

American Behavioral Scientist

<http://abs.sagepub.com>

Race Segregation Across the Academic Workforce: Exploring Factors That May Contribute to the Disparate Representation of African American Men

Jerlando F. L. Jackson

American Behavioral Scientist 2008; 51; 1004

DOI: 10.1177/0002764207312003

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/51/7/1004>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *American Behavioral Scientist* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://abs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 55 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/51/7/1004>

Race Segregation Across the Academic Workforce

Exploring Factors That May Contribute to the Disparate Representation of African American Men

Jerlando F. L. Jackson

University of Wisconsin–Madison

In terms of income and employment opportunities, previous studies have indicated that African American men fare less well than their White counterparts in the academic workforce, including a recent study by the author that found the hiring practices in higher education had a disparate effect on African American men. On the grounds that human capital and merit-based performance measures have proven to be critical criteria for decision making within the overall hiring practices in higher education, this study examined the extent to which these factors influence the observed representation of African American and White men in the academic workforce. This study found that both human capital and merit-based performance measures were good employment predictors for White men and, in contrast, were not good employment predictors for African American men in the academic workforce.

Keywords: *African Americans; disparate representation; men; workforce*

Both a Supreme Court decision and subsequent federal legislation have shown great promise for improving the work conditions for the African American community in education: *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* is among the most significant judicial turning points in the development of our country. By declaring that the discriminatory nature of racial segregation violated the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, it initiated a social contract that vowed to eradicate the injustices in the United States by addressing the inequities in the educational system between racial groups (Grant, 1995). Although it was generally understood that the decision would influence the educational experiences for African American students, it was also conceptualized to enhance the workplace conditions and employment opportunities for African American professionals in education.

With regard to hiring, workplace conditions (e.g., promotion, compensation, and job training), or any other matters related to employment, Title VII of the Civil

Rights Act of 1964 indicates that it is unlawful to discriminate against any individual for employment because of his or her race or color. Such legislation applies not only to employers with 15 or more employees, including state and local governments, but also to employment agencies and to labor organizations, as well as to the federal government. Title VII prohibits both intentional and unintentional discriminatory job policies that disproportionately exclude people of color (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). Under the segregation and classification of employees subsection, Title VII is violated when employees who belong to a protected group are segregated by physically isolating them from other employees or from customer contact.

More specifically, employers may not assign employees according to race or color. For example, Title VII prohibits assigning primarily African Americans to predominantly African American establishments or geographic areas. It is also illegal to exclude members of one group from particular positions, or to group or categorize employees or jobs, so that members of a protected group generally hold certain jobs. Coding applications or resumes to designate an applicant's race, by either an employer or employment agency, is evidence of discrimination where people of a certain race or color are excluded from employment or from certain positions (Kaplin & Lee, 1995).

Although the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, coupled with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, forbid racial segregation and discrimination in education, there is considerable evidence that they both still occur for students and professionals. With regard to professionals, for example, in fiscal year 2004, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) received 27,696 charges of race discrimination. The EEOC resolved 29,631 race charges in FY 2004 and recovered \$61.1 million in monetary benefits for charging parties and other aggrieved individuals (not including monetary benefits obtained through litigation; EEOC, 2006). The EEOC has also observed an increasing number of color discrimination charges. Since the mid-1990s, color bias filings have increased to 125%, from 413 in FY 1994 to 932 in FY 2004.

Results of several recent studies suggest that there is racial segregation and discrimination implicit in the hiring practices in higher education (e.g., Flowers & Jones, 2003; Jackson, 2002, 2003, 2006; Williams & Williams, 2006). African Americans, in general, and African American men, in particular, were found to be disadvantaged in the higher education workforce. The corpus of these studies has examined demographic shifts in the higher education workforce and has concluded that African Americans disproportionately hold lower level positions at less prestigious institutions. Within the context of this research, it is quite possible that implicit discriminatory practices in higher education produce "race segregation."

While this research is useful for identifying and describing race segregation in the higher education workforce, the methodological procedures and data treatment present problems explaining the results or even drawing inference from such data. Therefore, this study aims to disentangle these results by attempting to identify

factors that may influence hiring decisions in higher education. To that end, this study used data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (Abraham et al., 2002) to address the following research questions: (a) Do measures of human capital and merit-based performance help to explain the observed representation, by principal activity, of African American men in the academic workforce? and (b) Do measures of human capital and merit-based performance help to explain the observed representation, by principal activity, of White men in the academic workforce?

Conceptualizing Human Capital and Merit-Based Performance Measures in the Hiring Practices of Higher Education

Educational requirements, institutional prestige, job interviews, letters of recommendation, and prior professional achievements are common criteria used in the hiring practices of higher education (Trix & Psenka, 2003). These criteria often are used, whether intentional or unintentional, to control access to positions within organizations. In turn, as the societal value and benefit of both the position and organization increase, it is quite likely that the threshold of expectations within these criteria will alter. Such hiring practices have often been seen as “academic gate-keeping” practices. More specifically, this term represents a process of sorting through and choosing among a number of individuals and then determining who is worthy of selection (Erickson & Shultz, 1982).

Because higher social status positions and institutions tend to be less public with their hiring practices, examining and addressing these practices are particularly difficult (Trix & Psenka, 2003). Data on the hiring and promotion of African Americans, in general, and African American men, in particular, in the higher education academic workforce call to question hiring practices that yield disproportionate representation for this group (Jackson, 2004b, 2006). With this in mind, *Brown v. Board of Education* serves as a demarcation for broader access for educational opportunities in pre-K–12 education (and has philosophically been applied to higher education as well) but has resulted in little evidence of increased proportional representation in the academic workforce in higher education (Cole & Jackson, 2005). Below, human capital and merit-based performance measures are considered as a window of opportunity to understand hiring practices in higher education.

Human Capital Theory

Institutions of higher education, alongside their pre-K–12 school partners, are commonly viewed as central contributors to human capital development in the United States (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2003). For example, the national discourse related to remaining globally competitive includes major agenda items directed

toward recommendations and initiatives to expand the training of individuals in particular fields. Therefore, institutions of higher education are seen as major vehicles of accomplishing these urgent and needed results. Human capital theory also purports that individuals and society derive economic benefits from investments in people (Sweetland, 1996). Although various activities (e.g., health care) have been found to increase human capital, education receives the most research attention (Langelett, 2002). Myriad studies have examined education in various formats, including pre-K–12 schooling, higher and postsecondary education, and other informal education and on-the-job training (Cohn & Geske, 1990; Corazzini, 1967; Mincer, 1989; Schultz, 1961).

According to Langelett (2002), education (e.g., formal and informal) is a form of human capital, which requires both individual and societal investment. For the most part, individuals receive a private return, whereas government-funded initiatives yield a social return. Previous research has found that an investment in education increases an individual's income after controlling for important variables (e.g., cost of schooling, ability, and family background; Carnevale & Desrochers, 2003; Cohn & Hughes, 1994; Psacharopoulos, 1984). A unique aspect about human capital, as opposed to other forms of capital, is that it cannot be sold or given away. Dean (1984) identified eight ways in which education affects an individual's economic well-being. First, it increases human capital. Second, there is an inverse relationship between the average level of education and fertility rates in a cross-section of counties. Third, education reduces search time in labor markets. Fourth, there is a correlation between education and the health of the workforce. Fifth, there is a direct relationship between the education level of children and their parents. Sixth, there are consumption effects of education. Seventh, education has an effect on crime, social cohesion, and technology development. Last, there are income distribution effects that affect average income.

