

Seton Hall University

eRepository @ Seton Hall

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses
(ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

Fall 12-2-2020

Supports Used by Black Women Faculty for Career Advancement at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Andrea Delpriore

andrea.delpriore@student.shu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Delpriore, Andrea, "Supports Used by Black Women Faculty for Career Advancement at Historically Black Colleges and Universities" (2020). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2822.

<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2822>

Supports Used by Black Women Faculty for Career Advancement
at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

By

Andrea Del Priore

Dissertation Committee

Robert Kelchen, PhD, Mentor

Martin Finkelstein, PhD

Marybeth Gasman, PhD

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Higher Education

Department of Education, Leadership, Management & Policy

Seton Hall University

2020

© 2020 Andrea Del Priore



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT & POLICY

APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

Andrea Del Priore has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the **Ph.D.** during this Semester **Fall Semester 2020**.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
(please sign and date)

Dr. Robert Kelchen

Mentor

Date

Dr. Martin Finkelstein

Committee Member

Date

Dr. Marybeth Gasman

Committee Member

Date

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

Abstract

This study investigated the supports utilized by Black women in their career advancement as faculty members at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Although there is an abundance of scholarship about the challenges presented to Black women faculty at Predominantly White Institutions, the career advancement of Black women faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities has gone largely unstudied. Considering Historically Black Colleges and Universities are where Black women faculty achieve tenure in the highest percentages, this study took a non-deficit perspective and investigated what supports are used by Black women faculty internal to the institution, external to the institution, as well as the institutional cultural factors. The sites of this study were 43 HBCUs with 25% or more of tenured faculty composed of Black women. Faculty rank and discipline were considered when analyzing the electronic survey data. Theoretical frameworks of Black Feminist Theory and Intersectionality were used as lenses to examine the supports used. Some supports include shared governance, administrative disclosure, networks, family, religion, collaboration, mentors, working harder and smarter, and other strategies. This study provides a preliminary step in studying what supports Black women find most useful in navigating their faculty careers.

Key words: Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Black women faculty, career advancement, Intersectionality, Black Feminist Theory

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation mentor, Dr. Robert Kelchen, for always making time to support me during this process. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Martin Finkelstein and Dr. Marybeth Gasman, for their support and advice. I am very grateful to the participants of my study for trusting me and sharing their responses with me. Thank you for believing in me and my work. I would like to thank my Aunt Kerry for sharing her wisdoms and offering endless emotional support. I am forever indebted to my mother, grandmother, and sisters for supporting me endlessly, as well. Lastly, to my wonderful boyfriend, Billy, who believes in my crazy dreams and never gets tired of my agonizing. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	11
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction	14
Cultural and Support Factors	16
Black Lives Matter.....	21
Gap in the Literature	22
Black Leadership	22
Women’s Leadership	23
Purpose and Research Questions	26
II. Review of the Literature.....	28
Doctoral Student Pipeline	28
Tenure and Institution Type.....	32
Theoretical Frameworks	34
Intersectionality.....	34
Black Feminist Theory (BFT).....	38
Brief Historical Overview of HBCUs.....	42
Social Activism.....	52
HBCUs and Black Women Faculty	60
Shared Governance	61
Faculty Challenges in Higher Education	66
Social Inequalities.....	72

Outsiders Within	77
Devaluation of Contributions.....	78
Racial Microaggressions	81
Tenure.....	83
Navigating Academia.....	87
Suggestions for Enhancement of Career Advancement.....	91
Conclusion.....	94
 III. Methodology	 96
Sites	96
Sampling.	98
Research Design and Data Collection.....	99
Demographic Variables	99
Internal Support Variables	101
Same-Sex Institution	101
Control	101
Safe Spaces	102
Religion/Spirituality.....	102
Shared Governance	103
Culture.....	106
Mentoring.....	107
Communication.....	109
Collaboration.....	109
Social Activism.....	110
Valuation.....	111
Data Analysis	113
Trust and Credibility	114
Limitations	115

IV. Findings	116
Strategies.....	116
Safe Spaces	121
Religious/Spiritual Supports	123
Empowerment	125
Internal Support Factors.....	127
Internal Safe Spaces	127
Internal Mentoring	129
Internal Communication	131
Improve Internal Communication.....	134
Internal Collaboration	137
Internal Social Activism	140
Internal Valuation	143
Improve Internal Valuation.....	145
Internal & External Supportive Parties	147
Relationship Status.....	150
External Support Factors.....	152
External Mentoring	152
External Collaboration	155
External Social Activism	158
Cultural Support.....	162
Cultural Empowerment.....	162
Administrative Disclosure	164
Shared Governance	166
Faculty Senate	167
Collective Bargaining	171

V. Discussion	173
Research Questions	173
Collaboration.....	173
Mentoring.....	174
Safe Spaces.....	176
Religion.....	177
Valuation.....	178
Cultural Support.....	179
Relationship Status.....	180
By Discipline	181
Achieving Tenure.....	182
Shared Governance	183
Circumstances for NTT Faculty.....	184
Suggestions for Black Women Faculty.....	185
Recommendations for Future Research	186
Mentoring.....	187
Communication.....	188
Administrative Disclosure	189
Collaboration.....	189
Social Activism.....	190
Internal & External Supportive Parties	191
Business Faculty	192
Something Else	192
Liberal Arts Schools	193
Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty	193
COVID-19.....	194

References	195
APPENDIX	208

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
Table 1. Percentage of the Population by Race and Women Doctoral Recipients	23
Table 2. Faculty Members by Rank and Gender	24
Table 3. Faculty Rank by Race and Gender	25
Table 4. Assistant Professors by Race, Gender, and Institution Type	31
Table 5. Tenured Faculty by Race, Gender and Institution Type	31
Table 6. Full Professors by Race, Gender, and Institution Type	32
Table 7. Institutions with the Highest Percentage of Tenured Black Women Faculty	33
Table 8. Faculty Salary by Race and Gender	68
Table 9. HBCUs with the Highest Percentage of Tenured Black Women Faculty	97
Table 10. Demographic Variables and Faculty Status	100
Table 11. Institutional Variables	105
Table 12. Internal Support Variables	111
Table 13. Institutional Cultural Variables	112
Table 14. External Support Variables	112
Table 15. Strategies Used for Career Advancement by Discipline	120
Table 16. Strategies Used for Career Advancement by Rank	121
Table 17. Safe Spaces Used by Discipline	122
Table 18. Safe Spaces Used by Rank	123
Table 19. Religious Support by Discipline	124
Table 20. Religious Support by Rank	124
Table 21. Empowering Supports by Discipline	126
Table 22. Empowerment Supports by Rank	126
Table 23. Internal Safe Spaces by Discipline	128
Table 24. Internal Safe Spaces by Rank	129

Table 25. Internal Mentoring by Discipline.....	131
Table 26. Internal Mentoring by Rank.....	131
Table 27. Internal Communication by Discipline.....	133
Table 28. Internal Communication by Rank.....	133
Table 29. Improve Internal Communication by Discipline	136
Table 30. Improve Internal Communication by Rank	136
Table 31. Internal Collaboration by Discipline.....	139
Table 32. Internal Collaboration by Rank.....	140
Table 33. Internal Social Activism by Discipline.....	141
Table 34. Internal Social Activism by Rank.....	142
Table 35. Internal Valuation by Discipline.....	144
Table 36. Internal Valuation by Rank.....	144
Table 37. Improve Internal Valuation by Discipline	146
Table 38. Improve Internal Valuation by Rank	146
Table 39. Supportive Parties by Discipline.....	149
Table 40. Supportive Parties by Rank.....	150
Table 41. Relationship Status by Discipline.....	151
Table 42. Relationship Status by Rank.....	152
Table 43. External Mentoring by Discipline.....	154
Table 44. External Mentoring by Rank.....	155
Table 45. External Collaboration by Discipline	156
Table 46. External Collaboration by Rank	157
Table 47. Snapshot of Co-Authoring and Collaboration by Discipline.....	158
Table 48. Snapshot of Co-Authoring and Collaboration by Rank.....	158
Table 49. External Social Activism by Discipline.....	161
Table 50. External Social Activism by Rank.....	162
Table 51. Cultural Support by Discipline	163
Table 52. Cultural Support by Rank	164

Table 53. Administrative Disclosure by Discipline	165
Table 54. Administrative Disclosure by Rank	165
Table 55. Shared Governance by Discipline	166
Table 56. Shared Governance by Rank	167
Table 57. Faculty Senate by Discipline	168
Table 58. Faculty Senate by Rank	169
Table 59. Faculty Senate Decision-Making by Discipline	170
Table 60. Faculty Senate Decision-Making by Rank	171
Table 61. Collective Bargaining by Discipline	172
Table 62. Collective Bargaining by Rank	172

Chapter 1

Introduction

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2017a), Black women account for only 3% of full-time faculty, while White women compose 35%. When considering Black women make up 10.3% of doctoral recipients, it raises concern that such low numbers of Black women obtaining doctoral degrees are working in academia. Furthermore, from 1999 to 2009 the number of Black women faculty increased only .3% while the number of White women faculty increased 9.3% during that same period (Lloyd-Jones, 2014). This demonstrates underrepresentation of Black women faculty in academia, compared to the improved opportunities for White women faculty. NCES shows from 2013 to 2018 the number of Black women full-time faculty increased 13.3% compared to White women at 5.2%, which offers an optimistic outlook with the need to continue this trend. This shift may reflect an improvement in the academic climate based on heightened awareness of racial issues. However, scholars should keep a close eye on these numbers to recognize any dips that may occur again.

Adverse experiences as faculty members in higher education may cause many Black women faculty to leave for employment in other industries (Blackwell, Snyder, & Mavriplis, 2009; Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008; Gregory, 2001; Lee & Leonard, 2001; Tack & Patitu, 1992). Research studies show Black women faculty face issues of discrimination, excessive demands, racial microaggressions, isolation, and tokenism (Henry & Glenn, 2009; Hernandez, Ngunjiri, & Chang, 2015; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Myers, 2002; Thandi Sule, 2011; Williams, 2001; Wright & Dinkha, 2009). There are rare occasions to undertake leadership roles, inadequate chances to contribute in institutional and departmental decision making, diminutive direction about the academic workplace, scholarly contributions perceived as

inconsequential and discounted, disproportionate and perfunctory committee obligations, absence of collegiality, social seclusion, scarce guidance about tenure and promotion procedures, and a lack of mentoring (Ross & Edwards, 2016).

Institutions of higher education, and Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) in particular, have been unsuccessful in the career advancement of Black women faculty (Danley, Land, & Lomotey, 2009; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). NCES (2017b) indicated 2.4% of all tenured faculty are Black women (compared to 31.6% White women) at non-HBCUs, the vast majority of which are PWIs. In contrast, out of all tenured faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), 23.2% are Black women (compared to 10.1% White women). Black women faculty are subsequently overrepresented in temporary, part-time faculty roles. Danley et al. (2009) stated the lack of opportunities for Black women faculty's career advancement at PWIs is so severe that it threatens the very survival of the Black professoriate. In a 17-year study by Kaplan, Raj, Carr, Terrin, Breeze, and Freund, (2018) underrepresented medical faculty had significantly lower retention rates at 72% than their White counterparts at 86%. This study of medical faculty is one example of retention issues for non-White faculty members.

Bonner (2001) stated there are similar issues with promotion opportunities at HBCUs, but it may be to a lesser extent. With cultural and support factors unique to HBCUs, there could be relevant differences than those factors seen at PWIs. HBCUs, in line with the Higher Education Act of 1965, are institutions of higher education founded before 1964 with a specific mission to serve students of African American descent. HBCUs were the only realistic opportunity for African Americans to attend higher education during segregation under Jim Crow laws (Lomotey, 2010). PWIs are institutions of higher education where enrollment consists of 50% or

more White students. The traditions and patterns of PWIs are based on Western European values (Lomotey, 2010).

Within the top 10 institutions that have over 40% of tenured faculty composed of Black women, 6 are HBCUs. Out of these top 10 institutions, both HBCUs that are all women's colleges are included: Spelman College and Bennett College (NCES, 2017b).

Cultural and Support Factors

At HBCUs, relationships between students and faculty are more close-knit than at PWIs and a sense of racial pride is engendered (Conrad & Gasman, 2015). Furthermore, faculty members, the community, and other staff members see it as their obligation to ensure student success. HBCUs have an environment that nurtures students with a climate that is welcoming, inclusive, and promotes racial self-development (Conrad & Gasman, 2015). Additionally, HBCUs are known to engender safe spaces for conversation, innovation, excellence, teaching, affirming, and developing genuine relationships among faculty (Darrell, Littlefield, & Washington, 2016). Having a safe space to retreat to, whether in times of upset or for understanding, is vital to career advancement of Black women faculty. Safe spaces help Black women resist objectification as an outsider or as an oddity who is not accepted by colleagues (Hirt, Amelink, McFeeters, & Strayhorn, 2008). HBCUs also involve faculty in creating student activities on curricular and co-curricular levels (Conrad & Gasman, 2015).

Hirt et al. (2008) conducted a study focusing on student affairs administrators in HBCUs around the nation. They explained how “othermothering” refers to relationships of care in Black culture that expand beyond biological families. The history of othermothering derives from matrilineal caregiving traditions in the Black community and has long been prevalent within

academic social systems. As historical circumstances caused separation in the Black family unit, it became necessary to care for others' family members (Hirt et al., 2008).

Othermothering in higher education means Black women faculty ensure student success through a commitment to holistic care for students. Othermothering safeguards both academic and personal success for students because faculty members go above and beyond, giving students extra support, well beyond basic curricular and educational needs (Flowers, Scott, Riley, & Palmer, 2015). When Black women have the opportunity to othermother students at HBCUs, they have an outlet for institutional guardianship and cultural advancement (Hirt et al., 2008). Though othermothering has been investigated between faculty and students, it has not been studied between faculty members. While othermothering and mentoring may have some similarities in that one person guides another, there are stark contrasts between the two. Othermothering is specific to the Black community in a historical sense because during slavery, families were torn apart and there was a need for Black women to care for other people's children. These traditions have carried on during the plethora of social inequities that followed and still remain today.

Factors such as formal and informal mentoring, safe spaces in the form of religious, professional, and peer groups, resistance and activism, and shared governance structures play a role in shaping what sets HBCUs apart from PWIs. Black women faculty need professional and personal support if they are to be effective in their capacities and advance in their careers (Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

Traditionally, mentoring occurs when a faculty member of a higher rank guides, counsels, instructs, and facilitates the career advancement of a less experienced faculty member (Holmes, Danley Land, & Hinton-Hudson, 2001). Faculty members are more likely to succeed

and persist in academia when they participate in formal or informal mentoring (Holmes et al., 2001). Regardless of the type of mentoring, Black women faculty increase their career mobility and success in higher education through mentoring relationships (Gregory, 2001; Holmes et al., 2001). In such a relationship, mentees are exposed to insider information like writing opportunities, research, and grant funding. They gain more knowledge about the expectations of their role, gain access into networking groups, and receive guidance with their career decisions (Gregory, 2001; Holmes et al., 2001).

Mentoring Black women leaders at HBCUs makes a tremendous impact on their professional lives (Jackson, 2008). Many mentoring relationships at HBCUs are informal and rely on optimism, honesty, and confidentiality. When a Black woman working in higher education has another Black woman in a superior leadership role as a mentor, she may learn the skills needed to advance in her career. Black women leaders at HBCUs benefit from taking advice from mentors, from the support of supervisors and colleagues, and from the love and support of family members (Jackson, 2008).

HBCUs nurture a tradition of protest where Black women leaders integrate their academic work with political and social activism (Jean-Marie, 2006). Since the Civil Rights Movement and in times of a segregated education system, Black women leaders at HBCUs worked toward racial uplift and sustaining a sense of community through advocating for their rights and the rights of marginalized students. Generations of Black women leaders in HBCUs challenged the status quo and pushed for access to quality education and resources to continue to make racial progress in higher education and in society. There is an imperative social responsibility in which Black women leaders in higher education work with the community and

religious organizations in a collective effort to preserve the future of the Black community (Jean-Marie, 2006).

When faced with hostile environments ridden with racism and sexism, which are notorious at PWIs, Black women faculty must find support in order to advance in their careers (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). A plethora of qualitative research details personal accounts from Black women faculty members and interviews with Black women faculty who indicated negative experiences along racial and gender lines (Alfred, 2001a; Anderson, 2002; Bell, 1990; Constantine et al., 2008; Davis & Maldonado, 2015; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Gregory, 2001; Hernandez et al., 2015; Holmes et al., 2001; Jarmon, 2001; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014; Pittman, 2012; Thandi Sule, 2011; Williams, 2001).

For instance, Pittman (2012) found research participants believed their race played a large role in their negative experiences in higher education. Similarly, in a qualitative study conducted by Constantine et al. (2008) Black faculty members indicated they did not receive adequate mentoring, were marginalized, and invisible in their institution and in their departments (Constantine et al., 2008).

Structures that promote reliance on spiritual support, access to resources, assertion of rights, and active engagement have been shown to help Black women cope with the challenges to their career advancement (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Walker (2009) conducted a study on the lives of Black women at predominantly White organizations throughout history and found religious faith helps Black women with leadership skills and gives them the strength to advance despite racism and sexism.

Walker (2009) found Black women faculty gain support in various ways. She argued the historical and cultural backgrounds of Black women include a bond of sharing, togetherness, and dialogue. A chief way of knowing for Black women is through sharing experiences and cultural bonding. Support systems in the form of dialogue provide Black women faculty with energy and motivation. Black women faculty are able to reflect on experiences and have an outlet for frustrations (Walker, 2009). Holistic environments that incorporate various aspects of community, academia, and religion enhance leadership for Black women faculty (Gallien & Hikes, 2005).

Resistance to injustice in higher education has also been key to Black women faculty advancing in their careers (Hernandez, et al., 2015). Though activism is not supported at all HBCUs, at some HBCUs where Black women faculty advance in their careers, such as Spelman College, activism is accepted and promoted. Spelman is ranked number 4 out of all institutions in the nation for advancing the careers of Black women faculty. Fifty-one percent of tenured faculty at Spelman College are Black women (NCES, 2017b). Here, Black women faculty openly express their right to social justice and remember their historical counterparts who fought in the Civil Rights Movement. Recalling role models from the past who fought injustice and carrying on the tradition of fighting for the rights of Black women helps Black women advance in their higher education careers (Gallien & Hikes, 2005). More recently, Black women faculty at Spelman College protested with students against the visit of a hip-hop singer who was deemed to portray misogynistic images of Black women in his music video. Spelman's Feminist Majority Leadership Alliance and their chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People took part in the protest (Farrell, 2004).

Spelman College has been a trailblazer for social activism. Along with their team, Beverly Guy-Sheftall and M. Jacqui Alexander championed the Audre Lorde Project, which worked to create a climate that respects, values, and acknowledges the experiences of LGBTQIA+ African Americans on HBCU campuses (Williams, 2013). This study found that the HBCUs that had a program dedicated to women's studies with a focus on Black feminism more readily embraced discussions about sexuality and gender than did the HBCUs that lacked a women's studies program. HBCUs have some issues accepting LGBTQIA+ rights that in part have to do with their strong ties to Christianity and historical pressure to represent Black people as respectable, moral, and decent in traditional ways that value cisgender heterosexuality.

Black Lives Matter

In Harvey's (2017) study, professors at an HBCU were inspired by the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement and supported their students in embracing it. Faculty members taught students how to use their writing to take part in social activism and encouraged students to find ways to permeate institutional systems in order for the Black experience to be acknowledged and respected (Harvey, 2017). This study also found that compared to PWIs, the HBCU environment, which included students, administrators, and professors, validated the experiences and worth of Black students on campus.

Shared governance structures are essential in encouraging the career advancement of Black women faculty. According to Gasman (2009), who conducted a study of successful techniques HBCUs used for survival during dire economic times, it is important for HBCUs to maintain respect for academia even during a financial crisis. HBCUs such as Spelman College, which has greater shared governance than many institutions, encourage faculty members to take ownership of creating structures of shared governance. Faculty members became very involved

in structures such as institutional policy making, writing handbooks, and creating the curriculum. Spelman leaders support the notion that active, involved faculty members should take part in decision making in terms of the tenure process, promotion policies, review of curriculum, faculty handbooks, faculty hiring, development and review of programs, and faculty grievances (Gasman, 2009).

Gap in the Literature

Black Leadership

Black faculty face issues with retention, promotion, and success in higher education because of racial inequities (Louis, Rawls, Jackson-Smith, Chambers, Phillips, & Louis, 2016). Black faculty make up 3.2% of full professors, 5.4% of associate professors, and 6.2% of assistant professors. Black faculty compose only 4.9% of full-time, tenure track faculty (Pittman, 2012). Two examples, representing a range from highest to lowest numbers, include top-tier institutions of higher education: Black faculty make up 6.8% of faculty at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa and only 2.7% of faculty at the University of California, Berkeley (Kelly, Gayles, & Williams, 2017). These data show that even in the most renowned institutions, Black faculty members are underrepresented.

White faculty have advantages over faculty of color, which are both subtle and obvious. The promotion and tenure process contain heavy elements of congeniality and likability, which are subjective and misconstrued (Arnold, Crawford, & Khalifa, 2016). Holder and Nadal (2016) asserted that modern day racism in the workplace is presented as subtle actions that are challenging to point out. Racism is displayed very differently than before the Civil Rights Movement, when hostility and discrimination were blatant (Constantine et al., 2008).

Another concern is racial microaggressions, which are defined as common, concise, verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities that communicate negative, hostile, derogatory racial insults, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Racial microaggressions are largely due to individuals who hold unconscious biases about certain groups (Constantine et al., 2008; Holder & Nadal, 2016). Racial microaggressions are often used by White faculty in higher education who fail to realize the implications or the racist foundation of their actions and who attribute such occasions to misunderstandings or other causes besides racism (Constantine et al., 2008).

Women's Leadership

Higher education has become more inclusive for women faculty, but there are lingering barriers to women's movement into positions of leadership (Rochon, Davidoff, & Levinson, 2016). The academic tenure structure is built around men's lives (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Women only accumulate to a little over a quarter of all full professors. One common myth is there is a deficiency of qualified women in the academic pipeline, when in reality, women are prepared at a greater rate than men. Women earn more than 50% of all doctoral degrees (Johnson, 2017).

However, there are racial discrepancies among women doctoral recipients (see Table 1). According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2016), in 2014-2015 White women graduates composed 66.7% of the total women doctoral recipients, and Black women made up 10.3%. Compared to U.S. Census (2017) data, non-Hispanic White people compose 60.7% of the population, and Black people make up 13.4%.

Table 1

Percentage of the Population by Race and Women Doctoral Recipients

Race	Percentage of population	Percentage of women doctoral recipients
White	60.7%	66.7%
Black/African American	13.4%	10.3%
Asian/	5.8%	12.7%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	.2%	
Hispanic	18.1%	7.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.3%	.6%
Two or more races	2.7%	2.3%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2016).

NCES (2016) stated Asian/Pacific Islander women composed 12.7% of doctoral recipients, and Hispanic women made up 7.3%. Women from two or more races accumulated to 2.3% of total doctoral recipients, and American Indian/Alaska Native women made up .6% (NCES, 2016).

According to Williams (2001), one reason why there are few Black women faculty is this issue with the doctoral student pipeline, where there are few Black women doctoral recipients.

Considering the landscape of higher education with respect to how Black women faculty rank is an important preliminary step.

The following tables show the percentage of faculty members by rank and gender in all U.S. institutions and the percent in each rank by race and gender. Evidently, women occupy the lowest ranks of instructor and lecturer in the highest percentages, while men are found in the highest ranks of professor and associate professor in the highest percentages. The lowest percentages of women are found in the highest ranks at professor and associate professor while the lowest percentages of men are found in the lowest ranks of instructor and lecturer.

Table 2

Faculty Members by Rank and Gender

	Men	Women
--	-----	-------

Professor	67%	33%
Associate professor	55%	45%
Assistant professor	48%	52%
Instructor	43%	57%
Lecturer	45%	55%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

This indicates higher numbers of women faculty at the lowest ranks and notably lower numbers of women faculty at higher ranks.

Despite the fact that women have achieved greater education levels than men, this is not reflected in the level of prestige, salary, or the number of women with a high faculty rank. In

Table 3

Faculty Rank by Race and Gender

Gender & Rank		White	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	American Indian or Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
HBCU	Men professors	16.7%	12.5%	33.7%	1.3%	0.4%	0.1%
	Women professors	6.8%	3.6%	19.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%
	Men associate professors	14.3%	8.5%	26.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.2%
	Women associate professors	10.1%	4.0%	27.5%	1.2%	0.2%	0.1%
	Men assistant professors	11.8%	5.8%	23.0%	1.3%	0.2%	0.3%
	Women assistant professors	10.4%	3.1%	33.5%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%
	Men instructors	8.5%	2.2%	24.3%	2.5%	0.1%	0.0%
	Women instructors	13.4%	2.4%	40.1%	2.9%	0.3%	0.0%
	Men lecturers	8.2%	2.7%	25.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	Women lecturers	9.8%	2.5%	36.9%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-HBCU	Men professors	53.5%	7.4%	1.8%	2.2%	0.2%	0.1%
	Women professors	26.5%	2.6%	1.2%	1.3%	0.1%	0.0%
	Men associate professors	40.2%	6.8%	2.1%	2.5%	0.2%	0.1%
	Women associate professors	33.9%	4.7%	2.4%	2.1%	0.2%	0.1%
	Men assistant professors	30.9%	6.1%	1.9%	2.3%	0.2%	0.1%
	Women assistant professors	34.8%	5.6%	3.3%	2.5%	0.2%	0.1%

Men instructors	31.9%	2.5%	2.1%	3.3%	0.4%	0.1%
Women instructors	41.4%	3.5%	3.5%	4.1%	0.4%	0.1%
Men lecturers	33.8%	2.3%	1.6%	2.7%	0.1%	0.0%
Women lecturers	41.2%	3.9%	2.2%	3.6%	0.2%	0.0%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

fact, women of all races take a back seat to their male counterparts, being more likely to hold lower-ranking faculty roles (Johnson, 2017).

Davis and Maldonado (2015) explained that while more recent research has been conducted on women's leadership, there is a need to focus on these experiences for Black women working in institutions of higher education other than PWIs. Research conducted about HBCUs is likely to be different than PWIs because HBCU faculty are more focused on teaching and on student growth, whether inside or outside of the classroom (Conrad & Gasman, 2015).

Existing literature focuses on the challenges to career advancement faced by Black women in PWIs (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). Frequently, scholarship is produced by the dominant group and portrays faculty of color as deficient (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). According to Rios-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt, and Moll (2011), academia views marginalized persons as failures if they do not conform to the norms of the dominant group. Rather than viewing differences as setbacks to be overcome, a non-deficit perspective leverages the strengths of marginalized persons, viewing their cultural resources as valuable (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2011). My study took a non-deficit perspective.

Purpose and Research Questions

A thorough investigation of the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs has yet to be conducted. This quantitative study sought to uncover the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs with particular

attention to the intersection of race and gender. This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What internal support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
2. What external support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
3. What institutional cultural factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
4. What are the differences in supports by academic discipline and faculty rank?

Internal supports for my study are defined as either being provided by the institution or occurring on campus. An internal support would exist at the institution such as mentor who works at the same HBCU. External supports happen or exist outside of the institution and are not affiliated with the HBCU. For instance, an external religious support may be a church off campus that is not associated with the institution. For the purposes of my study institutional cultural supports encompass participant perspectives of feeling valued by the institution, empowered, encouraged, supported, and perceiving the institution to show concern for the faculty member. Cultural support also includes faculty perspectives of the warmth and friendliness of the institution, the values of the institution aligning with the faculty members' values, and community uplift and Black cultural heritage. Additionally, shared governance, social activism, and communication are all cultural factors in my study.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The following chapter provides a review of the literature surrounding the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement in higher education. This includes a look at the doctoral student pipeline, an analysis of institution types, a brief historical overview of HBCUs, discussions about the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), social activism, shared governance, and faculty challenges and how to navigate them. I used theoretical frameworks of Intersectionality and Black Feminist Theory throughout this research study. Theoretical frameworks were described in detail and included instances of how they relate to the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement. Various historical beliefs, stigmas, misconceptions, and patterns of inequality will serve as reference points in describing the existing literature.

Within academia, Black women faculty have often been described as outsiders within (Hernandez et al., 2015; Hill Collins, 2009; Holmes et al., 2001). Black women faculty employ numerous strategies to advance in their careers including collaborating with colleagues, turning to religion or spirituality, seeking mentors, and other forms of support (Jarmon, 2001; Moses, 1989; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). An investigation of tactics used by Black women faculty to navigate academia will be offered and suggestions for the support of career advancement will be reviewed.

Doctoral Student Pipeline

Increasing the number of Black women doctoral recipients and attracting them to a career in academia is an important preliminary consideration to the career advancement of Black

women faculty. Through paying attention to issues for undergraduate Black women, leaders in higher education can work to increase the number of Black women doctoral recipients who pursue a faculty career (Gregory, 2001). Compared to the numbers of Black women students entering academia, Black women faculty are disproportionally underrepresented. There are high numbers of Black women students and very low numbers of Black women faculty. According to the NCES (2017b), 64% of Black students who earned a bachelor's degree in the 2013-2014 academic year were women. Similarly, 2019 NCES data showed 64% of Black students who earned bachelor's degrees were women.

Since most Black college students are women, it is important that they have successful Black women faculty mentors (Gregory, 2001). Ensher and Murphy (1997) noted similarities in gender and race between mentor and protégé improves the quality of mentoring relationships. Lockwood (2006) stated women students are inspired by women faculty who have advanced in their careers. Women students see women faculty as examples to follow and subsequently strive to overcome sexist stigmas to achieve their goals (Lockwood, 2006).

There are also poor mentoring practices in doctoral programs (Danley et al., 2009). Just 4.75% of all doctoral degree recipients in the U.S. are Black women (NCES, 2017b). Danley et al. (2009) explained how there are problems in the pipeline leading up to the issues Black women faculty face in their careers. Black women doctoral students are often not exposed to the experiences of faculty members. White power and privilege, along with systemic racism are lingering problems (Danley et al., 2009).

For instance, in a study of 64 Black graduate teaching assistants (TAs) at PWIs, the participants were confronted with White students who questioned their authority, challenged them on a continual basis, and resisted cooperation. More than half of the TAs in this study

decided against pursuing a faculty career after these experiences (Danley et al., 2009). The daily experiences of 22 Black and Hispanic doctoral students at two PWIs and one institution with a 50% minority student body in Gildersleeve, Croom, and Vasquez's (2011) qualitative study were deemed dehumanizing. These included instances of isolation, racial microaggressions, and lack of understanding from professors. In one example, a Black woman doctoral student in this study explained how a White student used the "N" word.

Also, on a structural level, a Black woman doctoral student from Gildersleeve et al.'s (2011) study stated there were no resources available to support doctoral students of color, and these students did not feel welcome spending time in the department. Another Black woman in this study described the need to appear non-aggressive, so as not to upset the professor. When speaking during class and voicing an opposing viewpoint, she used a tone of voice that was not too loud, at the advice of another classmate (Gildersleeve et al., 2011). These issues Black women face as students may also present similar challenges if/when Black women decide to pursue careers as faculty members.

It is evident in the following tables that although Black women faculty represent a fair number of assistant professors (on the tenure track) at HBCUs, their numbers starkly decline in positions with secured tenure and higher status, in the ranks of associate professor and full professor. These numbers have similar patterns at PWIs but with despairingly low numbers.

