

Understanding Faculty Experiences with Discrimination:
The Role of Intersecting Identity and Institutional Characteristics

Sarah. S. Hurtado and Allison BrckaLorenz

Indiana University Bloomington

Paper presented at the 2016 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting,
Washington, DC.

Abstract

Understanding the experience of faculty members has been an important focus of higher education literature, particularly the prevalence of discrimination for underrepresented populations. Experiences with discrimination have the potential to negatively impact aspects of faculty overall experience, including satisfaction and retention and perceptions of campus climate. Most previous literature focuses on one or two specific identity characteristics (e.g., gender and race/ethnicity) and less attention has been paid to ways in which various identity characteristics intersect in one's experience. Using a large-scale multi-institution data set, this quantitative study examines faculty experiences with discrimination by identity and institutional characteristics, its impact on faculty ability to work, and perceptions of institutional support. Findings indicate nearly half of faculty who experienced discrimination indicated it was based on two or more identities and of the identities provided, academic rank was the highest reported reason for discrimination.

Understanding Faculty Experiences with Discrimination: The Role of Intersecting Identity and Institutional Characteristics

One of the larger purposes of higher education is to contribute to a democratic and egalitarian society. Through their students, staff, and faculty, institutions play a role in the larger “social, historical, and political context” (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2003, p. 41) and have the potential to enhance social equality for all. For this reason, higher education scholars (e.g., Hurtado et al., 2012) have urged colleges and universities to think critically about how campus environments may promote inequality and discrimination. Researchers have responded by examining how different groups experience and perceive the campus climate (Nelson Laird & Nisoke-Dossett, 2006; Sears, 2002; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998). Research on faculty has particularly focused on the prevalence of discrimination for underrepresented populations (McKinney, 1990; Perna, 2001; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). The majority of this literature revolves around a few specific groups (e.g., women and African American faculty) and little is known about the broader experiences of faculty. Understanding the relationship between faculty identity and discrimination is important because of its potential to impact promotion and tenure processes, retention of underrepresented populations, and perceptions of campus climate (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009; Sears, 2002; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998).

Literature Review

The experiences of faculty members have been well documented in the literature, in particular that of faculty from marginalized and underrepresented populations. These studies provide much evidence that faculty members experience inequity and discrimination based on social identities. Some identity groups (e.g., women and faculty of color) have received more

attention than others. In either case, gaining insight into this area of faculty life is an important step in creating more equitable and inclusive college campuses.

Despite increases in women faculty at all levels, they continue to be underrepresented and serve primarily in less prestigious faculty roles (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Touchton, Musil, & Campbell, 2008). Many studies have found that women feel less free to express themselves in departmental meetings, experience exclusion and isolation and experience sexual harassment from both students and colleagues (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Grauerholz, 1989; McKinney, 1990). Additionally, women faculty members are less likely to achieve promotion or tenure status (Snyder, Dillow, & Hoffman, 2008), either from being denied or leaving before going up for tenure (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Gardner, 2013), even after controlling for other factors (e.g. education and productivity) (Perna, 2001). This can lead to inequitable divisions of labor and salary discrepancies (Gardner, 2013).

Faculty of color have received much attention in this literature, with a specific attention paid to African American faculty. Thompson and Dey (1998) argue that African American faculty members experience multiple levels of marginality related to their race, research interests, and role in the larger academic community. Experiences with marginality impacted their levels of stress, particularly with regard to time constraints and promotion and tenure, which has the potential to impact their work environment and overall well-being (Thompson & Dey, 1998). Others looked at faculty of color more broadly, which has shown faculty of color are more likely to experience isolation (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008; Salazar, 2009), bias in hiring and promotion processes (Patitu & Hinton, 2003), and questioning by peers (Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009). Further, these faculty members have to balance multiple cultures (e.g., their personal

culture and academic culture), which are often different and can be taxing on the individual (Diggs et al., 2009; Jonsrud & Sadao, 1998). They also experience disproportionate expectations to engage in diversity related service on campus (e.g. committee work, mentoring students of color) (Thompson, 2008). This places constraints on their ability to devote time to their own research agendas (Garrison-Wade, Diggs, Estrada, Galindo, 2012). Experiences of discrimination are often attributed to underrepresentation of faculty of color; it is believed that by simply increasing compositional diversity many of these issues will naturally resolve. However, Jonsrud and Sadao (1998) found evidence of discrimination in the experiences with faculty of color, even at an institution that is three times as diverse as its peer institutions. This implies that discrimination is more deeply rooted than previously assumed.

Limited attention has been paid to aspects of identity different from gender and race/ethnicity. Lindholm and Astin (2006) discuss the importance and conceptualization of spirituality among faculty. The authors of this study find that different faculty experience spirituality differently as it relates to their role, but that being able to more freely explore their spirituality makes them more likely to have a positive outlook on their work environment. When looking at sexuality, Sears (2002) found lesbian, gay, or bisexual faculty at public institutions were three and a half times more likely to perceive their campus climate positively than their peers at private institutions. Sears also found that lesbian women more likely to experience hearing homophobic comments causing them to perceive the campus climate as less positive when compared to their gay men peers. This provides some insight into intersectionality of identities and how that plays into faculty experiences with discrimination.

Some literature has explored the intersection of identity in the experiences of faculty members, again, primarily focused on gender and race/ethnicity. For example, Gregory (2001)

found that for Black women, the intersection of the gender and race made them overwhelmingly more likely to experience discrimination on their campus. Ng (1993) deconstructs a specific personal experience as an example of discrimination often seen in higher education. In this incident her gender, race, and political views are challenged, which she argues is a normal act that silences the voices of various marginalized populations. As stated earlier, balancing personal identity with that of the academic community can be time consuming and challenging for individuals. Layering multiple aspects of a person's identity can make this even more difficult for individuals. Therefore, it is important to not only understand the experiences of discrimination by faculty, but how various aspects of identity play into these experiences.

