	Public	55.0	53.9	62.4	59.7	62.0
	Private	45.0	46.1	37.6	40.3	38.0
<b>Institution Size (based on undergraduate enrollment)</b>	Very Small (fewer than 1,000)	3.8	6.4	3.6	3.4	3.3
	Small (1,000-2,500)	21.6	13.7	22.9	22.1	20.9
	Medium (2,500-4,999)	19.4	21.3	16.9	16.1	16.9
	Large (5,000-9,999)	42.0	48.7	27.7	23.8	27.9
	Very Large (10,000 plus)	13.3	9.9	28.9	34.6	30.9

**Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Select FSSE Survey Items by Select Gender Identity and Racial/Ethnic Identification**

	Black Women		Black Men		White Women		White Men	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
How important is it to you that undergraduates at your institution: Participate in a community-based project (service-learning) as part of a course? (1=Not important, 2=Somewhat important, 3=Important, 4=Very important)	3.3	.8	3.1	.9	2.9	1.0	2.4	1.0
About how many of your undergraduate courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service-learning)? (1=None, 2=Some, 3=Most, 4=All)	2.0	1.0	1.8	.8	1.8	.8	1.6	.7
To what extent do you structure your selected course section so that students learn and develop in: Being an informed and active citizen (1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much)	3.2	.9	3.1	1.0	2.7	1.1	2.5	1.1

**Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Civic Engagement Items by Select Gender Identity and Racial/Ethnic Identification**

	Black Woman		Black Man		White Woman		White Man	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>To what extent does your institution emphasize for undergraduate students (1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much):</b>								
Helping people resolve their disagreements with each other	2.8	1.0	2.9	.9	2.3	.9	2.4	.8
Resolving conflicts that involve bias, discrimination, and prejudice	2.7	1.1	2.8	1.0	2.4	1.0	2.5	.9
Leading a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included	2.8	1.0	3.0	1.1	2.6	.9	2.7	.9
Contributing to the well-being of their community	3.1	1.0	3.2	.9	2.9	.9	2.9	.9
<b>During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how much have you encouraged students you teach or advise to do the following (1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very often):</b>								
Inform themselves about local or campus issues	2.9	.9	3.1	.8	2.8	.9	2.5	.9
Inform themselves about state, national, or global issues	3.0	1.0	3.1	.8	2.9	.9	2.8	.9
Discuss local or campus issues with others	2.8	1.0	2.9	.9	2.6	.9	2.3	.9
Discuss state, national, or global issues with others	2.8	1.0	2.9	1.0	2.7	.9	2.6	1.0
Raise awareness about local or campus issues	2.7	1.0	2.7	.9	2.5	.9	2.2	.9
Raise awareness about state, national, or global issues	2.8	1.0	2.8	1.0	2.6	1.0	2.5	1.0
Ask others to address local or campus issues	2.4	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.1	.9	1.9	.8
Ask others to address state, national, or global issues	2.5	1.0	2.4	1.0	2.1	1.0	1.9	.9
Organize others to work on local or campus issues	2.2	1.0	2.3	1.0	1.9	.9	1.7	.9
Organize others to work on state, national, or global issues	2.2	1.0	2.2	1.1	1.8	.9	1.7	.9