Table 4*Assistant Professors by Race, Gender, and Institution Type*

Institution type	Race	Men assistant professor	Women assistant professor
HBCU	White	11.8%	10.4%
	Asian	5.8%	3.1%
	Black or African American	23.0%	33.5%
	Hispanic or Latino	1.3%	0.9%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2%	0.1%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.1%
Non-HBCU	White	30.9%	34.8%
	Asian	6.1%	5.6%
	Black or African American	1.9%	3.3%
	Hispanic or Latino	2.3%	2.5%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.1%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

Table 5*Tenured Faculty by Race, Gender and Institution Type*

Institution type	Race	Men tenured	Women tenured
HBCU	White	15.3%	8.7%
	Asian	10.2%	3.8%
	Black or African American	29.2%	24.0%
	Hispanic or Latino	1.3%	1.0%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4%	0.2%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.2%	0.1%
Non-HBCU	White	47.4%	29.9%
	Asian	7.1%	3.6%
	Black or African American	1.9%	1.8%
	Hispanic or Latino	2.4%	1.7%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.1%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b)

Table 6*Full Professors by Race, Gender, and Institution Type*

Institution type	Race	Men full professor	Women full professor
HBCU	White	16.7%	6.8%
	Asian	12.5%	3.6%
	Black or African American	33.7%	19.1%
	Hispanic or Latino	1.3%	0.8%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4%	0.1%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.0%
Non-HBCU	White	53.5%	26.5%
	Asian	7.4%	2.6%
	Black or African American	1.8%	1.2%
	Hispanic or Latino	2.2%	1.3%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2%	0.1%
	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.0%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

Although there is much improvement needed within institutions of higher education at helping to advance the careers of Black women faculty, HBCUs have been notably more successful than PWIs.

Tenure and Institution Type

Out of all U.S. institutions of higher education there are 10 institutions that have over 40% of tenured faculty composed of Black women. Upon noting institution type, 6 of these 10 institutions are Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Out of these top 10 institutions, both HBCUs that are all women's colleges are included: Spelman College and Bennett College (NCES, 2017b). The following table displays how HBCUs are where tenured Black women faculty are most commonly found.

Table 7*Institutions with the Highest Percentage of Tenured Black Women Faculty*

	Institution name	Percentage Black women of all tenured faculty	Institution type
1	Herzing University-Kenner	67%	Non-HBCU
2	Interdenominational Theological Center	60%	HBCU
3	Southern University at Shreveport	57%	HBCU
4	Spelman College	51%	All-women HBCU
5	Pillar College	50%	Non-HBCU
6	City Colleges of Chicago-Kennedy-King College	50%	Non-HBCU
7	Apex School of Theology	47%	Non-HBCU
8	Livingstone College	45%	HBCU
9	Johnson C Smith University	44%	HBCU
10	Bennett College	44%	All-women HBCU

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

Evidently, HBCUs are doing the best job at advancing the careers of Black women faculty. However, there are some issues with the tenure and promotion of Black women in all institutions of higher education. According to Matchett and the National Research Council (2013), Black women are more likely than White women to be employed at minority-serving institutions like HBCUs but are less likely to be employed in a tenure-track rank. Only 1.1% of faculty who are tenured or on the tenure track consist of Black women, even though Black women compose 6.2% of the U.S. population (Matchett & National Research Council, 2013). Black women are unable to get the mentoring they need because of disparities in faculty demographics (Matchett & National Research Council, 2013).

Black women faculty in advanced career roles have much to offer other academics. According to Banks (1990), the absence of Black women is a true disadvantage to the imaginations of students and academics alike. Black women incorporate various life experiences in discussions about moral, social, and legal issues that are worth considering. Black women faculty bring a wealth of perspective and knowledge that often go unnoticed. Historically, scholarly literature has rarely captured such experiences at the intersection of race and gender (Banks, 1990). Studies show the intersection of race and gender plays a role in the career advancement experiences of Black women faculty (Myers, 2002; Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014; Thandi Sule, 2011; Williams, 2001; Wright & Dinkha, 2009). Black women faculty have experiences that differ from Black men faculty and from White faculty, which deserves investigation and attention.

Theoretical Frameworks

My study is conceptually informed by Intersectionality and Black Feminist Theory (BFT). Intersectionality emphasizes the complexity of the world, explains how political and social circumstances are molded by several factors, and how inequality and societal power dynamics are produced by a myriad of aspects that divide society (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). BFT describes how the intersection of race and gender shapes navigation through the workplace, challenging the dominant group, who treat Black women as inferior (Combahee River Collective, 1977; Hill Collins, 2009; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Thandi Sule, 2011). These theories provide a platform for understanding the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a framework that challenges social inequality (Hill Collins, 2012).

According to Hernandez et al. (2015), the merging of race and gender produces a unique identity for Black women, who are discriminated against and oppressed. Black women faculty have at least two ascribed statuses in their ethnicity and gender and so have distinct circumstances from their White counterparts (Gregory, 2001). This creates inequality in higher education that is lived through the career advancement experiences and lack of opportunities for Black women faculty members (Hernandez et al., 2015; Myers, 2002).

Intersectionality was first seen through the work of Harriet Tubman. Tubman is most well known for her valiant deeds rescuing approximately 70 people from slavery in her Underground Railroad. Tubman was also a prominent community organizer, nurse, Civil War veteran, border-crossing migrant, and suffragist (Hobson, 2014). Tubman's lived experiences inform Intersectionality in that she resisted extreme sexism and racism. Furthermore, in the spirit of Intersectionality, she acknowledged the oppression of those with varying ascribed identities, saving said peoples from enslavement and accepting the participation of free Black people and White allies (Hobson, 2014).

Important underpinnings of Intersectionality were produced by Anna Julia Cooper. Cooper had a fruitful career as an educator and was also an influential activist and scholar (Johnson, 2009b). Cooper critiqued literary works, which advised against teaching women (Daniel Hutchinson, 1981). She was active in efforts to secure Black women's rights to wages earned from work, noting over half of Black women at the time were head of household (Cooper, 1899). Cooper strove to create an anti-racist, anti-sexist curriculum and combatted a patriarchal education system (Johnson, 2009b).

Cooper highlighted the overlapping nature of race and gender and how these factors have an effect on Black women's lives (Johnson, 2009b). In Cooper's (1899) writing, she rejected the

notion of choosing the perspective of either race or gender but instead emphasized how these oppressed group identities are interconnected (May, 2009). Cooper spoke to Black women's experiences in a society where they were ignored and forced to be silent, stating Black women need a space to engage in dialogue (May, 2009). Cooper argued since Black women have a legacy of struggle, they are able to understand the significance and depth of issues and can help others learn this capability. She encouraged radical social change and a perspective of the world that acknowledged the intersection of race and gender (May, 2009).

Kimberle Crenshaw (1989) used Intersectionality to reject the notion seen in antiracist politics, feminist theory, and antidiscrimination law that race and gender are mutually exclusive. Crenshaw (1989) cited several court cases where Black women's discrimination lawsuits were rejected because of the courts' inability to deal with a combination of race and gender. In these cases, the courts have failed to recognize Black women's experiences in employment as distinct from White women, or in other cases, so distinct from White women and from Black men so as not to represent a larger class. Therefore, if Black women are unable to prove discrimination was either due to their race or their gender, they are unlikely to be protected by the law (Crenshaw, 1989). Crenshaw (1991) also spoke to legal cases involving rape, stating, compared to White women, Black women's cases are less likely to result in extended prison terms for their rapists and less likely to end in conviction.

Intersectionality is an interpretive, overarching framework that helps understand the experiences of Black women faculty in their career advancement in higher education (Hernandez et al., 2015). Intersectionality takes into account the convergence of factors such as race and gender. It also considers institutional factors, personal identities, and Black women faculty's positionality as outsiders within. Intersectionality recognizes that reactions to Black women

faculty's combination of race and gender leads to oppression and discrimination in education, society, and the workplace. Most important for this study, Intersectionality states the convergence of these factors makes an impact on Black women faculty's opportunity at career advancement and engagement in academic leadership (Hernandez et al., 2015).

Analytically, Intersectionality can be used as a tool in higher education to help solve issues people are confronted with (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). Many professionals within academia identify with various categories in more than one group, including ability, race, gender, citizenship, class, ethnicity, and sexuality. These identities are not mutually exclusive but work with one another and build on each other (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). An understanding of Intersectionality allows people to better cope with the complex discrimination they endure (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016).

Intersectionality describes how socially, individuals obtain power dynamics in their everyday lives (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). Some people are at an advantage and others are at a disadvantage in how they are treated in society based on factors such as their race and gender. Some groups benefit from economic changes, and other groups are very vulnerable. Social and economic structures exploit certain groups in complicated and intersecting ways so that others may profit (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016).

Intersectionality acknowledges that social inequality is seldom produced by one factor alone (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). One must consider the relationship between issues such as racism and sexism and across multiple platforms of power including interpersonal, cultural, disciplinary, and structural. Rather than focusing on differences between race and gender or between Black and White, for instance, Intersectionality views how these factors are interconnected. Intersectionality considers the intricacies of these everchanging power

relationships. It also weighs the influence of political, intellectual, and historical contexts (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016).

Hill Collins and Bilge (2016) stated Intersectionality requires one to investigate the experiences of marginalized people in an effort to understand human behaviors and life. There is also a social activist aspect where disenfranchised communities and individuals can become empowered (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). Hill Collins (2012) stated Intersectionality explains how systems of power such as race and gender are established and maintained in relationships. Social positions hold power and significance in relation to other people's place in the hierarchy. There is a matrix of domination where racial and gender groups are seated differently.

Cooper asserted a genuine liberation movement would not ask marginalized people to choose between race or gender as their primary identity. Contrarily, Black women have experiences with intertwining domination produced by racism and sexism simultaneously (May, 2009). Cooper pointed out though Black women are confronted with both racism and sexism, Black women are not acknowledged in either respect (Guy-Sheftall, 2009). This has implications for how Black women faculty experience the workplace including what they are able to imagine, what they know, and their physical realities (Hill Collins, 2012). This directly translates to Black women faculty's opportunities for career advancement, or lack thereof. As both Intersectionality and Black Feminist Theory indicate, Black women's race and gender are woven together and cannot be separated, creating distinct experiences.

Black Feminist Theory (BFT)

According to Back and Solomos (2000), Black women face unique challenges and have needs that are distinct from those of Black men and White women. This is a result of both

gender and racial oppression where Black women struggle in their experiences with patriarchy and White supremacy. It is also important to note that while Black women may have been exposed to such experiences, there are varying levels of consciousness and differing responses from each individual. Having an outlet to share these different responses creates a collective, beneficial standpoint. Additionally, BFT advocates for the dignity and empowerment of all people in an autonomous, humanist perspective (Back & Solomos, 2000).

Feminism first emerged to improve the lives of White women from the middle class, primarily through access to higher education and the professions (Dicker, 2008). In 1848 at the Seneca Falls Convention, White, feminist women expressed legal grievances including obtaining the right to vote and having a voice in government (Dicker, 2008). Also, among the main concerns of middle-class White women included a desire to own property, to gain custody rights of their children, and to keep their own wages earned from work (Dicker, 2008).

Though Black woman activist, Sojourner Truth, spoke at a feminist convention in 1851, she was met with hostility from Whites, who were riled by her race, ignoring her gender (Dicker, 2008). In 1868 when Black men received the right to vote, Sojourner Truth criticized the disregard for Black women. By the 1880s White women had gained access to higher education (Dicker, 2008). Unfortunately, during a demonstration in 1913, Black woman activist, Ida Wells-Barnett, was instructed by a White woman activist to join the march in the back of the parade in order to appease Southern voters (Dicker, 2008).

According to Back and Solomos (2000), subscribers to the White feminist movement have been conditioned to accept racist and sexist societal norms. White feminists have utilized discrimination, leveraged the support of White supremacists, and strategized their movement at the expense of Black women. This movement failed to acknowledge the differing types of

oppression faced by diverse groups of women (Back & Solomos, 2000). hooks (1981) explained how White feminists made comparisons between women's liberation and the liberation of Black people but were only referring to White women and Black men. White feminists (despite how unconscious it may have been) completely disregarded Black women, which revealed their commitment to sexism and racism toward Black women (hooks, 1981).

Back and Solomos (2000) argued that the social status of White women and Black women has never been equal. This brand of feminism perpetuated racist perspectives among White faculty teaching chiefly White students. Literary works referring to women only discuss White women, assuming this focus represents all American women. Furthermore, White feminists have attempted to rid themselves of all responsibility for racism, pointing to White men as the sole oppressors (Back & Solomos, 2000).

According to Andersen and Hill Collins (2013), concepts of race and gender are socially constructed and interconnected. Though the workforce has largely been divided between the traditional sexes, women of all races do not experience the same sort of gender oppression. This is one reason why the feminist movement, which has chiefly focused on White women, has largely been rejected by Black women (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013).

hooks (1981) described that when the White feminist movement started, the majority of Black women did not view womanhood as a critical component of their identity. The view that being Black was the only important aspect derived from sexist and racist conditioning. Prior to Black men receiving the right to vote, Black women activists attempted unsuccessfully to gain their rights (hooks, 1981).

According to Parker (2004), when White feminism emerged in institutional leadership, it continued to ignore the varied races and ethnicities of women. Scholarship on theories of leadership from a feminist perspective reinforced notions of White, middle-class gender norms. These included socialized concepts of women as nurturing, passive, and focused on relationships (Parker, 2004). Here, Black women's experiences are distorted at best, if included at all. This practice reinforces the misconception that White gender roles are ideal and Black women's experiences are illegitimate (Parker, 2004). Boisnier (2003) stated feminism in modern times still neglects to acknowledge the concerns of Black women.

In more recent years, White feminist academics have made strides to note differences in race, social class, sexual orientation, and more feminist perspectives. However, often times there is a lack of focus on the power dynamics and inequalities, which ultimately cause one brand of feminism to be considered "normal" and the next type of feminism to be considered "different" or "exotic" (Dill & Zinn, 2016).

A separate model, which somewhat differs from BFT, is the Helms womanist identity model. Compared to traditional feminism, the Helms womanist identity model better captures the identity development process of Black women (Boisnier, 2003). The Helms womanist identity model is flexible and personal for each woman. It encompasses a woman's transition from accepting societal definitions of womanhood to developing her own definition of womanhood (Boisnier, 2003).

According to Boisnier (2003), this model includes stages of passive acceptance, revelation, embeddedness–emanation, synthesis, and active commitment. These stages go from accepting gender roles, to perceiving men negatively and women positively, feeling connected to other women, obtaining a feminist identity and evaluating men individually, and finally

becoming active in achieving feminist goals. The embeddedness—emanation stage is when a woman feels a sense of connection with other women and may decide to spend time with self-affirming women to reinforce her identity. Synthesis happens when she moves beyond gender roles and evaluates men individually. The Helms womanist identity model does not require a woman to identify as a feminist or accept feminist views (Boisnier, 2003).

According to Back and Solomos (2000), Black women intellectuals must be central to BFT. Their insights into the oppression they experience cannot be fully felt by those who are not Black women. Black women must define their own reality because they are the ones existing in that reality. One core theme presented by Black feminist intellectuals is the importance for Black women to self-define (Back & Solomos, 2000). Due to historical stereotypes, Black women faculty are subjected to continuous attacks on their identity (Gregory, 2001). Back and Solomos (2000) stated self-definition creates a platform for Black women to resist oppression, express their experiences, label their history, shape who they are, and define their own reality. Therefore, it is critical for scholarly Black women leaders to produce BFT. It should also be developed on a continual basis as circumstances shift and change. Still, others are welcome to participate. Black women intellectuals are at the core of developing BFT and creating a strong foundation as a springboard to work with activists and scholars from other groups for social change (Back & Solomos, 2000).

Brief Historical Overview of HBCUs

During the time of overt slavery in the USA, Black people pursued their education despite the laws banning them from reading and writing. Just before the Civil War began, Lincoln University, Cheyney University, and Wilberforce University opened for free Black

people in the North (Gasman, 2007). However, quota systems in Northern schools limited how many Black students could attend college (United Negro College Fund, 2019).

After slavery ended, newly freed Black people were self-determined to educate themselves in common schools, native schools, and Sabbath schools (Anderson, 1988). Also, religious societies from the North sent Black and White missionaries to the South to start colleges and universities for Black students (United Negro College Fund, 2019). In 1837 the first HBCU, which remains in operation today, Cheyney University in Pennsylvania, was created through the \$10,000 endowment from a Quaker philanthropist named Richard Humphreys (Cheyney University, 2019). Missionary organizations and philanthropists were able to assist in developing HBCUs so long as the racial hierarchy was not changed (LeMelle, 2002). On the other hand, some colleges created by Black religious groups were Morris Brown College, Allen University, and Paul Quinn College (Gasman, 2007). Black Baptist groups created institutions such as Augusta Institute (present day Morehouse College), Selma University, Wayland Seminary, Benedict College, and Arkansas Baptist College in an effort to secure the financial and moral future of Black Baptists (Williams & Dixie, 2003).

Freed Black people initiated and maintained these schools largely from their own funds and labor and literacy spread quickly. By 1868, 40,000 Black students were enrolled in the American Methodist Episcopal (AME) church schools. This number increased to 200,000 by 1885 (Anderson, 1988). Then, 17 public Black colleges were created after the passing of the second Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890. A segregated school system was established in Southern and border states, where resources and facilities were not equal to that of White schools. When funds from missionary organizations were exhausted, White Northern

philanthropists began funding private Black colleges with ulterior motives to aggressively steer Black students toward laboring in the industrial workforce (Gasman, 2007).

The South's economic dependence on cheap agricultural labor through the coercion of Black children and adults led to a heavy emphasis on industrial education for Black students. In 1900, 49.3% of Black boys and 30.6% of Black girls worked compared to 22.5% of White boys and 7% of White girls. Similarly, while 40% of Black women worked that same year, 16% of White women did, along with 26% of married Black women compared to 3% of married White women. Northern philanthropists also desired to maintain the racial hierarchy and profit from the exploitation of Black workers in this way (Anderson, 1988). A Yankee named Samuel Chapman Armstrong created Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, which was followed by the creation of Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in 1881 by his student and former slave, Booker T. Washington. The Hampton-Tuskegee model aimed to produce Black teachers to impart a menial type of education. However, Black students did not appreciate the hard labor and extremely limited academic curriculum of the industrial school model (Anderson, 1988).

Black scholars encouraged a classical curriculum, which was traditionally liberal. Organizations that embraced this learning philosophy were missionary societies and religious organizations (Anderson, 1988). These included the Board of Missions for the Freedmen of the Presbyterian Church, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal church, the American Missionary Association, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion church, the Colored Methodist Episcopal church, and the African Methodist Episcopal church (Anderson, 1988). Morehouse, Spelman, Howard, Dillard, and Fisk were some institutions that emphasized a liberal arts curriculum (Gasman, 2007).

The American Missionary Association supported Tillotson, Straight, Tougaloo, Talladega, and Fisk colleges in 1900. Morris Brown University, Payne College, Central Park Normal and Industrial School, Allen University, Kittrell College, Campbell College, Turner Normal School, and Wilberforce University were supported by the African Methodist Episcopal church (Anderson, 1988). The Colored Methodist Episcopal church supported Mississippi Industrial College, Holsey Normal and Industrial Institute, Lane College, and Miles College. Furthermore, organizations such as the Niagara Movement, which included participation from Ida Wells-Barnett, fought for the civil rights of Black people. By 1905, the radical Niagara Movement demanded an end to the racial hierarchy, voting rights for Black people, and opportunities for education. Then in 1910, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was created to promote civil and political equality (Anderson, 1988).

Despite the desire to be self-determined, Black institutions sought funding from White philanthropists because state and federal governments often provided no financial assistance to Black educational institutions. White children received all public-school funds, while Black children did not. Additionally, though the government provided transportation for White children to go to school, they refused to do the same for Black children. School inspectors investigated Black schools to see if industrial training was the primary focus and if funding would be given (Anderson, 1988). Again, the general thrust for Black people's education was that of an industrial model that directed them into laborious careers, which most often included agricultural work. In many respects, the system was designed to work against Black people's interests.

The system of sharecropping, which followed slavery, was a coercion where Black families were constantly indebted to White planters (Franklin & James, 2015). Laws under the

New Deal left out agricultural workers from regulations to protect workers' rights. Consequently, White planters did not pay Black workers crop subsidies they were supposed to. Other employment sectors were closed off to displaced Black workers, causing further inequities (Franklin & James, 2015). Similarly, nonprofit employees, private domestic workers, and agricultural workers were excluded from Unemployment Insurance and Old Age Insurance, disproportionately hurting Black Americans. Additionally, during the 1930s, the Federal Housing Authority declined to insure mortgages for Black people and redlined Black neighborhoods, causing housing segregation (Franklin & James, 2015).

The racial disparities that occurred during the Great Depression and with the New Deal left Black people, and subsequently Black private colleges, in desperate financial circumstances (Gasman, 2007). In 1943, then-president of Tuskegee Institute, Frederick D. Patterson, decided to strategize a way to join forces with a multitude of Black college presidents to fundraise in a joint effort. The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) was created in 1944 and included membership from 27 Black colleges. Instead of raising capital from only a few wealthy individuals, the fund planned to gain the financial support of average citizens. This agenda included educating people about the contributions Black scholars were making, the issues Black people faced, and an understanding of Black students' needs. It also set up businesses to give donations on a regular, systematic basis. It was easier for businesses to give to one collective organization rather than choosing one college among many (Gasman, 2007). Along with businesses, the UNCF utilized prominent societal figures to spread their message.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr. also had an important part in fundraising for the UNCF. Although not trusting of the UNCF's Black leadership to handle funds on their own, it was Rockefeller's influence that persuaded the UNCF to consolidate its colleges into fewer, larger,

and stronger institutions. Rockefeller used his powerful reputation to persuade people that Black colleges created loyal citizens who were not radical (Gasman, 2007). He recruited publicity professionals who chose images of Black soldiers and nursing students to depict upstanding Americans as part of a healthy democracy. He also included photos with White and Black people together, which was novel during this time. Rockefeller attracted other White Northern donors through displaying images of Black students performing industrial work to highlight how Black colleges were producing industrial and productive members of society (Gasman, 2007).

Wealthy White women also played an important role in fundraising for the Women's Division of the UNCF, which was run by UNCF member, Betty Stebman (Gasman, 2007). Catherine Waddell made it fashionable for elite women to provide voluntary donations and took a particular interest in the all-women's Black colleges, Spelman and Bennett. White women from the elite class pulled strings to have the UNCF discussed over popular radio shows and for interracial receptions to be held, one of which was at the distinguished Colony Club. Edith Arthur McCullough was another wealthy White woman who used her lavish home to host luncheons where a Black leader of the UNCF was present to have discussions. These luncheons became exceedingly popular and promoted giving to the UNCF as the thing to do for ladies in society, though it was in the White participants' comfort zone and the Black guest was viewed as the "exotic" entertainment (Gasman, 2007). Though useful at the time, these efforts did not last as legal changes occurred.

Fundraising strategies and public relations shifted again when Brown vs. Board of education ended legal segregation, and the purpose of the Black college was questioned altogether (Gasman, 2007). Many people could not see that compared to White colleges, Black colleges maintained lower costs for Black students to afford an education, provided a friendly

environment for Black scholars, and had an increased concern for academic limitations placed upon Black students. After all, economic barriers were still in place, despite legal changes, and White schools in the Deep South did not admit great numbers of Black students until the 1970s. Therefore, UNCF advertisements explained how cost of attendance prohibited Black students from having many college choices. The UNCF also highlighted how they had always welcomed international students and White students in order to show racial cooperation (Gasman, 2007). This strategy was used, but at the same time Black leaders knew Black colleges must be preserved for their unique mission to serve Black students.

Starting in the latter part of the 1950s, students at Black colleges became more politically involved when the American government made grand contradictions about securing freedom during the Cold War while oppressing Black people at home (Gasman, 2007). Students protested against segregated facilities and the inclusion of Black studies programs and were often sent to jail. Donations to the UNCF fluctuated during this time, and leaders had to strategize, yet again. Public messages were carefully crafted to appeal to Whites, while also serving the interests of Black people. The UNCF left the choice up to each Black college how much or little they wanted to encourage students to protest (Gasman, 2007). This activity led the collective institutions to become more autonomous in having a say in the UNCF.

The UNCF was less controlled by wealthy Whites in the 1970s. In UNCF advertising campaigns, President Vernon Jordan depicted the struggles faced by the Black community, which included extreme poverty. This message was more aggressive toward those who did not contribute to changing these conditions. President Kennedy then helped the UNCF by persuading the Ford Foundation to support them (Gasman, 2007). Despite these supportive relationships, there were still harmful influences speaking against Black colleges.

Negative press has had the power to portray Black colleges in a damaging way. One study, “The American Negro College” (Jencks & Riesman, 1967) from the *Harvard Educational Review* made extreme statements about Black colleges being academically disastrous. The study had insufficient data collection, made partisan claims, and did not have accurate facts about the history or circumstances of Black colleges. Nevertheless, it had great sway in higher education and several media outlets. For instance, the article garnered much attention from the *New York Times*, *Newsweek*, and *Time*. Further, the arguments made by Jencks and Riesman (1967) are still debated by policymakers, scholars, and the media (Gasman, 2007). However, Black leaders confronted the errors made by Jencks and Riesman and the journal which published the article.

UNCF member-college presidents, Stephen J. Wright, Albert W. Dent, Hugh Gloster, and Benjamin E. Mays wrote letters in response to “The American Negro College” (Gasman, 2007). Wright emphasized that even though Black colleges faced disadvantages, they educated competent graduates. He noted the majority of Black colleges were undergraduate institutions, and so it was not fair to compare them to universities. Also, their general mission is to serve one of the most culturally deprived student populations in the nation, who obviously have not met Ivy League standards. He argued HBCUs have been underfinanced in the past and present. However, Black colleges have developed graduates to become capable public-school teachers, graduates who go on to be accepted into graduate schools and medical schools, who pass national medical exams, earn doctoral degrees, and some of whom become faculty members in PWIs (as cited in Gasman, 2007).

Wright went on to explain how Jencks and Riesman (1967) utilized impressions, speculations, judgments, and generalizations. Wright stated Jencks and Riesman (1967) made conclusions based on anecdotes and what people allegedly said rather than on facts and evidence.

There was also a lack of scholarly language when using phrases such as “Uncle Tom” to describe Booker T. Washington (as cited in Gasman, 2007). The fact that the authors would think it appropriate to use such terminology in an academic journal article and that the publication printed work including this language leads to skepticism about the integrity of these parties.

Mays also critiqued “The American Negro College’s” questionable methodology and pointed out the absurdity of comparing Black colleges to Ivy League institutions while overlooking the White institutions fraught with issues. He noted that in 1965, 401 PWIs had not been rated by any accrediting agencies because of their weak academic performance. Mays questioned why they were not labeled “academic disaster areas” but Black colleges were held to a higher standard (as cited in Gasman, 2007). The authors’ bias is again on display when labeling Black accredited colleges, but not unaccredited White colleges, as disasters, especially when considering White colleges have clearly had a more advantaged history.

Gloster focused on the disregard for Black college successes, Black students’ accomplishments, or Black professional achievements, and the racist undertone of the article. He pointed to a specific description within Jencks and Riesman’s (1967) work about a Black dean whose head would itch when talking to White men because in childhood he feigned the “darky” stance, saying “Yassir” and scratching his head (as cited in Gasman, 2007). The inclusions of such anecdotes and exclusion of any Black accomplishments reveals the skewed nature of the publication.

Dent used “The American Negro College” as an opportunity to put a positive twist on negative messaging. To the point made about Black students being academically underprepared, Dent explained how wonderful programs have been put in place such as Upward Bound and Spelman’s, Morehouse’s, and Dillard’s pre-freshman programs to assist incoming students in

filling academic gaps (as cited in Gasman, 2007). In addition to these presidents, other scholars have contributed to revealing flaws in this work.

Non-Black scholars also confronted the ignorance of “The American Negro College.” Former dean of Harvard College, John U. Monroe, in a 1968 interview entitled, “Negro Colleges-Their Outlook” with the *U.S. News and World Report* explained that Black colleges are not trying to imitate White colleges but focus on Black pride, identity, and awareness. He explained how grand institutions such as political parties and financial companies had no Black leadership and did not consider Black people’s concerns. In essence, a multitude of these institutional powers engendered an intricate social fabric of gains or losses, and so, White people had many gains and Black people had few (Monroe, 1968). This highlights Jencks and Riesman’s (1967) indifference toward institutional racism and Black colleges’ struggle with White power and control.

Sekora (1968) critiqued Jencks and Riesman’s (1967) methodology, failure to acknowledge historical White control over Black education, and perpetuation of stereotypes. Sekora stated “The American Negro College” distorted history, contained arguments built on inconclusive, incomplete, or biased statistics, made a crude simplification of complicated issues, and had a dehumanizing style. He went on to state that Black colleges were heavily encouraged by Whites to produce industrial laborers, yet Jencks and Riesman focused on their supposed failure in the liberal arts. He also defied the authors on their slander of Black college presidents’ involvement in the Civil Rights Movement by explaining that Black college presidents often donated much of their salaries to the NAACP and opened up their own homes to host meetings, all the while under the threat of torture and violence by White supremacists. Additionally, the overwhelming effects of state control over public Black colleges for 80 years was not addressed

by Jencks and Riesman, nor was the state's negligence in their economic responsibility to Black colleges (Sekora, 1968). Though the ignorant sentiments of such uninformed parties are still prevalent today, the UNCF created a new campaign to manage their own definition of Black colleges.

Beginning in the early 1970s, the "A Mind is a Terrible Thing to Waste" campaign has largely been successful in garnering funds for the UNCF. During this time, Rockefeller left the UNCF, which marked the end of White involvement in the everyday affairs of the organization (Gasman, 2007). The "A Mind of a Terrible Thing to Waste" campaign included a new Summer Medical Program, the creation of a direct mailing program, a financial aid and recruitment workshop, and the separation of the Board of Members and Board of Trustees into two groups. The new advertising campaign alluded to the past atrocities of slavery while pushing for increased opportunities to educate Black youth. It made references to the privileges of middle-class White people and drew attention to the fact that many Black students cannot enjoy the same activities. This campaign went on to portray hardworking, supportive Black parents and grandparents. It focused on reaping a return on investment for the business-minded donor and also narrowed in on the needs of individual Black students. There was an overwhelming response from middle-class Black donors. Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, for instance, raised half a million dollars for the UNCF (Gasman, 2007).

Social Activism

HBCUs have nurtured a second curriculum that went against White supremacy and segregation. This included concepts of self-esteem, idealism, race pride, dignity, cultural nationalism, self-love, empowerment, and nation building (Favors, 2019). Race consciousness has been emphasized at many HBCUs, along with citizenship and democracy. HBCU leaders

have worked to recondition the minds of Black students to reject the malicious propaganda about Black people. Black history week was created, a library of Black scholarship was established, and photos of Black leaders were displayed in classrooms. HBCUs hosted activists, scholars, and radical thinkers to speak to their campus communities (Favors, 2019). With this being said, there were assorted levels of participation in social activism from various HBCUs.

The level of participation of each HBCU varied greatly and depended on complex factors (Williamson-Lott, 2008). Participation in the Black freedom struggle was influenced by attitudes toward racial agitation, level of prestige, geographic location, and racial composition. Denomination and funding patterns also had an influence on the extent of involvement in social activism. For instance, the Black Baptist Missionary Convention was created by Black Baptist Ministers from Jackson State College in 1869 in an effort to elevate the Black race and correct the misconceptions held by violent White racists. Similarly, in the 1870s, the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AMEC) split with the Methodist Episcopal Church because of different perspectives about racial discrimination and segregation. Tougaloo College was funded by the American Missionary Organization (AMA), which had headquarters in New York and was therefore freer to participate in some of the most disruptive public protests. Although the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church promoted an end to racial discrimination, its history and continued association with Southern White Methodists had an effect on Black colleges' (such as Paine College's) connection to social activism and the use of campuses as movement centers (Williamson-Lott, 2008). Evidently, HBCUs did not have the autonomy to participate in demonstrations as they pleased and were oftentimes controlled by powerful forces. Another one of these forces was political powers.