Understanding experiences of discrimination and marginalization are important, because of their impact on faculty overall job satisfaction, perceptions of the institution, and impacts on students. Hesli and Lee (2013) found that women and faculty of color were less satisfied at all levels of faculty. Rosser (2004) found that two factors that impacted one's decision to leave academia are coming from a marginalized background and job dissatisfaction. In addition to job satisfaction, others have found that faculty members from marginalized faculty members are more likely to leave the institution, because of the impacts of discrimination (e.g., tenure and promotion processes, ability to engage in research) (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Xu, 2008). If this disproportionately impacts faculty from marginalized populations, then institutions are challenged in their ability to gain more equitable demographic composition (Smith, 1996). Compositional diversity in faculty influences their ability to be effective employees (Thompson & Sekaquaptewa, 2002) and students overall perceptions of campus climate (Park, 2009). If institutions are truly committed to developing equitable education

environments for all members of the campus community, it is important to understand the role of discrimination in the experience of faculty.

Theoretical Framework

This study is approached through intersectionality, which is a “lens that has been applied to understand how power relations shape life opportunities according to multiple social identities (Nunez, 2014). Crenshaw (1989) first articulated the concept of intersectionality by highlighting the multidimensionality of the experiences of marginalized individuals. This lens recognizes that individuals live within multiple social identities, and allows for deeper understanding of how the interaction of these identities influence one’s experiences and how they make meaning of these experiences (Nunez, 2014). Even more, intersectionality recognizes the systems of power and oppression associated with various social identities and how they interact with each other (Collins, 1990). This concept has since become an important theoretical tool for challenging issues of inequality (Nash, 2008). Nunez (2014) advocates for the use of intersectionality to transform institutions of higher education into more equitable environments for all students. This study uses a lens of intersectionality in an effort to better understand how various faculty members experience marginalization on their campus and how this marginalization might impact their ability to be successful in higher education environments.

Hurtado et al.’s (2012) diverse learning environment model (DLE) of campus climate specifically uses a lens of intersectionality in its foundation. The authors argue for the importance in identifying how institutions of higher education can promote inequality, and use the DLE as a theoretical framework for creating equitable and inclusive campuses. Although the DLE is multifaceted, within the model is a multidimensional campus climate framework for diversity. In this framework, Hurtado et al. discuss campus climate as reflecting both institutional

and individual level components. The individual components of the DLE are related to a person's perception of diversity (psychological dimension) and the behaviors and actions taken on campus to promote a diverse community (behavior dimension). In thinking about experiences of discrimination, there is a merging of both the psychological and behavioral dimensions (Hurtado et al., 2012). Tierney (1987) defines reality as "a process of social interchange in which perceptions are reaffirmed, modified, and replaced" (p. 64). Therefore, this study not only centers on a lens of intersectionality, but the psychological and behavioral dimensions of campus climate, because it relies on both perceptions and reported behaviors in its analysis of experiences with discrimination, discrimination's interference with one's ability to work, and perceptions of campus support.

Study Purpose

Discrimination has the potential to significantly impact the faculty experience. As the student body grows more diverse, faculty composition should follow (Hurtado et al., 2012); however, this becomes difficult if underrepresented groups experience discrimination. These experiences cause individuals to perceive campus climate as negative, to leave the academy, be denied tenure, etc. Therefore, this study explores faculty experiences with discrimination across various aspects of identity and its impact. To that end, this study is guided by the following research questions:

1. Who are the faculty who report experiencing discrimination, harassment, or isolation?
2. What institutional characteristics are common among faculty who report experiencing discrimination, harassment, or isolation?
3. How does perception of institutional support relate to reports of discrimination, harassment or isolation?

Methods

Data Source

For this study, the data comes from the 2015 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). FSSE was designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement, which is administered to undergraduate students. The purpose of FSSE is to measure faculty and instructor perceptions of and involvement in undergraduate student engagement at four-year colleges and universities. More specifically, FSSE focuses on the nature and frequency of student-faculty interactions, faculty emphasis on educational practices that are empirically linked with student learning and development, faculty values for institutional support and high-impact practice participation, and how faculty organize their time both in and out of the classroom. In the 2015 administration of FSSE, over 19,000 faculty members responded from 133 bachelor's-granting colleges and universities in the United States. A brief item set focusing on perceptions of campus climate and experiences with discrimination was appended to FSSE at 16 institutions yielding 2,356 faculty responses. The complete wording of items examined from the campus climate experimental item set can be found in Table 1.

Sample

The sample for this study includes the 2,356 faculty who responded to the FSSE 2015 campus climate experimental items (Table 1). The largest proportions of these faculty were in Arts & Humanities (19.7%), Social Sciences (14.3%), and Business (11.7%) disciplinary areas. Smaller proportions of faculty were from a variety of other disciplinary appointments. Less than a third (30%) are full professors, with smaller proportions ranked as Associate Professors (23.1%), Assistant Professors (19.0%), full-time Lecturers/Instructors (7.5%), and part-time Lecturers/Instructors (20.3%). Around one-third of faculty (34.9%) were tenured, and close to

two-thirds (59.1%) had earned a doctorate degree. Around half of faculty identified as women (52.4%) with around two in five (42.8%) identifying as men. Nearly all (98.8%) faculty in the sample were U.S. citizens, and around three-quarters (72.8%) identified as White. Smaller proportions of faculty identified as Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander (3.8%); Black or African American (7.2%); and Hispanic or Latino (3.0%). Around four in five faculty (81.7%) identified as being heterosexual. For more sample details, as well as an overview of the sample's demographic characteristics by discrimination experience (not experiencing discrimination, experiencing discrimination but it not interfering with their ability to work, and experiencing discrimination and it interfering with their ability to work) see Table 2.