It must be noted that all views of human capital are not affirmative. Theodore Schultz (1961), in his presidential address for the American Economic Association, stated,

The mere thought of investment in human beings is offensive to some among us. Our values and beliefs inhibit us from looking upon human beings as capital goods, except in slavery, and this we abhor. We are not unaffected by the long struggle to rid society of indentured service and to evolve political and legal institutions to keep men free from bondage. These are achievements that we prize highly. Hence, to treat human beings as wealth that can be augmented by investment runs counter to deeply held values. It seems to reduce man once again to a mere material component, to something akin to property. (pp. 313-314)

Schultz seemed to wrestle psychologically with the notion of connecting the word *capital* to people, thus strongly considering the potential effects of this action. In some respects, the sentiment of the quote raises questions, if we are dehumanizing each other by using such a concept. Likewise, Langelett (2002) brings our attention

to another detractor for human capital theory—screening hypothesis. Equally or more important than the production of human capital is the screening process used by potential employers to sort individuals throughout the hiring process. From this perspective, the screener has the power and authority to make evaluative judgments on what forms and type of human capital are more or less important. Withstanding these identified drawbacks of human capital theory, the theory continues to resonate with the American culture, depicting the country as a place where one can actually pursue social mobility and success, often through the acquisition of education (Sweetland, 1996).

Merit-Based Performance

With fewer financial resources, the modern American economy insists that organizations and companies work more efficiently to produce greater outcomes (Bok, 2003). Nowhere can this pressure be felt more than at institutions of higher education, in particular, state-funded institutions. A common response to these pressures is the implementation of a merit-based pay system (Lauer, 1991). In such a system, individual job performance is linked to salary increases. A merit pay system is best situated within an organization, when there is a logical flow between organizational goals and outcomes (Lauer, 1991). Yet, the link between institutional goals and outcomes is unclear at colleges and universities (Perez, 2004). Nonetheless, it is a pay system under which most faculty are evaluated.

With some exceptions (e.g., 2-year institutions), institutions of higher education in the United States tend to value teaching, research, or service, awarding more weight to one of the three according to institutional mission (Altbach, Berdhal, & Gumpert, 1999). These applied weights are signals for faculty roles and rewards often materializing themselves into “shop talk,” such as “publish or perish,” “up or out,” and “research versus teaching” (Marchant & Newman, 1994). As such, these discussions provide a road map for which activities are more important as it pertains to evaluations. Institutional reward systems show preference among teaching, research, and service, with a significant portion of institutions focused primarily on research (Graham & Diamond, 1997). Faculty evaluations are used for various reasons in higher education. For example, they are used for contract renewal for new faculty, tenure decisions, promotion in rank (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professor), and merit pay (Thelin, 2004). Regardless of the evaluative purpose, a central concern is, “How will good performance be identified and measured?”

Aligned with this notion, Alger (1998) has noted several problems with measuring merit for faculty of color. First, although the evaluation system may appear neutral, in practice, it can have a disparate effect on faculty of color. For example, using a narrow definition of merit, emphasizing publication in traditional journals may ignore emerging areas of scholarship and appropriate venues for faculty of color research. Second, service commitments are given less weight in the evaluation

process. This can have a negative effect on faculty of color, in particular if they are allocated to serve on all the diversity-related committees. Last, using collegiality as an evaluation criterion for faculty of color is problematic. Alger (1998) also notes that collegiality is often used as a code word for shared backgrounds, interests, and personal and social perspectives. Because this measure is ambiguous, it is quite likely that it could be used against faculty whose ideas and work challenge the status quo of the department.

Lauer (1991) outlines four conditions that need to be met in order to have a successful merit pay system. First, good performance leads to increased pay. The institution needs to guarantee increased pay for good performance, or it will not work. For example, a raise less than the cost of living increase represents a loss in absolute dollars. Second, disclosure is needed to verify system credibility. Within a "true" merit system, the winners are known and top producers are announced and awarded for their achievements. Third, rewards show organizations' values. Although money is an important asset, it may not be the best award available. Fourth, pay increases need to be significant. An effective system provides at least two times the average increment. Therefore, an awardee could possibly get twice the amount of merit the average employee gets. In addition to these four conditions, Andrews and Marzano (1983) recommend establishing the criteria for good performance, stipulating the actual reward, and identifying how many faculty members are eligible for merit pay, prior to the evaluation exercise.

Some institutions have spent a great deal of time addressing the aforementioned concerns and benefits about merit pay systems. For example, in 1998, Middle East Technical University developed a system to measure performance for faculty members (Uctug & Koksall, 2003). It includes separate criteria and measures for each college within the university. For the most part, these criteria include publications, editorial work, professional and other research-related activities, educational activities, memberships and awards, and other activities (see Table 1). The institution developed this system for use with faculty recruitment and promotion. The attempt was made to assign points to almost every possible activity and work of a faculty member. Seemingly human capital and merit-based performance appraisal variables show great promise for providing an explanation as to why some occupations are predominately White and male.

Review of Related Research

For approximately 15 years, research literature on the higher education workforce has documented that Whites are highly represented in upper level positions, whereas people of color (e.g., African Americans) tend to be concentrated in less prestigious ones (Konrad & Pfeffer, 1991). Acknowledging this problem, many institutions of higher education have framed rhetoric around diversifying the higher education

Table 1
Annual Performance Assessment Scheme

Activity or Work	Points
Journal paper	
Full paper published in an A-type national journal	6
Full paper published in a B-type national journal	2
Chapter in a book	
Chapter in a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by a nationally known publisher	8
Chapter in a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by another national publisher	6
Book	
Scientific, professional books, or textbooks published by nationally known publishers	20
Scientific, professional books, or textbooks published by other national publishers	10
Editor of a book	
Editor of a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by a nationally known publisher	5
Editor of a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by another national publisher	3
Conference paper	
Full paper presented at and published in the proceedings of a refereed, regularly held conference	3
Abstract of a paper presented at and published in the proceedings of a refereed, regularly held conference	1
Conference presentation	
Unpublished presentation in a refereed, regularly held conference	1
Editor of a proceedings or a special issue	
Editor of the proceedings of a refereed, regularly held conference or of the special issue of a journal	3
Translation of a book	
Published translation of a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by an international publisher	6
Translation of a paper or chapter	
Published translation of a full paper published in a peer-reviewed journal covered by Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, or Arts & Humanities Citation Index core list, or a book chapter in a scientific, professional book, or textbook published by an international publisher	1
Citations	
Each citation by other authors	0.2

Source: Uctug and Koksall (2003).

Note: The following scheme is used for distributing points in common works: single contributor = point given (p); two contributors = $0.8xp$; more than two contributors = $1.8p/n$; more than one chapter in a book = $(1 + k/c)p$; n = number of contributors; c = total number of chapters in the book; k = number of chapters written by the author.

workforce, yet few initiatives have resulted in significant outcomes. Outside of educating citizens for societal needs, it is believed that one of the important functions of higher education institutions is the hiring, selection, and training of employees (Bledstein, 1976; Sveiby, 1997). The following section outlines research in three knowledge domains to inform this study: (a) hiring and selection process in higher education; (b) peer review and rater bias; and (c) discrimination in higher education.