Political powers were involved in controlling HBCUs. For instance, in 1878 Democrats downgraded the curriculum of Alcorn University to Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College, to focus on industrial education, ended scholarships funded by the state, and made a reduction in annual appropriations. Struggles of this type lingered into the 1940s when the state's financial suffocation of Black institutions left them vulnerable to state control. On a grand scale, there were representatives from White terrorist organizations at every governmental level (Williamson-Lott, 2008). There were also political occurrences that tied the Red Scare to the Black freedom struggle. Anti-communism sentiment and the Black freedom struggle occurred during the same time period. Therefore, organizations and people that identified with the Civil Rights Movement were considered communist entities who were not to be trusted (Williamson-Lott, 2008). In addition to political forces, HBCU presidents shaped the level of activism on campus.

HBCU presidents have been varied in their stance on social activism. Unfortunately, they have been bound by the control of racist, Southern legislators, whom many HBCU presidents appeased in order to keep their occupations, their institutions open, staff compensated, and students unscathed (Favors, 2019). Violent White mobs, brutal tactics by police, and the Ku Klux Klan made participation in social activism extremely dangerous. There were instances where White people would throw bombs onto campus, and the police would fire bullets into crowds of peaceful protestors. Boards of trustees would threaten to fire presidents, revoke accreditation or charters, and financially sanction public institutions. There were several instances of White supremacists harassing and interrogating activist faculty members and their families, Black activist residences being shot, and student activists being killed, and so some HBCU presidents did not readily embrace social activism. There were many cases of students at

Black colleges protesting patriarchal presidents and administrators (Favors, 2019; Williamson-Lott 2008). While some presidents were very conservative in their approach to social activism, others were far more liberal.

There were many HBCU presidents who did encourage social activism. Black nationalism was embraced by Bennett College President James Corrothers in 1873. Corrothers encouraged students to boycott racist shops and spend their money elsewhere. Similarly, in 1927, President David Dallas Jones encouraged students at Bennett to support Black-owned businesses. Joseph Samuel Clark, the first president of Southern University during the Depression era, encouraged the spread of militant ideas and distance between White and Black people so that Black scholars could discuss these concepts. In 1962 President Alfonso Elder of North Carolina College (present day North Carolina Central University) publicly endorsed protesting as a constitutional right (Favors, 2019). Along with these presidents, faculty members played an important role in encouraging student activism.

Many HBCU faculty planted seeds of activism and nurtured students' sense of purpose, dignity, and determination (Favors, 2019). Faculty members were known to hold literary club meetings in their own homes. During the 1950s, Jane McAllister from Jackson State University encouraged students to confront White supremacy head-on. Similarly, Elsie Lewis, faculty member at Southern University, created *The Observer*, a campus bulletin that discussed the political process and voting rights. Laurence Hayes at Alabama State University (ASU) encouraged the bus boycotts in 1955 by altering the lyrics to a popular song to include activist sentiments and playing it regularly at football games. Furthermore, Jo Ann Gibson Robinson from ASU was involved with the concept of a bus boycott and was arrested for her involvement in them. Similarly, Montgomery King and Marie Davis Cochrane, two Southern University

faculty members, refused to give up their seats on a bus and were arrested (Favors, 2019). These are just some of the instances where faculty members were influential in social activism at HBCUs.

Unfortunately, faculty members at public HBCUs were not permitted to express their support of the movement because they would consequently face dangerous ramifications. Faculty members were often intimidated by racist public officials and boards of trustees. In comparison, Tougaloo faculty were more able to participate because they were independent of funding from the state and until 1962, held the prestige of being the only accredited Black College in Mississippi (Williamson-Lott, 2008). There were also several organizations created in the HBCU environment, which prompted Black academics to fight for their rights.

Since the late 1800s through the 1970s (and today), HBCUs have been involved in organizations to grapple with White supremacy. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was utilized by faculty members to assert their rights under the first, fifth, and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution. However, the AAUP did not confront the state's control over faculty members' academic freedom. Furthermore, administrators at private colleges were permitted to limit academic freedom of faculty members since there were no guidelines about institutional compliance. Consequently, it was common for faculty members at Black colleges to be fired without any due process (Williamson-Lott, 2008). In addition to faculty, students have been involved in organizations to confront White supremacy.

HBCU students were involved in several organizations in response to racism. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was founded by Black college students in the early 1960s and met regularly at Tougaloo College to confront issues such as desegregation, lynching, violence, voter rights, and White peoples' expectations vs. Black academic goals

(Favors, 2019; Williamson-Lott, 2008). Bennett College hosted activist speakers in 1945 and supported the Fair Employment Practice Committee. The NAACP was another organization that HBCU students, faculty, and administrators were involved with. In 1942 students from Jackson State University attended the fourth annual student conference of the NAACP, and Southern University established a chapter of the NAACP in 1944. In 1968 North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University created the Student Organization for Black Unity, which confronted the obstinacy of leaders in the White community toward the concerns of Black people and the racist institutions and policies that stifled the economic livelihood of working class and poor neighborhoods (Favors, 2019).

In addition to organizations such as these, the written word was another outlet for students and faculty advisors to voice concerns about injustice. HBCU newspapers and radio shows were an important outlet for messages of social activism. Faculty advisors and editors encouraged students to voice their concerns. In the late 1800s at Tougaloo College, the *Tougaloo Quarterly* was utilized to speak out against White supremacy. As early as 1891, there is evidence at Tougaloo College of literary societies spreading militant concepts. Tougaloo also had *The Voice of the Movement* and *The Student Voice*, along with the yearbook *The Eaglet*, which embraced and celebrated activism (Williamson-Lott, 2008). *Southern University Digest* mocked American democracy in 1929, when considering Black people did not have equal rights, then wrote about White violence against Black people and arrests for resisting Jim Crow laws (Favors, 2019). Similarly, ASU's *Hornet* and *Freshmore* admonished Jim Crow segregation in 1952 and promoted an understanding of Black heritage. Rust College *Bearcat* displayed involvement in the movement, as well. At Jackson State University the *Blue and White Flash* expressed concern for Black peoples' civil liberties and encouraged race consciousness.

Radio programs have also expressed social activist tendencies at HBCUs. *Bennett College on the Air* discussed issues of racial growth for African Americans, Black history, and the need for courses about Black issues. Students and faculty attacked White supremacy through the airwaves at Southern University, as well, around the early 1940s (Favors, 2019). During the Black Power era in the late 1960s, Jackson State University students created an underground newspaper called the *Gadfly*, which reprimanded students who were not involved with the movement. Correspondingly, Tougaloo had an underground newspaper, the *Harambee*, which encouraged students to immerse themselves in social activism (Williamson-Lott, 2008). Along with literary and verbal displays of activism, HBCU students and faculty also used physical efforts.

Throughout history, many HBCU students have taken physical action to protest for their rights. In 1937, a movie theater cut out a portion of a film that depicted Black and White performers dancing on the same stage (Favors, 2019). The students at Bennett and North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State College staged a boycott, and the theater company acquiesced, playing movies unedited. Then, when a local Black school was closed by the school board in 1951 and the students were sent to work in cotton fields, Southern University students marched to the newspaper office, then to the courthouse, and finally the school board office. Consequently, the school board reopened the school. Likewise, in 1952 when a grocer local to ASU raped a Black girl and did not face legal ramifications, students boycotted his store and put him out of business (Favors, 2019). Abstaining from conducting transactions with racist business owners was one form of protest, while physically being present where segregation norms mandated Black people must not be, was another.

Sit-ins and marches were effective forms of social activism for students at HBCUs. Boycotts of segregated businesses by Rust College and Mississippi Industrial students in the 1960s left White businesses crippled (Williamson-Lott, 2008). In 1960 students had a sit-in at the Montgomery County Courthouse and a subsequent march of 1,000 students. Equally, Tougaloo students hosted a sit-in at a library and were arrested, in 1961, followed by student protests at Jackson State University. Then, the police infiltrated Jackson State campus with dogs, clubs, and tear gas. The students marched to the jail to protest that the Tougaloo students were being held there. Subsequently, the case was dismissed, and the students' jail sentences were suspended. Another sit-in was hosted in 1960 by Southern University students at a lunch counter and they were arrested. There was a sit-in at the bus station and at a drugstore the next day, followed by 3,500 protestors marching to the state capital. Soon after, in 1961, four thousand Southern University students picketed downtown stores and marched to the prison where they were met with beatings from police, were tear gassed, and were mauled by dogs (Favors, 2019). There was also a 3-hour sit-in at a Whites only Woolworth in 1963 where students were abused by rabid White supremacists, after which President Adam Beittel drove the protestors to safety (Williamson-Lott, 2008).

An attempt by South Carolina University (now South Carolina State University) students to desegregate a bowling alley in 1968 left three students dead and 34 injured by law enforcement. Called the Orangeburg Massacre, this led to a student march to downtown Greensboro, carrying a casket, followed by students throwing bricks and bottles at White drivers. The National Guard was called in to control the crowd. Soon thereafter, in 1969 North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University participated in mass jailings as a result of protesting police brutality, wealth disparities, inadequate health care, and indecent housing (Favors, 2019).

In the academic year from 1969-1970 nearly two thirds of college students were involved in over 9,000 protests (Williams, 2008). These overt forms of social activism were initially sparked within the HBCU environment where faculty members embedded in students the belief that they were deserving of dignity, respect, and the rights of full citizenship. Despite these more positive aspects of the movement, sexism also existed alongside the fight for racial justice.

According to Cole and Guy-Sheftall (2003), historically there has been much tension within the Black community when Black women were perceived to prioritize gender allegiance over racial solidarity. Still today, Black women's vantage points and interests are often ignored in the face of adversity. Black women are expected to show racial unity even at their own expense (Cole & Guy-Sheftall, 2003). According to hooks (1981), Black women's rights took a backseat to Black men's rights in the 20th century, through the Civil Rights Movement and into the 1960s. Black men declared publicly that Black women adhere to sexist gender roles and remain subservient (hooks, 1981). Contrary to these sentiments, addressing the needs and concerns of Black women is critical for a healthy academic system and a burgeoning society.

HBCUs and Black Women Faculty

Black women faculty and HBCUs are essential for the long-term success of higher education in the U.S. Frierson and Tate (2011) explained how although many critics question the relevance of HBCUs, HBCUs are progressive in fields like STEM. In engineering and science fields, HBCUs have graduated 20% of Black students across the country even though HBCUs only make up 3% of higher education institutions nationwide. Students who graduated from an HBCU are more likely to go on to obtain doctoral degrees (Frierson & Tate, 2011). It is important to note that HBCUs that focus on educating Black women students are especially

successful in graduating Black women who then go on to receive doctorates (Frierson & Tate, 2011).

A study conducted by Wolf-Wendel (1998) investigated institutions that granted bachelor's degrees and the subsequent post-baccalaureate success of their women graduates. Her findings pointed out the number of Black women who received a bachelor's degree who then went on to receive a doctoral degree or who were listed in the *Who's Who Among Black Americans*. Wolf-Wendel particularly noted which institutions were coeducational and which were same-sex institutions. She also acknowledged whether the institutions were PWIs or minority-serving institutions and whether the women graduates were African American, Latina, or European American.

According to Wolf-Wendel (1998), Black women's colleges outproduced White women's colleges, co-educational PWIs, and co-educational HBCUs in terms of Black women's post-baccalaureate success. In measuring the number of Black women graduates an institution produced, who were successful after receiving their bachelor's degree, Wolf-Wendel found all-women HBCUs produced 47 times more Black women graduates than co-educational PWIs, 6 times greater than co-educational HBCUs, and 10 times greater than all-women PWIs. This means an all-women HBCU environment creates the best circumstances for Black women student success (Wolf-Wendel, 1998).

Shared Governance

Shared governance in higher education refers to the participation of all parties in managing and organizing the institution (Davenport, 2015). Everyone from students, graduate assistants, support staff, part time/adjunct faculty, junior faculty, and tenured faculty have a

voice in shaping policy and in the decision-making process (Davenport, 2015; Minor, 2004). Faculty members require as much administrative disclosure as possible in all areas of governance in order for shared governance to be possible. Some shared responsibilities include characteristics of student life connected to the educational process, faculty status, research, method of instruction, subject matter, and the curriculum. However, according to Davenport, lack of shared governance at institutions which are primarily African American is a chief barrier to faculty development and advancement.

The decision-making process of leaders at HBCUs has traditionally been in a top-down, hierarchical structure and even described as authoritarian (Scott & Hines, 2014). With financial pressures looming and scarce human capital resources, presidents and chancellors have held a tight grip of control and power within the institution. Unfortunately, like many non-HBCU institutions also undergoing transformations, this has led to siloed-off divisions and departments whose main purpose is to maintain the status quo (Scott & Hines, 2014).

Negative media attention surrounding accreditation processes, academic quality, and financial instability have likely put a strain on relationships between administrators and faculty at HBCUs (Gasman, Baez, Drezner, Sedgwick, Tudico, & Schmid, 2007). This is exacerbated by the need for validation of personnel and disciplines, department audits, and the supervision of measured results (Scott & Hines, 2014).

In comparison to PWIs, HBCUs have chronically faced inadequate funding, which puts pressure on administrators to control budgets (Gasman et al., 2007). Across the board, HBCUs do not receive equitable funding compared to other types of institutions (Boland & Gasman, 2014). The Association for Public Land-Grant Universities found from 2010 to 2012, states failed to comply with the 100% match to public HBCU 1890 land-grant institutions. Extension

and research fees lacked nearly \$57 million in federal funding (Arnett, 2015). Predominantly White flagship institutions are provided double the state funding per student in some states, compared to Historically Black Institutions (Hodge-Clark, Daniels, & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2014). A general misunderstanding of HBCUs' mission and student needs has led to policymakers offering suggestions, which could potentially cause great harm to HBCUs and their students.

Federal and state policy proposals present disadvantages to HBCUs. Such policy proposals included temporary alterations to the federal Parent PLUS Loan Program, the threat of an unfair college rating system, modifications to the Pell Grant, and sequestration (Hodge-Clark et al., 2014). Policies in some states are threatening to close or merge HBCUs into other institutions (Hodge-Clark et al., 2014). These laws disproportionately affect HBCUs in favor of flagship universities and PWIs (Boland & Gasman, 2014).

Modifications to the 2011 Federal Parent PLUS Loan Program included regulations which made it harder for parents to be approved for loans at a fixed-rate, thereby hurting HBCU enrollment. Some HBCUs saw enrollment drops of 20%. In the 2012-2013 academic year, Howard University lost \$7 million in tuition revenue generated from the Parent PLUS Program (Hodge-Clark et al., 2014). Though these modifications were quickly undone, they caused measurable harm to HBCUs.

Concepts for rating systems often include traditional metrics for success, which miss the mark for the student needs and mission of HBCUs. Rating systems such as these do not account for HBCUs' student population consisting of predominantly minority, low-income, and first-generation students (Hodge-Clark et al., 2014). When the recession hit in 2008, this caused particular harm to low-income HBCU students. HBCUs rely more heavily on tuition revenue

and have smaller endowments compared to PWIs (Boland & Gasman, 2014). The combination of underprepared students, declining alumni donations, decreases in endowment funding, and reductions in state funding leave HBCUs in a predicament (Scott & Hines, 2014). HBCUs have tried to keep their tuition low so it is manageable for their students. Factors such as graduation rates along with limited resources are two variables in the proposed rating system, which would portray HBCUs in a negative light (Hodge-Clark et al., 2014). Such rating systems with no regard for the mission and values of HBCUs and the students and communities they were designed for serve to defame the character of HBCUs. The “rationale” for such rating systems is from a Eurocentric point of view and does not consider the needs of HBCU students. This way of thinking pervades academia to the detriment of HBCUs on a continual basis.

With the weight of such rating systems and in considering the long-term sustainability of HBCUs, collaborative leadership, a flat structure, and the participation of several members of the institution is encouraged. Faculty members should have autonomy and be treated as HBCU leaders (Scott & Hines, 2014). Faculty focus on mentoring students and racial uplift and generally have not traditionally focused on shared governance (Gasman et al., 2007). Additionally, the history of providing African Americans with an industrial education for immediate employment is unique when considering many PWIs have typically focused on the spread of knowledge for its own sake. Unfortunately, a disproportionate amount of HBCUs have been placed on the American Association of University Professors’ list of censured administrations because these administrations were deemed to disregard shared governance principles (Gasman et al., 2007). More recently there are only a few HBCUs on this list including: South University and Agricultural and Mechanical College in 2013, Bethune Cookman University in 2011, and Clark Atlanta University in 2010 (AAUP, 2019).

Chancellors, presidents, regents, and/or boards at HBCUs place emphasis on fiscal management since there is excessive pressure for funding and competition from PWIs in attracting students. Although institutions of higher education are being run more like a corporation, it is important to keep faculty at the center of decision making (Crawford, 2017). The corporate model strives to reduce labor costs through eliminating tenure and exploiting adjunct faculty (DeBoy, 2015). In this way faculty are less likely to pursue their rights or be engaged politically. In this model, highly paid administrators dominate and faculty are subservient. However, this is not appropriate in an academic environment. In order to advance the institution, there must be participation from various parties. Within higher education, the expertise of faculty must be leveraged (DeBoy, 2015). It is essential that the structure remain flat as opposed to hierarchical. Faculty members must be revered as researchers and teachers, as opposed to mere employees (Crawford, 2017). Honest feedback, critical thinking, freedom of expression, and open communication are necessary for the institution to thrive (DeBoy, 2015).

Faculty senates at most institutions of higher education are the highest legislative body to advise the president on internal policy, academic, and other concerns (Davenport, 2015). The senate's recommendations represent the consensus of faculty members on topics such as promotion, tenure, economic policy changes, layoffs, restructuring, and other major policy changes. The faculty senate is also involved in institution-wide academic policies and standards. These include grading policies, the reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs, policies for retention, admission, and recruitment of students, degree-granting requirements, curricular structure, and curriculum policy. However, the board of trustees and campus administrators are known to overrule faculty senates at HBCUs (Davenport, 2015). In public senates, Black faculty may find it taboo to openly challenge presidents and

boards. Black faculty may be concerned about how it would be perceived because of existing stereotypes about Black people and the hypervisibility of the race (Gasman et al., 2007). The history of HBCUs being funded by powerful White stakeholders puts them in a precarious position where some perceive autocratic leadership to help strengthen chances for survival (DeBoy, 2015).

Collective bargaining is another powerful tool used in shared governance structures (Davenport, 2015). Collective bargaining conveys equal legal power to administrators and faculty unions in negotiating workload, benefits, salary, and terms of employment. Collective bargaining contracts create a structure for shared governance and faculty involvement within an institution. Conversely, behaviors and attitudes of administrators and board of regents at HBCUs typically do not reflect a desire to negotiate with faculty on equal footing to produce such a legally binding agreement. It is rare to find collective bargaining agreements at HBCUs. A 2014 phone survey found 21% of HBCUs had collective bargaining agreements or employment contracts with faculty. Similarly, only 15% of HBCUs had a faculty union or professional association (Davenport, 2015). At some HBCUs with collective bargaining agreements, administrators will deny updated agreements, reject requests for additional funding, and neglect to attend meetings to discuss collective bargaining agreements (Davenport, 2015).

Faculty Challenges in Higher Education

A plethora of research has been conducted at PWIs with grim findings regarding the experiences of Black women faculty. For instance, de facto segregation exists in higher education based on race and gender in terms of institution type, academic fields, and faculty rank (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Black women faculty are disproportionately employed in less prestigious, public, two-year institutions rather than private, elite, four-year institutions.

Black women faculty have also been filtered into disciplines of lesser academic levels (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Black women faculty are often unable to rise to higher ranks in academia and are denied promotions, in addition to psychological costs and health concerns associated with racial microaggressions (Holder & Nadal, 2016). The notion that higher education offers equal opportunities based on meritocracy is struck down when considering Black women faculty have access to fewer resources in their job roles and have less social mobility than their White, male counterparts (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

According to Henry and Glenn (2009), institutions of higher education fail both structurally and culturally to recognize or value what Black women faculty have to offer. Black women faculty are shunned by supervisors and colleagues alike, being deemed unqualified and even being sexually harassed (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Compared to Whites, Blacks earn less in salary, obtain less prestigious roles, and are less likely to be employed in higher education (Dickens, 2014).

Black women faculty are most commonly seen in the non-tenure track ranks of instructor and lecturer, and these disparities have lingered for decades. Table 3 indicates higher percentages of women than men at ranks of instructor and lecturer for almost all races (NCES, 2017b). Black women faculty are often seen working in undervalued fields such as women's studies, ethnic studies, the humanities, the social sciences, and education, where resources are scarce. They may strive for social justice through research and giving back in the form of service to socioeconomically and politically subjugated communities (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

While NCES provides current data on the salary information of non-medical men and women faculty, the most recent data representing Black women is from 2009. Data submission for the Fall of 2010 was optional, according to NCES, and was therefore not used. The College and University Professional Association (CUPA, 2019) is an organization for human resources professionals in higher education that gathers faculty salary information. CUPA's (2018) faculty survey grouped women of color into one category and indicates women of color make approximately 85 cents to White men's dollar. Unfortunately, it does not specify this information for Black women. However, the NCES (2009) data in Table 8 indicate higher percentages of Black women faculty at lower salary levels:

Table 8

Faculty Salary by Race and Gender

Salary range	Black women faculty	Black men faculty	White women faculty	White men faculty
\$10,000–\$24,999	17.3%	6.7%	16.6%	12.8%
\$25,000–\$39,999	20%	14.9%	21.3%	10.6%
\$40,000–\$54,999	20%	13.8%	18.3%	12.5%
\$55,000–\$69,999	13.5%	15.9%	15.2%	14.4%
\$70,000–\$84,999	9.2%	14.9%	11.6%	16.5%
\$85,000–\$99,999	8.1%	19.5%	8.8%	18.3%
\$100,000 +	8.6%	12.3%	6.5%	19.8%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2009).

Institutions of higher education have been unsuccessful in advancing the careers of Black women faculty (Danley et al., 2009; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Issues arise in areas such as hiring practices, networking, mentoring, and valuation of research. Some illustrations of career impeding occurrences for Black women faculty include being isolated, ignored, alienated, sexually harassed, verbally abused, denied funding for diversity programming, and other budget constraints (Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

Black women faculty face racism and sexism in institutional hiring practices (Holmes et al., 2001). PWIs have attempted to hire Black women faculty but claim there are not enough qualified candidates (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014). While acknowledging that there are low numbers of Black women faculty candidates, it is ironic that the leaders determining the required qualifications are the same ones stating Black women do not meet said qualifications (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014). It seems there is an inherent bias in terms of hiring standards and practices.

Pabon Lopez and Johnson (2014) discussed a collection of essays detailing the experiences women of color in higher education. They explained how achievement of diversity goals such as hiring more Black women faculty, go unrewarded. Deans who strive to reach this goal do not receive concrete rewards from university leaders (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014). There is also a stigma attached to targeting a Black woman to hire as a faculty member. The misconception is that she is not as qualified as her White counterparts because the focus is less on expertise, knowledge, and skills, and more so on race (Holmes et al., 2001). Danley et al. (2009) stated the lack of opportunities for Black women faculty's career advancement is so severe that it threatens the very survival of the Black professoriate.

Henry and Glenn (2009) found that it is essential for Black women faculty to connect with other Black women so they may thrive professionally. However, there are so few Black women employed as faculty members that this recommendation is difficult to implement. Having a Black woman mentor is also important for Black women faculty to advance in their careers (Henry & Glenn, 2009). New Black women faculty members may strongly prefer a mentor of their own race. However, it is highly unlikely at PWIs because there are such low numbers of non-White faculty (Holmes et al., 2007).

Unfortunately, there is a lack of Black women present to form bonds to support their career advancement. Some may argue Black women faculty should seek mentors who are not Black women (Henry & Glenn, 2009). While some Black women faculty members may benefit from such a relationship, many others' requests for cross-racial and cross-gender mentoring are rejected by senior faculty or end in unfavorable results (Henry & Glenn, 2009). Most senior faculty members prefer to mentor a junior faculty member who is of the same race and gender, limiting mentoring opportunities for Black women faculty (Lloyd-Jones, 2014).

Alfred (2001b) investigated five, tenured, Black women faculty's professional development histories at PWIs. Alfred (2001b) found it is common practice for White professionals in academia to ignore the voices of Black women faculty. It is a particular challenge for the dominant group to see past race and gender and listen to what Black women faculty are saying. The combination of their race and gender make Black women faculty invisible (Alfred, 2001b). The feeling of invisibility is experienced in the lack of support for the research of Black women faculty (Henry & Glenn, 2009). Though not all Black women faculty focus their research on race issues, numerous Black women faculty do, contributing to important

scholarship on social justice issues, advocacy, and equity and giving a voice to groups that were historically marginalized (Lloyd-Jones, 2014).

Furthermore, in scenarios where faculty members must evaluate one another, White faculty may invalidate the appraisal of a Black woman faculty member of another Black woman faculty member (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014). A White colleague may deem the evaluation biased because they share the same background. Contrarily, this racial bias is not called to attention upon White faculty recommending another White faculty member (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014).

Alfred (2001b) went on to explain how White men and women in academia have preconceived notions about Black women faculty's forms of expression. Whites may assume Black women faculty will speak in a stereotypical way or "talk Black." With these assumptions and expectations, the dominant group fails to actually hear what Black women are articulating. White professionals may believe Black women faculty should only present issues of race regardless of their desire to research other topics (Alfred, 2001b). However, when Black women faculty do desire to research issues pertaining to people of color, they find a dearth of support (Henry & Glenn, 2009).

According to Parker (2004), traditional organizational structures in corporations and businesses are from a White, male perspective and too closely intertwine leadership ideals with managing others. PWIs recreate White ideals in their traditions, symbols, demographics, culture, and curriculum and are neutral about or devoid of racialized perspectives (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). The deeply rooted philosophy that White male norms are ideal is evident in higher education, which is reflected in the disproportionate number of White males who are tenured (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Higher education has adopted the fallacy that White

male concepts of knowledge, individuality, interpretation of truth, and perspectives of reality are the only correct way of understanding the world (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). In contrast, social constructionism focuses on an ongoing process of negotiation and communication of purpose and meaning. Social agreement is a cornerstone of social constructionism, in all facets of the institution (Bess & Dee, 2012).

Connections may be made between the culture seen in corporate organizations and higher education. Similarities are evident in how the structure is hierarchical and emphasizes authority instead of acknowledging relationships and identities as negotiable (Parker, 2004). From this view, leadership is individualistic, and communication is secondary instead of complex and continuous (Parker, 2004). Parker stated institutions focus on the narratives of men's lives in organizations, emphasizing detachment and controlling others.

The dominant group pervades higher education to such an extent as to exclude Black women from gaining their fair share of faculty roles (Danley et al., 2009; Henry & Glenn 2009). Superficial efforts to rectify this injustice are evident in the lack of rewards for undertaking serious diversity initiatives (Pabon Lopez & Johnson, 2014). Deficient access to adequate mentoring may be one of the most harmful factors to the career advancement of Black women faculty, given the evidence suggesting mentoring is strongly aligned with career mobility and success (Gregory, 2001; Holmes et al., 2007).

Social Inequalities

According to Andersen and Hill Collins (2013), Black women have less wealth than their male counterparts and White women due to institutional factors. The median wealth of married Black women with a bachelor's degree is \$45,000 while that of married White women is

\$260,000. Married Black women with children have an average wealth of \$16,000 while married White women with children have an average wealth of \$65,529. Furthermore, single Black women with children have \$0 wealth compared to White women at \$3,000. Single Black women aged 60 and over who have earned a bachelor's degree, on average, obtain \$11,000 in wealth compared to single White women with a bachelor's degree (in the same age range) whose average wealth is \$384,400 (Khaing, Bhattacharya, Price, Hamilton, & Darity, 2017)

Additionally, Black women are disproportionately challenged with debt and lack of assets. Black women experience the unique, unfortunate circumstances, based on the intersection of their race and gender, of a system that does not leverage their strengths or meet their needs (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013). One may argue it is difficult for Black women faculty to advance in their careers when confronted with a disproportionate amount of financial instability and a multitude of barriers to the accumulation of wealth.

The gender wage gap also poses issues for Black women. Black women made 64% of wages earned by White men for the same work. Regarding women's earnings compared to men of their same race/ethnicity, Black women earned 91% of what Black men earned for the same work (AAUW, 2018).

According to Andersen and Hill Collins (2013), gendered and racial disparities lie in various chances to accumulate wealth, including how fringe benefits, the tax code, and government benefits leave out Black women. Black women are disproportionately filtered into service occupations, which do not offer wealth-enhancing benefits such as health insurance, paid sick days, or retirement plans. Similarly, they are more likely to work part-time and therefore are ineligible for unemployment insurance (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013).

Since Black women are less likely than their White counterparts to own homes, they are less likely to reap returns from tax benefits like interest deductions on home mortgages (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013). When Black women do take out a home-loan, they are more likely to be hit by high costs from predatory lenders. Black women are also challenged with obtaining other means of retirement income, so they rely on Social Security more so than Whites do. They are less likely to obtain benefits as the spouse of high-income beneficiaries and receive lower benefits through Social Security due to lower earnings (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013).

According to Andersen and Hill Collins (2013), there is a prevalent misconception that racism in the form of housing discrimination, economic discrimination, and employment discrimination no longer exists. This is largely due to the media's depiction of Blacks being on an even playing field in terms of obtaining lucrative careers, having financial access to the same products as the dominant group, and living in harmony (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013).

Many incorrectly believe barriers to upward mobility no longer burden Black people (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013). On the contrary, this sense of false meritocracy hides the advantage of having White privilege and the institutional racism embedded in society. Race indeed shapes opportunities, including political, social, and economic control and mobility (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013; Brown & Freeman, 2004; Crenshaw et al., 1995). Such opportunities are blatantly reflected in a White, men-dominated higher education system where White men faculty are overwhelmingly seen at the highest faculty ranks, disproportionately enjoying the most control and career mobility out of all faculty members.

Legal issues are also interwoven into these social fabrics. According to Crenshaw et al. (1995), perceiving the Constitution as color-blind supports White supremacy and ignores the value of Black consciousness, culture, and community (Crenshaw et al., 1995). Brown and

Freeman (2004) stated since the Constitution fails to guarantee rights to women and Black people, it perpetuates social injustices. A study conducted by Best, Edelman, Krieger, and Eliason (2011) looked back at 35 years of litigation and found women of color to be the group who lost employment discrimination litigation the most. Furthermore, intersectional discrimination lawsuits were only half as likely to win, compared to single-base discrimination lawsuits. Equal Employment Opportunity laws do not recognize how employment practices maintain market-based discrimination, disregard structural discrimination, and posit discrimination as intentional (Best et al., 2011). The same harmful stereotypes used by employers are adopted by legal judges and juries. Furthermore, the law classifies demographic characteristics into one-dimensional classes (Best et al., 2011). For instance, sex discrimination litigation states all women are affected the same and equally by sex-based discrimination, and race discrimination law states all Black people are affected in the same way and equally by race-based discrimination. The prototypical case for each of these legal scenarios involves White women and Black men, respectively. However, Black women experience more than one axis of bias and therefore require more protection than the law acknowledges (Best et. al, 2011).

In essence, Supreme Court justices and those who insist differences of sex and race do not matter cause these issues to matter even more (Brown & Freeman, 2004). Brown and Freeman explained how being racially unaware is an imagined state of mind and that being conscious about race does not equate to prejudice. Through pretending to be color-blind, White policymakers not only free themselves of responsibility of reflecting on intentional or unintentional racism but also of opportunities for redress and social justice (Brown & Freeman, 2004).

Annamma, Jackson, and Morrison (2017) used the term “color-evasive” to more accurately describe the notorious misconception that race should not be considered in law, policy, education, or society. Essentially, to pretend race does not exist is to avoid addressing racial inequality, ignore historical facts, and promote White supremacy. Color-evasiveness holds norms of the dominant group as ideals and masquerades these attitudes as neutral and as the only natural way of being. Whites with these attitudes pretend to have no knowledge about race and subsequently are unaware of structural racism, which creates advantages for them (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). In a nation obsessed with race, it is truly impossible to be blind to color, and so those evading the issue are attempting to obliterate the experiences of people of color (Annamma et al., 2017).