Institutions included in this study were diverse. Two were research universities, ten were master's-granting institutions, and four were bachelor's-granting. Nine were privately controlled, and eight were selectively competitive or very competitive. The largest proportions of the institutions were located in the plains regions (five institutions) and the Northeast (five institutions). The rest were located in the Southeast (three institutions) and the Southwest (three institutions). At the faculty level, around two-thirds (66.4%) were teaching at Master's colleges and universities, with smaller percentages teaching at doctorate-granting institutions (21.0%) and bachelor's-granting institutions (12.7%). Over half (58.5%) were teaching at privately controlled institutions. The largest proportions of faculty were teaching at very large (31.6%) or large (38.4%) institutions, with smaller proportions at medium (13.9%), small (11.0%) or very small (5.1%) institutions. Around one-third of faculty were teaching at institutions located in the Plains (33.6%) and Northeast (29.1%) regions. Around two in five were teaching at institutions in the Southeast (16.2%) or Southwest (21.0%). Over twenty percent of faculty were teaching at either noncompetitive (28.7%), competitive (23.4%), or very competitive (29.2%) institutions with

fewer teaching at less competitive (18.7%) institutions. For more sample details, as well as an overview of the sample's institution characteristics by discrimination experience see Table 2.

Measures

Demographic questions from the FSSE core survey, institution-level characteristics, and items on the Campus Climate experimental item set related to perceptions of institution support by identity were examined in relation to faculty experiences with discrimination. The focus of this study is on items from the same experimental set, which asked faculty if they had experienced any offensive behavior, discrimination, isolation, or harassment at their institution. Response options were "Yes, and it interfered with my ability to work," "Yes, but it did not interfere with my ability to work," and "No." If faculty members selected either of the yes options they were asked upon what the discrimination was based. They were provided a list of various identities and instructed to select all that apply. The demographic faculty characteristics examined in this study included faculty's academic disciplinary area, academic rank, tenure status, education level, age, gender identity, citizenship, racial/ethnic identification, and sexual orientation. The course-level information examined included teaching lower- or upper-division courses and course format (classroom instruction, distance education, combination, etc.) The institution-level characteristics examined included basic Carnegie classification, institutional control, institution size, institution region, and Barron's selectivity.

Analyses

To answer the first research question about the faculty who report experiencing discrimination, descriptives of faculty who report experiencing discrimination were examined by various faculty characteristics. Faculty characteristics examined can be seen in Table 2. Additional descriptive analysis was used to examine different aspects of identity which faculty

felt contributed to the discrimination they experienced. The relationships between intersecting identities were examined by looking at the perceived bases of discrimination when faculty selected more than one aspect of identity as the basis. To answer the second research question about the relationship between discrimination and institutional characteristics, a similar descriptive analysis was used to examine reports of discrimination by faculty at varying types of institutions. Institution characteristics examined include Carnegie Basic classification, control, institution size, institution region, and Barron's selectivity (Table 2). To answer the third research question about the relationship between perceived institutional support and discrimination, ANOVA analyses with post hoc Tukey tests were run to examine the differences between faculty perceptions of institutional support by various identity demographics by differing perceptions of discrimination (none; yes, and it interfered with their ability to work; and yes, but it did not interfere with their ability to work).

Limitations

Results from this study yield important information about the experiences of discrimination among faculty at various institutions. Most scholarship in this area does not elaborate on the intersectionality of faculty identity and experiences. However, one of the challenges in our measures is that we cannot distinguish between whether faculty who had multiple identities as the basis of their discrimination experienced this in one incident or in multiple. In either case, however, this study still draws attention to holistic experience of faculty. We also do not know who is doing the discriminating and in what circumstances faculty are feeling discriminated against. The discrimination could come from anyone at their institution such as students, colleagues, administration, and could come from a variety of situations such as in teaching, faculty meetings, hiring and promotion, etc.

Although this study does contain responses from a large number of faculty at a variety of institutions, institutions elect to participate in FSSE, they are not randomly selected from institutions in the United States. Additionally, only a small subset of institutions were eligible to receive the experimental item set, and institutions were allowed to opt out of having their faculty receive the questions. With this in mind, our results may not be generalizable from an institution-level perspective. Institutions are also allowed to choose which faculty are invited to participate in FSSE so results may not be representative at the faculty level. The smallest grouping of faculty were non-U.S. citizens so all results concerning this subgroup should be interpreted with caution. Even though faculty were informed that their identities would remain anonymous to their institution, it is still possible that faculty were afraid to respond to questions about discrimination and harassment. Therefore, results from this study should not be interpreted as widely generalizable but as a snapshot of experiences at several varied institutions.

Results

1. Who are the faculty who report experiencing discrimination, harassment, or isolation?

In answering the study's first research question, we found that roughly 22% of faculty experienced discrimination at their institution. Table 3 shows a breakdown of discrimination by various faculty characteristics. When looking by academic discipline, faculty in the soft sciences experienced discrimination at higher proportions than their peers in the hard sciences. Engineering faculty members were the least likely to have the discrimination interfere with their work (3%). There was not much difference when looking at class level of students taught. However, with regard to course format, faculty members who taught in a combination course (class instruction and distance education) experienced higher proportions of discrimination (31%) than faculty in all other course formats. Interestingly, when looking at rank and tenure

status, Associate professors (33%) and tenured faculty (33%) experienced discrimination at higher proportions than their peers, with lecturers experiencing the least amount of discrimination (18% full-time and 11% part-time). Although a slightly higher proportion of women (24%) than men (19%) experienced discrimination, roughly the same percentage felt it interfered with their ability to work (9% and 8% respectively). When considering race, Black (23%) and White (20%) faculty members reported discrimination at slightly lower proportions than other races/ethnicities, however; of those that did, discrimination was more likely to impact their work (9% and 8% respectively). Faculty members who identified as heterosexual were less likely to experience discrimination when compared to peers with different sexual orientations.