Hiring and Selection in Higher Education

Sagaria (2002) organized the administrator and management selection literature into two approaches: rational and representational. She conceptualized the rational approach as a logical and objective evaluation focused on human capital variables (e.g., years of experience). Within this approach, she highlights research that prescribes the steps of the hiring and selection process (e.g., Kaplowitz, 1996) and focuses on the symmetry between candidate and job characteristics (e.g., Taylor & Bergman, 1987), employers' preferences (e.g., Cox, Schlueter, Moore, & Sullivan, 1989; McLaughlin & Riesman, 1985; Reid & Rogers, 1981; Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980), and consideration of gender (e.g., Futoran & Wyer, 1986) and race (e.g., McIntyre, Moberg, & Posner, 1980). On another note, the representational approach views the hiring process as symbolic and unpredictable (Sagaria, 2002). The research supporting this approach has included studies that viewed search committees as symbols manipulated by political dynamics (e.g., Birnbaum, 1988), examined searches as complex decision-making processes (e.g., Olsen, 1976), and provided insights into the ritualistic nature of selection procedures (e.g., Twombly, 1992), presidential candidates' experiences (e.g., McLaughlin & Riesman, 1985), and the experiences for people of color (e.g., de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988; WoodBrooks, 1991).

A component of the hiring and selection process is the interviewer's perception of the candidate (Hitt & Barr, 1989), which unfortunately includes subjective judgment (Cesare, 1996). Wade and Kinicki (1995) note, "The relationship between objective applicant qualifications and the hiring decision is an indirect one, and that subjective qualifications mediate this relationship" (p. 151). Likewise, previous research has documented the influence of nonverbal cues (e.g., gender and race) on interviewer perceptions of applicants' qualifications (Parson & Liden, 1984). In fact, for three decades, research has shown interviewers to be heavily influenced by physical characteristics, behavior, and other nonverbal cues not directly related to the job (Schmitt, 1976). For example, Zebrowitz, Tenenbaum, and Goldstein (1991) found that "baby-faced" and female applicants were favored for positions requiring warmth and submission, whereas "mature-faced" or male applicants were favored for positions requiring shrewdness and leadership. In turn, baby-faced and female applicants were more likely to be discriminated against with regard to higher status positions.

Peer Review and Rater Bias

A chief concern of any performance evaluation is whether bias enters the process due to rater or ratee characteristics (e.g., race and gender). Steinpress, Anders, and Ritzke (1999) note that peer review evaluations have been criticized for poor interrater reliability, lack of objectivity, and nepotism. Over the years, research has indicated that both men and women rate the quality of work by men higher when the gender is known (O'Leary & Wallston, 1982). More specifically, Wenneras and Wold

(1997) state, "Our study strongly suggests that peer reviewers cannot judge scientific merit independent of gender" (p. 341). The majority of the research has focused on the causes of gender bias but provides guidance to understand bias, based on race and ethnicity (Bauer & Baltes, 2002; Davison & Burke, 2000; Gunderson, Tinsley, & Terpstra, 1996). In 1980, Nieva and Gutek found that gender bias occurs when one gender is rated higher than the other given similar performance. As a consequence, these results have implications for not only performance evaluations but also hiring decisions.

Based on the work of social-cognitive theory, researchers have found a link between stereotypes and perceived behavior or characteristics, based on gender (e.g., Del Boca, Ashmore, & McManus, 1986; Swim & Sanna, 1996). Stereotyping is used to categorize individuals into groups, and in turn, these categorizations influence group attributes placed on individuals from the group by others (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000; Seta & Seta, 1993). It is unfortunate that these stereotypes are likely to influence the rater's evaluation of a member from specific groups (Martell, 1991). For instance, Biernat and Manis (1994) found that individuals use shifting standards based on stereotypes to make judgments. Basically, these researchers suggest that when an individual judges someone from a different social group, the individual implicitly uses his or her self-developed conception of group means or standards, likely based on stereotypes for that particular group. For example, the standard for what is tall is not the same for men and women. In contrast, racially similar applicants are perceived to be better candidates and are given higher ratings than racially dissimilar applicants (Prewett-Livingston, Field, Veres, & Lewis, 1996).

Discrimination in the Higher Education Workforce

Although the identification of insufficient participation for African Americans and other people of color in the educational pipeline highlights the lack of diversity within the higher education workforce, it does not depict the whole story (Jackson, 2003). It does not account for the unwelcoming and unaccommodating environment at institutions of higher education created by discrimination in the workplace (Trower & Chait, 2002); the otherwise qualified candidates who forego graduate school or select alternative career options are left out of the educational pipeline equation. Moreover, Trower and Chait posit that academe, like other professions, has a strong culture of beliefs associated with accepted methods for doing business, which is not easily altered or changed. This culture is not challenged until there are new priorities that need to be considered—like race and ethnicity.

Discrimination in the higher education workforce could go undetected for the most part because of its covert nature. That is, contemporary forms of prejudice or racism are less conscious and more subtle (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Although these forms may be more subtle, indirectly expressed, and

rationalized, they have equally negative consequences for people of color (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998). This new form of racism has been viewed as aversive. In this context, Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) developed the terminology and define it. For example, they state, "Aversive racism is hypothesized to characterize the racial attitudes of many whites who endorse egalitarian values, who regard themselves as non-prejudiced, but who discriminate in subtle, rationalizable ways" (p. 315). The explicit and implicit nature of higher education institutions make them prime candidates for this form of racism (Misra, Kennelly, & Karides, 1999).

A large portion of the literature on faculty of color explores their experiences, the majority of which unearths negative ones (James & Farmer, 1993; Myers & Turner, 1995; Turner & Myers, 2000; Washington & Harvey, 1989). Faculty members in these studies speak of marginalization, poor working conditions, lack of person-environment fit, and pressures to work harder than their White counterparts (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Tack & Patitu, 1992). To provide a deeper understanding of the primary issues of concern for people of color in the academic workforce, this subsection will highlight seven themes from the literature used to characterize the faculty of color experience.

Lack of support. Since the 1960s, African American faculty and other faculty of color have increasingly filled faculty positions at colleges and universities (Turner & Myers, 2000). Yet, despite the gains made in recent years, there is a great deal of organizational change that still needs to take place. To be sure, it is unrealistic for an organizational culture that once excluded racial and ethnic minorities purely on the basis of appearance to quickly transform into a system completely anchored in fairness and equal opportunity (Björk & Thompson, 1989; Spann, 1990). Notwithstanding this glaring reality, many African American faculty and other faculty of color are well aware of the problems in higher education. Thus, they have expressed a lack of support by their academic departments as an attributing factor to low retention rates for faculty of color (D. Smith, Wolf, & Busenberg, 1996). The most commonly cited areas for lack of support include, but are not limited to, (a) not receiving adequate financial support; (b) being subjected to differential evaluation mechanisms; (c) qualitative review processes; (d) undue regulation; (e) inappropriate questioning related to nonscholarly matters; and (f) receiving inadequate information. Thus, the need for support, from fellow faculty colleagues of color, is one of the most influential factors for the promotion and tenure among faculty of color.