Crenshaw et al. (1995) stated the legal system also neglects to acknowledge degrees of mixed race. Legally and socially, it is accepted that a person with one drop of blood from Black ancestry is considered to be racially Black (Crenshaw et al., 1995). According to Delgado (1995), along with measuring the width of the nose and determining the texture of one’s hair, legal authorities would historically determine race by whether one had a single ancestor of African descent. Such primitive perspectives on race have not changed much in modern times (Delgado, 1995).

According to Crenshaw et al. (1995), such perspectives support the notion that White racial purity exists. Racial subordination was partially built on this concept, which is still prevalent. Furthermore, race has been incorrectly deemed a scientific fact rather than a legal and social assertion. Pretending the American system of categorizing races is apolitical and objective completely disregards political and socioeconomic history. Race is a complex phenomenon that

transcends legal formalism. The law should address White privilege and consider racial dimensions in legislative decision-making (Crenshaw et al., 1995).

Outsiders Within

Black feminist intellectual, Patricia Hill Collins, coined the phrase “outsider within” to describe Black women intellectuals who are marginalized by the dominant group while having knowledge of White American culture (as cited in Holmes et al., 2007). According to Crenshaw et al. (1995), Black women intellectuals are not wholly accepted by the feminist community, the Black community, or the White community. Many Black women faculty find a need to balance their lives with the Black community while still fitting in with the dominant group in higher education.

Black women faculty’s familial upbringing may have to do with their development as leaders and with their career advancement (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). The support and strong guidance from family and extended family provides Black women faculty members with the confidence, resiliency, and independence to gain success and advance in their careers (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). According to Andersen and Hill Collins (2013), Black women are raised to be responsible in terms of working, being financially independent, and helping their families to survive economically. Black women are also encouraged by their families to be ambitious and assertive, which may often be misconstrued within academic environments as being “pushy” and “loud” (Andersen & Hill Collins, 2013).

According to Moses (1989), Black women graduate students who insist on gaining support or mentoring from a scholar in their academic department are often considered aggressive. Regarding the pipeline from doctoral programs to faculty ranks, Andersen and Hill

Collins (2013) stated it is common for the most assertive Black women students with high levels of poverty to be pushed out of academia or to leave. Although Black women attend college at higher rates than Black men, there has been a sharp increase in unequal educational attainment, specifically among women from different economic classes. Women from high-income families have made substantial gains in educational attainment compared to women from low-income families (Bailey & Dynarski, 2011).

According to Williams (2001) Black women faculty are treated as outsiders in their career advancement endeavors, as indicated by mainstream academic dialogue excluding their ideas. Similarly, Black women faculty are placed in an outsider's role when Black social and political theories are from Black men's perspectives, and feminist theories are controlled by White women. This ultimately leaves Black women faculty in a solitary position that can be detrimental to their career advancement (Williams, 2001). Black women faculty find it necessary to accept academic norms that are tied to notions of the inferiority of Black people and of women (Hill Collins, 2009).

Devaluation of Contributions

An additional, critical issue lies in the racist, sexist mainstream journal standards, which fail to consider scholarship on race and gender issues to be worthwhile, severely damaging the tenure and career advancement prospects of Black women faculty (Lloyd-Jones, 2014). The devaluation of Black women faculty's scholarship and cultural resources is embedded within academia. Epistemological racism exists within higher education when considering which scholarship is valued (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Mainstream research publications value White norms and view work outside of the scope of the dominant group as illegitimate.

Academia has elevated and validated White Eurocentric scholarship as superior to Black and other non-White contributions (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Women's studies journals and ethnic journals are seen as second class and inferior in rigor to mainstream journal outlets (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Contributions of knowledge about, by, and for Black women are deemed inherently biased. Black women faculty may be unsuccessful at publishing their work in mainstream journals and then subsequently penalized for publishing elsewhere (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Black women faculty may send their writing to specific journals to reach certain ethnic or racial communities, but White colleagues may not value these journals as much as mainstream ones (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). The dominant group's control over knowledge stifles the career advancement of Black women faculty. Their claim that higher education's system is an objective meritocracy is false (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

Unfortunately, mainstream journals only publish a small number of articles on the topic of race, making it challenging for Black women faculty to publish in a top-tier journal (Lloyd-Jones, 2014). In addition to this, colleagues do not value journals that focus on gender and race issues as much as they value mainstream journals. Publishing in non-mainstream journals may also likely diminish the rewards of tenure and promotion (Lloyd-Jones, 2014). In short, Black women faculty find their colleagues do not value their opinions (Henry & Glenn, 2009).

According to Delgado (1995), White, male scholars dominate the literary works about the Civil Rights Movement, citing one another and leaving out Black women scholars. These authors rarely cite or discuss in depth the writing of feminists or scholars of color. The concerns of feminists and critical race theorists are largely disregarded, and Black women are mistakenly deemed subjective. White, male scholars may desire to remain at the forefront of Civil Rights

scholarship for personal gratification, to have control, and to ensure systemic change does not occur (Delgado, 1995).

hooks (1981) explained how written works refer to White men by simply saying “men,” White women by stating “women,” and Black men by referring to Black people as a whole, completely leaving Black women out of the conversation. Daniels (2015) described one modern example in Sheryl Sandberg’s popular text *Lean In*, which speaks to women as a collective group when she is merely referring to those who work in corporations who are White, middle-class or upper-class, heterosexual, cisgender, women. Cole and Guy-Sheftall (2003) encouraged analytical frameworks of the Black community, which are centralized on gender and consideration of ways to reframe the concept of race loyalty to consider other gender identities besides men’s. However, there is still a lack of inclusive practices within the academic curriculum.

According to Moses (1989), the curriculum in institutions of higher education is void of scholarship from Black women. Currently, there are still critical problems in academia, including lack of racial inclusivity within the curriculum, increased support of race scholarship, and more supportive departmental climates (Romero, 2017). The issues of concern for Black women are often deemed peripheral in academic departments and programs. Black studies are typically from a Black male standpoint, and women’s studies are usually based on White women’s experiences (Moses, 1989). Sleeter (2005) stated society and the education system do not value knowledge and viewpoints other than that of the dominant group and have been regularly omitted from the mainstream. Many people believe the curriculum is diverse enough and it is not an important issue any longer. However, while there have been various ethnicities

included, there remains the same perspective across the curriculum, forming a sanitized point of view (Sleeter, 2005).

Racial Microaggressions

Racial microaggressions impede career advancement opportunities for Black women faculty (Hernandez et al., 2015). According to Constantine et al. (2008), Black women faculty experience racial microaggressions in the devaluation of their research, feelings of invisibility and hypervisibility, an unwelcoming environment from disrespectful students and colleagues who question their credentials, enormous expectations to participate in work that will not advance their careers, and inadequate mentoring (Constantine et al., 2008).

Higher education conceptualizes academic quality in ways that reinforce the interests of the dominant group (Constantine et al., 2008). Therefore, White colleagues do not respect the scholarship of Black women faculty, especially if the research is focused on communities of color (Constantine et al., 2008). Without acknowledgement of scholarly accomplishments, it is difficult to advance in an academic career. Black women faculty may end up feeling dissatisfied with their job and maintain minimal well-being (Holder & Nadal, 2016).

Black women faculty report feelings of betrayal, isolation, loneliness, and an overall chilly climate that pushes many of them to drop out of academic careers (Constantine et al., 2008). Those who do stay are pressured to take on initiatives for Black students, allotting less time for research, which is harmful to their career advancement. The stereotype of a Black woman as a maternal figure comes into play when mundane tasks such as program coordination are disproportionately pushed off onto Black women faculty (Constantine et al., 2008).

There are heavy expectations for Black women faculty to get involved with solving sociocultural controversies, educate Whites on multicultural issues, and serve in leadership roles to Black campus groups (Constantine et al., 2008). There is an incorrect assumption that Black faculty are experts in all things having to do with race and ethnicity. With so few Black women faculty in higher education, they become stretched very thin with these burdens. It is important to note that Black women faculty are not compensated accordingly for these extra activities (Constantine et al., 2008).

Racial microaggressions have been linked to decreased confidence, paranoia, depression, anxiety, high blood pressure, decreased productivity, absenteeism, and attrition (Holder & Nadal, 2016). Black women faculty may continuously push themselves to work harder in an effort to be respected by White colleagues. They may blame themselves, doubt their competence, become disillusioned, and experience emotional pain (Constantine et al., 2008).

Black women faculty may find they are invisible to White colleagues until an instance arises involving the topic of race, when they become hypervisible (Constantine et al., 2008). This may occur during a visit from an accrediting body or when the department wants to recruit a faculty member of color. Black women faculty may feel used or overexposed (Constantine et al., 2008). Another instance of hypervisibility is when Black women faculty are often made to feel uncomfortable and insecure about the clothes they choose to wear and the manner in which they prefer to style their hair. Extra thought and consideration is exerted to appear less Afrocentric. Similarly, some Black women faculty may go to great strides to continuously perfect their grammar in their speech to avoid perpetuating stereotypes about Black people (Constantine et al., 2008).

Black women faculty also have the negative experience of having their credentials questioned by both colleagues and students (Constantine et al., 2008). For instance, in the campus cafeteria someone may mistake a Black woman faculty member for a cafeteria employee, or, a student in the department may think a Black woman faculty member is a secretary and then ask her to make copies (Constantine et al., 2008). At times Black women faculty may be unsure if the discrimination they are facing is in reaction to their race, gender, or a combination of these and several other factors. Black women faculty members who are asked to serve as department chairs may find their colleagues do not trust their judgment, challenge their decisions, and are indirect when confronting issues (Constantine et al., 2008).

Black women faculty do not receive adequate mentoring in higher education, which hurts their career advancement (Constantine et al., 2008). Black women faculty may sense White, senior faculty members are uncomfortable in their presence, and the latter may negatively stereotype or underestimate their capabilities (Holder & Nadal, 2016). White, senior faculty may be reluctant to share their influence and social capital, which is vital to advancing the careers of Black women faculty. Even if a Black woman faculty member has outstanding publications, she still needs access to informal networks where critical information is divulged and working relationships are refined (Holder & Nadal, 2016). Senior faculty of color may feel threatened if they perceive a junior Black woman faculty member to be gaining too much success (Constantine et al., 2008). The pressure placed on Black women faculty to be model citizens can cause much mental anxiety at representing their entire race (Holder & Nadel, 2016).

Tenure

One of the chief indicators of career advancement for faculty members in higher education is obtaining tenure. Being able to survive the 6 years it takes to gain tenure is a

tremendous determinant of which faculty members will stay or leave an institution or academia altogether (Gregory, 2001). Unfortunately, Black women faculty are disproportionately seen in non-tenure track ranks, which limits their career advancement, academic freedom, and job security. Those Black women faculty who do gain tenure-track roles may find they are repeatedly rejected for tenure by more than one institution (Gregory, 2001).

Moses (1989) stated the tenure process is similar to obtaining membership at an exclusive club, beset with subjectivity. Parker (2017) also noted how many institutions of higher education are guided by vague, subjective tenure processes that systematically discriminate against Black women because these policies are informal and open to interpretation. Prottas, Shea-Van Fossen, Cleaver, & Andreassi, (2017) found that women perceived the tenure process to be less just than men faculty did. Male bonding occurs in the professoriate where men faculty may discuss topics such as sports with one another. Men faculty may assume an air of authority regardless of their actual job title (Moses, 1989). Black women faculty become hypervisible, expected to do more service, and are assumed to want to do diversity work, none of which add to the prospect of achieving tenure. In addition, Black women faculty at PWIs often feel utterly alone (León & Thomas, 2016). Though men faculty may intellectually comprehend issues of sexism or racism, operationally they are often unable to acknowledge and consider such issues as they relate to themselves (Moses, 1989). Even though both Black and White women faculty are expected to keep quiet, White women faculty may be able to enact the role of the “good daughter” with White men faculty, while Black women faculty do not have the same option (Moses, 1989).

Women faculty of color may utilize the strategy of keeping White faculty who decide their tenure status even closer than friends or enemies (Marbley, Wong, Santos-Hatchett, Pratt, & Jaddo, 2011). The tenure process is guided by seemingly objective, unexamined assumptions

that are actually biased in favor of Eurocentric epistemology (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). White men on the tenure track are more likely to view their academic environments as supportive, compared to women faculty and faculty of color (Lawrence, Celis, & Ott, 2014). The notion that the merit system works based on individual effort, regardless of race or gender, to give everyone what they deserve is incorrect. For instance, when a faculty member publishes in an ethnic studies or women's studies journal it holds less value than if they publish in a mainstream journal and may even count against them in the tenure review process. Furthermore, biased student evaluations of courses involving ethnic or gender issues may also count as a strike against faculty members during the tenure review process (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Black women faculty members may find the tenure process to be unfairly weighed, unrealistic, inappropriate, and ambiguous (Gregory, 2001). Furthermore, when reviewing the work of Black women faculty, their research may seem exceedingly controversial, and their community service may appear too political in the eyes of White colleagues (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

White colleagues may neglect to respect the quality of Black women faculty's research because they are overly focused on which journal the work is published in (Gregory, 2001). White faculty members may also consider the scholarship of Black women faculty as less important if it is regarding the voices and experiences of Black people (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). Often times, the dominant group fails to value research regarding the Black community, does not consider it scholarly work, is unable to see the significant contributions of knowledge to higher education, and fails to understand how these experiences are relevant to academic fields (Gregory, 2001).

According to Moses (1989), Black women faculty are at a disadvantage in gaining tenure because they are bogged down by additional responsibilities. Black women faculty are expected to take on mundane tasks, to serve on committees as a representative for the Black population, to handle tense or sensitive situations involving race, and to counsel Black students (Moses, 1989). Black women faculty tend to do more committee work, advise more students, and do more teaching than their White, male colleagues. Black faculty are held responsible for managing any and all diversity-related initiatives and policies while maneuvering these efforts around the fragility and animosity of their White colleagues (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). An entire academic department is responsible for mentoring students, serving on committees, advising students, teaching undergraduates, and other duties that do not aid in achieving tenure (Gregory, 2001). Though Black women faculty are often caring, creative, devoted to serving the campus, to serving the community, and to quality teaching, these factors are not rewarded by tenure or promotion (Gregory, 2001).

At PWIs White people generally assume Black faculty will mentor Black students (Holmes et al., 2007). There is a fallacy that one monolithic Black culture exists and that Black faculty should take the full responsibility of counseling Black students. While the cultural similarities outweigh the differences, and it is critical for Black students to have access to Black mentors, Black women faculty should not have to singlehandedly manage the needs of the entire Black student population (Holmes et al., 2007).

According to Watkins (2018), although extremely important for students and often intrinsically rewarding for faculty, othermothering can become draining on faculty members and can detract from their research activities. Othermothering can result in positive reflections on faculty members when students succeed, and these relationships are even described by some

faculty members as the highlight of their career. However, career advancement can be stunted if there is not a balance between othermothering, research, teaching, and service. There can be a shortage of time to manage administrative tasks and student responsibilities, along with research projects (Watkins, 2018).

Navigating Academia

Alfred (2001a) stated Black women faculty successfully navigate academia through defining themselves, fluidity in their life structure, the power of knowledge, voice, and visibility. Fluidity in life structure allows Black women faculty to play integral roles within various settings (Alfred, 2001a). Black women faculty can take advantage of active participation with both the Black community and within academia, among other areas of their choosing (Alfred, 2001a). In fact, when Black women faculty are able to make arrangements for household obligations such as cleaning and childcare, they may achieve great professional success from serving in multiple roles (Gregory, 2001). These roles demonstrate fluidity of life structure and include mother, wife, community advocate, advisor, colleague, teacher, committee member, and published researcher. The key components are when Black women faculty are able to cope, adapt, and arrange their lives with the support of their children, spouses, department heads, and other colleagues and family members (Gregory, 2001).

Black women faculty may use marginalization as a strategy and reject marginalization as negative. According to Alfred (2001a), Black women faculty may even view marginalization as a benefit because it allows them to navigate between several different worlds. Alfred (2001a) stated Black women faculty have access to closely observe the mannerisms of the dominant group to subsequently form ways to cope with oppression. However, they are not obligated to commit to or identify with White culture. Black women faculty may choose to perceive

marginality as an advantage where they can take pride in Black culture while knowing the behaviors of the oppressor to form survival skills (Alfred, 2001a). Hernandez et al. (2015) stated marginality is a platform for direct action and advocacy where Black women faculty can make improvements to their institutions in small yet significant ways. There are resources and rewards available including exposure to different experiences, assistance in learning new skillsets, access to information, and expanded opportunities that can engender a sense of richness to one's life (Bell, 1990).

From the perspective of marginalization as a strategy, Alfred (2001a) explained how bicultural competence offers the opportunity to navigate different cultures without constraints. Having bicultural competence means maintaining an adaptable, active life structure that molds relationships, mobility, and interactions between and within two cultural settings (Bell, 1990). Black women faculty may choose to organize their lives in this way, preserving their Black heritage without assimilating completely into the dominant group (Bell, 1990). Bicultural competence allows Black women faculty to fluctuate from the White world at work to the Black community, enacting different roles and accepting two cultures (Bell, 1990). Black women faculty who have a strong sense of self and have developed cultural pride may choose to navigate their careers with this mindset (Alfred, 2001a). It is important to note that while Black women faculty may watch and observe the demeanor of the dominant group, they do not have to emulate it (Alfred, 2001a).

According to Patitu and Hinton (2003), many Black women faculty view themselves as fighters rather than victims. Some strategies used to facilitate career advancement include religious faith and spiritual development, family and other support networks, retreating, and working harder and smarter (Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Alfred's (2001b) qualitative

study examined the experiences of 5 tenured Black women at PWIs. Patitu and Hinton (2003) also interviewed 5 Black women faculty members who expressed similar findings. Jarmon (2001) described the need to work 14- to 16-hour days in order for Black women faculty to meet the high demands placed upon them. Effectively navigating academia may mean constantly working.

With pressure to do more work in order to be deemed equal, many Black women faculty work harder than their White colleagues (Alfred, 2001b; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Research participants noted their White men counterparts were not required to conduct research in the same amount (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Research participants in Alfred's (2001b) study noted a common understanding among Black women that they must be better at their jobs than their White colleagues in order to be perceived as equal to them.

Additionally, having flexible strategies is important (Jarmon, 2001). When striving to establish expertise and experience to receive funding for research, Black women faculty may find conducting seminars, trainings, workshops, and symposia related to their research helps familiarize funding agencies with their work, making them more likely to receive grant opportunities (Jarmon, 2001).

For support, Black women faculty may seek colleagues outside of their institution to publish with when internal colleagues do not approach them to co-author (Jarmon, 2001). For Black women faculty to be successful, they may also seek support through social networks and professional associations (Gregory, 2001). In addition to professional support, personal support is also important.

Support from family and with household chores are also powerful strategies to help Black women faculty navigate academia. Several Black women who have advanced in their careers rely on household support for cleaning and childcare (Gregory, 2001). Unmarried Black women faculty may find friends and parents as their cornerstone for support (Gregory, 2001). Married Black women faculty with children often identify their children and spouses as their foundation for support. Other interpersonal support networks include mentors and relatives (Gregory, 2001). Though women may find spousal support to be related to career success, women perceive less spousal support than men in this regard (Ocampo, Restubog, Liwag, Wang, & Petelczyc, 2018). Importantly, there is a lack of research that speaks specially to Black women or Black women faculty and how marital status relates to career advancement in higher education.

According to Alfred (2001b), some Black women faculty successfully navigate their careers in academia by knowing everything they can about how things are run, including any unwritten rules, who the decision makers are, who has sway in the department, and where the bureaucracy lies (Alfred, 2001b). Mentoring is a chief way Black women faculty learn the ins and outs of their institution and department (Holmes et al., 2007). This aids them in meeting the expectations of the institution. Being familiar with the culture of specific disciplines also boosts career advancement for Black women faculty. Some Black women decide to do this by forming relationships with colleagues chiefly based on similar research interests (Alfred, 2001b).

According to Alfred (2001b), there are also Black women faculty who rely on knowing the “rules of the game” to advance in their careers. In terms of acceptable cultural behaviors, personal characteristics, values, and attitudes, these Black women faculty members abide by the unwritten guidelines in order to succeed, regardless of whether or not they agree with these rules or like them (Alfred, 2001b).

Moses (1989) stated mentoring and sponsorship are foundations of faculty career advancement. Mentoring is usually important in the early career stages and sponsorship in later stages of the faculty member's career. Sponsorship may include promotion of scholarship, access to publishers, assistance in obtaining research grants, and exposure to professional networks. Unfortunately, many Black women faculty report a lack of mentoring, support, and overall collegiality from their colleagues in academia. Therefore, they need to seek such support elsewhere (Moses, 1989).

Suggestions for Enhancement of Career Advancement

Hernandez et al. (2015) suggested Black women faculty work with each other and with other faculty of color to pool their resources. This way, if funds for conducting research or attending a conference are low, they can work together to get more done (Hernandez et al., 2015). Black women faculty can also use collaborative research projects to lead by example (Thandi Sule, 2011). Through working together, Black women faculty can gain more visibility than if they conduct research alone (Hernandez et al., 2015).

Hernandez et al. (2015) noted when Black women faculty work on projects such as collaborative autoethnographies with each other and with other faculty of color, they create a powerful bond of cultural and professional understanding. A collaborative autoethnography allows Black women faculty to share and interpret their stories to make connections with themselves and others (Hernandez et al., 2015). This forms a sense of community that helps them cope with the hardships of bureaucracy, complacency, and politics that come with the dominant culture in higher education (Hirt et al., 2008). This bond offers a safe space for Black women faculty to express themselves authentically (Hernandez et al., 2015; Williams, 2001).

The Black community provides a strong support for Black women faculty in order to heal slights caused by systemic racism in higher education (Hirt et al., 2008). Other forms of safe spaces include individual psyche, extended family, Black community organizations, and churches (Alfred, 2001a).

The University of Michigan developed a safe space at the Center for the Education of Women, called the Women of Color in the Academy Project (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). This organization served as a networking platform for Black women faculty members, helped to increase their career satisfaction, assisted them with career development in the academy, and supported their research initiatives (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). It also worked to emphasize the cultural and academic contributions Black women faculty make to society and to higher education (Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

Hernandez et al. (2015) suggested a safe space within higher education where women faculty of color meet regularly to brainstorm methods to take advantage of their marginalized position in academia and actively produce research. The meetings provide sustenance during the discord of bureaucracy, complacency, politics, and tenure review (Hernandez et al., 2015). This consistent interaction encourages professional growth in a supportive environment (Hernandez et al., 2015). It serves as a sanctuary where an outlet for authentic expression is offered, and women faculty of color gain an understanding of their various cultures (Hernandez et al., 2015).

Co-mentoring may be another solution for Black women faculty who do not have adequate access to networks (Holmes et al., 2007). Co-mentoring is an egalitarian system where several people contribute to mentoring one another (Holmes et al., 2007). Unlike traditional mentoring, co-mentoring is less hierarchical. One who has more experience than another is not viewed as having a higher rank. Co-mentors share knowledge with each other, empower one

another, and learn from each other. This would help Black women faculty become less isolated and develop supportive relationships in academia (Holmes et al., 2007).

Religious institutions are also important safe spaces for Black women faculty. According to Walker (2009), many Black women faculty turn to faith in God to cope with discrimination based on their race and gender. This is with the hope that strength may be gained, and appropriate responses may be revealed. For Black women faculty, the personal relationship with God can help in their career advancement while handling adversity (Walker, 2009). Churches, for instance, are a refuge where Black women can rebuild their self-image, which is susceptible to negative stereotypes by White colleagues (Alfred, 2001a). Many Black women who are successful attend church on a regular basis (Gregory, 2001). Religion provides them with encouragement, guidance, and strength, which boosts their perseverance in competitive and stressful academic climates (Gregory, 2001).

Faith can also motivate and empower Black women faculty in their struggle for justice. Walker (2009) stated the church is a place for Black women faculty to practice and learn leadership skills. They are placed in the center of religious organizations where they may gain emotional and spiritual energy. Religion may also assist Black women faculty in confronting and accepting realities in their career advancement (Walker, 2009). These realities invariably include sexism and racism.

Forsyth and Carter (2014) developed the Racism Related Coping Scale to assess how Black Americans cope with and resist racism. Though their study was not specific to Black women faculty, their findings are true for Black women faculty, being that they are Black Americans. Out of the domains tested, Empowered Action and Spiritual Coping were the most effective ways Black Americans dealt with racism. Empowered Action entailed Black women

faculty solving the problem on an institutional level and refraining from confronting individuals (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Empowered Action involved employing collective efforts, formal networks, and legal and community resources to address the circumstances and hold the organization accountable, along with those involved (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Spiritual Coping is defined in forms of prayer, meditation, and other divine practices. Spiritual Coping has to do with garnering empowerment, strength, encouragement, and support from religious books and institutions (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). These two domains relied on Black women faculty affirming their rights, keenly engaging the situation, harnessing resources, and spiritual practices and values (Forsyth & Carter, 2014).

Having effective coping strategies for dealing with racism boosts Black women faculty's success. Racism is shown to have an impact on stress levels, well-being, and sense of self (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Coping strategies are shown to reduce the negative psychological and physical results of racism on the health of Black women faculty (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Factors included under the domain, Empowered Action, included taking or threatening to take legal action, seeking legal counsel, telling her story in a public setting, making formal complaints, organizing demonstrations and boycotts, informing civil rights organizations and the media, insisting on speaking with greater authority figures, and acquiring the help of others (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). Factors included in the Spiritual Coping domain included praying, meditating, staying positive in the face of adversity, reading religious texts for guidance and strength, seeking guidance from the media, attending houses of worship more often, and relying on the belief in a higher power (Forsyth & Carter, 2014).

Conclusion

Theoretical frameworks of Black Feminist Theory and Intersectionality provide appropriate historical, legal, political, and social contexts for understanding the complex experiences of Black women faculty in higher education. Recognizing subconscious misconceptions and subliminal slights on the character and contributions of Black women faculty can help White faculty members change their damaging behaviors, however unintentional they may be. Long engrained racist and sexist publication practices may be more difficult to change but must advance toward more inclusive valuation of scholarly contributions. Similarly, tenure review practices profoundly need modification and are a potential area for legal ramifications. Despite the many injustices explored in the experiences of Black women faculty, there are equally as many interesting navigational strategies implemented by Black women faculty to combat those injustices. Ultimately, it is most critical to remove as many barriers as possible in the way of Black women faculty, so they may take the lead in their career advancement, express their true experiences and needs, and be acknowledged and respected for their monumental contributions to higher education.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This chapter will explain how I used quantitative measures to investigate the factors associated with the career advancement of Black women faculty at HBCUs, with particular attention to the intersection of race and gender. This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What internal support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
2. What external support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
3. What institutional cultural factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
4. What are the differences in supports by academic discipline and faculty rank?

This study investigated the HBCUs with the highest percentages of tenured Black women faculty.

Sites

The sites of this study were 43 HBCUs with 25% or more of tenured faculty composed of Black women. The reason for this was to see what is working in terms of the career advancement of Black women faculty. Twenty-three out of these 45 institutions with 25% or more of tenured faculty composed of Black women are located in Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Table 9*HBCUs with the Highest Percentage of Tenured Black Women Faculty*

Institution name	Percentage Black women of all tenured faculty	Institution name	Percentage Black women of all tenured faculty
Interdenominational Theological Center	60%	Fisk University	29%
Southern University at Shreveport	57%	Texas Southern University	29%
Spelman College	51%	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	29%
Livingstone College	45%	Winston-Salem State University	29%
Johnson C Smith University	44%	Dillard University	29%
Bennett College	44%	Norfolk State University	28%
Oakwood University	37%	Southern University and A & M College	28%
Hampton University	35%	South Carolina State University	28%
Clinton College	33%	Langston University	28%
Shaw University	33%	Miles College	27%
Southwestern Christian College	33%	Wiley College	27%
Coppin State University	33%	Alcorn State University	26%
University of the District of Columbia	33%	Morris College	26%
Bowie State University	32%	Jackson State University	26%
Grambling State University	32%	Virginia Union University	26%
Virginia State University	32%	Morehouse College	25%
Alabama State University	32%	North Carolina Central University	25%
Stillman College	32%	Fort Valley State University	25%
Morehouse School of Medicine	32%	Le Moyne-Owen College	25%
Bethune-Cookman University	30%	Rust College	25%
Huston-Tillotson University	30%	Selma University	25%
		Voorhees College	25%
		Benedict College	25%
		Claflin University	25%

Note. Percentages reported for all U.S. institutions. Source: (NCES, 2017b).

I was unable to obtain approval through Coppin University or North Carolina Central University IRB. Therefore, any participants' responses from these institutions were deleted from my sample, and the remaining 43 institutions' participants' responses were analyzed.

According to NCES (2017b), these 45 HBCUs employ 2,306 Black women faculty who are tenured, on the tenure track, or not on the tenure track/no tenure system. My desired sample size was 10%, or a total of 230 respondents from all ranks. NCES (2017b) indicated there are approximately 942 total tenured Black women faculty within these 45 institutions. Keeping with the same desired sample size of 10%, I hoped to gain 94 tenured respondents.

Sampling

Participants were faculty members who self-identify as Black women. Participants whose names most closely appeared to be those of women's names were selected from institutions' websites. Any names that appeared to be either men's or women's names (i.e., "Courtney" and "Morgan") were also included. There were several names I had never heard of before and so I included these faculty members, as well. In the numerous instances where I was unsure of the gender, I included the faculty member in my email solicitation. Participants were recruited through e-mail blasts specifically asking for respondents who identified as Black women. I sent 4,243 e-mail solicitations asking faculty to participate in my survey. There were several names on institutions websites that I had never heard of before, and I was unsure if these names were women's or men's names. In order to avoid any guessing, I included all of them that I was uncertain about. One hundred nine of these e-mails bounced back for various reasons such as spam blockers within the institution that do not accept emails from external parties or the faculty member moving on to a different institution.

There was a 2.6% response rate where 109 Black women faculty members completed my survey. This included 28 non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, 37 tenure-track faculty, and 44 tenured faculty. Twenty-two faculty members consisted of those working in the discipline of medicine and health; 21 worked in education and 21 in the social sciences. Seventeen faculty members

were employed in the arts or other humanities discipline; 14 worked in business, 6 in computer science, mathematics, or statistics, and 6 in the natural sciences.

Research Design and Data Collection

A consent form was administered to research participants, along with information about the security of the Qualtrics electronic survey instrument. Survey questions targeting factors of career advancement were included. Questions investigated internal and external supports.

Theoretical frameworks of Intersectionality and BFT were the basis for choosing the factors. These theories encourage marginalized persons to seek support in the form of social activism to become empowered and drive change (Back & Solomos, 2000; Delgado, 1995; Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016; Taylor, Gillborn, & Ladson-Billings, 2009; Yosso, 2005). According to Yosso, CRT rejects a deficit perspective of Black women faculty and instead acknowledges and learns from their skills, knowledge, and abilities. Contrary to the plethora of research conducted at PWIs, which focuses on the challenges Black women face in conforming to the norms of the dominant group, this study was strengths based. My study took a non-deficit perspective and leveraged the strengths of Black women faculty and of HBCUs.

My study used survey research in the form of an electronic survey. Research shows there is a decreased chance of social desirability bias, and participants may answer more candidly with electronic surveys than with paper surveys or interviews (Booth-Kewley et al., 2007; Gnambs & Kaspar, 2015; Kurnik & Baumgartner, 2017). This is important for my study because of the sensitive nature of issues of race and gender.

Demographic Variables

One core theme presented by Black feminist intellectuals is the importance for Black women to self-define (Back & Solomos, 2000). Therefore, my survey included open-ended

questions asking how the research participant identifies in terms of race and gender. Due to historical stereotypes, Black women faculty are subjected to continuous attacks on their identity (Gregory, 2001). Back and Solomos stated self-definition creates a platform for Black women to resist oppression, express their experiences, label their history, shape who they are, and define their own realities.