Faculty members were asked to select the basis of their discrimination (Table 4). Of faculty members who experienced discrimination, approximately 43% of them selected more than one identity as the basis. Academic rank, title, or current position was most frequently cited as the basis of discrimination, especially for faculty who selected more than one identity (61% of those who selected two identities and 42% of those who selected three or more identities). For those who selected two identities, rank was followed by age, gender, and race/ethnicity at roughly equal proportions (27%, 23%, and 25% respectively). For those who selected three or more identities, faculty selected age at lesser proportions (19%) and “other” at greater proportions (23%). Gender identity and racial or ethnic identification each accounted for about 8% of faculty who only experienced one type of discrimination. However, these identities were each selected by about one in four of the faculty who indicated that two or more identities were the basis of discrimination. “Other” was selected by about 15% for those who selected one identity, 17% for those who selected two identities, and 23% for those that selected three or more identities. The nature of write-in information for those selecting “other” included such things as

personal or family situations, physical appearance, being a parent, sexual harassment, and harassment from students. In general, faculty members who only selected a single identity as the basis of discrimination experienced interference with work at lesser proportions (Table 5). However, as faculty members experienced more types of discrimination, the more likely it was to interfere with their ability to work (47% for those who selected three or more). Identities most likely to impact one's ability to work were country of citizenship; academic rank, title or position; and other (67%, 47%, and 46% respectively).

2. What institutional characteristics are common among faculty who report experiencing discrimination, harassment, or isolation?

Table 3 also provides information about the frequency of discrimination by institutional characteristics. Faculty members at doctorate-granting (28%) institutions were more likely to experience discrimination than master's granting (22%) and bachelor's granting (21%) institutions. At public institutions, roughly 30% of faculty members experienced discrimination. These faculty members also reported this discrimination interfering with their work at higher proportions. Faculty at large (5,000-9,999) institutions experienced discrimination at higher proportions, while faculty members at small (1,000-2,499) institutions were least likely to experience discrimination. However, faculty members at very small (fewer than 1,000) and very large (10,000 or more) were least likely to have this discrimination influence their work. With regard to region, faculty members in the Northeast were most likely to report discrimination. These faculty members reported experiencing discrimination almost twice as much as their peers at institutions in the Plains (31% and 17% respectively). When looking at selectivity, faculty members at noncompetitive institutions experienced discrimination at lower proportions (13%). In general, the more competitive an institution the more likely its faculty members experienced

discrimination; however, faculty at competitive institutions experienced discrimination at higher proportions than those at very competitive institutions (32% and 25% respectively). Additionally, faculty members at competitive institutions who experienced discrimination were most likely to have discrimination interfere with their work.

3. How does perception of institutional support relate to reports of discrimination, harassment or isolation?

With regard to perceptions of support (Table 6), faculty members who had not experienced any discrimination viewed their institution as more supportive for all identity groups. Faculty who experienced discrimination that interfered with their work had the lowest views for institutional support for religion, political views, race/ethnicity, and age. However, there was not a significant difference between those who experienced discrimination that did not interfere with their work and those who experienced discrimination that did interfere with their work and their perceptions of institutional support for sexual orientation and gender identity. By examining the post-hoc Tukey tests, we see great disparities in perceptions of institutional support for those who felt discrimination by age, racial or ethnic identification, political views and spiritual views. Note that for the following average perceptions of institutional support, 4=Very much, 3=Quite a bit, 2=Some, and 1=Very little in the extent to which faculty feel their institution is supportive of faculty based on a variety of demographics. Faculty perceptions of support for people based on age were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.37, p < .05$), faculty who had been discriminated against but it did not interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.874, p < .05$), and faculty who had been discriminated against and it did interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.55, p < .05$). This difference in perceptions of institutional support represented the widest gap in feelings of perception, nearly a whole point

different in perceptions of support between faculty who had not been discriminated against and those who had and it affected their ability to work. With respect to faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on racial/ethnic identification, significant differences were found for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.38, p < .05$), faculty who had been discriminated against but it did not interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.80, p < .05$), and faculty who had been discriminated against and it did interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.61, p < .05$). Results were similar for faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on political views and religious or spiritual views. Faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on political views were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.14, p < .05$), faculty who had been discriminated against but it did not interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.54, p < .05$), and faculty who had been discriminated against and it did interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.36, p < .05$). Faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on religious or spiritual views were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.26, p < .05$), faculty who had been discriminated against but it did not interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.66, p < .05$), and faculty who had been discriminated against and it did interfere with their work ($\bar{x} = 2.49, p < .05$).

Patterns for perception of support were slightly different for support based on country of citizenship, disability or impairment, gender identity, and sexual orientation. With perceptions of institutional support based on these aspects of identity, there were not differences between feeling discriminated against and having it impact their work or not impact their ability to work. Faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on gender identity were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.17, p < .05$) and faculty who had been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 2.61$ and $\bar{x} = 2.53$ for those that the

discrimination did not interfere with their ability to work and those that the discrimination did, respectively). Faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on country of citizenship were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.39, p < .05$) and faculty who had been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 2.82$ and $\bar{x} = 2.68$ for those that the discrimination did not interfere with their ability to work and those that the discrimination did, respectively). Similarly, faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on disability or impairment were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.35, p < .05$) and faculty who had been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 2.83$ and $\bar{x} = 2.68$ for those that the discrimination did not interfere with their ability to work and those that the discrimination did, respectively). Faculty perceptions of institutional support for people based on sexual orientation were significantly different for faculty who had not been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 3.16, p < .05$) and faculty who had been discriminated against ($\bar{x} = 2.65$ and $\bar{x} = 2.55$ for those that the discrimination did not interfere with their ability to work and those that the discrimination did, respectively).