Revolving door syndrome. Although the recruitment of African American faculty and other faculty of color is on the rise, retaining these individuals is still another struggle that institutions are facing (R. M. Smith, 1994). The "revolving door syndrome" refers to the issue of retaining faculty of color at institutions of higher education. To help close the revolving door, it is clear that it will take some initiative on the part of academic departments, specifically academic chairpersons (Bensimon, Ward, & Sanders, 2000). It is imperative that academic chairpersons figure out ways

to minimize the influence of a formerly racially segregated academic community and “legislated integration.” Although legislation or policy can reduce blatant discrimination and racism on the nation’s campuses, it cannot create a community of collegiality among faculty members in a department. To further exacerbate matters, too many African American faculty mistakenly believe that the revolving door syndrome is a function of their performance (Blackwell, 1996; Spann, 1990; Turner & Myers, 2000).

Tokenism. Tokenism has negatively affected African American faculty and other faculty of color (Mitchell, 1982; Padilla & Chávez, 1995; Turner & Myers, 2000). Many of these faculty feel that they must continually prove themselves to their colleagues (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). They are confronted with attitudes from peers that they were hired as a token without being qualified. The perceptions held by some non-minority faculty that faculty of color are less qualified or less likely to make contributions in research are a byproduct of tokenism. Predicating the hire of one person of color builds into the concept of a “token hire,” because this contributes further to the isolation by being “the one” in the department. It is common for tokenism to manifest itself in a myriad of forms (e.g., committee overload, marginality, and professional isolation); therefore, it is crucial that academic departments develop well-thought-out strategies to identify and eliminate each form (for strategies, see Jackson, 2001, 2004a, 2006).

Typecasting. The typecasting syndrome is the attitude that only African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, or Asian Americans can teach ethnic-related courses (Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999). Although some may argue that faculty of color are better suited to conduct research or teach courses about ethnic minorities, discrimination, racism, and diversity issues, all faculty of color may not want to teach or conduct research in these areas. However, some faculty of color are pushed or strongly encouraged to pursue those activities (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). Moreover, some faculty of color believe that these important lines of inquiry are not valued or viewed as scholarly contributions by colleges and universities (Banks, 1984; de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). This form of typecasting may adversely affect faculty members of color who prefer pursuing other areas of research, thus minimizing their academic freedom. Typecasting can be eliminated by merely allowing faculty of color to determine their research and teaching agenda through traditional means of scholarship as opposed to mandating or using faculty of color to teach the “diversity course” (Tack & Patitu, 1992).

One-minority-per-pot. The one-minority-per-pot is the “unwritten quota system” in which departments hire one minority per department (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). In the past, prior to recent civil rights legislation, there was a different system in place. The quota system was viewed as the “no minorities allowed” rule. This

condition was easily enforced, usually through violence, and remained in place for hundreds of years (Washington & Harvey, 1989). As the number of faculty of color increased on campuses, faculty of color began to notice a different phenomenon. Today, in too many academic departments, there may be one or two faculty of color in the department. With this condition in place, it is possible for faculty of color to be overrepresented in ethnic studies departments; meanwhile, in other departments, the prevailing practice is one minority per department (Anderson, 1994; Banks, 1984; Blackwell, 1996).

Brown-on-brown taboo. The brown-on-brown research taboo implies that research interests of many faculty of color focus on their ethnicity and other persons of color (Turner & Myers, 2000). White colleagues often see research by faculty of color on people of color as unimportant and not valid. It is ironic that “white-on-white” research is afforded legitimacy, but “brown-on-brown” research is questionable and challenged at the same time that many White social scientists are establishing their professional careers as experts on minority issues (de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). Blackwell (1996) found that faculty of color experienced criticism by peers over the journals in which they published. Peers were not as concerned about the quality of research as they were about what the research entailed. The quality of research by faculty of color is also challenged when it is published on diversity issues in ethnic-specific journals. This fact supports the contention that faculty of color have to not only undergo the rigors of tenure and promotion, but also deal with racism on many different levels (Tack & Patitu, 1992).

Method

Dataset

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) designed and conducted the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99; Abraham et al., 2002) survey. NSOPF:99 was conducted to address the need for national-level data on college faculty and instructors, those who directly affect the quality of teaching and learning at American postsecondary institutions (Abraham et al., 2002). Therefore, NSOPF is the most comprehensive dataset on the academic workforce. The data collection occurred during the academic year 1998-1999, which included 960 degree-granting postsecondary institutions and an initial sample of 31,354 faculty and instructional staff. Approximately 28,600 faculty and instructional staff were sent a questionnaire. Subsequently, a subsample of 19,813 faculty and instructional staff was drawn for additional survey follow-up. Approximately 18,000 faculty and instructional staff questionnaires were completed for a weighted response rate of 83%. The response rate for the institution survey was 93%. The weighted responses represent the national estimates for 1999 (957,767; Abraham et al., 2002).

To correct for the nonsimple random sample design and to minimize the influence of large sample sizes on standard errors, the effective sample size was altered by adjusting the relative weight downward as a function of the overall design effect (Thomas, Heck, & Bauer, 2005). This was achieved by multiplying the relative weight by the reciprocal of the Design Effect (DEFF) value and then reweighting the data with the DEFF adjusted relative weight.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for the academic workforce were based on individuals' responses to the principal activity question on the NSOPF:99. The question asked, "What was your principal activity at this institution during the 1998 Fall term? If you have equal responsibilities, please select one." Possible responses were teaching, research, clinical service, administration, on sabbatical from the institution, and other activity. These responses were recoded to create three dummy variables for the academic workforce: (a) administration, (b) teaching, and (c) research. Faculty members contained within the administration category have assumed institutional positions committed to administrative functions (e.g., department chair, dean, and vice president of academic affairs). Faculty members categorized as teaching tend to represent the traditional tenured or tenure-track faculty (e.g., assistant, associate, and full professor) profile of a mix between teaching, research, service, and outreach. Last, the research category (e.g., research professor and research scientist) includes individuals who are, for the most part, in non-tenure-track positions focused on research.

Independent Variables

In selecting independent variables, decisions were guided by research on human capital theory and merit-based performance measures. Accordingly, the logistic regression models included 10 variables. The human capital measures included (a) institutional type of highest degree; (b) field of highest degree; (c) institutional type of place of employment; (d) institutional control of place of employment; and (e) years held current position. The merit-based performance measures included (a) career publications; (b) external funding; (c) total number of grants; (d) teaching committees; and (e) administrative committees.

Analyses

Due to the dichotomous nature of the dependent variables, logistic regression was used to examine the extent to which human capital and merit-based performance measures explained the low observed representation for African American men and high observed representation for White men in the academic workforce (Cabrera, 1994). Several measures of fit were used when judging the significance of each logistic regression model: χ^2 of the model, pseudo R^2 , and PCPs. A significant χ^2 indicates that

the independent variable as a group correlates with the dependent variable. At most, the pseudo R^2 represents the proportion of error variance in relation to a null model. PCP represents the percentage of cases predicted by the model. PCPs higher than 55% signify a good fit for the model (Cabrera, 1994). As a measure of the magnitude of effect, Δp s were used, which represents the change in the probability in the dependent variable due to a change in the factor variable under consideration. For example, a Δp value of 0.045 indicates that a one-unit change in the predictor is related to a 4.5 percentage point increase in the likelihood that a faculty member would become an academic leader.