Additionally, since career advancement for faculty members in higher education is largely evident in faculty rank, a survey question was included asking what the faculty member's current rank was. Faculty rank indicated whether or not the respondent is tenured, on the tenure-track, or NTT. Black women faculty have also been filtered into disciplines of lesser academic levels (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Therefore, a survey question asked which academic discipline the faculty member worked in.

Table 10

Demographic Variables and Faculty Status

Demographic variable	Survey question
Race/ethnicity	How do you identify in terms of race and ethnicity?
Gender	How do you identify in terms of gender?
Faculty status	Survey question
Rank	What is your current faculty rank?
Discipline	Which academic discipline do you currently work in?

Internal Support Variables

Same-Sex Institution

A survey question asked participants to specify whether the institution is all-women, all-men, or co-educational. All-women HBCUs are associated with the career advancement of Black women faculty (Wolf-Wendel, 1998). The top 10 U.S. institutions with over 40% of tenured faculty composed of Black women include both all-women's HBCUs: Spelman College and Bennett College (NCES, 2017b). Additionally, Morehouse College and Morehouse School of Medicine are all-male HBCUs with high percentages of tenured Black women faculty (25% and 32%, respectively; NCES, 2017b). Unfortunately, participation from faculty members at same-sex institutions was not enough to utilize for comparisons with co-educational institutions in my study.

Control

A survey question asked whether the institution is private or public. Upon comparing 21 HBCUs with 25% or more of all tenured faculty consisting of Black women faculty and 23 HBCUs with 16% or less of all tenured faculty consisting of Black women faculty, a *t* test was run determining a significant relationship in control. Private HBCUs have significantly higher percentages of tenured Black women faculty $t(41.41) = 2.52, p = .016$. Unfortunately, there was not enough participation from faculty members at private HBCUs to make comparisons with public HBCUs. For categorical variables (size and setting, state, enrollment, undergraduate instructional program, undergraduate profile, Carnegie basic classification, and religious affiliation), chi-square tests were used, yielding no significant results.

Safe Spaces

Survey questions asked how the research participant uses safe spaces and what safe spaces her institution provided. The respondent selected all the answer choices that applied to her. These included the Black community, her own psyche, extended family, religion/faith/spirituality, and group meetings for Black women and women of color. There was also an option “Something else” where the participant entered her own text in an open-ended response. Internal and external safe spaces are vital to career advancement for Black women faculty (Alfred, 2001a; Hernandez et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). The Black community provides a strong support for Black women faculty (Hirt et al., 2008). Other forms of safe spaces include individual psyche, extended family, Black community organizations, and churches (Alfred, 2001a).

Hernandez et al. (2015) suggested a safe space where women faculty of color meet regularly to actively produce research. This consistent interaction encourages professional growth in a supportive environment (Hernandez et al., 2015). It serves as a sanctuary where an outlet for authentic expression is offered, and women faculty of color gain an understanding of their various cultures (Hernandez et al., 2015).

Religion/Spirituality

Questions included topics of religious offerings by the institution and the use of faith by Black women faculty. Answer-choice options included praying, meditating, reading religious texts, attending a house of worship, relying on her beliefs in a higher power, the institution providing a prayer space, meditation space, time to read or reflect on her spirituality, and a house of worship on campus. Research participants were asked to select all the answer choices that

applied. There was an option stating religious factors do not support the faculty member with her career advancement. Another question asked which religious/spiritual supports her institution provided (if any). Relying on religion helps Black women faculty in their career advancement (Forsyth & Carter, 2014; Gregory, 2001; Walker, 2009).

Religious institutions are important safe spaces for Black women faculty. According to Walker (2009), many Black women faculty turn to faith in God to cope with discrimination based on their race and gender. For Black women faculty, the personal relationship with God can help in their career advancement while handling adversity (Walker, 2009). Many Black women who are successful attend church on a regular basis (Gregory, 2001). Religion provides Black women faculty with encouragement, guidance, and strength, which boosts their perseverance in competitive and stressful academic climates (Gregory, 2001).

Faith can also motivate and empower Black women faculty in their struggle for justice. Walker (2009) stated the church is a place for Black women faculty to practice and learn leadership skills. Black women are placed in the center of religious organizations where they may gain emotional and spiritual energy. Religion may assist Black women faculty in confronting and accepting realities in their career advancement (Walker, 2009). Factors included praying, meditating, staying positive in the face of adversity, reading religious texts for guidance and strength, seeking guidance from the media, attending houses of worship more often, and relying on the belief in a higher power (Forsyth & Carter, 2014).

Shared Governance

Faculty members require as much administrative disclosure as viable in all areas of governance in order for shared governance to be possible. My survey included a multiple-choice

question regarding the participant's perception of the amount of administrative disclosure within the institution. Some shared responsibilities included characteristics of student life connected to the educational process, faculty status, research, method of instruction, subject matter, and the curriculum (Davenport, 2015). Survey questions asked the respondent to select all of the activities where shared decision making occurs at their institution. These included answer-choice options of characteristics of student life connected to the educational process, faculty status, research, method of instruction, subject matter, the curriculum, tenure and promotion, economic policy changes, layoffs and/or restructuring. The participant also had the option to select if they are involved with none of these activities.

Collective bargaining is another powerful tool used in shared governance structures (Davenport, 2015). Collective bargaining conveys equal, legal power to administrators and faculty unions in negotiating workload, benefits, salary, and terms of employment. My survey included a question about whether or not the institution partakes in collective bargaining.

Faculty senates at most institutions of higher education are the highest legislative body to advise the president on internal policy, academic, and other concerns (Davenport, 2015). The survey asked research participants if there is a faculty senate at their institution, their level of decision-making power, and involvement in which specific areas. The senate's recommendations represent the consensus of faculty members on topics such as promotion, tenure, economic policy changes, layoffs, restructuring, and other major policy changes. The faculty senate is also involved in institution-wide academic policies and standards. These include grading policies, the reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs, policies for retention, admission, and recruitment of students, degree-granting requirements, curricular structure, and curriculum policy (Davenport, 2015).

Table 11*Institutional Variables*

Institutional variable	Survey question
Same-Sex institution	The institution where I am employed as a faculty member is: co-educational, all women, or all men?
Control	The institution where I am employed as a faculty member is: public or private?
Safe spaces	What safe space(s), if any, does your institution provide that help you advance in your career?
Religion/Spirituality	What religious/spiritual support, if any, does the institution where you are employed provide that help support your career advancement?
Religion/Spirituality	(If faculty member uses religious factors) Which religious/spiritual support, if any, does the institution where you are employed provide that help support your career advancement (select all that apply)?
Shared governance	How would you rate the administrative disclosure within the institution where you are employed?
Shared governance	What are some areas of shared decision-making that faculty are involved with (select all that apply)?
Shared governance	Do you have a faculty senate?
Shared governance	Is the faculty senate involved with decision-making in any of the following areas (select all that apply)?
Shared governance	Do the faculty within your institution partake in collective bargaining?

Culture

Survey questions had a multiple-choice question (select all that apply) asking how institutional cultural factors empower faculty members to advance in their career. The respondent had the option to select that the institution's culture does not empower her to advance in her career. A constructive institutional culture that empowers employees has several aspects. This includes showing concern for others, being a part of decision making, openness, warmth, and friendliness. Additional attributes include encouraging accomplishments, the pursuit of excellence, support of personal development, appreciation, integrity, and independent thinking (Sparrowe, 1994).

Institutional culture and how well employees internalize the assumptions, values, and goals of that culture are also part of trust and empowerment (Culbert & McDonough, 1986; Sparrowe, 1994). When an employee identifies with their institution their trust increases (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). Information about the mission of the institution is critical for empowering employees. Mission information is important to give employees purpose and meaning and also allows them to align their decisions with the institution's goals (Spreitzer, 1995). A survey answer choice, which participants may select, indicated the respondent identifies with her institution's values, assumptions and goals.

According to Alfred (2001a), some Black women faculty successfully navigate their careers in academia by knowing everything they can about how things are run, including any unwritten rules, who the decision makers are, who has sway in the department, and where the bureaucracy lies (Alfred, 2001a). A multiple-choice survey question was included asking participants for various strategies they use including knowing the unwritten rules, help with household chores, working harder and smarter, and familial support. As indicated in my

literature review, working harder and smarter is a recurrent theme in extant research about the career advancement of Black women faculty in higher education (Alfred, 2001b; Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). As such, working harder and smarter was an important part of my survey questions.

Black women faculty can take advantage of active participation with both the Black community and within academia, among other areas of their choosing (Alfred, 2001a). The key components are when Black women faculty are able to cope, adapt, and arrange their lives with the support of their children, spouses, department heads, and other colleagues and family members (Gregory, 2001).

Mentoring

Additionally, questions looked at types of mentoring (formal and informal) and associated behaviors, including role modeling and socialization, which are all critical components of a fruitful career (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Davis et al., 2011; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Gregory, 2001; Johnson, 2001; Jones, 2013; Matchett & National Research Council, 2013; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Survey questions asked whether or not mentoring outside of, and within, the institution helps advance participants' careers. Participants were presented with multiple choice questions asking how, is applicable (and to select all that apply).

Questions targeting socialization, role modeling, and networking were also included because these formal and informal mentoring structures are associated with career advancement (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Davis et al., 2011; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Gregory, 2001; Holmes et al., 2007; Johnson, 2001; Lockwood, 2006). These multiple-choice questions asked participants to select all answer choices that apply to them.

Mentoring is a chief way Black women faculty learn the ins and outs of their institution and department (Holmes et al., 2007). Having a Black woman mentor is important for Black women faculty to advance in their careers (Henry & Glenn, 2009). According to Matchett and the National Research Council (2013), Black women are unable to get the mentoring they need because of disparities in faculty demographics. Co-mentoring may be another solution for Black women faculty who do not have adequate access to networks (Holmes, et al., 2007). Co-mentors share knowledge with each other, empower one another, and learn from each other. My survey asked participants if they have a Black woman mentor and if they have a mentor who is a woman of color. Since participants were permitted to select more than one option for my survey questions; it is possible that those participants who had a Black women mentor also selected that they have a mentor who is a woman of color (even if the mentor was a Black woman).

Questions also targeted individuals and groups who fulfil mentoring functions, including religious groups, professional organizations, family, and friends. Some strategies used to facilitate career advancement include religious faith and spiritual development, family, and other support networks (Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). For Black women faculty to be successful, they may also seek support through social networks and professional associations (Gregory, 2001).

Factors such as the opportunity to grow and learn, resources, support, and access to information help to empower employees. Informal organizational systems produce lines of power for employees. This is seen in alliances made through positive relationships with subordinates, peers, and superiors (Laschinger & Finegan, 2005).

Communication

Organizational trust is linked to information sharing and open communication (Laschinger & Finegan, 2005; Mishra, 1996; Sparrowe, 1994; Tyler & Kramer, 1996). Forthcoming, accurate communication, timely feedback, and adequate explanations are linked to trust at higher levels. Information about advancement opportunities, job performance, the methods behind evaluating employees, and promotion opportunities are important for leaders to effectively communicate (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). Performance information also ties into feelings of competence and being valued (Spreitzer, 1995). Organizational empowerment can be increased through using more devices for communication, communicating with more people, and making more information available (Spreitzer, 1995). My survey included multiple choice questions (select all that apply) asking respondents if and how communication plays a role in their career advancement and if and how the institution can improve communication.

Collaboration

Included in the survey questions were factors of collaboration, specifically with Black women. Research participants were asked if and how they use collaboration inside and outside of their institution. Respondents had the option of selecting they do not use collaboration to advance in their careers. Forming groups focused on collaboration helps Black women faculty cope (Hernandez et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008; Williams, 2001). Institutions that emphasize collaboration over competition and that engender extensive ways to form networks are more empowering (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). When employees recognize mutual conflicts such as financial need, they can diminish their fear of exploitation and join forces through collaborative support (Mishra, 1996).

Social Activism

The integration of Intersectionality and BFT encourages social activism, recognizing systemic structures as racist and sexist. Social activism is utilized by Black women faculty to resist political, social, and legal structures that disenfranchise Black women (Delgado, 1995; Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016; Taylor et al., 2009). Intersectionality states disenfranchised communities and individuals can become empowered through social activism (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016). Academic leaders should discard the myth of color-blind objectivity within academia and encourage social justice movements to fight for the rights of oppressed groups (Yosso, 2005).

Certain institutions promote and encourage resistance in the form of protesting and/or advocating for one's legal rights in various ways. The Social Activism factor takes into account on-campus and off-campus forms of legal support utilized by Black women faculty in their career advancement. A multiple-choice survey question (select all that apply) asked how the institution uses social activism to advance the participant's career with the option to select that the institution does not utilize social activism to advance her career. Similarly, an additional multiple-choice question asked how the participant advances her own career through the use of social activism, with the option of choosing that she does not use social activism to advance her career.

Social activism may be seen in collective efforts, formal networks, and legal and community resources that address the circumstances and hold the organization accountable, along with those involved (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). This includes taking or threatening to take legal action, seeking legal counsel, telling her story in a public setting, making formal complaints, organizing demonstrations and boycotts, informing civil rights organizations and the

media, insisting on speaking with greater authority figures, and acquiring the help of others (Forsyth & Carter, 2014).

Valuation

Survey questions also targeted the tenure process and participants' ideas being valued and respected. Sentiments of value and respect promote trust and empowerment (Culbert & McDonough, 1986; Spreitzer, 1995). Some empowering experiences include having successful role models to observe and strategies that include emotionally supportive work environments (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). My survey asked participants multiple-choice questions (select all that apply) about if and how their institution values them and their work and in what ways the institution can value participants' work more.

Table 12

Internal Support Variables

Internal support variable	Survey question
Mentoring	Within your institution, do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career?
Mentoring	Within your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?
Collaboration	How do you use collaboration within your institution to advance in your career (select all that apply)?
Valuation	In what ways does your institution or department support your career advancement through valuing your work (select all that apply)?
Valuation	In what ways could your institution or department value your work more (select all that apply)?

Table 13*Institutional Cultural Variables*

Institutional cultural variable	Survey question
Culture	How does your institution's culture empower you to advance in your career?
Communication	How does communication within your institution play a role in your career advancement (select all that apply)?
Communication	How can your institution improve communication to help in your career advancement (select all that apply)?
Social activism	How does your institution use social activism to advance your career (select all that apply)?

Table 14*External Support Variables*

External support variables	Survey question
Self	What kind of strategies do you use to advance in your career?
Safe spaces	What safe space(s), if any, do you use that help you advance in your career (select all that apply)?
Religion/spirituality	What religious/spiritual factors, if any, help support your career advancement (select all that apply)?
Interpersonal	Which internal and external parties support your career advancement?

External support variables	Survey question
Mentoring	Outside of your institution, do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career?
Mentoring	Outside of your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?
Social activism	How do you use social activism to advance your career (select all that apply)?
Collaboration	How do you use collaboration outside of your institution to advance in your career (select all that apply)?
Empowerment	Empowerment is when an employee feels a sense of self-importance, physical energy, and emotional vitality. In what ways do you feel empowered to advance in your career (select all that apply)?

Data Analysis

Recorded responses from Qualtrics were transferred to SPSS (Version 25). I used descriptive statistics, crosstabs, *t* tests, and chi-square tests to analyze my data. I investigated how religion, social activism, safe spaces, and mentoring relationships are used by Black women faculty to advance in their careers. I analyzed responses from NTT faculty, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty separately and compared the groups to each other. The experiences of faculty members from different faculty ranks is likely different. The tenure process should have an impact on faculty members' responses because the tenure process has a paramount relationship to whether the faculty members have benefits, the faculty members' salary, job security, status, and other important factors related to their livelihood. Also, NTT faculty may have different responses since their employment status could differ greatly. Adjunct faculty,

instructors, lecturers, and other NTT faculty were grouped together since their numbers accumulated to too few alone, and since these faculty members are not on the tenure track. Associate professors and full professors were grouped together, as well, since their numbers also accumulated to too few alone, and since these faculty members are all tenured. Participants were not required to answer every question to submit the survey, so some participants left questions blank.

I also analyzed responses based on the following disciplines: business, education, medicine and health, the social sciences, and the arts or humanities. Different academic disciplines have varying cultures and behavioral norms within their respective departments (Alfred, 2001a). Therefore, the experiences and responses of faculty members are likely to be different depending on their discipline. Regarding discipline, responses from faculty members in computer science, mathematics, or statistics and the natural sciences accumulated to very few and were therefore omitted when sorting the data by discipline. There were only six participants in computer, science, mathematics, or statistics, and six in the natural sciences.

Trust and Credibility

Since my study focused on issues of race, it was important to check my bias on a regular basis. I consulted with numerous faculty members on and off campus, administrators on and off campus, students in my program, and the dean within my academic department. It was imperative for me to keep an open dialogue with my committee and other scholars who assisted me with this. I met with my mentor and another esteemed faculty member on a weekly basis and communicated with my committee regularly. I also established rapport with participants through knowledge and respect and provided prompt response to e-mails and phone-call requests. I

spoke with two participants over the phone. I exchanged e-mails with over a dozen participants. Many were very supportive of my work.

Limitations

There were some limitations to this study. Subgroups of Black women have different experiences, which may not always be generalized as a collective experience. Although the self-identification question was left open-ended, there was not enough participation from Black Latinas or other specific groups to make valid analyses. Furthermore, this study did not investigate experiences of gender variations or the LGBTQIA+ community because there were no participants who self-identified as LGBTQIA+. In addition, the survey did not capture the ages of the participants. It is not safe to assume that NTT faculty are younger than tenured faculty, for instance, although that may very well be the case. Since Black women faculty are disproportionately filtered into lesser academic ranks, there could be older faculty members serving as NTT faculty. While it may be true that tenured faculty are older, and some intellectuals may argue are more likely to be married than tenure-track faculty, other scholars would disagree. Considering this population has largely gone unstudied, what is true for other groups of faculty might not necessarily be true for Black women faculty. Therefore, without asking participants, it is difficult to tell their age and is thus a limitation of my study.

Chapter 4

Findings

Many research studies have focused on PWIs and the struggles Black women faculty have in conforming to the norms of the dominant group (Henry & Glenn, 2009; Hernandez et al., 2015; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Myers, 2002; Thandi Sule, 2011; Williams, 2001; Wright & Dinkha, 2009). The need to focus on institutions other than PWIs is addressed in my research study, which highlights Black women faculty at HBCUs. Instead of looking at the challenges faced by Black women faculty, I created my study around the supports that help Black women faculty advance in their careers at HBCUs.

These supports come from numerous areas internally and externally. Black women faculty may find mentors within their institution or outside of it, religious support within their institution or outside of it, support from colleagues who work with them or from colleagues who work somewhere else. These are just a few examples of the internal and external supports. There are also cultural supports inside of HBCUs, which I investigate in my study, some of which include HBCUs as a source of Black cultural heritage, community uplift, and issues of shared governance.

Strategies

The beginning of my survey started off with demographic questions and broad themes of support both internally and externally. Open-ended questions were asked about how the participant self-identified in terms of race and ethnicity and in terms of their gender. The majority of respondents wrote in for race or ethnicity that they were African American or Black. As stated previously, while there were six participants who identified as Cuban, Afro-Latina,

Hispanic, or mixed ethnicity, this number accumulated to too few. Whether or not the participants who identified as Black or African American were Caribbean, Nigerian, or any other specific ethnicity is unclear. It is possible that participants could have written in that they are Black when they are also Caribbean, for example, but chose not to write this specific ethnicity. Similarly, for example, a Nigerian American faculty member could have written in that they were African American. Furthermore, there was no variation in how participants identified in terms of their gender. All the participants identified as women, female, or cisgender.

The questions were narrowed down more specifically in theme as the survey progressed. All non-tenure track faculty (instructors, adjuncts, and lecturers) were grouped together since their numbers accumulated to too few alone, and all tenured faculty (associate and full) were grouped together for this same reason. Participants were not required to answer every question to submit the survey, so some participants left questions blank. Responses from faculty members in computer science, mathematics, or statistics and the natural sciences were deleted because they accumulated to very few.

Support strategies were an important part of my survey. Participants were first asked, “What kind of strategies do you use to advance in your career (select all that apply)?” Answer-choice options included collaborating with colleagues, religion, mentors, family, networks, retreats, working harder and smarter, knowing the unwritten rules, getting help with household chores, something else, or they do not use strategies to advance in their career.

Tables 15 and 16 show collaborating with colleagues was overwhelmingly selected by faculty members from all disciplines and ranks. Results showed that 85.7% of NTT faculty, 94.6% of tenure-track faculty, and 88.6% of tenured faculty selected “Collaborating with colleagues.” Moreover, 85.7% of business faculty, 85.7% of education faculty, 95.5% of

medicine and health faculty, 100.0% of social sciences faculty, and 82.4% of arts and humanities faculty selected this answer choice. Evidently, collaboration is a huge support used by Black women faculty at HBCUs to advance in their careers.

“Support from networks” was selected frequently by faculty in business (71.4%), social sciences (90.5%), and the arts or humanities (82.4%) disciplines. Working harder and smarter also was a very common answer for faculty members in business, medicine and health, social sciences, and arts or humanities disciplines.

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to select response option “Learning or knowing the unwritten rules” than NTT faculty. I conducted t tests to investigate any significant difference by discipline and rank. When comparing tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty, “Learning or knowing the unwritten rules,” $t(63) = -2.54, p = .014$, was significant; 42.9% of NTT faculty selected this response while 73% of tenure-track faculty did. It may be the demands on the tenure track which lead tenure-track faculty to seek support by learning or relying on their knowledge of unofficial guidelines, while NTT faculty find this support less useful to their career advancement or perhaps are not particularly looking for career advancement. Something else, $t(63) = -2.06, p = .044$, was also significant. Zero percent of NTT faculty selected this answer choice, while 13.5% of tenure-track faculty did. This leaves a lot to ponder and requires future qualitative studies to investigate what that something else could be for tenure-track faculty members.

Tenured faculty selected answer choice “Going on retreats” more often than NTT faculty did. When comparing NTT and tenured faculty, “Going on retreats,” $t(70) = 2.07, p = .042$, was significant; 14.3% of NTT faculty selected this response while 36.4% of tenured faculty did. It is unclear whether or not having the option to go on retreats is more available to tenured faculty

and if this is why they selected this answer choice significantly more often. Most likely, the lack of support and poor working conditions for NTT faculty members across the board in higher education has something to do with this. These conditions include lack of office space, no job security, low compensation, no medical insurance coverage, and lack of professional development (Maxey & Kezar, 2015). When comparing tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty, no strategies in this question were significant.

Social science faculty were more likely to collaborate with colleagues, although all disciplines showed high responses to this answer choice. When I ran a chi-square test by discipline, collaborating with colleagues produced significant results (the p value for significance was .001); 85.7% of business faculty, 85.7% of education faculty, 95.5% of medicine and health faculty, 100.0% of social science faculty, and 82.4% of arts or humanities faculty selected this response.

Social science faculty were also more likely to seek mentors. Response option “Seeking mentors” produced significant results (the p value for significance was .030); 35.7% of business faculty, 57.1% of education faculty, 77.3% of medicine and health faculty, 85.7% of social science faculty, and 76.5% of arts and humanities faculty selected this response. Furthermore, 71.4% of NTT, 78.4% of tenure-track, and 59.1% of tenured faculty selected this response option.

There were differences in networking support across disciplines. “Support from networks” yielded significant results, as well (the p value for significance was .011); 71.4% of business faculty, 42.9% of education faculty, 45.5% of medicine and health faculty, 90.5% of social science faculty, and 82.4% of arts and humanities faculty chose this response option. Fifty

percent of NTT faculty, 73.0% of tenure-track faculty, and 65.9% of tenured faculty chose this option.

Findings from my study showed collaboration as a major support. Support from networks and working harder and smarter were also frequently selected options in my survey. Prior literature did highlight collaborating with colleagues and seeking mentors as supportive (Hernandez et al., 2015; Jarmon, 2001; Moses, 1989; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Thandi Sule, 2011). Prior literature also coincided with my findings where it said Black women faculty find support in knowing the unwritten rules (Alfred, 2001b).

Table 15

Strategies Used for Career Advancement by Discipline

Strategy	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Collaborating with colleagues	85.7%	85.7%	95.5%	100.0%	82.4%
Turning to religion	42.9%	57.1%	72.7%	66.7%	76.5%
Seeking mentors	35.7%	57.1%	77.3%	85.7%	76.5%
Support from family	50.0%	47.6%	81.8%	76.2%	76.5%
Support from networks	71.4%	42.9%	45.5%	90.5%	82.4%
Work harder & smarter	85.7%	61.9%	81.8%	81.0%	70.6%
Going on retreats	28.6%	14.3%	27.3%	42.9%	35.3%
Knowing unwritten rules	57.1%	61.9%	59.1%	81.0%	52.9%
Help with chores	35.7%	9.5%	36.4%	19.0%	23.5%
Something else	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	14.3%	17.6%
I don't use strategies	7.1%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 16*Strategies Used for Career Advancement by Rank*

Strategy	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Collaborating with colleagues	85.7%	94.6%	88.6%
Turning to religion	60.7%	64.9%	65.9%
Seeking mentors	71.4%	78.4%	59.1%
Support from family	60.7%	59.5%	75.0%
Support from networks	50.0%	73.0%	65.9%
Work harder & smarter	67.9%	78.4%	77.3%
Going on retreats	14.3%	29.7%	36.4%
Knowing unwritten rules	42.9%	73.0%	65.9%
Help with chores	14.3%	27.0%	22.7%
Something else	0.0%	13.5%	6.8%
I don't use strategies	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%

Safe Spaces

Safe spaces were an important topic of my survey to see if Black women faculty use these supports to battle racism and sexism and advance in their careers. Some examples of safe spaces include groups for Black women, where ideas may be expressed authentically, the Black community, individual psyche, extended family, Black community organizations, and religious institutions (Alfred, 2001a; Hernandez et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Walker, 2009).

Participants were asked, “What safe space(s), if any, do you use that help you advance in your career (select all that apply)?” Answer choices consisted of the Black community, my own psyche, family, religion, and I do not use safe spaces. Religious safe spaces were the most selected response option with 50.0% of business faculty, 66.7% of education faculty, 77.3% of medicine and health faculty, 66.7% of social sciences faculty, and 64.7% of arts and humanities

faculty selecting this response. Similarly, based on rank, “religion/faith/spirituality” was the most common selection with 60.7% of NTT faculty, 73.0% of tenure-track faculty, and 59.1% of tenured faculty choosing this option. The open-ended question asking what safe spaces the participant uses produced a wide range of responses. These included online mentoring groups, friends/colleagues in the academy/at other universities, Black professional groups, travel, their husband, parents, family, virtual communities, a therapist, a private network, Black women faculty at other institutions, and church.

Upon running a *t* test comparing tenure-track faculty to tenured faculty, there were no significant differences. Similarly, tenure-track faculty compared to NTT faculty produced no significant results. However, tenured faculty compared to NTT faculty had significant differences in selection of “Something else,” $t(70) = 2.089$, $p = .040$; 31.8% of tenured faculty chose this option, compared to 10.7% of NTT faculty. I ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results.

Table 17

Safe Spaces Used by Discipline

Safe space	Business	Education	Med & health	Soc sci	Arts or hum
The Black community	35.7%	33.3%	45.5%	52.4%	41.2%
My own psyche	50.0%	38.1%	45.5%	47.6%	70.6%
Extended family	50.0%	28.6%	36.4%	47.6%	52.9%
Religion/faith/spirituality	50.0%	66.7%	77.3%	66.7%	64.7%
I do not use safe spaces to help Me advance in my career	21.4%	0.0%	9.1%	4.8%	0.0%
Something else	7.1%	23.8%	9.1%	23.8%	41.2%

Table 18*Safe Spaces Used by Rank*

Safe space	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
The Black community	32.1%	48.6%	40.9%
My own psyche	42.9%	62.2%	40.9%
Extended family	53.6%	37.8%	40.9%
Religion/faith/spirituality	60.7%	73.0%	59.1%
I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career.	10.7%	5.4%	2.3%
Something else	10.7%	18.9%	31.8%

Religious/Spiritual Supports

Tenure-track faculty responded that they use meditation more than tenured faculty responses. Survey question, “What religious/spiritual factors, if any, help support your career advancement (select all that apply)?” produced significant results when *t* tests were run. Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty had a significant difference, $t(79) = -2.11$, $p = .038$, in their use of survey response option, “Meditating;” 36.4% of tenured faculty selected meditation as a support they use, while 59.5% of tenure-track faculty meditate. There were no significant results between tenure-track and NTT faculty or between tenured and NTT faculty. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results.

My results showing a heavy reliance on religious and spiritual factors agree with prior literature, which says religion is a major cornerstone Black women faculty use for support in their career advancement (Forsyth & Carter, 2014; Gallien & Hikes, 2005; Gregory, 2001; Jarmon, 2001; Moses, 1989; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Walker, 2009). This is true for the findings of my research study. Prayer was used by 71.4% of business faculty, 71.4% of education faculty, 86.4% of medicine and health faculty, 81.0% of social science faculty, and 76.5% of arts

or humanities faculty. Likewise, 82.1% of NTT faculty, 83.8% of tenure-track faculty, and 68.2% of tenured faculty rely on prayer for support in their career advancement.

Table 19

Religious Support by Discipline

Religious/Spiritual Factor	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Praying	71.4%	71.4%	86.4%	81.0%	76.5%
Meditating	21.4%	61.9%	54.5%	47.6%	41.2%
Reading religious texts	21.4%	38.1%	54.5%	38.1%	41.2%
Attending a house of worship	64.3%	57.1%	59.1%	47.6%	64.7%
Relying on my beliefs in a higher power	57.1%	61.9%	86.4%	81.0%	88.2%
Religious/spiritual factors do not help support my career advancement	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	9.5%	5.9%
Something else	0.0%	9.5%	4.5%	0.0%	11.8%

Table 20

Religious Support by Rank

Religious/Spiritual Factor	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Praying	82.1%	83.8%	68.2%
Meditating	39.3%	59.5%	36.4%
Reading religious texts	35.7%	43.2%	38.6%
Attending a house of worship	50.0%	67.6%	52.3%
Relying on my beliefs in a higher power	75.0%	78.4%	72.7%
Religious/spiritual factors do not help support my career advancement	3.6%	8.1%	0.0%
Something else	0.0%	5.4%	6.8%

Empowerment

My survey went on to investigate in what ways Black women faculty felt empowered to advance in their careers. Tables 21 and 22 detail response options including having opportunities, resources, access to information, and being involved in decision-making. Tenured faculty chose the answer choice, “Through being part of the decision-making process,” as an empowering support more than NTT faculty did. I ran t tests and found NTT faculty and tenured faculty had a significant difference, $t(70) = 2.01$, $p = .049$, in their use of survey response about being part of decision making processes; 52.3% of tenured faculty chose this answer choice, while 28.6% of NTT faculty did. This is most likely because NTT faculty are not invited to be involved in decision-making, while tenured faculty are. Table 21 shows “Having opportunities to grow and learn” was also a highly selected response with 58.8% of arts or humanities faculty and 50% of medicine and health faculty choosing this option. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results.