Discussion

Faculty who identified as historically marginalized identities and those who identified as privileged identities experienced discrimination at their institution. For example, about 20% of White faculty reported discrimination. This highlights some of the complexities and intersections of identity. Although they may be privileged in some areas, faculty members may be experiencing discrimination based on other aspects of their identity (e.g., gender or age). This is further emphasized by the fact that almost half of the faculty who experienced discrimination felt it was based on two or more identities. Unfortunately, our data does not show whether that means one act of discrimination was based on multiple identities or multiple acts were each based on a

specific identity. However, our findings highlight the importance of broadening the scope of understanding the experience of faculty based on identity. In doing so we are able to see how intersecting discrimination further impacts the faculty experience. This is seen in the fact that as the number of identities serving as the basis of discrimination increases so does the likelihood that discrimination interferes with one's ability to work.

This study supports previous research regarding interpersonal relationships contributing to overall perceptions of campus climate. Those who experienced discrimination perceived institutional support of all identities lower than those who had not experienced discrimination. Interesting differences in this finding were with regard to perceived support for people based on their gender and sexual orientation. Experiencing discrimination lessened their view of institutional support for these identities, but there was not a difference between the perceptions of those who had it interfere with their work and those who did not. Negative perceptions of campus climate can impact other aspects of the faculty experience including satisfaction and retention (Johnsrud, 2002). Although this is a broad study of identity categories, it is important to keep in mind some individuals may experience frequent or particularly severe forms of discrimination, which may further influence their perception of campus climate. This is an important implication for institutions as they try to create more inclusive and supportive environments. Some of their efforts may be in vain if individuals, policies or procedures, are still enacting discrimination on campus.

Implications

Much has been published on faculty experiences with discrimination. Multiple studies have discussed the challenges that faculty members from a variety of marginalized populations

face in the academy. However, findings from this study contribute to this literature in a number of ways including implications for training, facilitating inclusivity, and future research.

Training

Given the high proportion of faculty members who have experienced discrimination at their campus, it is important that institutions think critically about the type of support they provide for those who have been marginalized. Much attention has been paid recently to whether or not institutions have policies, procedures, and training for students to report issues of discrimination or harassment. However, less attention has focused on similar policies for faculty. Institutions should consider how they inform faculty of their ability to report these issues without fear of retaliation. As an example, a number of the write-in responses indicated sexual harassment as the basis of their discrimination. Although much of the focus related to Title IX has been on students, faculty members are protected under this law in the same way (AAUW, n.d.). Institutions are obligated to protect faculty members from any discrimination based on their sex or gender and from any form of sexual misconduct. Institutions should consider providing faculty members with training so they are knowledgeable of the resources available to them should they experience discrimination.

Inclusivity

Although the prevalence of discrimination varied by institution, it was not limited to certain institutions types; faculty at all institutions experienced discrimination. Therefore, all institutions should be careful to monitor the experiences of faculty members to ensure they are promoting an equitable environment for everyone. As stated, faculty members who experience discrimination are less satisfied in their roles (Heslie & Lee, 2013), and faculty members who are less satisfied are more likely to leave the institution (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Xu, 2008). Even

more, institutions should think critically about how they proactively support faculty members from marginalized populations. Broadly speaking, faculty members from historically underrepresented and marginalized populations (e.g., faculty of color, LGBT faculty) experienced discrimination at higher frequencies than their peers. As institutions work to diversify their faculty, they should ensure they are offering support to these faculty members.

Future Research

As stated, there are a number of studies centering on the intersections of identity in faculty experiences. However, many of these focus strictly on the intersections of gender and race (e.g., African American women). Although these studies are important and provide insight into how these faculty members experience academia, this study highlights the importance of looking more broadly at faculty identities. This is particularly important given that a number of faculty members felt discriminated against based on three or more identities, and these faculty were most likely to have their ability to work impacted. Lastly, academic rank, title, or current position was overwhelmingly selected as the basis of discrimination for those who indicated more than one identity as the basis. Therefore, future research should continue to investigate how faculty members develop an identity around their academic rank and seek to better understand what these experiences look like.

Table 1. Select Campus Climate Experimental Set Items

Please answer the following questions about the safety and support at your institution and the attitudes, behaviors, and standards of faculty, staff, administrators, and students concerning the level of respect for individuals.

3. To what extent is your institution supportive of people based on the following:

Response options: Very much, Quite a bit, Some, Very little

- a. Age
- b. Country of citizenship
- c. Disability or impairment
- d. Gender identity
- e. Political views
- f. Racial or ethnic identification
- g. Religious or spiritual views
- h. Sexual orientation

4. Have you experienced any offensive behavior, discrimination, isolation, or harassment at your institution?

Response options: Yes, and it interfered with my ability to work; Yes, but it did not interfere with my ability to work; No

[If yes] **Upon what was it based? (Select all that apply.)**

- Academic rank, title, or current position
 - Age
 - Country of citizenship
 - Disability or impairment
 - Gender identity
 - Political views
 - Racial or ethnic identification
 - Religious or spiritual views
 - Sexual orientation
 - Other, please specify: [TEXT]
-

Table 2. Select Faculty, Course, and Institution Characteristics for Overall Sample (Column Percentages)