Limitations of Study

There are several limitations for this study worth noting. First, the analyses for this study were limited to variables contained in NSOPF:99. The NSOPF:99 is the most comprehensive survey of the academic workforce and a rich data source; however, human capital and merit-based performance measures were somewhat limited. Although the 10 variables used for these analyses were applicable, other forms of human capital and merit-based performance measures were not available. Second, analyses for this study were limited to cross-sectional data. Therefore, these results include members of the academic workforce employed during the year of data collection. In turn, implications of this study present one point in time. Third, separate logistic regression models were run for both African American and White men. In doing so, direct comparisons between groups are not possible. However, these models were developed separately to understand explanations for observed representation for each group independently.

Fourth, cautions for strict interpretations of the African American male models are warranted because of the potential challenges associated with the power of the analysis based on the sample size. For example, the patterns of effects show that, for the most part, the coefficients in both sets of models are going in the same direction and that the magnitude for these coefficients is similar. Whereas these limitations are apparent in this study, the results still provide a window for understanding the differential outcomes for African American and White men in the academic workforce.

Results

Descriptive Results

Table 2 presents the descriptive data for both African American and White men in the academic workforce. For both groups, the largest percentage received their highest degree from research institutions. Likewise, the lowest percentage of highest degrees was earned at liberal arts institutions. Whereas both groups had 15.2% of its

Table 2
Descriptive Distribution of Human Capital and Merit-Based
Performance Measures by Group: Fall 1998

Variable	African American Men (estimated pop. = 18,601)	White Men (estimate pop. = 231,599)
	Observed Value	Observed Value
Highest degree—institutional type		
Research	48.50%	58.70%
Doctoral	14.30%	11.60%
Comprehensive	18.40%	12.50%
Liberal arts	3.60%	2.00%
2-year	15.20%	15.20%
Highest degree—field		
Agriculture and home economics	1.00%	2.20%
Business	8.60%	7.60%
Education	14.20%	10.60%
Engineering	3.60%	5.50%
Fine arts	6.60%	6.80%
Health services	7.60%	10.60%
Humanities	13.20%	13.10%
Natural sciences	17.80%	18.10%
Social sciences	10.70%	10.90%
Other programs	16.70%	14.60%
Employment—institutional type		
Research	16.40%	28.20%
Doctoral	7.40%	9.00%
Comprehensive	23.30%	19.80%
Liberal arts	14.30%	9.20%
2-year	38.60%	33.80%
Employment—institutional control		
Public	69.10%	69.50%
Private	30.90%	30.50%
Years held current position	9.19	11.54
Career publications	17.00	31.05
External funding	\$12,548.97	\$16,038.83
Total number of grants	.3865	.5846
Teaching committees, served	1.80	1.76
Admin. committees, served	2.51	2.49

members with highest degrees from 2-year institutions, the percentage distribution represented the second highest for White men and the third highest for African American men. Approximately 18.4% of African American men and 11.6% of White men received their highest degree at comprehensive institutions. Last, the distribution of African American and White men with highest degrees from doctoral institutions was 14.3% and 11.6%, respectively.

As for field of highest degree, the highest percentage of African American men was in the fields of natural sciences (17.8%), other programs (16.7%), and education (14.2%), whereas the three fields of study with the most White men were natural sciences (18.1%), other programs (14.6%), and humanities (13.1%). The fields of study with the lowest percentage of African American and White men were the same: (a) agriculture and home economics, (b) engineering, and (c) fine arts.

The institutional type for employment varied for both groups, with one exception. Both groups had the largest percentage of members employed at 2-year institutions. For African American men, comprehensive institutions had the second largest percentage, followed by research, liberal arts, and doctoral institutions, respectively. The second largest percentage of White men was employed at research institutions, followed by comprehensive, doctoral, and liberal arts institutions. The employment distribution of African American and White men by institutional control was similar. For the most part, both groups had the majority of its members employed at public institutions (69%), whereas the remainder worked at private institutions (31%).

The average distribution of the merit-based performance measures was skewed in favor of White men with two exceptions: teaching and administrative committee work. African American men were in their current position on average 9.19 years, whereas White men had 11.54 years. With regard to career publications, African American men had 17 and White men had 31. The average yearly external funding for African American men was \$12,548.97, and for White men, it was \$16,038.83. Closely related was the average number of external grants, approximately .3865 for African American men and .5846 for White men. When considering service on teaching committees, African American men averaged 1.80 per year, whereas White men averaged 1.76. Likewise, African American men averaged 2.51 administrative committees and White men averaged 2.49.

Logistic Regression Results

Table 3 shows the results of three separate logistic regression models for White men in the academic workforce. Three separate models were specified for traditional employment categories in the academic workforce: (a) administration, (b) teaching, and (c) research. Each model reports the beta weights for all variables and Δp values for statistically significant variables. The first of the data columns indicates the beta weights, which represent the relative importance of each variable, controlling for all others in the model. The second column displays the statistically significant Δp values, which show the change in the probability of default that each significant variable makes, controlling for all others. Based on the goodness-of-fit indices, these three models were a good fit.

In the Administration Model, the beta weights and Δp values indicate that there was one variable that generates significant increases in the probability of White men's observed representation in positions with the principle function of administration:

Table 3
Logistic Regression Results for White Men in the
Academic Workforce by Principal Activity

Variable	Administration		Teaching		Research	
	Beta	Δp	Beta	Δp	Beta	Δp
Human capital measures						
Highest degree—institutional type						
Doctoral			.168		-.689*	-0.0394
Comprehensive	-.154		-.008		-.920	
Liberal arts	.077		-.591**	-0.1346	.264	
2-year	.202		-.712**	-0.1644	.135	
Highest degree—field						
Agriculture and home economics	-.478		-.194		1.633***	0.2333
Business	-1.179**	-0.605	.825****	0.1383	1.450**	0.1951
Engineering	-.956***	-.0534	.464**	0.0857	1.168**	0.1422
Fine arts	-.928***	-.0524	.960****	0.1549	-.834	
Health services	-1.136***	-.0593	-.600***	-0.1368	.811	
Humanities	-1.012***	-.0554	.603***	0.1074	.914	
Natural sciences	-.658***	-.0413	.346**	0.0659	1.967****	0.3094
Social sciences	-1.056****	-.0568	.377**	0.0712	1.797***	0.2697
Other programs	-.804***	-.0477	.253		-.171	
Employment—institutional type						
Doctoral	-.432*	-0.0297	.804****	0.1356	-.898****	-0.0473
Comprehensive	.023		1.373****	0.1965	-2.761****	-0.0771
Liberal arts	-.059		1.253****	0.1857	-3.385****	-0.0798
2-year	.112		1.608****	0.2146	-18.663	
Employment—institutional control						
Public	-.922****	-.0522	.072		-.059	
Years held current position	-.033		.017****	0.0035	-.034****	-0.0025
Merit-based performance measures						
Career publications	-.006		-.003***	-0.0006	.003**	0.0002
External funding	.002		.000**	-0.0000	.000**	0.0000
Total number of grants	.000		-.083****	-0.0174	.215****	0.0179
Teaching committees, served	-.005		.064****	0.0130	-.004	
Admin. committees, served	-.031		-.092****	-0.0193	-.093**	-0.0068
Constant	.256****	.0233	-.408**		-1.860***	
Adjusted weighted sample	-.2189****					
Estimated population size	6,910		6,910		6,910	
p_c	231,599		231,599		231,599	
Model χ^2 , df	.0901		.7096		.0828	
Pseudo R^2	219.470, 24****		640.566, 24****		773.478, 24****	
PCP	.151		.271		.519	
	91.2%		78.7%		93.4%	

Note: PCP = percentage of cases predicted by the model. Δp statistics are shown only for those variables whose coefficients were significant.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$. **** $p < .001$.

service on administrative committees. Significant decreases in default probability are produced by earning a highest degree in the following fields (compared with education): agriculture and home economics, business, engineering, fine arts, health services, humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and other programs. In addition, employment at 2-year institutions significantly decreases the default probability.