Table 21*Empowering Supports by Discipline*

Empowering supports	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Having opportunities to grow and learn	28.6%	47.6%	50.0%	47.6%	58.8%
Having resources available to me	28.6%	33.3%	50.0%	42.9%	52.9%
Receiving support	21.4%	42.9%	63.6%	47.6%	58.8%
Having access to information	21.4%	47.6%	45.5%	38.1%	52.9%
Through being part of the decision-making process	21.4%	38.1%	54.5%	38.1%	47.1%
I do not feel empowered to advance in my career	28.6%	19.0%	13.6%	23.8%	29.4%
Something else	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%

Table 22*Empowerment Supports by Rank*

	NTT Faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Having opportunities to grow and learn	42.9%	54.1%	47.7%
Having resources available to me	42.9%	40.5%	47.7%
Receiving support	39.3%	48.6%	54.5%
Having access to information	39.3%	37.8%	47.7%
Through being part of the decision-making process	28.6%	35.1%	52.3%
I do not feel empowered to advance in my career	10.7%	27.0%	20.5%
Something else	3.6%	5.4%	4.5%

Internal Support Factors

Internal Safe Spaces

My survey also focused on internal aspects of support factors used by Black women faculty. These supports were either provided by the HBCU or occurred on campus (as opposed to professional groups external to the institution, mentors who work somewhere else, houses of worship off campus, etc.), for instance, mentors on campus, use of religious supports occurring on campus, and other supports happening or existing at the place of employment (at the HBCU). Participants were asked, “What safe space(s), if any, does your institution provide that help you advance in your career (select all that apply)?” An open-ended answer choice was offered where 23 respondents wrote in that there were no safe spaces provided. Twenty-five percent of tenured faculty, 21.6% of tenure-track faculty, and 14.3% of NTT faculty indicated this. Moreover, 33.3% of social science faculty, 21.4% of business faculty, 9.1% of medicine and health faculty, 23.5% of arts or humanities faculty, and 4.8% of education faculty members responded as such. This is very interesting and deserves more attention in a qualitative study where participants may explain more on the subject.

NTT faculty showed they did not use safe spaces for career advancement as much as tenure-track or tenured faculty did. I ran t tests again by faculty rank. No significant results were found when comparing tenure-track and tenured faculty. However, when comparing tenure-track faculty to NTT faculty, there was a significant difference, $t(63) = 2.15, p = .036$, in selection of answer choice, “I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career.” 35.7% of NTT faculty selected this response, while 13.5% of tenure-track faculty did. Similarly, this same question produced a significant difference, $t(70) = -2.56, p = .013$, in responses from NTT faculty and tenured faculty. As evidenced in Table 24, 11.4% of tenured faculty selected this

answer choice, while 35.7% of NTT faculty did. When comparing tenure-track and NTT faculty, “Something else” was also significantly different, $t(63) = -2.22, p = .030$; 17.9% of NTT faculty selected this option, compared to 43.2% of tenure-track faculty.

It is interesting to speculate why this many NTT faculty do not use safe spaces. Perhaps there are fewer safe spaces available to NTT faculty. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline to determine which internal safe spaces were used by Black women faculty members, which yielded no significant results.

Table 23

Internal Safe Spaces by Discipline

Internal safe space	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Religious or spiritual group meetings for Black women	7.1%	14.3%	13.6%	14.3%	11.8%
Group meetings for women of color	0.0%	9.5%	27.3%	9.5%	5.9%
The Black community	0.0%	9.5%	9.1%	9.5%	5.9%
I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career	28.6%	23.8%	27.3%	23.8%	29.4%
Something else	28.6%	19.0%	22.7%	0.0%	29.4%
	21.4%	23.8%	27.3%	42.9%	35.3%

Table 24*Internal Safe Spaces by Rank*

Internal safe space	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Religious or spiritual	10.7%	16.2%	9.1%
Group meetings for Black women	10.7%	13.5%	9.1%
Group meetings for women of color	10.7%	10.8%	4.5%
The Black community	21.4%	29.7%	25.0%
I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career	35.7%	13.5%	11.4%
Something else	17.9%	43.2%	31.8%

Internal Mentoring

Fewer tenured faculty had a Black woman mentor (27.3%), compared to tenure-track (40.5%) and NTT faculty (35.7%). Perhaps tenured faculty have found the need to embrace mentors who are men or who are White, conforming to dominant norms, in order to advance in their careers, or they are no longer assigned a mentor formally because they are tenured. When looking by discipline, 57.1% of social science faculty selected they have a Black woman mentor, 40.9% of medicine and health faculty, 29.4% of arts or humanities faculty, 14.3% of education faculty, and 14.3% of business faculty.

Tenure-track and NTT faculty have mentors who are women of color more so than tenured faculty do. The survey question, “If you use an internal mentor within your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?” produced significant differences, $t(79) = -2.25$, $p = .027$, between tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty in the answer choice “I have a mentor at my institution who is a woman of color.” Results depicted in Table 26 show 6.8% of tenured faculty selected this

response compared to 24.3% of tenure-track faculty. Similarly, NTT and tenured faculty had a significant difference, $t(70) = -2.22, p = .030$, in selection of this same answer choice; 6.8% of tenured faculty selected this response compared to 25% of NTT faculty. There were no significant results when comparing NTT faculty to tenure-track faculty. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which yielded no significant results.

When looking at the selection of “I have a Black woman mentor at my institution,” 37 faculty members chose this response. “I have a mentor at my institution who is a woman of color” garnered 19 responses. There were 16 faculty members who chose both of these response options. It could be that some participants selected both because they have a Black woman mentor and Black women are women of color. However, it is unclear if the respondents who selected both have a Black woman mentor and another mentor who is a woman of color other than a Black woman.

Internal mentoring also involves collegial relationships where parties share information about informal norms of institutions and departments. “I learn the ins and outs of my institution and/or department” was also a popular answer choice among rank and discipline; 32.1% of NTT faculty, 54.1% of tenure-track faculty, and 36.4% of tenured faculty chose this response. Furthermore, 21.4% of business faculty, 38.1% of education faculty, 40.9% of medicine and health faculty, 61.9% of social science faculty, and 47.1% of arts or humanities faculty selected this option. This coincides with prior literature, which states mentoring is a chief way Black women faculty learn the ins and outs of their institution and department (Holmes et al., 2007).

Table 25*Internal Mentoring by Discipline*

Internal mentoring	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Black woman mentor	14.3%	14.3%	40.9%	57.1%	29.4%
Woman of color mentor	14.3%	9.5%	22.7%	19.0%	23.5%
Learn the ins & outs	21.4%	38.1%	40.9%	61.9%	47.1%
Promote scholarship	7.1%	14.3%	22.7%	28.6%	23.5%
Research grants	7.1%	4.8%	4.5%	19.0%	11.8%
Professional networks	7.1%	19.0%	22.7%	38.1%	23.5%
Social networks	14.3%	4.8%	13.6%	23.8%	11.8%
Co-mentoring	7.1%	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%	11.8%
Role-modeling	21.4%	23.8%	40.9%	28.6%	35.3%
Something else	21.4%	4.8%	13.6%	14.3%	23.5%

Table 26*Internal Mentoring by Rank*

Internal mentoring	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Black woman mentor	35.7%	40.5%	27.3%
Woman of color mentor	25.0%	24.3%	6.8%
Learn the ins & outs	32.1%	54.1%	36.4%
Promote scholarship	17.9%	27.0%	13.6%
Research grants	7.1%	21.6%	9.1%
Professional networks	25.0%	29.7%	18.2%
Social networks	17.9%	21.6%	9.1%
Co-mentoring	3.6%	8.1%	4.5%
Role-modeling	25.0%	27.0%	29.5%
Something else	14.3%	13.5%	18.2%

Internal Communication

Tenure-track faculty selected a response stating they receive more forthcoming communication, compared to tenured faculty. Survey question “How does communication within your institution play a role in your career advancement (select all that apply)?” produced

significant results when t tests were run. Tenure-track and tenured faculty had a significant difference, $t(79) = -2.05$, $p = .043$, in selection of answer choice “I receive forthcoming, accurate communication;” 13.6% of tenured faculty selected this response compared to 32.4% of tenure-track faculty. This is interesting when noting the literature, which states forthcoming, accurate communication is linked to trust at higher levels, and it is important for leaders to effectively communicate (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). There seems to be a lot to unpack here and a lot that is still unknown about how Black women faculty at HBCUs perceive communication within their departments and within their institutions. Tenure-track and NTT faculty and tenured and NTT faculty showed no significant differences. I ran a chi-square test by discipline, which yielded no significant results.

By discipline, several faculty members selected the response “I receive helpful information about my job performance;” 42.9% of education faculty, 36.4% of medicine and health faculty, 52.4% of social science faculty, and 47.1% of arts or humanities faculty chose this option. On the other hand, 21.4% of business faculty selected “Communication does not play a role in my career advancement.” Some faculty members in each rank also selected “I receive helpful information about my job performance” with 39.3% of NTT faculty, 40.5% of tenure-track faculty, and 34.1% of tenured faculty choosing this response. This may allude to environments, which generally have positive and effective communication at the HBCUs in this study.

Table 27*Internal Communication by Discipline*

Internal communication	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Communication does not play a role in my career advancement.	21.4%	19.0%	31.8%	9.5%	29.4%
I receive forthcoming, accurate communication.	7.1%	19.0%	36.4%	14.3%	23.5%
I receive timely feedback & adequate explanations.	14.3%	23.8%	22.7%	19.0%	29.4%
I receive helpful information about advancement/promotion opportunities.	14.3%	33.3%	31.8%	33.3%	47.1%
I receive helpful information about my job performance.	14.3%	42.9%	36.4%	52.4%	47.1%
I receive helpful information about the methods behind evaluating employees.	14.3%	33.3%	31.8%	23.8%	23.5%
Something else	35.7%	0.0%	4.5%	23.8%	23.5%

Table 28*Internal Communication by Rank*

Internal communication	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Communication does not play a role in my career advancement.	21.4%	32.4%	20.5%
I receive forthcoming, accurate communication.	14.3%	32.4%	13.6%
I receive timely feedback & adequate explanations.	21.4%	27.0%	15.9%
I receive helpful information about advancement/promotion opportunities.	28.6%	32.4%	29.5%

Internal communication	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I receive helpful information about my job performance.	39.3%	40.5%	34.1%
I receive helpful information about the methods behind evaluating employees.	10.7%	27.0%	29.5%
Something else	21.4%	13.5%	15.9%

Improve Internal Communication

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to indicate a lack of forthcoming, accurate communication than NTT faculty. When *t* tests were run, there were significant differences in responses to survey question “How can your institution improve communication to help in your career advancement (select all that apply)?” Upon comparing tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty, “My institution could have more forthcoming, accurate communication,” $t(63) = -2.19$, $p = .032$, was significant. Results depicted in Table 30 show 25% of NTT faculty and 51.4% of tenure-track faculty selected this answer choice. This could possibly be because NTT faculty are not as invested in the institution or that the institution is not as invested in NTT faculty.

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to indicate a desire for improved communication about promotion opportunities, as compared to tenured faculty. When comparing tenure-track and tenured faculty, “My institution could better communicate advancement/promotion opportunities” produced significant results, $t(79) = -2.30$, $p = .024$. Table 30 shows 31.8% of tenured faculty and 56.8% of tenure-track faculty chose this response. The dynamics of the tenure-track most likely cause tenure-track faculty members to be eager to have more forthcoming communication and to know about advancement/promotion opportunities. There were no significant differences in responses from NTT and tenured faculty.

Social sciences and arts or humanities faculty specified communicating with more people as a way to improve communication, more so than the other disciplines did. A chi-square test was run by discipline about how to improve internal communication, producing a p value for significance of .040 where response option “My institution could communicate with more people” was significant. Table 29 indicates 14.3% of business faculty, 38.1% of education faculty, 31.8% of faculty in medicine and health, 61.9% of social science faculty, and 52.9% of arts or humanities faculty selected this answer choice.

“Making more information available” was a popular answer choice with faculty from most disciplines; 70.6% of faculty from the arts or humanities and 66.7% of faculty from the social sciences selected this response, followed by 47.6% of faculty from education and 45.5% of faculty from medicine and health. “More forthcoming, accurate information” was selected by 52.9% of arts or humanities faculty, 52.4% of social science faculty, and 35.7% of business faculty. Business faculty seem more satisfied than other disciplines perhaps because faculty members in this discipline are more highly compensated.

Table 29*Improve Internal Communication by Discipline*

Improve internal communication	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
My institution does not need to improve.	14.3%	4.8%	13.6%	9.5%	5.9%
Make more information available.	21.4%	47.6%	45.5%	66.7%	70.6%
Utilize more outlets/device.	28.6%	23.8%	36.4%	52.4%	52.9%
Communicate with more people.	14.3%	38.1%	31.8%	61.9%	52.9%
Methods behind evaluating employees	7.1%	33.3%	40.9%	47.6%	58.8%
Communication about job performance	21.4%	19.0%	27.3%	28.6%	47.1%
Advancement/promotion opportunities	21.4%	42.9%	31.8%	52.4%	58.8%
More timely feedback and better explanations	28.6%	47.6%	22.7%	28.6%	64.7%
More forthcoming, accurate communication	35.7%	38.1%	36.4%	52.4%	52.9%
Something else	14.3%	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%	17.6%

Table 30*Improve Internal Communication by Rank*

Improve internal communication	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
My institution does not need to improve.	7.1%	8.1%	11.4%
Make more information available.	53.6%	59.5%	50.0%
Utilize more outlets/device.	42.9%	35.1%	36.4%
Communicate with more people.	32.1%	43.2%	38.6%
Methods behind evaluating employees	28.6%	51.4%	34.1%
Communication about job performance	21.4%	29.7%	27.3%
Advancement/promotion opportunities	32.1%	56.8%	31.8%

Improve internal communication	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
More timely feedback and better explanations	28.6%	48.6%	36.4%
More forthcoming, accurate communication	25.0%	51.4%	40.9%
Something else	10.7%	8.1%	4.5%

Internal Collaboration

Tenured and tenure-track faculty showed they use internal co-authors more than NTT faculty do. Participants were asked, “How do you use collaboration within your institution to advance in your career (select all that apply)?” I ran *t* tests, yielding significant results. “I publish with co-authors from my institution” showed a significant difference, $t(63) = -2.32, p = .024$, between tenure-track and NTT faculty; 10.7% of NTT faculty selected this response, while 35.1% of tenure-track faculty did. This same answer choice produced significant differences, $t(70) = 3.06, p = .003$, between tenured and NTT faculty; 43.2% of tenured faculty selected this answer choice, while 10.7% of NTT faculty did. It seems NTT faculty could possibly be less concerned with publishing in general, since they are not on a tenure-track. Though not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that tenured faculty are using internal co-authors more so than tenure-track faculty.

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to select that their institution had prospects to co-author with Black women, as compared to the responses of tenured faculty. The answer choice “My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with Black women” produced significant differences, $t(79) = -2.10, p = .039$, between tenure-track and tenured faculty members; 11.4% of tenured faculty chose this answer compared to tenure-track faculty at 29.7%. This response deserves further investigation through future qualitative research studies, as the reasons are not

readily apparent to me. It is probable that there is a focus on supporting tenure-track faculty through the tenure process.

Upon comparison of opportunities to collaborate with Black women and women of color internally, there were several faculty members who selected both response options. A total of 20 participants selected that their institution provides opportunities to collaborate with Black women. This is compared to 17 faculty members who indicated their institution provides opportunities to collaborate with women of color. There were 15 respondents who selected both of these response options. Based on these data, it is uncertain if the participants who selected both options have Black women collaborators (since Black women are also women of color) or if they have chances to collaborate with Black women and additional scholars from various other races and ethnicities.

Also worthy of note, 50.0% of business faculty selected they do not use internal collaboration, while 45.5% of medicine and health faculty indicated their institution emphasizes collaboration; 57.1% of education faculty and 52.4% of social science faculty selected they pool resources with colleagues internally. Furthermore, 41.2% of arts or humanities faculty selected their institution provides professional groups for collaboration, and 45.5% of medicine and health faculty and 47.6% of social science faculty indicated they publish with internal co-authors.

There were also interesting responses by rank; 28.6% of NTT faculty selected “I pool resources with others inside my institution,” and 45.9% of tenure-track faculty and 38.6% of tenured faculty also selected this answer choice, which was the response selected most often by each rank. This aligns with extant literature, which says when funds for conducting research or

attending a conference are low, Black women can work together to get more done and gain more visibility than if they conduct research alone (Hernandez et al., 2015).

Table 31

Internal Collaboration by Discipline

Internal collaboration	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I do not use collaboration within my institution to advance in my career.	50.0%	9.5%	18.2%	4.8%	29.4%
My institution emphasizes collaboration.	7.1%	28.6%	45.5%	28.6%	23.5%
My institution provides social networks for collaboration.	14.3%	19.0%	13.6%	23.8%	23.5%
My institution provides professional groups for collaboration.	7.1%	19.0%	18.2%	23.8%	41.2%
My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with Black women.	7.1%	9.5%	27.3%	19.0%	29.4%
My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with women of color.	14.3%	4.8%	18.2%	14.3%	29.4%
I pool resources with others inside my institution.	14.3%	57.1%	22.7%	52.4%	35.3%
I publish with co-authors from my institution.	7.1%	28.6%	45.5%	47.6%	23.5%
Something else	0.0%	9.5%	9.1%	9.5%	29.4%

Table 32*Internal Collaboration by Rank*

Internal collaboration	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I do not use collaboration within my institution to advance in my career.	21.4%	21.6%	15.9%
My institution emphasizes collaboration.	17.9%	37.8%	22.7%
My institution provides social networks for collaboration.	14.3%	24.3%	13.6%
My institution provides professional groups for collaboration.	10.7%	27.0%	20.5%
My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with Black women.	14.3%	29.7%	11.4%
My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with women of color.	14.3%	24.3%	9.1%
I pool resources with others inside my Institution.	28.6%	45.9%	38.6%
I publish with co-authors from my institution.	10.7%	35.1%	43.2%
Something else	17.9%	16.2%	6.8%

Internal Social Activism

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to say their institution was an outlet to voice concerns about injustice, as compared to NTT faculty. A survey question asked how the faculty member's institution uses social activism to advance their career. This yielded significant differences, $t(63) = -2.54$, $p = .014$, in answer choice "My institution is an outlet to voice concerns about injustice." This was found when comparing tenure-track and NTT faculty members; 7.1% of NTT faculty selected this response, while 32.4% of tenure-track faculty did. This may be an indication that NTT faculty are somehow less able to utilize outlets to voice concerns about injustice. There were no significant results between tenure-track and tenured faculty or NTT and tenured faculty.

“My institution does not use social activism” was the most common response; 32.1% of non-tenure track faculty, 37.8% of tenure-track faculty, and 45.5% of tenured faculty selected this response. This may show, in general, that there are some HBCUs that may not readily embrace displays of social activism. Various HBCUs have different levels of commitment to social justice, and their students and faculty do not necessarily embrace social activism (Hicks Tafari, Arango Ricks, & Bates Oates, 2016).

I also ran a chi-square test, which yielded no significant differences in responses by discipline. Table 33 shows “My institution does not use social activism” was the most common response by discipline; 42.9% of faculty from the business discipline selected this answer choice, 47.6% of faculty from education, 36.4% of faculty from medicine and health, and 41.2% from the arts or humanities. “My institution is an outlet to voice concerns about injustice” was also selected by 38.1% of social science faculty and 35.3% of arts or humanities faculty. Moreover, 41.2% of arts or humanities faculty also selected “My institution empowers me to incorporate social activism into my work.” It seems the arts or humanities discipline does stand out a bit and is worth investigating further in future studies.

Table 33

Internal Social Activism by Discipline

	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Internal social activism					
My institution does not use social activism.	42.9%	47.6%	36.4%	23.8%	41.2%
My institution is an outlet to voice concerns about injustice	0.0%	19.0%	13.6%	38.1%	35.3%
My institution is active in social justice movements.	7.1%	0.0%	18.2%	14.3%	35.3%

	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Internal social activism					
My institution breaks down structures which oppress Black women.	0.0%	9.5%	13.6%	9.5%	29.4%
My institution empowers me to incorporate social activism into my work.	7.1%	9.5%	18.2%	28.6%	41.2%
My institution resists structures that disenfranchise Black women.	7.1%	0.0%	9.1%	4.8%	23.5%
My institution organizes demonstrations and boycotts.	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	4.8%	5.9%
Something else	7.1%	9.5%	13.6%	9.5%	23.5%

Table 34

Internal Social Activism by Rank

	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Internal social activism			
My institution does not use social activism.	32.1%	37.8%	45.5%
My institution is an outlet to voice concerns about injustice.	7.1%	32.4%	20.5%
My institution is active in social justice movements.	7.1%	16.2%	15.9%
My institution breaks down structures which oppress Black women.	10.7%	10.8%	13.6%
My institution empowers me to incorporate social activism into my work.	14.3%	24.3%	18.2%
My institution resists structures that disenfranchise Black women.	3.6%	10.8%	6.8%
My institution organizes demonstrations and boycotts.	0.0%	5.4%	4.5%
Something else	17.9%	10.8%	9.1%

Internal Valuation

Tenure-track faculty perceived their colleagues to value their opinions more so than NTT faculty did. I ran t tests to determine if there were significant differences by rank. The question posed was, “In what ways does your institution or department support your career advancement through valuing your work (select all that apply)?” There was a significant, $t(63) = -2.23$, $p = .029$, difference found in the response “My colleagues within my institution or department value my opinions” between tenure-track and NTT faculty. Results depicted in Table 36 show 32.1% of NTT faculty selected this answer choice compared to 59.5% of tenure-track faculty. It could be that NTT faculty’s opinions are less valued because they have a lower rank or because they often do not have a formal role in shared governance. There were no significant differences between tenure-track and tenured faculty or between NTT and tenured faculty. This same option had a high response rate with tenured faculty, 52.3% of whom indicated so.

Based on responses by discipline, it seems there is a healthy sense of valuation in the HBCU environment, where Black women faculty members believe their colleagues value their ideas. “My colleagues within my institution or department value my opinions” was also a popular answer choice among most disciplines. Table 35 indicates 47.6% of social science faculty, 58.8% of arts or humanities faculty, 61.9% of education faculty, and 63.6% of medicine and health faculty chose this response. I ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results.

My data offer somewhat optimistic findings about the valuation of Black women faculty at HBCUs, compared to the disturbing findings at PWIs, where Black women faculty are severely undervalued (Constantine et al., 2008; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). It seems, based on my findings, there are fairly more positive relationships based

on respect between colleagues and that Black women faculty's opinions are generally valued at HBCUs more so than at PWIs.

Table 35

Internal Valuation by Discipline

Internal valuation	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
My institution or department shares the same values that are seen in my work.	14.3%	28.6%	31.8%	38.1%	29.4%
My institution or department shows me they value my work by assisting me with grant applications.	28.6%	38.1%	22.7%	9.5%	29.4%
My colleagues within my institution or department value my opinions.	21.4%	61.9%	63.6%	47.6%	58.8%
My institution or department does not value my work enough.	28.6%	33.3%	22.7%	19.0%	35.3%
Something else	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	23.5%

Table 36

Internal Valuation by Rank

Internal valuation	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
My institution or department shares the same values that are seen in my work.	14.3%	32.4%	34.1%
My institution or department shows me they value my work by assisting me with grant applications.	17.9%	29.7%	20.5%
My colleagues within my institution or department value my opinions.	32.1%	59.5%	52.3%
My institution or department does not value my work enough.	25.0%	32.4%	31.8%
Something else	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Improve Internal Valuation

My survey then went on to probe ways Black women faculty thought their institution could value them more. There were some interesting findings, although the chi-square test I ran by discipline yielded no significant results. Table 37 shows there were fairly mixed responses by discipline; 28.6% of business faculty and 47.1% of arts or humanities faculty selected response option “My institution or department values my work enough.” Education faculty (42.9%) and faculty in medicine and health (40.9%) indicated internal valuation could be improved through encouragement of their accomplishments and support of their personal development; 28.6% of social science faculty selected “Providing more grants and/or contracts.”

Responses to the same question: “In what ways could your institution or department value your work more (select all that apply)?” were analyzed by rank. I ran a *t* test by faculty rank, which produced no significant results. Faculty members of all ranks indicated “Encourage my accomplishments and support my personal development” as the most prominent way to improve internal valuation. Table 38 indicates 28.6% of NTT faculty, 43.2% of tenure-track faculty, and 27.3% of tenured faculty selected this option. Tenured faculty also selected “Providing more grants and/or contracts” (27.3%), “Colleagues could better show me they value my opinions” (27.3%), and “My institution or department values my work enough” (27.3%).

Table 37*Improve Internal Valuation by Discipline*

Improve internal valuation	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Providing more grants and/or contracts	14.3%	28.6%	22.7%	28.6%	29.4%
Colleagues could better show me they value my opinions.	14.3%	28.6%	27.3%	19.0%	47.1%
Be more friendly toward me	0.0%	9.5%	22.7%	4.8%	23.5%
Encourage my accomplishments and support my personal development	14.3%	42.9%	40.9%	23.8%	47.1%
My institution or department values my work enough.	28.6%	23.8%	36.4%	19.0%	47.1%
Something else	14.3%	4.8%	13.6%	19.0%	17.6%

Table 38*Improve Internal Valuation by Rank*

Improve valuation	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Providing more grants and/or contracts	21.4%	27.0%	27.3%
Colleagues could better show me they value my opinions.	17.9%	27.0%	27.3%
Be more friendly toward me	3.6%	16.2%	13.6%
Encourage my accomplishments and support my personal development	28.6%	43.2%	27.3%
My institution or department values my work enough.	25.0%	29.7%	27.3%
Something else	14.3%	10.8%	20.5%

Internal & External Supportive Parties

My survey then investigated internal and external supports to gain an understanding of both professional and personal people Black women faculty rely on to help in their career advancement. Some of these supports included family, friends, children, and colleagues. The survey question asked, “Which internal and external parties support your career advancement (select all that apply)?”

Tenure-track faculty indicated family as an immense support, while NTT faculty did not indicate family as much. I ran t tests by faculty rank to see if there were any significant differences when investigating internal and external supportive parties. Upon comparing responses from tenure-track and NTT faculty, “Family members” came up as significantly different, $t(63) = -2.45, p = .017$; 53.6% NTT faculty chose this answer choice, while 81.1% of tenure-track faculty selected this response. It is unclear why this might be, but qualitative interviews may shed some light on the subject.

In one survey study (Johnson, 2009a), work–family conflict was not a significant factor in job satisfaction for associate professors, while it was significant for tenure-track faculty and full professors. This indicates opposing findings to mine, where it states tenure-track faculty may experience a conflict with the demands of having young children and/or being in a new relationship. In my study, tenure-track faculty relied on family for support in career advancement, instead of family causing a conflict with work. On the other hand, my study did not have enough participation to separate associate from full professors.

Another survey study (Shreffler, Shreffler, & Murfree, 2019) also focused on work–family conflict, which disadvantaged women, as compared to men. This study showed mothers

have increased work–family conflict as faculty members in higher education, compared to men and women without children. However, this study did not parse out faculty by rank or race. It seems my study differs greatly to existing literature because the focus has not been on Black women at HBCUs, and there needs to be more attention placed on this population.

Arts or humanities and the social science disciplines indicated family was an incredible support, much more so than business or education disciplines did. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which determined a significant difference in selection of answer choices “family members” (the p value for significance was .024) and “my child or children” (the p value for significance was .048); 42.9% of business faculty, 66.7% of education faculty, 77.3% of medicine and health faculty, 81.0% of social science faculty, and 94.1% of arts or humanities faculty selected family as a response. Furthermore, 21.4% of business faculty, 33.3% of education faculty, 54.5% of medicine and health faculty, 23.8% of social science faculty, and 70.6% of arts or humanities faculty chose their children as a support. Based on this information, it seems the business faculty members are much less supported by their family and children, while the arts or humanities faculty members are profoundly supported by these parties. However, the business faculty are heavily supported by colleagues, as shown by 57.1% of business faculty responses.

Friends were also an important support across disciplines and rank; 42.9% of business faculty, 66.7% of education faculty, 68.2% of medicine and health faculty, 71.4% of social science faculty, and 88.2% of arts or humanities faculty chose “friends” as supportive to their career advancement. Moreover, 64.3% of NTT faculty, 59.5% of tenure-track faculty, and 72.7% of tenured faculty selected this option. This coincides with previous literature that states

Black women faculty may find friends, children, and relatives as their cornerstone for support (Gregory, 2001).

Interestingly, spousal support was not selected in very high numbers. According to Table 39, among the highest percentages, 50.0% of medicine and health faculty and 58.8% of arts and humanities faculty, selected their spouse as a support to their career advancement. Table 40 shows these numbers were also somewhat low by rank. 32.1% of NTT faculty, 37.8% of tenure-track faculty, and 40.9% of tenured faculty chose this response option. This contradicts prior literature that stated Black women faculty often identify spouses as their foundation for support (Gregory, 2001). It may speak to the fact that women perceive less spousal support than men regarding career success (Ocampo et al., 2018). However, the lack of scholarship about how the marital status of Black women faculty relates to their career advancement calls for needed research.

Table 39

Supportive Parties by Discipline

Supportive party	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Department head	21.4%	61.9%	50.0%	52.4%	47.1%
Colleagues	57.1%	52.4%	54.5%	66.7%	70.6%
Mentor(s)	35.7%	42.9%	45.5%	71.4%	64.7%
Friends	42.9%	66.7%	68.2%	71.4%	88.2%
Family members	42.9%	66.7%	77.3%	81.0%	94.1%
Child(ren)	21.4%	33.3%	54.5%	23.8%	70.6%
Spouse or partner	14.3%	28.6%	50.0%	28.6%	58.8%
Someone else	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	23.5%

Table 40*Supportive Parties by Rank*

Supportive party	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Department head	42.9%	59.5%	38.6%
Colleagues	42.9%	62.2%	61.4%
Mentor(s)	42.9%	62.2%	54.5%
Friends	64.3%	59.5%	72.7%
Family members	53.6%	81.1%	75.0%
Child(ren)	35.7%	43.2%	43.2%
Spouse or partner	32.1%	37.8%	40.9%
Someone else	0.0%	5.4%	6.8%

Relationship Status

My survey asked for the relationship status of faculty members to investigate how personal relationships support career advancement. Tenured faculty were more likely to be married than tenure-track faculty members and were more likely to live with their significant other. Furthermore, tenured faculty were more likely to have a domestic partner, compared to NTT faculty. I ran *t* tests to gauge differences in relationship status by faculty rank. Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty showed significant differences in selection of answer choices “I have a spouse,” $t(79) = -2.24, p = .028$. Table 42 indicates 56.8% of tenured faculty selected this option, while 32.4% of tenure-track faculty chose this response. Tenure-track and tenured faculty also showed significant differences in response, “I do not live with my partner/significant other/spouse” $t(79) = -2.38, p = .020$; 4.6% of tenured faculty chose this response compared to 21.6% of tenure-track faculty. NTT faculty and tenured faculty had a significant difference in choosing “I have a domestic partner” $t(70) = -2.27, p = .027$. Table 42 shows 0% of NTT faculty chose this option, while 10.7% of tenured faculty selected this answer choice.

In considering faculty rank when looking at relationship status, tenure-track faculty were the most common to identify as single, at 51.4%. Only 32.4% of tenure-track faculty had a spouse. In comparison, NTT faculty's highest indication was that they had a spouse, at 48.4% and tenured faculty at 56.8%. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which yielded no significant results. Table 41 indicated 57.1% of business faculty, 52.4% of education faculty, 27.3% of medicine and health faculty, 47.6% of social science faculty, and 35.3% of arts or humanities faculty selected they were single. Table 41 also shows 42.9% of business faculty, 33.3% of education faculty, 63.6% of medicine and health faculty, 42.9% of social science faculty, and 47.1% of arts or humanities faculty chose that they were married. These findings somewhat contradict prior literature that states married Black women faculty often identify their spouses as their foundation for support (Gregory, 2001).

Table 41

Relationship Status by Discipline

Relationship status	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I have a partner.	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
I have a significant other.	0.0%	14.3%	9.1%	4.8%	11.8%
I have a domestic partner.	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%
I have a spouse.	42.9%	33.3%	63.6%	42.9%	47.1%
I am single.	57.1%	52.4%	27.3%	47.6%	35.3%
I do not live with my partner/significant other/spouse.	0.0%	23.8%	13.6%	9.5%	11.8%

Table 42*Relationship Status by Rank*

Relationship status	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I have a partner.	7.1%	2.7%	0.0%
I have a significant other.	10.7%	8.1%	4.5%
I have a domestic partner.	10.7%	2.7%	0.0%
I have a spouse.	46.4%	32.4%	56.8%
I am single.	28.6%	51.4%	38.6%
I do not live with my partner/significant other/spouse.	14.3%	21.6%	4.5%

External Support Factors*External Mentoring*

My survey went on to focus on external factors that support Black women faculty in their career advancement. These supports are found outside of the HBCU and can range from mentors at other institutions, networking groups outside of the HBCU, colleagues who do not work at the same institution, and various other supports existing or occurring off campus.