		Experienced Discrimination			Sample total %
		Did not experience discrimination %	Did not interfere with ability to work %	Interfered with ability to work %	
Academic discipline	Arts & Humanities	17.7	27.4	25.1	19.7
	Biological Sciences, Ag., & Nat. Resources	5.5	4.0	4.3	5.2
	Physical Sciences, Math., & Computer Science	9.6	6.3	5.2	8.7
	Social Sciences	13.7	13.5	19.9	14.3
	Business	12.4	10.6	7.1	11.7
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	3.6	3.3	4.7	3.6
	Education	10.2	12.2	14.7	10.9
	Engineering	1.8	1.7	<1	1.7
	Health Professions	11.8	8.6	6.2	10.8
	Social Service Professions	6.2	5.9	4.7	6.0
	Other disciplines	7.4	6.6	7.6	7.3
Class level of students taught	Lower division	45.3	40.8	41.5	44.3
	Upper division	50.8	52.5	53.2	51.2
	Other,	4.0	6.7	5.3	4.5
Course format	Classroom instruction on-campus	63.5	76.4	73.7	66.3
	Classroom instruction at an auxiliary location	2.9	1.4	2.1	2.6
	Distance education	26.5	11.3	13.7	23.2
	Combination of class instruction and distance ed.	7.1	10.9	10.5	8.0
Rank	Full Professor	30.2	24.7	36.6	30.1
	Associate Professor	20.0	30.6	37.6	23.1
	Assistant Professor	18.2	25.3	16.8	19.0
	Full-time Lecturer/Instructor	8.1	7.6	3.0	7.5
	Part-time Lecturer/Instructor	23.6	11.8	5.9	20.3
Tenure status	No tenure system at this institution	26.3	14.9	13.6	23.6
	Not on tenure track	31.8	24.8	13.1	29.1
	On tenure track but not tenured	11.7	15.6	13.1	12.3
	Tenured	30.2	44.7	60.2	34.9
Education level	Did not earn a doctoral degree	45.2	28.3	23.8	40.9
	Earned doctoral degree	54.8	71.7	76.2	59.1
Age	34 or younger	9.3	12.3	4.6	9.2
	35-44	21.2	22.9	21.4	21.4
	45-54	26.9	30.6	37.2	28.4
	55-64	28.9	26.4	28.6	28.5
	65 or older	13.8	7.7	8.2	12.5
Gender identity	Man	44.7	36.1	37.1	42.8
	Woman	51.4	58.9	51.9	52.4
	Another gender identity	<1	0.0	<1	<1
	I prefer not to respond	3.9	5.0	10.5	4.7
U.S. citizen	No	1.3	1.7	0.0	1.2
	Yes	98.7	98.3	100.0	98.8
Racial/ethnic identification	Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander	3.8	4.7	3.3	3.8
	Black or African American	7.2	7.0	7.1	7.2
	Hispanic or Latino	2.9	4.3	2.4	3.0
	White	75.4	65.0	62.4	72.8
	American Indian, Alaska Native, Other, Multiracial	4.5	8.7	7.1	5.3
	I prefer not to respond	6.3	10.3	17.6	7.9
	Heterosexual	84.1	75.7	70.5	81.7
Sexual orientation	Gay	1.6	2.6	2.4	1.8
	Lesbian	1.7	4.3	2.9	2.2
	Bisexual	1.1	1.6	2.9	1.3
	Another sexual orientation	<1	<1	0.0	<1
	Questioning or unsure	<1	1.0	0.0	<1
	I prefer not to respond	11.1	14.1	21.4	12.5

Table 2 (continued). Select Faculty, Course, and Institution Characteristics for Overall Sample (Column Percentages)

		Experienced Discrimination			Sample total %
		Did not experience discrimination %	Did not interfere with ability to work %	Interfered with ability to work %	
Basic Carnegie classification	Doctorate-granting universities	20.0	24.6	23.8	21.0
	Master's-granting colleges and universities	67.0	62.5	66.8	66.4
	Bachelor's-granting colleges	13.0	12.9	9.3	12.7
Control	Public	37.7	51.5	57.9	41.5
	Private	62.3	48.5	42.1	58.5
Institution size	Very small (fewer than 1,000)	5.4	4.9	3.3	5.1
	Small (1,000-2,499)	12.0	7.8	7.5	11.0
	Medium (2,500-4,999)	13.5	16.8	13.1	13.9
	Large (5,000-9,999)	34.8	46.3	56.1	38.4
Region	Very large (10,000 or more)	34.3	24.3	20.1	31.6
	Northeast	26.1	39.8	38.3	29.1
	Plains	36.4	22.3	27.6	33.6
	Southeast	16.4	17.5	12.6	16.2
	Southwest	21.0	20.4	21.5	21.0
Barron's selectivity	Noncompetitive	32.5	16.5	15.9	28.7
	Less competitive	18.4	20.1	18.7	18.7
	Competitive	20.7	29.8	35.5	23.4
	Very competitive	28.4	33.7	29.9	29.2

Table 3. Faculty Reports of Discrimination by Faculty, Course, and Institution Characteristics (Row Percentages)