The beta weights and Δp values for the Teaching Model indicate that there are 12 variables that generate significant increases in the probability of White men's

observed representation in positions with the principle function of teaching: highest degree field (compared with education) in business, engineering, fine arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. Likewise, employment in the following institutional types (compared with research institutions)—doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, and 2-year institutions—increase the default probability. Last, increased years in current position, increased levels of external funding, and increased participation on teaching committee service increase the default probability. Receiving a highest degree from liberal arts and 2-year institutions compared with research institutions produces significant decreases in default probability. Likewise, receiving a highest degree in the field of health services compared with education decreases the default probability. Last, increased career publications, grants, and participation in administrative committees significantly decrease the default probability.

In the Research Model, the beta weights and Δp values indicate that there are eight variables that generate significant increases in the probability of White men's observed representation in positions with the principle function of research: receiving highest degrees in the following fields (compared with education): agriculture and home economics, business, engineering, natural sciences, and social sciences. Likewise, increased career publications, increased levels of external funding, and increased number of grants significantly increase the default probability. Earning a highest degree from doctoral institutions compared with research institutions produces significant decreases in default probability. In addition, employment at doctoral, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions (compared with research institutions) decreases the default probability. Last, increased years in current position and increased participation on administrative committees decrease default probability.

Table 4 shows the results of three separate logistic regression models for African American men in the academic workforce. Fewer beta weights and Δp values are significant for the African American male population. In the Administration Model, the beta weights and Δp values indicate that there is one variable that generates significant increases in the probability of African American men's observed representation in positions with the principle function of administration: service on administrative committees. In the Teaching Model, the beta weights and Δp values indicate that there are three variables that generate significant increases in the probability of African American men's observed representation in positions with the principle function of teaching: receiving a highest degree in natural sciences (compared with education), employment at comprehensive institutions (compared with research institutions), and employment at liberal arts institutions (compared with research institutions). In the Research Model, the beta weights and Δp values indicate that there is one variable that generates significant increases in the probability of African American men's observed representation in positions with the principle function of research: increased number of grants. Based on the goodness-of-fit indices, these three models were a good fit.

Table 4
Logistic Regression Results for African American Men in the
Academic Workforce by Principal Activity

Variable	Administration		Teaching		Research	
	Beta	Δp	Beta	Δp	Beta	Δp
Human capital measures						
Highest degree—institutional type						
Doctoral	-.116		-.595		.626	
Comprehensive	-.215		-.912		-1.079	
Liberal arts	.976		-.816		1.492	
2-year	-.201		.182		-17.059	
Highest degree—field						
Agriculture and home economics	-.960		-.641		1.776	
Business	-.641		.654		.531	
Engineering	-.871		.825		-2.563	
Fine arts	-2.242		1.110		-16.609	
Health services	.144		-1.452		.801	
Humanities	-.828		.637		-.118	
Natural sciences	-1.588		1.391*	0.1637	-.109	
Social sciences	-.404		-.077		1.167	
Other programs	-1.170		.511		-.151	
Employment—institutional type						
Doctoral	-.268		1.249		-.337	
Comprehensive	-.722		1.369**	0.1623	-2.289	
Liberal arts	-.187		1.581*	0.1753	-2.583	
2-year	-.439		1.052		-18.359	
Employment—institutional control						
Public	.124		-.017		1.400	
Years held current position	-.008		.026		-.036	
Merit-based performance measures						
Career publications	-.005		.004		.005	
External funding	.000		.000		.000	
Total number of grants	-.014		-.078		.350*	0.0155
Teaching committees, served	-.016		-.015		.137	
Admin. committees, served	.311***	0.0252	-.158		-.462	
Constant	-2.296*		.090		-1.846	
Adjusted weighted sample	555		555		555	
Estimated population size	18,601		18,601		18,601	
P_e	.0885		.7654		.0392	
Model χ^2 , <i>df</i>	18.313, 24		27.774, 24		26.416, 24	
Pseudo R^2	.241		.251		.562	
PCP	91.2%		81.5%		97.2%	

Note: PCP = percentage of cases predicted by the model. Δp statistics are shown only for those variables whose coefficients were significant.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

Discussion

The logistic regression models employed in this study, based on human capital and merit-based performance measures, were designed to simulate hiring practices

in higher education. The animating intent was to model, to the degree that is possible, important criteria and variables considered in the hiring process. Statistically significant results emerged for both sets of models (i.e., African American and White men); however, overall, the magnitude of these variables was small. Nonetheless, at least five conclusions may be drawn from this study. First, the logistic regression models seem to contain appropriate variables to explain the high observed representation of White men in the academic workforce, especially so for the Teaching Model. This proposition finds support because the teaching category in this study represents the typical faculty profile that represents the bulk of the target population of NSOPF:99.

Second, the lack of significant variables in the African American male models, in turn, helps to explain the observed representation of African American men in the academic workforce. Put simply, the lack of influence may explain the documented low observed representation. There are at least two possible reasons for this occurrence: (a) the analytic model excludes or does not adequately measure all of the relevant variables, or (b) hiring practices in higher education disadvantage African American men in the academic workforce. With regard to the analytic model, the reader of this study must remain open to the statistical and data limitations as a possible explanation for the results. Likewise, the reader should remain open to the possibility that there are disadvantages for African American men in the academic workforce.

With regard to the latter, it is important to note that Sagaria (2002), in her work on the filtering process in administrative searches in higher education, coined the concept "debasement filter." More specifically, she found that debasement is a form of racism that materializes in four ways: (a) the doubt of the seriousness or genuineness of the African American candidate's interest in the position by the search chair; (b) the chair's perception of professional invisibility for African American candidates; (c) the devaluing of professional experiences and competencies; and (d) the expectation that African Americans would be responsible for responding to issues germane to their and other groups of color.