Mentoring is a chief way Black women faculty receive support and advance in their careers. Tenure-track faculty said their external mentors helped them with grants, while NTT faculty did not indicate so. I ran *t* tests to compare faculty rank and responses to the survey question “If you have an external mentor outside of your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?” When comparing tenure-track and NTT faculty responses to “My mentor helps me obtain research grants” the results were significantly different, $t(63) = -2.29, p = .025$. Zero percent of NTT faculty selected this response compared to 16.2% of tenure-track faculty. This is probably because NTT faculty typically are not expected to receive grants and may not be eligible for

them in some cases. No significant results were found between tenure-track and tenured faculty or between NTT and tenured faculty.

Table 44 shows many respondents reported having a Black woman mentor outside of their institution with 53.6% of NTT faculty, 48.6% of tenure-track faculty, and 36.4% of tenured faculty selecting this answer choice. Additionally, role modeling was frequently selected; 32.1% of NTT faculty, 45.9% of tenure-track faculty, and 47.7% of tenured faculty chose this option. This coincides with prior research, which states role modeling is associated with career advancement (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Davis et al., 2011; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Gregory, 2001; Holmes et al., 2007; Johnson, 2001; Lockwood, 2006).

In response to the option “I have a Black woman mentor outside of my institution,” 49 participants selected this. In comparison, 19 participants selected “I have a mentor outside of my institution who is a woman of color.” Upon noting selection of both of these response options, 17 participants chose both of them. It is unclear if the faculty members who chose both of them have a Black woman mentor and/or a woman of color mentor from another race or ethnicity.

Faculty from business and medicine and health disciplines responded much less to the option, stating their mentors helped them promote their scholarship than faculty from the social sciences, education, and the arts or humanities. I also ran chi-square tests by discipline to determine if there was a significant difference in use of external mentoring supports. “My mentor helps me promote my scholarship” produced significant results. The *p* value for significance was .043. Table 43 indicates 7.1% of business faculty, 47.6% of education faculty, 9.1% of medicine and health faculty, 42.9% of social science faculty, and 35.3% of arts or humanities faculty chose this response. Prior literature tells us mentors do play a vital role in

helping to promote scholarship (Shieh & Cullen, 2018). Therefore, this may be a cause for concern in the responses of business and health and medicine faculty.

Table 43 shows 57.1% of faculty from the education discipline, 54.5% of faculty from medicine and health, and 47.6% from the social sciences have a Black woman mentor outside of their institution. Furthermore, 57.1% of faculty from education and 61.9% from the social sciences selected the response that their mentor exposes them to professional networks, and 45.5% of medicine and health faculty, 52.9% of arts or humanities faculty, and 61.9% of social sciences faculty use role modeling. Moreover, 42.9% of business faculty do not have an external mentor. These findings do support prior literature, which stated Black women benefit from Black women mentors, who expose them to professional networking and role modeling (Henry & Glenn, 2009). It is interesting, however, to narrow down which mentoring functions, in particular, are most important to my population. The business discipline does seem distinct from the rest of the discipline categories.

Table 43

External Mentoring by Discipline

External mentoring	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I have a Black woman mentor outside of my institution.	21.4%	57.1%	54.5%	47.6%	35.3%
I have a mentor who is a woman of color.	21.4%	9.5%	18.2%	23.8%	11.8%
Access publishers	0.0%	23.8%	0.0%	9.5%	17.6%
Promote my scholarship	7.1%	47.6%	9.1%	42.9%	35.3%
Obtain research grants	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	5.9%
Exposes me to professional networks	14.3%	57.1%	27.3%	61.9%	35.3%
Exposes me to social networks	7.1%	47.6%	13.6%	33.3%	41.2%
Through external co-mentoring	21.4%	4.8%	4.5%	14.3%	5.9%
Through role-modeling	21.4%	23.8%	45.5%	61.9%	52.9%
Something else	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	4.8%	11.8%
I don't have an external mentor.	42.9%	14.3%	22.7%	19.0%	35.3%

Table 44*External Mentoring by Rank*

External mentoring	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I have a Black woman mentor outside of my institution.	53.6%	48.6%	36.4%
I have a mentor who is a woman of color.	25.0%	18.9%	11.4%
Access publishers	7.1%	8.1%	15.9%
Promote my scholarship	25.0%	35.1%	31.8%
Obtain research grants	0.0%	16.2%	9.1%
Exposes me to professional networks	35.7%	43.2%	43.2%
Exposes me to social networks	28.6%	32.4%	22.7%
Through external co-mentoring	3.6%	13.5%	13.6%
Through role-modeling	32.1%	45.9%	47.7%
Something else	0.0%	10.8%	6.8%
I don't have an external mentor.	25.0%	18.9%	22.7%

External Collaboration

Next, my survey focused on Black women faculty's use of collaboration with external colleagues. Tenured faculty responded more than NTT faculty that they utilize external professional groups. I ran *t* tests to determine if any of the responses were significantly different by rank. NTT and tenured faculty showed significantly different, $t(70) = 2.26, p = .027$, responses in selecting "I collaborate through external professional groups." Table 46 shows 65.9% of tenured faculty selected this answer choice, compared to 39.3% of NTT. Tenure-track and NTT and tenure-track and tenured faculty showed no significant results. I ran a chi-square test by discipline, which yielded no significant results.

Collaborating with external professional groups was also the most common response by discipline. Table 45 shows 42.9% of business faculty, 66.7% of education faculty, 63.6% of

medicine and health faculty, 57.1% of social science faculty, and 58.8% of arts or humanities faculty selected this response. Furthermore, 64.7% of arts or humanities faculty selected “I collaborate with Black women outside of my institution.” These findings coincide with previous studies, which stated seeking external support is essential for the career advancement of many Black women faculty (Gregory, 2001; Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Moses, 1989).

When exploring the overlap between responses indicating external collaboration with Black women and women of color, there were some participants who selected both response options. There were 52 faculty members who chose the option stating, “I collaborate with Black women outside of my institution.” There were 38 faculty members who selected “I collaborate with women of color outside my institution.” When noting how many selected both, there were 32 participants in total. It could be that the participants who selected both collaborate with Black women and women of color who are not Black women. However, it is unclear if these participants are referring to Black women when selecting of both of these response options.

Table 45

External Collaboration by Discipline

External collaboration	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc Sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I do not use collaboration outside of my institution to advance in my career.	7.1%	14.3%	13.6%	9.5%	11.8%
I collaborate through external social networks.	21.4%	42.9%	40.9%	57.1%	58.8%
I collaborate through external professional groups.	42.9%	66.7%	63.6%	57.1%	58.8%
I collaborate with Black women outside of my institution.	35.7%	42.9%	54.5%	42.9%	64.7%
I collaborate with women of color outside my institution.	28.6%	33.3%	36.4%	23.8%	52.9%

External collaboration	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc Sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I pool resources with others.	14.3%	38.1%	36.4%	28.6%	35.3%
I seek external co-authors to publish with.	21.4%	28.6%	18.2%	33.3%	41.2%
Something else	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	4.8%	5.9%

Table 46

External Collaboration by Rank

External collaboration	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I do not use collaboration outside of my institution to advance in my career.	14.3%	16.2%	4.5%
I collaborate through external social Networks.	28.6%	43.2%	50.0%
I collaborate through external professional Groups.	39.3%	56.8%	65.9%
I collaborate with Black women outside of my institution.	42.9%	48.6%	50.0%
I collaborate with women of color outside my institution.	35.7%	37.8%	31.8%
I pool resources with others.	28.6%	37.8%	27.3%
I seek external co-authors to publish with.	21.4%	32.4%	34.1%
Something else	7.1%	2.7%	4.5%

My study asked research participants about internal and external co-authoring as well as internal and external collaboration. However, it did not specify whether or not these activities were research related. The survey questions about co-authoring and the general question about using collaboration as a strategy are included in Tables 47 and 48 for a summary view of the data.

Table 47*Snapshot of Co-Authoring and Collaboration by Discipline*

	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I publish with co-authors from my institution.	7.1%	28.6%	45.5%	47.6%	23.5%
I seek external co-authors to publish with.	21.4%	28.6%	18.2%	33.3%	41.2%
Collaborating with colleagues as a strategy	85.7%	85.7%	95.5%	100.0%	82.4%

Table 48*Snapshot of Co-Authoring and Collaboration by Rank*

	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
I publish with co-authors from my institution.	10.7%	35.1%	43.2%
I seek external co-authors to publish with.	21.4%	32.4%	34.1%
Collaborating with colleagues as a strategy	85.7%	94.6%	88.6%

Based on these snapshots, it seems that collaboration encompasses supportive activities beyond research only.

External Social Activism

Seeking support for career advancement through social activism outside the institution was the next focus of my survey. Overall, as Table 50 indicates, 35.7% of NTT faculty, 32.4% of tenure-track faculty, and 27.3% of tenured faculty said they do not use social activism to

advance their careers. Table 49 shows 42.9% of business faculty, 28.6% of education faculty, 27.3% of medicine and health faculty, 19.0% of social science faculty, and 35.3% of arts or humanities faculty selected this answer choice. Twenty-five percent of NTT, 32.4% of tenure-track, and 36.4% of tenured faculty selected the response that they voice their concerns about injustice, while 7.1% of business faculty, 38.1% of education faculty, 27.3% of medicine and health faculty, 38.1% of social science faculty, and 52.9% of arts or humanities faculty selected this response.

Tenured faculty were the most prone to utilize their research to express support of social justice. Additionally, tenure-track faculty were more likely than NTT faculty to use their writing as an outlet toward this goal. I ran *t* tests by rank and discovered tenure-track and NTT faculty had significant differences in selection of response option “I strive for social justice through my research and scholarly work,” $t(63) = -2.14, p = .036$. Table 50 shows 14.3% of NTT faculty chose this response, while 37.8% of tenure-track faculty did. There was also a significant difference in selection of this answer choice between tenured and NTT faculty, $t(70) = 2.26, p = .027$; 38.6% of tenured faculty selected this response compared to 14.3% of NTT faculty. Table 49 indicates 7.1% of business faculty, 42.9% of education faculty, 22.7% of medicine and health faculty, 38.1% of social science faculty, and 52.9% of arts and humanities faculty selected this answer choice.

A study conducted by Rose (2017) revealed that whether or not a faculty member identified themselves as a social activist has a lot to do with which academic discipline they work in. Activism is integrated into certain disciplines such as gender studies, youth studies, and social work. Therefore, most likely, the respondents in my study from the social sciences, arts or humanities, and education disciplines are more prone to embrace social activism. These findings

do not strongly support existing literature, which stated Black women may strive for social justice through their research (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). At HBCUs, Black women faculty's involvement in social activism seems to be more varied by academic discipline.

Compared to NTT faculty, tenure-track faculty were more likely to select the response option stating they give back. Tenure-track and NTT faculty also had significant differences in selection of answer choice, "I give back in the form of service to socio-economically and politically subjugated communities," $t(63) = -2.32, p = .024$; 10.7% of NTT faculty selected this option compared to 35.1% of tenure-track faculty. Table 49 shows 7.1% of business faculty, 14.3% of education faculty, 27.3% of medicine and health faculty, 33.3% of social sciences faculty, and 41.2% of arts and humanities faculty selected this response. These findings do not strongly support existing literature, which stated Black women may strive for social justice through giving back in the form of service to socioeconomically and politically subjugated communities (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002).

I also ran a chi-square test by discipline. My findings do not support prior literature that stated coping strategies such as informing civil rights organizations and the media help Black women faculty's career advancement (Forsyth & Carter, 2014). There may have been some coping strategies Black women faculty use that I neglected to include on my survey. "Something else" was significant (the p value for significance was .004) with 7.1% of business faculty, 4.8% of education faculty, 9.1% of medicine and health faculty, 0.0% of social science faculty, and 41.2% of arts or humanities faculty choosing this option.

Table 49*External Social Activism by Discipline*

External social activism	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
I do not use social activism to advance my career.	42.9%	28.6%	27.3%	19.0%	35.3%
I voice my concerns about Injustice.	7.1%	38.1%	27.3%	38.1%	52.9%
I am active in social justice movements external to my institution.	0.0%	19.0%	9.1%	23.8%	29.4%
I am active in social justice movements within my institution.	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%	11.8%
I strive for social justice through my research and scholarly work.	7.1%	42.9%	22.7%	38.1%	52.9%
I give back in the form of service to socio-economically and politically subjugated communities.	7.1%	14.3%	27.3%	33.3%	41.2%
I seek legal counsel and/or action when my rights are not upheld.	0.0%	4.8%	9.1%	19.0%	17.6%
I make formal complaints.	7.1%	9.5%	4.5%	4.8%	29.4%
I organize demonstrations and Boycotts.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%
I inform civil rights organizations and the media.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Something else	7.1%	4.8%	9.1%	0.0%	41.2%

Table 50*External Social Activism by Rank*

	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure- Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
External social activism			
I do not use social activism to advance my career.	35.7%	32.4%	27.3%
I voice my concerns about injustice.	25.0%	32.4%	36.4%
I am active in social justice movements external to my institution.	7.1%	24.3%	18.2%
I am active in social justice movements within my institution.	0.0%	5.4%	4.5%
I strive for social justice through my research and scholarly work.	14.3%	37.8%	38.6%
I give back in the form of service to socio-economically and politically subjugated communities.	10.7%	35.1%	25.0%
I seek legal counsel and/or action when my rights are not upheld.	7.1%	18.9%	6.8%
I make formal complaints.	14.3%	13.5%	9.1%
I organize demonstrations and boycotts.	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
I inform civil rights organizations and the media.	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%
Something else	10.7%	10.8%	11.4%

Cultural Support*Cultural Empowerment*

My survey went on to ask if the HBCU culture has anything to do with career advancement. I ran *t* tests by rank for the question “How does your institution’s culture empower you to advance in your career (select all that apply)?” and produced no significant results. I ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results, either. Table 52 indicates 32.1% of NTT faculty, 37.8% of tenure-track faculty, and 36.4% of tenured faculty selected the response option “My institution’s culture encourages my accomplishments.” Table

51 shows 28.6% of business faculty, 38.1% of education faculty, 45.5% of faculty from medicine and health, 38.1% of faculty from the social sciences, and 41.2% or arts or humanities faculty selected this response.

Some of the survey response options about the cultural climate being friendly produced low percentages; 14.3% of business faculty, 28.6% of education faculty, 31.8% of faculty from medicine and health, 14.3% from the social sciences, and 35.3% or arts or humanities faculty responded that their institution's culture is open, warm, and friendly. Similarly, 17.9% of NTT, 27.0% of tenure-track, and 20.5% of tenured faculty selected this answer choice.

Table 51

Cultural Support by Discipline

Cultural support	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
My institution's culture emphasizes concern for me and my career advancement.	7.1%	9.5%	27.3%	14.3%	35.3%
My institution's culture is open, warm, and friendly.	14.3%	28.6%	31.8%	9.5%	35.3%
My institution's culture encourages my accomplishments.	28.6%	38.1%	45.5%	38.1%	41.2%
My institution's culture supports my personal development.	21.4%	38.1%	40.9%	23.8%	29.4%
I identify with my institution's values, assumptions, and goals.	14.3%	28.6%	40.9%	23.8%	47.1%
Through community uplift and as a source of Black cultural heritage	14.3%	33.3%	31.8%	28.6%	47.1%
My institution's culture does not empower me to advance in my career.	14.3%	28.6%	27.3%	28.6%	41.2%
Something else	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	17.6%

Table 52*Cultural Support by Rank*

Cultural support	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure- Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
My institution's culture emphasizes concern for me and my career advancement.	14.3%	24.3%	15.9%
My institution's culture is open, warm, and friendly.	17.9%	27.0%	20.5%
My institution's culture encourages my accomplishments.	32.1%	37.8%	36.4%
My institution's culture supports my personal development.	21.4%	32.4%	29.5%
I identify with my institution's values, assumptions, and goals.	25.0%	27.0%	34.1%
Through community uplift and as a source of Black cultural heritage	17.9%	37.8%	27.3%
My institution's culture does not empower me to advance in my career.	17.9%	35.1%	31.8%
Something else	10.7%	5.4%	6.8%

Administrative Disclosure

Survey questions then discussed the amount of administrative disclosure within the institution. I ran a chi-square test by rank and discipline, which yielded no significant differences in responses. Table 53 indicates 64.7% of faculty from the social sciences, 41.2% of faculty from education, and 31.3% of faculty from the arts or humanities selected "There is not much administrative disclosure." Table 54 shows 32.4% of tenure-track and 34.1% of tenured faculty selected this response, and 33.3% of business faculty and 27.8% of medicine and health faculty selected "There is a fair amount of administrative disclosure. Table 54 shows 17.9% of NTT faculty selected this option. These findings coincide with previous literature, which

explains strained relationships between faculty and administrators (DeBoy, 2015; Gasman et al., 2007; Scott & Hines, 2014).

Table 53

Administrative Disclosure by Discipline

Administrative disclosure	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
There is complete administrative disclosure.	22.2%	0.0%	11.1%	5.9%	6.3%
There is a good amount of administrative disclosure.	11.1%	29.4%	33.3%	5.9%	25.0%
There is a fair amount of administrative disclosure.	33.3%	23.5%	27.8%	0.0%	25.0%
There is not much administrative disclosure.	22.2%	41.2%	22.2%	64.7%	31.3%
There is no administrative disclosure.	11.1%	5.9%	5.6%	23.5%	12.5%

Table 54

Administrative Disclosure by Rank

Administrative disclosure	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
There is complete administrative disclosure.	14.3%	5.4%	2.3%
There is a good amount of administrative disclosure.	14.3%	10.8%	22.7%
There is a fair amount of administrative disclosure.	17.9%	24.3%	13.6%
There is not much administrative disclosure.	14.3%	32.4%	34.1%
There is no administrative disclosure.	7.1%	10.8%	11.4%

Shared Governance

My survey went on to investigate shared governance, which may play a part in the career advancement of faculty members. The survey asked, “What are some areas of shared decision-making that faculty are involved with in the institution where you are employed (select all that apply)?” I ran t tests by rank, which indicated tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty had a significant difference in selection of the answer option “Tenure and promotion,” $t(63) = -2.91, p = .005$. Table 56 shows 17.9% of NTT faculty selected this answer choice compared to 51.4% of tenure-track faculty. This same response option produced significant results between NTT and tenured faculty $t(70) = 2.86, p = .006$. 50% of tenured faculty selected this option, while 17.9% of NTT faculty did. There was also a significant difference between NTT faculty and tenured faculty in selection of answer choice “Method of instruction,” $t(70) = 2.34, p = .022$; 52.3% of tenured faculty selected this response, while 25% of NTT faculty did. This is most likely due to the fact that NTT faculty are not usually permitted to partake in shared governance activities. Tenure-track and tenured faculty yielded no significant differences in responses.

I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which yielded no significant results. However, there were some interesting findings that showed which shared-governance areas faculty members were most involved in. For instance, Table 56 indicates “The curriculum” as a popular answer choice among all the faculty ranks. Table 55 shows 57.1% of business faculty, 71.4% of education faculty, 63.6% of medicine and health faculty, 76.2% of social science faculty, and 64.7% of arts or humanities faculty selected this answer choice. Additionally, 52.4% of education faculty and 54.5% of medicine and health faculty indicated research as an area of shared decision-making they are involved with.

Table 55

Shared Governance by Discipline

Shared governance	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Characteristics of student life connected to the educational process	35.7%	38.1%	36.4%	23.8%	17.6%
Faculty status	35.7%	28.6%	31.8%	23.8%	58.8%
Research	14.3%	52.4%	54.5%	38.1%	47.1%
Method of instruction	42.9%	47.6%	45.5%	28.6%	64.7%
Subject matter	21.4%	38.1%	45.5%	28.6%	52.9%
The curriculum	57.1%	71.4%	63.6%	76.2%	64.7%
Tenure and promotion	42.9%	38.1%	36.4%	52.4%	47.1%
Economic policy changes	0.0%	9.5%	9.1%	0.0%	5.9%
Layoffs and/or restructuring	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Something else	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	5.9%
None	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	14.3%	17.6%

Table 56

Shared Governance by Rank

Shared governance	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Characteristics of student life connected to the educational process	25.0%	27.0%	31.8%
Faculty status	32.1%	32.4%	38.6%
Research	35.7%	40.5%	45.5%
Method of instruction	25.0%	45.9%	52.3%
Subject matter	32.1%	32.4%	43.2%
The curriculum	60.7%	67.6%	70.5%
Tenure and promotion	17.9%	51.4%	50.0%
Economic policy changes	3.6%	2.7%	9.1%
Layoffs and/or restructuring	3.6%	2.7%	2.3%
Something else	0.0%	2.7%	2.3%
None	3.6%	13.5%	2.3%

Faculty Senate

The latter portion of my survey went on to ask if there was a faculty senate and how much sway the faculty senate has in the decision-making process. The faculty senate can be a powerful tool for faculty members to assert their interests and advance in their careers. This question aimed to gauge the level of involvement the faculty senate has. I ran a chi-square test by rank, which yielded no significant results. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which did not yield any significant results, either. Despite this, there were some interesting findings. The most popular answer choice among all disciplines was: “Yes and we have some say in governing the institution.” Table 57 shows 33.3% of business faculty, 43.8% of education faculty, 55.6% of medicine and health faculty, 44.4% of social science faculty, and 62.5% of arts or humanities faculty selected this response. Table 58 shows 25.0% of NTT, 81.1% of tenure-track, and 52.3% of tenured faculty selected this same answer choice. This demonstrates a fair amount of involvement by the faculty senate in the decision-making process.

Table 57

Faculty Senate by Discipline

Faculty senate	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Yes, and our voice is well respected in governing the institution.	22.2%	31.3%	22.2%	16.7%	6.3%
Yes, and we have some say in governing the institution.	33.3%	43.8%	55.6%	44.4%	62.5%
Yes, but our decisions are often overturned.	22.2%	12.5%	11.1%	33.3%	31.3%
No, but we plan on creating one.	11.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No, and there are no plans to establish a faculty senate.	11.1%	6.3%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%

Table 58*Faculty Senate by Rank*

Faculty senate	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Yes, and our voice is well respected in governing the institution.	25.0%	29.7%	9.1%
Yes, and we have some say in governing the institution	25.0%	81.1%	52.3%
Yes, but our decisions are often overturned	10.7%	27.0%	15.9%
No, but we plan on creating one	3.6%	5.4%	2.3%
No, and there are no plans to establish a faculty senate	0.0%	5.4%	4.5%

Next, my survey investigated which areas the faculty senate were involved with. Some areas included decision-making surrounding admissions, recruitment, retention, grading, academic programs, and the curriculum. The survey asked, “Is the faculty senate involved with decision-making in any of the following areas (select all that apply)?” I ran *t* tests by rank, which produced no significant results. I also ran chi-square tests by discipline and saw no significant results.

Table 59 shows 42.9% of education faculty, 47.6% of social science faculty, and 76.5% of arts or humanities faculty chose “curriculum policy” as an area of decision-making they were involved with. Table 60 shows 35.5% of NTT faculty, 54.1% of tenure-track faculty, and 48.9% of tenured faculty chose this option, as well. Fifty percent of faculty from the business discipline selected “policies for retention” as an area where they were involved in decision-making,

whereas 45.5% of faculty from medicine and health and 76.5% of faculty from the arts or humanities chose “the reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs” as an area in which they were involved with the decision-making process. Table 60 indicates 35.5% of NTT, 48.6% of tenure-track, and 42.2% of tenured faculty selected this same answer choice.

Table 59

Faculty Senate Decision-Making by Discipline

Faculty senate decision-making	Business <i>n</i> = 14	Education <i>n</i> = 21	Med & health <i>n</i> = 22	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 21	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 17
Grading policies	42.9%	33.3%	22.7%	38.1%	41.2%
The reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs	35.7%	33.3%	45.5%	42.9%	76.5%
Policies for retention	50.0%	23.8%	40.9%	28.6%	35.3%
Admissions	21.4%	19.0%	27.3%	23.8%	29.4%
Recruitment of students	21.4%	23.8%	18.2%	14.3%	29.4%
Degree-granting requirements	42.9%	23.8%	13.6%	38.1%	52.9%
Curricular structure	28.6%	23.8%	31.8%	42.9%	70.6%
Curriculum policy	35.7%	42.9%	40.9%	47.6%	76.5%
Something else	7.1%	4.8%	4.5%	14.3%	35.3%
None	0.0%	4.8%	4.5%	9.5%	5.9%
We do not have a faculty senate.	7.1%	9.5%	9.1%	4.8%	0.0%

Table 60*Faculty Senate Decision-Making by Rank*

Faculty senate decision-making	NTT faculty <i>n</i> = 28	Tenure-Track faculty <i>n</i> = 37	Tenured faculty <i>n</i> = 44
Grading policies	32.3%	37.8%	33.3%
The reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs	35.5%	48.6%	42.2%
Policies for retention	25.8%	43.2%	33.3%
Admissions	25.8%	24.3%	22.2%
Recruitment of students	22.6%	18.9%	20.0%
Degree-granting requirements	19.4%	40.5%	37.8%
Curricular structure	32.3%	45.9%	42.2%
Curriculum policy	35.5%	54.1%	48.9%
Something else	12.9%	18.9%	8.9%
None	0.0%	8.1%	6.7%

Collective Bargaining

The final question on my survey asked about collective bargaining, which is a tool that gives faculty some power and control over their career advancement. The results show not many faculty have collective bargaining. In a yes or no response, faculty members were asked, “Do the faculty within your institution partake in collective bargaining?” I ran a chi-square test by rank but found no significant results. I also ran a chi-square test by discipline, which produced no significant results. Nevertheless, as indicated in Tables 61 and 62, the majority of responding faculty members from each discipline and in all ranks said they do not partake in collective bargaining. This leaves some concern about how faculty members advocate for their interests.

Table 61*Collective Bargaining by Discipline*

	Business <i>n</i> = 9	Education <i>n</i> = 17	Med & health <i>n</i> = 16	Soc sci <i>n</i> = 18	Arts or hum <i>n</i> = 16
Collective bargaining					
Yes	22.2%	35.3%	25.0%	5.6%	31.3%
No	77.8%	64.7%	75.0%	94.4%	68.8%

Table 62*Collective Bargaining by Rank*

	NTT <i>n</i> = 18	Tenure-Track <i>n</i> = 32	Tenured <i>n</i> = 36
Collective bargaining			
Yes	22.2%	28.1%	16.7%
No	77.8%	71.9%	83.3%

Chapter 5

Discussion

My study focused on HBCUs and the supports that Black women faculty use for their career advancement. I used quantitative measures (an electronic survey) to investigate these support factors and focused on the intersection of race and gender. Some support factors explored were family, friends, colleagues, networks, valuation, culture, shared governance, religion, collaboration, communication, mentors, safe spaces, social activism, and other strategies.

Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What internal support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
2. What external support factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
3. What institutional cultural factors are used by Black women faculty for career advancement at HBCUs?
4. What are the differences in supports by academic discipline and faculty rank?

Collaboration

Collaboration was a very important support for the participants in my study. Collaboration shows that Black women faculty in my study from all ranks and disciplines chiefly rely on working on research with other scholars to help them advance in their careers. Not only is this necessary to advance in their careers, but it is supportive in abstract ways to cope with

their experiences, make connections, and navigate institutional politics (Hernandez et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008).

My study aligned with prior literature that stated collaboration is a powerful support for Black women faculty (Hernandez et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008; Thandi Sule, 2011; Williams, 2001). Many Black women faculty in my study indicated that they collaborated with external parties. These mainly included external social networks, external professional groups, and Black women outside of participants' institutions. A fair number of participants selected that they publish with internal co-authors. Evidently, external collaboration is more heavily relied upon than internal. When viewing Tables 47 and 48, it seems the primary reason for collaborating with colleagues as a strategy is not for generating research but for other forms of career advancement support. While research activity is still an important component to support for career advancement, as noted in Tables 31 and 32, based on my research study, Black women are working with colleagues in various ways. As indicated, pooling resources is another powerful way Black women faculty can gain support to advance in their careers (Hernandez et al., 2015). The findings in my study coincide with prior literature in this respect.

Mentoring

Mentoring is a principal way Black women faculty members are able to understand the ins and outs of their institution and/or department, especially for tenure-track faculty. Mentoring was a highly selected support used by faculty from all ranks in my study. External Black women mentors, external professional networks, and external role models were the most common mentoring support. Black women faculty in my study also relied on Black women mentors internal to their institution to learn the ins and outs of their institutions and/or departments.

Social science faculty were more likely to seek mentors, get support from networks, and collaborate with colleagues. Lloyd-Jones (2014) stated the social sciences discipline is where most scholarly contributions from Black women derive. Concerns about oppression and poverty have been central to many HBCUs since their founding and prompted the pioneering of social work programs in the 1920s (Marshall, Davis Smith, Green, Anderson, Harry, Byrd, Pratt-Harris, Bolden, & Hill, 2016). It could be that this discipline is more friendly to Black women faculty because it is less male dominated and has more women faculty members, or, perhaps, the social work mission being so close to home for many HBCUs has encouraged support for the career advancement of Black women faculty in some way. Women have high numbers of faculty in social work, education, and nursing but very low numbers in disciplines such as the natural sciences, medicine, and law (Hirshfield, & Joseph, 2012).

One study showed ineffective mentoring as a hindrance to women medical faculty reaching higher career ranks (Blood et al., 2012). There are also low numbers of women faculty in disciplines such as mathematics, engineering, and technology (Xu, 2012).

Women are underrepresented in the STEM field, and there is a male culture within these disciplines (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Ward and Wolf-Wendel took a look at the experiences of faculty members who are mothers. Oftentimes being the only woman in a STEM-related department means hypervisibility and an increased workload, excessive committee work, and obligations to women graduate students. Additionally, the unique nature of the lab environment creates a lot of pressure to stay staffed and funded through grants, even during maternity leaves (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Although this is relevant, it does not home in on Black women faculty, specifically.

The humanities discipline consists of time-consuming paper grading requirements and extensive book-writing expectations, but it has the flexibility to complete these tasks independently in the early mornings or late in the evenings while children are asleep. Opportunities for women have increased in the social sciences over the past 30 years. However, there may be a generational divide where senior women faculty without children do not realistically believe a successful woman faculty member can have children (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Again, this is pertinent to the topic, but it would be useful to have a specific focus on Black women. Future studies should address if there is a generational divide, as well.

While all of these studies are interesting and provide some insights, they focus on White women faculty at PWIs. Again, White women faculty's experiences cannot be assumed to be similar to Black women faculty's experiences. Future research needs to investigate the disciplines within HBCUs and how they shape support for mentoring, networking, and collaboration opportunities.

Safe Spaces

When asked what safe spaces the institution provides that help participants advance in their career, an open-ended answer choice was offered where 23 respondents wrote in that there were no safe spaces provided. It raises some concern that 21% of respondents in my study expressed this. It is interesting because HBCUs are places for Black cultural pride. However, when it comes to Black women faculty, specifically, there may be some instances when the HBCU is not an environment that engenders the confidence in Black women that they have a place to go on campus where they feel safe from discrimination. On the other hand, respondents may be expressing that the HBCU in its entirety is a safe space and therefore, no safe spaces are needed. There were several participants who left this open-ended answer option blank. Then,

there were a handful of respondents who wrote that there were mentoring or development opportunities, but they were not specific to race or gender but based on being a junior or full-time faculty member. In summation, the majority of responses were the ones that indicated there were no safe spaces provided, and the remaining open-ended responses were just a few stating the aforementioned.