		Experienced Discrimination			
		Did not experience discrimination	Did not interfere with ability to work	Interfered with ability to work	Total discrimination
		%	%	%	%
Academic Discipline	Arts & Humanities	69.4	18.7	11.9	30.6
	Biological Sciences, Ag., & Nat. Resources	81.9	10.3	7.8	18.1
	Physical Sciences, Math., & Comp. Science	84.7	9.7	5.6	15.3
	Social Sciences	74.1	12.8	13.1	25.9
	Business	82.1	12.2	5.7	17.9
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	75.6	12.2	12.2	24.4
	Education	72.2	15.1	12.7	27.8
	Engineering	84.2	13.2	2.6	15.8
	Health Professions	84.0	10.7	5.3	16.0
	Social Service Professions	79.4	13.2	7.4	20.6
	Other disciplines	78.2	12.1	9.7	21.8
Class level of students taught	Lower division	78.6	12.7	8.6	21.4
	Upper division	76.2	14.2	9.6	23.8
	Other	68.1	20.9	11.0	31.9
Course Format	Classroom instruction on-campus	73.7	16.0	10.3	26.3
	Classroom instruction at an auxiliary location	84.9	7.5	7.5	15.1
	Distance education	87.8	6.8	5.5	12.2
	Combination of class instruction and distance ed	68.7	19.0	12.3	31.3
Rank	Full Professor	77.3	11.1	11.6	22.7
	Associate Professor	66.6	17.9	15.5	33.4
	Assistant Professor	73.5	18.1	8.4	26.5
	Full-time Lecturer/Instructor	82.5	13.8	3.8	17.5
	Part-time Lecturer/Instructor	89.4	7.9	2.8	10.6
Tenure Status	No tenure system at this institution	86.1	8.6	5.3	13.9
	Not on tenure track	84.3	11.6	4.2	15.7
	On tenure track but not tenured	73.1	17.1	9.8	26.9
	Tenured	66.7	17.4	15.9	33.3
Education level	Did not earn a doctoral degree	85.2	9.4	5.5	14.8
	Earned doctoral degree	71.5	16.5	12.1	28.5
Age	34 or younger	77.8	17.7	4.5	22.2
	35-44	76.7	14.2	9.2	23.3
	45-54	73.7	14.3	12.0	26.3
	55-64	78.6	12.3	9.2	21.4
	65 or older	85.8	8.2	6.0	14.2
Gender Identity	Man	80.6	11.3	8.1	19.4
	Woman	75.7	15.0	9.3	24.3
	Another gender identity	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	I prefer not to respond	64.4	14.4	21.2	35.6
U.S. Citizen	No	81.5	18.5	0.0	18.5
	Yes	77.0	13.4	9.6	23.0
Racial/ethnic identification	Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pac. Islander	75.6	16.3	8.1	24.4
	Black or African American	77.5	13.1	9.4	22.5
	Hispanic or Latino	73.5	19.1	7.4	26.5
	White	80.0	12.0	8.1	20.1
	Am, Indian, Alaska Native, Other, Multiracial	65.3	22.0	12.7	34.7
	I prefer not to respond	61.4	17.6	21.0	38.6
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	79.3	12.6	8.1	20.7
	Gay	67.5	20.0	12.5	32.5
	Lesbian	61.2	26.5	12.2	38.8
	Bisexual	63.3	16.7	20.0	36.7
	Another sexual orientation	60.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
	Questioning or unsure	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	I prefer not to respond	68.5	15.4	16.1	31.5

Table 3 (continued). Faculty Reports of Discrimination by Faculty, Course, and Institution Characteristics (Row Percentages)

		Experienced Discrimination			
		Did not experience discrimination %	Did not interfere with ability to work %	Interfered with ability to work %	Total discriminatio n %
Basic	Doctorate-granting universities	73.3	16.0	10.7	26.7
Carnegie classification	Master's-granting colleges and universities	77.7	12.8	9.5	22.3
	Bachelor's-granting colleges	79.1	13.9	7.0	20.9
Control	Public	69.9	16.9	13.2	30.1
	Private	81.9	11.3	6.8	18.1
Institution size	Very small (fewer than 1,000)	81.0	12.9	6.0	19.0
	Small (1,000-2,499)	83.9	9.6	6.4	16.1
	Medium (2,500-4,999)	74.6	16.5	8.9	25.4
	Large (5,000-9,999)	69.8	16.4	13.8	30.2
	Very large (10,000 or more)	83.5	10.5	6.0	16.5
Region	Northeast	69.0	18.6	12.4	31.0
	Plains	83.2	9.0	7.7	16.8
	Southeast	78.0	14.7	7.3	22.0
	Southwest	77.1	13.2	9.7	22.9
Barron's selectivity	Noncompetitive	87.0	7.8	5.2	13.0
	Less competitive	75.9	14.7	9.5	24.1
	Competitive	68.3	17.4	14.3	31.7
	Very competitive	74.7	15.7	9.7	25.3

Table 4. Bases for Discrimination Overall and When Two, or Three or More Identities Were Selected

	Overall Basis	Basis When 2 Identities Were Selected	Basis when 3 or More Identities Were Selected
Academic rank, title, or current position	15.0	61.3	41.6
Age	1.6	27.4	18.9
Country of citizenship	<1	4.8	4.3
Disability or impairment	<1	4.0	3.5
Gender identity	8.0	23.4	22.8
Political views	2.1	13.7	12.8
Racial or ethnic identification	7.6	25.0	21.8
Religious or spiritual views	3.1	12.9	13.4
Sexual orientation	3.3	10.5	10.1
Other	14.8	16.9	22.6
2 identities	24.1	--	--
3 or more identities	19.1	--	--

Table 5. Relationship Between Basis of Discrimination and Interference with Work

		Did not interfere with work	Interfered with work	
Basis of Discrimination (Checked only 1 box)	Academic rank, title, or current position	53.3	46.7	
	Age	75.0	25.0	
	Country of citizenship	33.3	66.7	
	Disability or impairment	66.7	33.3	
	Gender identity	65.9	34.1	
	Political views	72.7	27.3	
	Racial or ethnic identification	76.3	23.7	
	Religious or spiritual views	68.8	31.3	
	Sexual orientation	76.5	23.5	
	Other	53.9	46.1	
	Checked any 1 box		61.8	38.2
	Checked 2 boxes		57.3	42.7
	Checked 3 or more boxes		52.6	47.4