Third, the criteria and variables privileged in the hiring practices in the academic workforce may be problematic for African American men. For instance, a cursory review across all logistic regression models for White men shows that 44 variables were statistically significant. In essence, this suggests that the variables modeled appear to be good predictors for White men. In contrast, only five variables were statistically significant across all logistic regression models for African American men. In turn, it seems reasonable to suggest that another set of variables is a better predictor for African American men. Previous research does lend support to the notion that people of color are judged on different criteria from their White counterparts (e.g., de la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988; Konrad & Pfeffer, 1991; Turner & Myers, 2000). Attempting to contextualize these stereotypical views of African American

men within American society, Erin Texeira (2006) more recently writes in the *Washington Post*,

Every day, African-American men consciously work to offset stereotypes about them—that they are dangerous, aggressive, angry. Some smile a lot, dress conservatively and speak with deference: “Yes, sir,” or “No, ma’am.” They are mindful of their bodies, careful not to dart into closing elevators or stand too close in grocery stores.

Fourth, human capital and merit-based performance measures appear to be related to the hiring practices in the academic workforce, although they differ in their degree of explanation for the separate models for African American and White men. The results suggest that the accrual of valued human capital and increased merit-based performance serves White men well in the academic workforce. As for African American men, these variables are important as well, but human capital and merit-based performance measures not modeled, and possibly non-job-related variables, are more important. In short, the accrual of the modeled human capital and merit-based performance measures does not seem to adequately explain increases in the observed representation of African American men in the academic workforce.

The logistic regression models simulate hiring practices that are well entrenched concerning personnel decisions in higher education. This study was primarily concerned with how specific groups (i.e., African American and White men) were doing independently in terms of model outcomes. In general, the results suggest that if institutions of higher education intend to have diversity as a strategic direction, major consideration should be given to changing merit criteria and human capital expectations. For example, the University of Colorado is considering changing the tenure system for faculty of color (Anas, 2006). More specifically, the institution may readjust the work profiles for faculty of color to accommodate the increased service duties.

The practical implications of the results reported in this study are important. Collectively, these results suggest that the hiring practices in the academic workforce could be restructured to minimize the disparate effects on African American men, thereby limiting racial bias in personnel decisions and ultimately addressing the resulting race segregation of the higher education workforce. These practical responses to empirical research could permit institutions of higher education to more fully maintain fidelity to the intent and spirit of *Brown v. Board of Education* and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In closing, there are two logical extensions for this study. First, further inquiries using these or related data should employ a pooled sample to provide direct comparison between African American and White men. Second, the use of multinomial logistic regression to examine differences across the separate logistic regression models (i.e., administration, teaching, and research) of this study may be quite revealing. Although these endeavors may not yield findings much different from this study, the potential intellectual contribution is compelling.

References

- Abraham, S. Y., Steiger, D. M., Montgomery, M., Kuhr, B. D., Tourangeau, R., Montgomery, B., et al. (2002). *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99): Methodology report* (NCES 2002-154). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Alger, J. B. (1998). Minority faculty and measuring merit: Start by playing fair. *Academe*, 84, 71.
- Altbach, P. G., Berdhal, R. O., & Gumpert, P. J. (1999). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political and economic challenges*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Anas, B. (2006, May). Colorado considers tenure changes for minority professors. *The Daily Camera*. Available May 31, 2006, from www.dailycamera.com
- Anderson, B. (1994). Permissive social and educational inequality 40 years after Brown. *Journal of Negro Education*, 63, 443-450.
- Andrews, H., & Marzano, W. (1983). Awarding faculty merit based on higher-level needs: For merit to succeed, certain levels of basic needs first must be satisfied. *Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development*, 1, 105-107.
- Banks, W. (1984). Afro-American scholars in the university: Roles and conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27, 325-338.
- Bauer, C. C., & Baltes, B. B. (2002). Reducing the effects of gender stereotypes on performance evaluations. *Sex Roles*, 47, 465-476.
- Bensimon, E. M., Ward, K., & Sanders, K. (2000). *The department chair's role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Biernat, M., & Manis, M. (1994). Shifting standards and stereotype-based judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 5-20.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). Presidential searches and the discovery of organizational goals. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 489-509.
- Björk, L. G., & Thompson, T. E. (1989). The next generation of faculty: Minority issues. *Education and Urban Society*, 21, 341-351.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1996). Faculty issues: Impact on minorities. In C. S. V. Turner, M. Garcia, A. Nora, & L. Rendon (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education* (pp. 315-326). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education in America*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourguignon, E., Blanshan, S. A., Chiteji, L., MacLean, K. J., Meckling, S. J., Sagaria, M. A., et al. (1987). *Junior faculty life at Ohio State: Insights on gender and race*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Cabrera, A. F. (1994). Logistic regression analysis in higher education: An applied perspective. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook for the study of higher education* (Vol. 10, pp. 225-256). New York: Agathon Press.
- Carnevale, A. P., & Desrochers, D. M. (2003). *Standards for what? The economic roots of K-16 reform*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Cesare, S. J. (1996). Subjective judgment and selection interview: A methodological review. *Public Personnel Management*, 25, 291-306.
- Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and men in organizations: Sex and gender issues at work*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cohn, E., & Geske, T. G. (1990). *The economics of education* (3rd ed.). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Cohn, E., & Hughes, W. W. (1994). A benefit-cost analysis of investment in college education in the United States: 1969-1985. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 109-123.

- Cole, D. G., & Jackson, J. F. L. (2005). The impact of interracial interactions and campus-based diversity functions on students' educational satisfaction in higher education. In D. N. Byrne (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: Its impact on public education 1954-2004* (pp. 249-270). New York: The Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund.
- Corazzini, A. J. (1967). When should vocational education begin? *Journal of Human Resources*, 2(1), 41-50.
- Cox, J. A., Schlueter, D. W., Moore, K. K., & Sullivan, D. (1989, March). A look behind corporate doors. *Personnel Administrator*, pp. 56-59.
- Davison, K. H., & Burke, M. J. (2000). Sex discrimination in simulated selection contexts: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 225-248.
- de la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcon, J. J. (1988). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 299-314.
- Dean, E. (1984). *Education and economic productivity*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Del Boca, F. K., Ashmore, R. D., & McManus, M. A. (1986). Gender-related attitudes. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K. Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female-male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts* (pp. 121-163). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences and challenges of aversive racism. In S. T. Fiske & J. L. Eberhardt (Eds.), *Racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science*, 11, 315-319.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2006). *Race-based charges FY 1992 – FY 2005*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Flowers, L. A., & Jones, L. (2003). Exploring the status of Black male faculty utilizing data from the national study of postsecondary faculty. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 12, 3-13.
- Futoran, G. C., & Wyer, R. S. (1986). The effects of traits and gender stereotypes on occupational suitability judgments and the recall for judgment-relevant information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 475-503.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). New York: Academic Press.
- Graham, H. D., & Diamond, N. (1997). *The rise of American research universities: Elites and challengers in the post war era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Grant, C. A. (1995). Reflections on the promise of Brown and multicultural education. *Teachers College Record*, 96(4), 707-721.
- Gunderson, D. E., Tinsley, D. B., & Terpstra, D. E. (1996). Empirical assessment of impression management bias: The potential for performance appraisal error. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11, 57-76.
- Hitt, M. A., & Barr, S. H. (1989). Managerial selection decision models: Examination of configural cues processing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 53-61.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2001). A new test for diversity: Retaining African American administrators at predominantly White institutions. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Retaining African Americans in higher education: Challenging paradigms for retaining students, faculty, and administrators* (pp. 93-109). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2002). Retention of African American administrators at predominantly White institutions: Using professional growth factors to inform the discussion. *College and University*, 78, 11-16.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2003). Toward administrative diversity: An analysis of the African American male educational pipeline. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 12, 43-60.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2004a). An emerging engagement, retention, and advancement model for African American administrators at predominantly White institutions: The results of two delphi studies. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students in higher education* (pp. 211-222). New York: Peter Lang.