Table 6. Perception of Institution Support by Discrimination Experience

			Mean		Sig.	95 CI	
			Diff.	SE		LB	UB
Age	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.626	.053	***	-.75	-.50
		Yes, interfered with work	0.191	.077	*	.01	.37
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.816	.063	***	-.97	-.67
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-0.191	.077	*	-.37	-.01
Country of citizenship	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.576	.052	***	-.70	-.45
		Yes, interfered with work	.130	.075		-.04	.31
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.78	.062	***	-.85	-.56
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-.100	.075		-.31	.04
Disability or impairment	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.518	.053	***	-.64	-.39
		Yes, interfered with work	.140	.076		-.03	.32
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.664	.062	***	-.81	-.52
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-.100	.076		-.32	.03
Gender identity	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.565	.060	***	-.71	-.42
		Yes, interfered with work	.070	.087		-.13	.28
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.644	.071	***	-.81	-.48
		Yes, did not interfere with work	.000	.087		-.28	.13
Political views	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.61	.059	***	-.74	-.46
		Yes, interfered with work	.180	.085		-.02	.38
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.784	.070	***	-.95	-.62
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-.100	.085		-.38	.02
Racial or ethnic identification	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.57	.053	***	-.70	-.45
		Yes, interfered with work	0.196	.077	*	.02	.38
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.773	.063	***	-.92	-.63
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-0.196	.077	*	-.38	-.02
Religious or spiritual views	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.598	.057	***	-.73	-.46
		Yes, interfered with work	.160	.083		-.03	.36
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.766	.068	***	-.92	-.61
		Yes, did not interfere with work	-.100	.083		-.36	.03
Sexual orientation	Yes, did not interfere with work	No	-0.512	.062	***	-.66	-.37
		Yes, interfered with work	.090	.090		-.12	.30
	Yes, interfered with work	No	-0.64	.074	***	-.78	-.43
		Yes, did not interfere with work	.000	.090		-.30	.12

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

References

- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The Black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in US higher education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 112-127.
- American Association of University Women. (n.d.). *Know your rights: Workplace sexual harassment*. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/what-we-do/legal-resources/know-your-rights-at-work/workplace-sexual-harassment/>
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). Touchton, J. G., Musil, C. M., & Campbell, K. P. (2008). *A measure of equity: Women's progress in higher education*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Bronstein, P. & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(5), 557-585.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). The tie that binds: Race, gender and US violence. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21(5), 917-938.
- Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., & Owens, D. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A central challenge in the multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD*, 86(3), 348-355.
- Crenshaw, K. (2000). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989, 139-167.

- Diggs, G.A., Garrison-Wade, D.F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review, 41*, 312-333.
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education, 36*(3), 349-370.
- Garrison-Wade, D. F., Diggs, G. A., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2012). Lift every voice and sing: Faculty of color face the challenges of the tenure track. *The Urban Review, 44*(1), 90-112.
- Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority, and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles, 21*(11/12), 789-801.
- Gregory, S.T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status and future. *Journal of Negro Education, 70*(3), 124-138.
- Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C.L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cullear, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J.C. Smart and M.B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (41-122). Springer.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pederson, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. In A. J. Kezar (Ed.), *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* (Vol. 26). Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538-563.
- Johnsrud, L.K. & Sadao, K.C. (1998). The common experience of “otherness”: Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315-342.
- Johnsrud, L.K. (2002). Measuring the quality of faculty and administrative worklife: Implications for colleges and university campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 379-395.
- Lindholm, J.A. and Astin, H.S. (2006). Understanding the “interior” life of faculty: How important is spirituality? *Religion & Education*, 33(2), 64-90.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles*, 23 (7/8), 421-438.
- Milem, J.F., Chang, M.J., & Antonio, A.L. (2005). Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective. *One in a series of three papers commissioned as part of the making excellence inclusive initiative from the Association of American Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Milem, J.P. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affects student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Eds.), *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action* (233-249). Cambridge Harvard: Education Publishing Group.
- Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist review*, 89(1), 1-15.
- Nelson Laird, T. F. & Niskode-Dossett, A.S. (2006?). How Gender and Race Moderate the Effect of Student Interactions across Difference on Student and Faculty Perceptions of the Campus Environment.

Ng, R. (1993). "A woman out of control": Deconstructing sexism and racism in the university.

Canadian Journal of Education, 18(3), 189-205.

Núñez, A. M. (2014). Employing multilevel intersectionality in educational research Latino

identities, contexts, and college access. *Educational Researcher, 43*(2), 85-92.

Park, J. J. (2009). Are we satisfied? A look at student satisfaction with diversity at traditionally

White institutions. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*(3), 291-320.

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.

Perna, L.W. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in*

Higher Education, 42(5), 541-567.

Salazar, C. F. (2009). Strategies to survive and thrive in academia: The collective voices of

counseling faculty of color. *International Journal for the Advancement of*

Counselling, 31(3), 181-198.

Sears, J.T. (2002). The institutional climate for lesbian, gay, and bisexual education faculty:

What is the pivotal frame of reference? *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(1), 11-37.

Sekaquaptewa, D., & Thompson, M. (2002). The differential effects of solo status on members of

high-and low-status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(5), 694-707.

Smith, D. G. (1996). Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths. Washington, DC:

Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Snyder, T. D., Dillow, S. A., & Hoffman, C. M. (2008). Digest of Education Statistics, 2007.

NCES 2008-022. *National Center for Education Statistics*

- Thompson, C. Q. (2008). Recruitment, retention, and mentoring faculty of color: The chronicle continues. *New directions for higher education*, 2008(143), 47-54.
- Thompson, C.J. & Dey, E.L. (1998). Pushed to the margins: Sources of stress for African American college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(3), 324-345.
- Tierney, W. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 2-21.
- Turner, C.S.V., Gonzalez, J.C., & Wood, J.L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139-168.
- Xu, Y. J. (2008). Gender disparity in STEM disciplines: A study of faculty attrition and turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(7), 607-624.