- Jackson, J. F. L. (2004b). Engaging, retaining, and advancing African Americans to executive-level positions: A descriptive and trend analysis of academic administrators in higher and postsecondary education. *Journal of Negro Education, 73*, 4-20.
- Jackson, J. F. L. (2006). Hiring practices of African American males in academic leadership positions at American colleges and universities: An employment trends and disparate impact analysis. *Teachers College Record, 108*, 316-338.
- James, J., & Farmer, R. (1993). *Spirit, space and survival: African American women in (White) academe*. New York: Routledge.
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). *The law of higher education: A comprehensive guide to legal implications of administrative decision making* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kaplowitz, R. A. (1996). *Selecting college and university personnel*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.
- Konrad, A. M., & Pfeffer, J. (1991). Understanding the hiring of women and minorities in educational institutions. *Sociology of Education, 64*, 141-157.
- Langelett, G. (2002). Human capital: A summary of the 20th century research. *Journal of Education Finance, 28*, 1-24.
- Lauer, A. L. (1991). Searching for answers: Should universities create merit pay systems? *NACUBO Business Officer*, pp. 52-54.
- Marchant, G., & Newman, I. (1994). Faculty activities and rewards: Views from education administrators in the USA. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 9*(2) 145-152.
- Martell, R. F. (1991). Sex bias at work: The effects of attentional and memory demands on performance ratings of men and women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 1939-1960.
- McIntyre, S., Moberg, D. J., & Posner, B. Z. (1980). Preferential treatment in preselection decisions according to sex and race. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*, 738-749.
- McLaughlin, J. B., & Riesman, D. (1985). The vicissitudes of the search process. *Review of Higher Education, 8*(4), 341-355.
- Mincer, J. (1989). Human capital and the labor market: A review of current research. *Educational Researcher*, pp. 27-34.
- Misra, J., Kennelly, I., & Karides, M. (1999). Employment chances in the academic job market in sociology: Do race and gender matter? *Sociological Perspectives, 42*, 215-247.
- Mitchell, J. (1982). Reflections of a Black social scientist: Some struggles, some doubts, some hopes. *Harvard Educational Review, 52*, 27-44.
- Myers, S. L., Jr., & Turner, C. S. V. (1995). *Minority faculty development project*. Minneapolis: Midwestern Higher Education Commission.
- Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1980). Sex effects on evaluation. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 267-276.
- O'Leary, V. E., & Wallston, B. S. (1982). Women, gender, and social psychology. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 9-43.
- Olsen, J. P. (1976). Choice in an organized anarchy. In J. G. March & J. P. Olsen (Eds.), *Ambiguity and choice in organizations* (pp. 82-139). Bergen, Norway: Harald Lyche & Company.
- Padilla, R. V., & Chávez, R. C. (1995). *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Parson, C. K., & Liden, R. C. (1984). Interviewer perceptions of applicant qualifications: A multivariate field study of demographic characteristics and nonverbal cues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 557-568.
- Perez, M. G. (2004). Fair and facially neutral higher educational admissions through disparate impact analysis. *Michigan Journal of Race and Law, 9*, 467-502.
- Prewett-Livingston, A. J., Field, H. S., Veres, J. G., & Lewis, P. M. (1996). Effects of race on interview ratings in a situational panel interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 178-186.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1984). Returns to education: A further international update and implications. *Journal of Human Resources, 20*, 583-604.

- Reid, J., & Rogers, J. (1981). Search for academic vice-presidents and provosts. *AAHE Bulletin*, 33, 4-6.
- Rynes, S. L., Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1980). Individual reactions to organizational recruiting: A review. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 529-542.
- Sagaria, M.A.D. (2002). An exploratory model of filtering in administrative searches: Toward counter-hegemonic discourse. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 676-710.
- Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 29, 79-101.
- Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *American Economic Review*, 60, 1-15.
- Seta, J. J., & Seta, C. E. (1993). Stereotypes and the generation of compensatory and noncompensatory expectancies of group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 722-731.
- Smith, D., Wolf, L. E., & Busenberg, B. E. (1996). *Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 785)
- Smith, R. M. (1994). Successful recruitment of minority faculty: Commitment, culture, choice. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 152-156.
- Spann, J. (1990). *Retaining and promoting minority faculty members: Problems and possibilities*. Madison: University of Wisconsin System.
- Steinpress, R. E., Anders, K. A., & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex Roles*, 41, 509-528.
- Sveiby, K. E. (1997). *The new organizational wealth: Managing & measuring knowledge-based assets*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Sweetland, S. R. (1996). Human capital theory: Foundations of a field of inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 341-359.
- Swim, J. K., & Sanna, L. J. (1996). He's skilled, she's lucky: A meta-analysis of observers' attributions for women's and men's successes and failures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 507-519.
- Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 353 885)
- Taylor, M. S., & Bergman, T. J. (1987). Organizational recruitment activities and applicants' reactions at different stages of the recruitment process. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 261-285.
- Teixeira, E. (2006). Black men quietly combating stereotypes. *Washington Post*. Retrieved July 3, 2006, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2006/07/01/AR2006070100462.html>
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thomas, S. L., Heck, R. H., & Bauer, K. W. (2005). Weighting and adjusting for design effects in secondary data analyses. In P. D. Umbach (Ed.), *Surveying research: Emerging issues* (pp. 51-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Trix, F., & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 191-220.
- Trower, C. A., & Chait, R. P. (2002, March/April). Faculty diversity. *Harvard Magazine*. Retrieved May 5, 2004, from <http://www.harvard-magazine.com/on-line/030218.html>
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L., Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Turner, C. S. V., Myers, S. L., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 27-59.
- Twombly, S. B. (1992). The process of choosing a dean. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63, 651-983.
- Uctug, Y., & Koksals, G. (2003). An academic performance measurement system and its impact on quality of engineering faculty work at Middle East Technical University. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, 251-262.
- Wade, K. J., & Kinicki, A. J. (1995). Examining objective and subjective applicant qualifications within a process model of interview selection decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, pp. 151-155.

- Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). *Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly White institutions*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Report No. 2. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 075)
- Wenneras, C., & Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. *Nature*, 387, 341-343.
- Williams, B. N., & Williams, S. M. (2006). Perceptions of African American male junior faculty on promotion and tenure: Implications for community building and social capital. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 287-315.
- WoodBrooks, C. M. (1991). *The construction of identity through the presentation of self: Black women candidates interviewing for administrative positions in a research university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Zebrowitz, L. A., Tenenbaum, D. R., & Goldstein, L. H. (1991). The impact of job applicants' facial maturity, gender, and academic achievement on hiring recommendations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 525-548.

Jerlando F. L. Jackson, PhD, is interested in workforce diversity and workplace discrimination in higher and postsecondary education. He is an associate professor of higher and postsecondary education in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, a faculty associate for the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education, and a faculty affiliate in the Weinert Center for Entrepreneurship (School of Business) at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.