Religion

Religious safe spaces were the most selected response option among faculty ranks and disciplines. This is, in part, a testament to the history of religious influences in the fiber of Black educational institutions (Anderson, 1988; Gasman, 2007; LeMelle, 2002; United Negro College Fund, 2019). Relying on religion for career advancement is a very powerful support for Black women faculty (Forsyth & Carter, 2014; Gregory, 2001; Jarmon, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Walker, 2009).

Prayer was overwhelmingly relied upon by faculty members from all ranks and disciplines as a support to their career advancement. Many HBCUs have historical religious affiliations, embrace prayer, and promote these practices. If they have not done so already, policymakers may want to consider incorporating spiritual spaces into the campus environment so that faculty members can have this critical source of support available to them. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act specifies, as long as it does not impose an undue hardship on the employer, that the employer is required to reasonably accommodate an employee's sincerely held moral, ethical, or religious beliefs or practices (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [U.S. EEOC], 1997). While a prayer room is not specifically required by the law, providing such a space is shown to improve employee morale, increase productivity, and promote inclusion, which subsequently leads to greater innovation, improved decision-making, and higher returns

(Gurchiek, 2018). Also, considering 59.5% of tenure-track faculty utilize meditation as a support, higher education leaders may want to allot more time and space for faculty members to meditate. These support options are low cost for institutions of higher education because there are few resources required, if any at all, to allow for prayer and meditation.

Valuation

With the exception of NTT faculty and business faculty, roughly more than half of Black women faculty selected that they felt their colleagues valued their opinions. This offers an optimistic outlook when considering the devaluation of Black women faculty's contributions at PWIs, the racial microaggressions, and downright harassment evidenced in prior literature (Danley et al., 2009; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Lloyd-Jones, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). It is important to a faculty member's job satisfaction, stress levels, enthusiasm about work, and sense of agency in reaching their career goals to have supportive colleagues who recognize their talent and to perceive the department in which they work to value their scholarly contributions, service work, and teaching (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014). Several inferences may be made from the participants' responses that they are valued. Prior literature tells us the HBCU environment engenders racial pride and inclusion (Conrad & Gasman, 2015). There seem to be additional supportive aspects to the HBCU environment where Black women faculty are valued by their colleagues.

There were mixed responses by rank and discipline, none of which were significantly different, about ways to improve internal valuation. Among one of the more popular responses was encouraging the faculty member's accomplishments. According to Hinton (2010), when colleagues within a Black woman faculty member's department did not encourage her accomplishments, it became essential for her to turn to a Black woman dean and a Black senior

faculty member outside of her discipline. These supports provided the faculty member with the encouragement she needed to accomplish her research and projects.

There were also many faculty members who selected that their institution or department values their work enough. This is another optimistic difference found at HBCUs when comparing them to PWIs. More information is needed through qualitative inquiry to learn about this.

Cultural Support

The responses to the portion of the survey that asked about the supportive cultural aspects of the HBCU environment were somewhat surprising. Responses were low to survey options stating there was concern for the faculty member and her career advancement and that the institution's culture was open, warm, and friendly. There is a lot to unpack here because prior literature tells us that the HBCU culture embodies extra care and support (Flowers et al., 2015; Hirt et al., 2008). It seems the emphasis in prior literature was on student experiences and has not addressed the perspective of women faculty members. While this care and support is beneficial toward students, existing literature does not fully investigate Black women faculty members' experiences at HBCUs.

One study (Sawyer-Kurian & Coneal, 2018) focused on African American women with families working at HBCUs. This study suggested mentoring programs for said faculty members and a shift in focus away from tenure and promotion norms that value the behaviors of White men. Additionally, the authors stated credit should be earned toward tenure for othermothering activities. It also pointed out the lingering issues with lack of promotion for women and the pay gap between men and women faculty.

It seems that providing extra support for students goes unrewarded and perhaps unnoticed. Conversely, the additional support given to students might be a mutually beneficial relationship. It could also be that a friendly atmosphere is not necessarily important to Black women faculty members in their career advancement. Either way, future studies need to explore why Black women faculty do not perceive the HBCU culture to be friendly or concerned about them.

There were responses that indicated there was encouragement within the HBCU cultural environment for Black women faculty's accomplishments. In fact, this was one of the highest percentage of responses across all ranks and disciplines. There were also responses indicating the faculty member identified with the institution's values and that there was support of personal development. Perhaps the HBCU culture provides professional encouragement for faculty, which does not mirror the more personal care that is given to students. There is an indication that Black women faculty members are revered as scholars within the HBCU culture. At any rate, more work needs to be done to uncover these complex cultural dynamics.

Relationship Status

It may be inferred that marriage is not highly supportive to career advancement during the tenure process for Black women faculty. Since tenured faculty were more likely to be married and/or live with a significant other, compared to tenure-track faculty, it may be that Black women faculty on the tenure track are not getting married because they do not find it supportive to their careers. In fact, being single might be the most supportive relationship status to the careers of tenure-track Black women faculty, considering this group had the highest selection of this relationship status. On the other hand, many tenured faculty in this study were married, showing that for tenured Black women faculty, marriage may be supportive to career

advancement after tenure is achieved. Extant literature fails to focus on how relationship status influences the careers of Black women faculty. Therefore, additional research is needed in this area.

By Discipline

Having opportunities to grow and learn was a highly selected answer choice, particularly with arts or humanities faculty and medicine and health faculty. Academic leaders may want to implement initiatives to enable Black women faculty to have growth opportunities available to them. This is an area in need of future research, especially for Black women faculty at HBCUs. More information is needed about what types of growth opportunities are applicable.

Relevant literature about the work environment for women in higher education discusses job satisfaction and the need for a critical mass. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) focused on job satisfaction and found that women in engineering were the least satisfied, followed by the social sciences, then the sciences, and finally women in the health field being the most satisfied. Even though most studies about the chilly atmosphere faced by women faculty focus on the STEM field, on average, there is a similar unwelcoming climate in any department where women faculty are underrepresented (Maranto & Griffin, 2011). Bouvier (2013) found the work environment for women faculty who are pre-tenure is positively impacted in history and management fields when a critical mass is met. This is reached when 15% of faculty are women or when approximately three or more women faculty are in key leadership roles in small institutions, taking part in decision-making about outcomes and processes (Bouvier, 2013). Cselenszky's (2011) study focused on women leaders (presidents, deans, etc.) in higher education. She found having a critical mass of women has a major impact on how quickly governance and policy issues are implemented, especially those issues related to marginalized

groups of people (Cselenszky, 2011). Therefore, it seems the most important concern is the amount of Black women faculty within each academic discipline.

Within the HBCUs in my study, it could be that the arts or humanities and medicine and health disciplines have had success in reaching a critical mass of Black women faculty. Future studies should pull more data about this and combine it with qualitative investigations.

Achieving Tenure

Roughly greater than half of the faculty members in my study indicated learning or knowing the unwritten rules was supportive to their career advancement. These norms, which include unwritten rules, are not unique to HBCUs but are similar to the norms at all institutions of higher education. While not all requirements of the job can be written down, academic leaders should work to establish as many concrete procedures as possible, especially when considering tenure and promotions. More than half of tenure-track faculty selected their institution could better communicate advancement/promotion opportunities. This finding bolsters the need for more formal procedures when it comes to how academic leaders are communicating rules related to achieving tenure and deciding on tenure. Vague requirements guiding important tenure and promotion decisions are subject to bias and subjective decision making (Arnold et al., 2016; Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Gregory, 2001; Lawrence et al., 2014; Moses, 1989). Policymakers may wish to continually outline and revise more tangible guidelines about the tenure and promotion process, rather than relying on unwritten rules.

Further, disciplines where women are more prevalent significantly indicated a desire for increased communication among more people. Greater than half of social science faculty and arts or humanities faculty responded in this way, further demonstrating a need for more

structured communication rather than relying on unwritten rules. Similarly, greater than half of faculty from the arts or humanities and faculty from the social sciences selected internal communication could be improved by making more information available.

Shared Governance

When asked which areas of shared governance they participated in, numerous faculty members in my study indicated the curriculum. Although HBCUs have not traditionally focused on shared governance, they should use shared governance for survival during dire economic times (Gasman, 2009; Gasman et al., 2007). Academic leaders at HBCUs can work to break down barriers to faculty development and advancement through increased shared governance (Davenport, 2015). In recent years, fewer and fewer HBCUs have been placed on the American Association of University Professors' list of censured administrations (AAUP, 2019). This goes to show HBCUs may be embracing forms of shared governance. Policymakers should look for ways to facilitate the implementation of shared governance structures at HBCUs. Intricate historical and present-day circumstances need to be carefully considered. At times, presidents and administrators tried to protect the institution and its stakeholders by asserting rules, which may have been deemed strict (Favors, 2019; Williamson, 2008). Some may argue that certain HBCUs' doors are still open today because of such leadership. Circumstances such as these have led many HBCUs to be uncertain about whether or not shared governance structures will protect their institution and the faculty members within them, who depend on the institution for their livelihood.

When asked if there was a faculty senate and its involvement level in decision-making, the most common response was that they do have a faculty senate, which has some say in governing the institution. There may be links between these HBCUs with the highest percentage

of tenured faculty consisting of Black women and an increased level of influence in the faculty senate. Future studies should investigate this. More information is also needed about how this relates to the career advancement of Black women faculty. Since the most common areas of decision-making the faculty senate took part in were curriculum, retention, and academic programs, how does this translate to career advancement?

The participants in my study across ranks and discipline largely did not partake in collective bargaining at their respective institutions. More information is needed about whether or not faculty members perceive collective bargaining as a support to their career advancement. Myers's (2011) study showed that faculty unions did not result in job satisfaction most likely because their bargaining power was not very strong and only resulted in slightly higher salaries. Compared to faculty members, administrators control more information, are more central to the institution, and have better access to gatekeepers, which may be why faculty collective bargaining power pales in comparison. Furthermore, terms and conditions of employment do not necessarily translate to job satisfaction, which has a lot to do with campus climate (Myers, 2011). Given this information and considering career advancement, future studies should home in on the perceptions of faculty members who do partake in collective bargaining.

Circumstances for NTT Faculty

My study shows the concerns of NTT faculty at HBCUs are generally similar to those of NTT faculty at other types of institutions. Since going on retreats was a significantly more common support for tenured faculty than NTT faculty, leaders in higher education may want to consider creating some improved initiatives for non-tenure track faculty. Only a little more than a quarter of NTT faculty responded that they felt empowered when being part of decision-making processes. However, when asked about shared governance, significantly fewer NTT

faculty than higher ranking faculty indicated they were involved in helping decide on method of instruction. Since NTT faculty are not invited to be involved in decision-making, policymakers might want to consider incorporating them into the process, as they are an important part of the educational environment. Academic leaders may also want to consider what safe spaces are available to NTT faculty. Conversely, there may be a portion of NTT faculty who are less concerned with their career advancement. Qualitative interviews are needed to shed light on this.

NTT faculty had unique responses to many of the survey questions. Compared to other faculty ranks, NTT faculty did not indicate that family members were a significant support for their career advancement. Although about half of NTT faculty responded that family was a supportive party, this percentage was much less than tenure-track and tenured faculty responses. It could be that there is less need for this type of support since the pressure of the tenure-track is not there. However, it is unclear based on the survey data alone.

Suggestions for Black Women Faculty

Overhauling deeply engrained sexist subliminal or overt beliefs within higher education and society is quite a task, to say the least. Much of the improvements that could be made to increase support for the career advancement of Black women faculty has to do with problems with the patriarchy that are seen throughout the country, within PWIs, and cannot easily be dismantled. However, I do have some other suggestions based on my research findings.

Based on my study, I would encourage Black women faculty to investigate many different avenues of support. If the faculty member is at all religious or spiritual, I would encourage the faculty member to get more involved in that religion or spirituality. If possible, allot time each day for prayer or meditation and let the people around them know this is a

priority and a non-negotiable. Reasonable religious accommodations in the workplace should be protected under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, so faculty members may want to inquire with their human resources department about what is acceptable and permissible at their place of employment.

Secondly, I encourage faculty to branch out and connect with Black women in the area, out of state, across the country, and internationally. Go virtual and set time on the calendar every couple of weeks to connect with Black women colleagues. The internet is a powerful tool to use to reach out for support. LinkedIn is just one platform where scholars can search for each other and send messages. Facebook also has groups for Black women in higher education. Additionally, scholars could start their own groups. Perhaps researching institutions' faculty websites, searching for Black women, and messaging them would be a start to organizing a collaborative support group.

Recommendations for Future Research

Considering the plethora of research conducted at PWIs, there is a clear need to focus additional research studies on Black women faculty at HBCUs from a non-deficit perspective. Though numerous studies investigated the experiences of women or even women of color as a collective group, the body of literature about the career advancement experiences of Black women faculty, specifically, needs further development and investigation.

Current research on career advancement for women in terms of leadership development lacks a focus on Black women faculty in higher education (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). Literature from a traditional, White, feminist perspective often incorrectly assumes women from all races and ethnicities share the same career experiences (Davis & Maldonado, 2015). A study

on how Intersectionality plays a part in the career advancement experiences specific to Black women in academia is still needed. Extant literature emphasizes the barriers for Black women in PWIs. However, there is a need for investigation into the individual experiences of Black women faculty and how they advance in their careers (Davis & Maldonado, 2015).

Mentoring

A thorough investigation of mentoring is needed using BFT (Holmes et al., 2007). It is worth studying how much mentoring matters to the career advancement of Black women faculty and how mentoring impacts Black women faculty's career development (Holmes et al., 2007). Given the historical background of the oppression of Black women, it is important to investigate this in relation to BFT, which encompass significant political and sociological influences that shape professional and personal experiences (Holmes et al., 2007). In terms of mentoring, policies and practices should be reviewed from a BFT lens, keeping in mind the racist and sexist tradition of exclusion (Holmes et al., 2007). Also, understanding legal implications and how to take legal action in order for Black women faculty to gain upward mobility in the face of discrimination is an additional area for consideration (Holmes et al., 2007).

My study coincided with prior literature in pointing to mentoring as a chief support for Black women faculty. There is still much more to investigate about the relevance of Black women faculty having Black women mentors, and to what extent mixed race and mixed gender mentoring is effective in supporting the career advancement of Black women faculty. My study indicated fewer tenured faculty had a Black woman mentor compared to tenure-track and NTT faculty. It also indicated very few tenured faculty stated they have a mentor who is a woman of color, compared to tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty.

If tenured Black women faculty did have access to Black women mentors or mentors who are women of color, it would be interesting to study how these relationships would compare to those relationships between White mentors and mixed-gender mentoring unions. When looking by discipline, many social science and medicine and health faculty and some arts or humanities faculty selected they have a Black woman mentor, compared to very few education faculty and business faculty. This raises questions about the mentoring practices for Black women faculty in the education and business disciplines. For instance, how supportive are the mentoring relationships in advancing the careers of Black women faculty? There are gaps in understanding the dynamics of these relationships.

Communication

Low numbers of faculty from all ranks indicated they receive forthcoming, accurate communication. About half of tenure-track faculty selected their institution could have more forthcoming, accurate communication. Future studies need to address what forms of communication Black women faculty members would like to see and the specific areas where communication is lacking. It is still unknown if improvements in communication need to be developed by administrators, deans, college presidents, other faculty members, all the above, or another entity entirely.

Another area of interest is in the experiences of faculty members at the associate professor rank who are striving to achieve full professor. Considering there is a stark drop in the percentage of Black women faculty from associate professor to full professor, as indicated by the NCES (2017b), it is alarming that some barriers may be in place or supports are lacking for Black women faculty to reach their full career potential. A gap is exposed here since all tenured

faculty were grouped together because the number of participants in each rank were too few when separated.

Administrative Disclosure

The highest percentages in responses regarding administrative disclosure pointed to not much administrative disclosure perceived by the Black women faculty in my study. For complex reasons, including financial uncertainty of the institution, there are likely tense relationships between faculty and administrators at HBCUs (DeBoy, 2015; Gasman et al., 2007; Scott & Hines, 2014). There is no simple solution to bridging this gap in disclosure, especially considering historically, administrative decision-making often had life-or-death consequences when dealing with rabid White supremacists and with the racism that pervaded legislative bodies (Williamson-Lott, 2008). It goes without saying that these sorts of injustices have not entirely disappeared from institutions of higher education and various institutions within society. Therefore, administrators may deem lack of disclosure a protective effort at helping the institution thrive. Clearly, more work needs to be done at understanding the administrative disclosure at HBCUs from various perspectives.

Collaboration

Tenure-track faculty were more likely to select that their institution had prospects to co-author with Black women, as compared to the responses of tenured faculty. There may be a focus on supporting tenure-track faculty through the tenure process. Qualitative studies would help to investigate this further. Additionally, half of business faculty selected they do not use internal collaboration. However, slightly less than half of business faculty indicated they collaborate through external professional groups, and the majority of business faculty indicated

that they collaborate with colleagues. Since it can be deduced that business faculty are collaborating with external parties, further exploration into this is required to understand why. It could be the climate within this particular discipline makes it somehow difficult for Black women faculty to make connections within their institutions.

Social Activism

The majority of faculty members in my study indicated their institution does not use social activism. Future studies should focus on the HBCUs that do embrace social activism and see how that relates to the career advancement of Black women faculty members. For instance, is social activism empowering and somehow promotes career advancement or could it be problematic in some way?

Future studies should explore the extent to which NTT faculty are interested in utilizing an outlet to voice concerns about injustice, what barriers stand in the way of doing so, if they are interested in advancing their careers, and if so, how this relates to their career advancement. Almost half of arts or humanities faculty selected their institution empowers them to incorporate social activism into their work. It seems the arts or humanities discipline is distinct in their responses about social activism because, compared to the other disciplines, it had the highest response rates to “My institution empowers me to incorporate social activism into my work” and “My institution breaks down structures which oppress Black women.” Future studies should investigate how the arts or humanities embrace social activism and how this relates to the career advancement of Black women faculty.

When asked about involvement in external social activism, there were not many responses indicating this was a strong support to career advancement. About half of the arts and

humanities faculty indicated that they voice their concerns about injustice and that they strive for social justice in their research and scholarly work. This is most likely due to social activism being more ingrained within this discipline, as compared to other disciplines (Rose, 2017). In terms of career advancement, it may not benefit the faculty member to be active in social justice movements. Historically, there were Black women faculty who played very important roles within the Black freedom struggle, but this often came at a high cost to their livelihood and safety (Favors, 2019; Williamson-Lott, 2008). Considering White supremacy continues to pervade higher education, it could be that social activism is actually detrimental to the career advancement of Black women faculty. More research is needed on this to fully understand the perspectives of Black women faculty.

Internal & External Supportive Parties

Family, friends, and colleagues were important supports to Black women faculty, as indicated by survey responses, across rank and discipline. However, spousal support was not selected in high numbers as a support to career advancement. Prior literature speaks to women in general, stating compared to men, women find less spousal support for career advancement (Ocampo et al., 2018). In a study conducted by Sabharwal and Corley (2009), men faculty across all disciplines were significantly more likely to be married. Since the existing body of literature does not focus on Black women faculty, there is a lot of room for investigation about Black women faculty and how marital status relates to career advancement. Support from children was also not selected in high numbers. In Sabharwal and Corley's study, men faculty were more likely to have children, with the exception of women faculty in engineering. It seems children are not very supportive to the career advancement of faculty members in this study. However, this leaves much unsaid about the likely complex reasons why. It may not be that

children are unsupportive but that the academic environment still has not made much room for faculty members managing the responsibilities that come with motherhood.

Business Faculty

As previously mentioned, business faculty members showed unique responses in several areas. In regard to supportive parties, business faculty indicated much less support from family and children, as compared to the arts or humanities faculty members. However, the business faculty are heavily supported by colleagues, as shown by greater than half of business faculty responses.

Something Else

The questions that yielded a significant number of responses for “Something else” indicate there is need for a more thorough exploration on these topics. Future research studies should look into this, ideally with a qualitative methodology such as semi-structured interviews. Faculty chose “Something else” when asked about strategies, collaboration, religious/spiritual supports, empowering supports, cultural support, shared governance, faculty senate decision-making, safe spaces used and provided by the institution, how internal mentors help career advancement, social activism, valuation, how internal communication plays a role, how collaboration is used, and how the institution uses social activism for these purposes. While most of these “Something else” responses were well under a quarter of responses, a thorough investigation should uncover the details of what encompasses these supports.

Liberal Arts Schools

Existing literature focuses on the experiences of Black faculty members at institutions that focus heavily on research (Pittman, 2012). Future investigations should also consider the experiences of Black women faculty members at colleges and universities that do not focus so much on research production. Liberal arts schools may present a different type of environment with varying experiences, compared to schools that have very high research activity.

Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty

Extant literature investigates the experiences of Black women faculty who are either on the tenure track or have received tenure (Constantine et al., 2008). Considering Black women faculty are overrepresented in part-time, temporary faculty roles and in NTT positions of lecturer and instructor, it would be interesting to learn about how these career advancement experiences manifest themselves similarly or differently from those Black women faculty members in tenure-track ranks (Delgado Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). These experiences may prove to be quite distinct from those on the tenure track.

Another area for research in the future is in the ethnic nuances of Black women faculty members. Present studies do not distinguish between Caribbean Black Americans, African Americans, foreign-born Blacks, Black Hispanics, and other ethnic identities of Black women faculty members (Pittman, 2012). Very few studies focus specifically on experiences with racial microaggressions for Black faculty in higher education (Pittman, 2012). There is also a need to narrow this focus to Black women faculty's experiences with racial microaggressions.

COVID-19

With the Black community being disproportionately affected by the novel coronavirus (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020), future studies should investigate what this means for Black women faculty members at HBCUs. The responsibilities of othermothering could increase as Black students are faced with the unprecedented pandemic. The literature states othermothering can be rewarding, and it can also be overwhelming. Therefore, it could potentially strengthen the valuation of Black women faculty at HBCUs, or it could pose a hardship to their career advancement. It could likely be both and much more. It is also likely that Black women faculty are dealing with concerns about the pandemic within their own families. This could increase their need for career support.

References

- Alfred, M. V. (2001a). Reconceptualizing marginality from the margins: Perspectives of African American tenured female faculty at a white research university. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25(1), 1–11.
- Alfred, M. V. (2001b). Success in the ivory tower. Lessons from Black tenured female faculty at a major research university. In R. O. Mabokela & A. Greene (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent black women scholars in higher education* (pp. 57–79). Stylus Publishing.
- American Association of University Professors. (2019, February). *Censure list. Academic freedom*. <https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/academic-freedom/censure-list>
- American Association of University Women. (AAUW). (2018). *The simple truth about the gender pay gap fall 2018 edition*. AAUW. <https://www.aauw.org/app/uploads/2020/02/AAUW-2018-SimpleTruth-nsa.pdf>
- Andersen, M. L., & Hill Collins, P. (2013). *Race, class, & gender: An anthology* (8th ed.). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, J. D. (2002). Race in American higher education. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 3–22). State University of New York Press.
- Annamma, S. A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison, D. (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: Using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 20(2), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248837>
- Arnett, A. (2015). Separate and unequal. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 32(8), 12–14.
- Arnold, N. W., Crawford, E. R., & Khalifa, M. (2016). Psychological heuristics and faculty of color: Racial battle fatigue and tenure/promotion. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(6), 890–919. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11780891>
- Back, L., & Solomos, J. (2000). *Theories of race and racism: A reader*. Routledge.
- Bailey, M. J., & Dynarski, S. M. (2011). Gains and gaps: Changing inequality in U.S. college entry and completion. *National Bureau of Economic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w17633>
- Banks, T. L. (1990). Two life stories: Reflections of one Black woman law professor. *Berkeley Women's Law Journal*(6), 46–56.
- Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented Black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110607>

- Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2012). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice* (Vol. 1). Stylus.
- Best, R. K., Edelman, L. B., Krieger, L. H., & Eliason, S. R. (2011). Multiple disadvantages: An empirical test of Intersectionality theory in EEO litigation. *Law & Society Review*, 45(4), 991–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00463.x>
- Blackwell, L. V., Snyder, L. A., & Mavriplis, C. (2009). Diverse faculty in STEM fields: Attitudes, performance, and fair treatment. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(4), 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016974>
- Blood, E. A., Ullrich, N. J., Hirshfeld-Becker, D. R., Seely, E. W., Connelly, M. T., Warfield, C. A., & Emans, S. J. (2012). Academic women faculty: Are they finding the mentoring they need? *Journal of Women's Health*, 21(11), 1201–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2012.3529>
- Boisnier, A. D. (2003). Race and women's identity development: Distinguishing between feminism and womanism among Black and White women. *Sex roles*, 49(5-6), 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024696022407>
- Boland, W., & Gasman, M. (2014). *America's public HBCUs: A four state comparison of institutional capacity and state funding priorities*. Penn Center for Minority Serving Institutions. 1–16.
- Bonner, F. B. (2001). Addressing gender issues in the Historically Black College and University community: A challenge and call to action. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 176–191. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211209>
- Booth-Kewley, S., Larson, G. E., & Miyoshi, D. K. (2007). Social desirability effects on computerized and paper-and-pencil questionnaires. *Computers in human behavior*, 23(1), 463–477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.10.020>
- Bouvier, D. L. (2013). *The situational context of tenured female faculty in the academy and the impact of critical mass of tenured female faculty on pre-tenure faculty job satisfaction: A four discipline study* (Publication No. ohiou1368055373) [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University]. OhioLINK.
- Brown, M. C., & Freeman, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Black colleges: New perspectives on policy and practice* (No. 3). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Campbell, C. M., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(1), 49–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9303-x>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, July 24). *Health equity considerations and racial and ethnic minority groups*. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html>

- Cheyney University. (2019, May 28). *The first HBCU*. Cheyney University of Pennsylvania. <https://cheyney.edu/who-we-are/the-first-hbcu/>
- Cole, J. B., & Guy-Sheftall, B. (2003). *Gender talk: The struggle for women's equality in African American communities*. One World, Ballantine Books.
- CUPA-HR. (2019, July 19). *College and University Professional Association for Human Resources*. CUPA-HR. <https://www.cupahr.org/>
- The Combahee River Collective. (1977). A Black feminist statement. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 42(¾), 271–280. (Fall/Winter 2014). The Feminist Press at the City University of New York.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471–482. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306983>
- Conrad, C., & Gasman, M. (2015). *Educating a diverse nation: Lessons from minority-serving institutions*. Harvard University Press.
- 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 & Development*, 86(3), 348–355. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00519.x>
- Cooper, A. J. (1899). Colored women as wage earners. *Southern Workman and Hampton School Record*, 28(1), 295–298.
- Crawford, J., II. (2017). HBCUs: Accreditation, governance and survival challenges in an ever-increasing competition for funding and students. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 2(3), 1–13.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). 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(1), 139–167.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. The New Press.
- Cselenszky, M. P. (2011). *Phenomenological study of empowering women senior leaders in higher education* (Publication No. 995) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ScholarWorks.
- Culbert, S. A., & McDonough, J. J. (1986). The politics of trust and organization empowerment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 10(2) 171–188.

- Daniel Hutchinson, L. (1981). *Anna J. Cooper, a voice from the South*. Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Daniels, J. (2015). The trouble with white feminism: Whiteness, digital feminism and the intersectional internet. *CUNY Academic Works*. 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2569369>
- Danley, L., Land, R., & Lomotey, K. (2009). The power of pathways: Strategies for the preparation of African American faculty. *The SAGE handbook of African American education*, 319–336.
- Darrell, L., Littlefield, M., & Washington, E. M. (2016). Safe spaces, nurturing places. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(1), 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1119016>
- Davenport, E. (2015). Unionization and shared governance at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Thought & Action*, 39–54.
- Davis, D. J., Reynolds, R., & Jones, T. B. (2011). Promoting the inclusion of tenure earning Black women in academe: Lessons for leaders in education. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 5(1), 28–41.
- Davis, D. R., & Maldonado, C. (2015). Shattering the glass ceiling: The leadership development of African American women in higher education. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 35, 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.18738/awl.v35i0.125>
- DeBoy, J. L. (2015). Shared governance at Lincoln University: An elusive quarry. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 8(4), 235–240. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v8i4.9431>
- Delgado, R. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Temple University Press.
- Delgado Bernal, D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the ‘legitimate’ knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282>
- Dickens, D. D. (2014). *Double consciousness: The negotiation of the Intersectionality of identities among academically successful Black women* (Publication No. 3635597). [Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Dicker, R. C. (2008). *A history of U.S. feminisms*. Seal Press.
- Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Trust in top management and immediate supervisor: The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information receiving. *Communication Quarterly*, 49(4), 382–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370109385637>

- Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (1997). Effects of race, gender, perceived similarity, and contact on mentor relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(3), 460–481. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1547>
- Farrell, E. F. (2004, June 4). It's gettin' hot in here. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Its-Gettin-Hot-in-Here/24825>
- Favors, J. M. (2019). *Shelter in a time of storm: How Black colleges fostered generations of leadership and activism*. UNC Press Books.
- Flowers, A. M., III, Scott, J. A., Riley, J. R., & Palmer, R. T. (2015). Beyond the call of duty: Building on othermothering for improving outcomes at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Journal of African American Males in Education*, 6(1), 59–73
- Forsyth, J. M., & Carter, R. T. (2014). Development and preliminary validation of the Racism-Related Coping Scale. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 6(6), 632. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036702>
- Franklin, D. L., & James, A. D. (2015). *Ensuring inequality: The structural transformation of the African-American family*. Oxford University Press.
- Frierson, H. T., & Tate, W. F. (Eds.). (2011). *Beyond stock stories and folktales: African Americans' paths to STEM fields* (Vol. 11). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Gallien, L. B., & Hikes, Z. (2005). The fusion of curricular and co-curricular affairs at Spelman College: An administrative case study. *Journal of College and Character*, 6(7), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1482>
- Gasman, M. (2009). Historically Black Colleges and Universities in a time of economic crisis. *Academe*, 95(6), 26, 1–7.
- Gasman, M. (2007). *Envisioning black colleges: A history of the United Negro College Fund*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gasman, M., Baez, B., Drezner, N. D., Sedgwick, K. V., Tudico, C., & Schmid, J. M. (2007). Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Recent trends. *Academe*, 93(1), 69–77.
- Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). 'Am I going crazy?!': A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1), 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.539472>
- Gnambs, T., & Kaspar, K. (2015). Disclosure of sensitive behaviors across self-administered survey modes: A meta-analysis. *Behavior research methods*, 47(4), 1237–1259.
- Gregory, S. T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124–138. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211205>
- Gurchiek, K. (2018, March 23). *Prayer and meditation rooms can increase inclusion*. Society for Human Resource Management. <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr->

- Guy-Sheftall, B. (2009). Black feminist studies: The case of Anna Julia Cooper. *African American Review*, 43(1), 11–15.
- Harvey, E. (2017). *The impact of Black Lives Matter on Black college students* (doi:10.13021/G8XH52) [Master's Thesis, George Mason University]. Mason Archival Repository Service.
- Henry, W. J., & Glenn, N. M. (2009). Black women employed in the ivory tower: Connecting for success. *Advancing women in leadership*, 29(2), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.18738/awl.v29i0.271>
- Hernandez, K. A. C., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Chang, H. (2015). Exploiting the margins in higher education: A collaborative autoethnography of three foreign-born female faculty of color. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(5), 533–551.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.933910>
- Hicks Tafari, D. N., Arango Ricks, S., & Bates Oates, F. (2016). Teaching social justice ain't easy: The unique challenges and opportunities of teaching social justice at an HBCU. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(2).
- Hill Collins, P. (2009). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P. (2012). Social inequality, power, and politics: Intersectionality and American pragmatism in dialogue. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 26(2), 442–457.
<https://doi.org/10.5325/jspecphil.26.2.0442>
- Hill Collins, P., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Polity Press.
- Hinton, D. (2010). Creating community on the margins: The successful Black female academician. *Urban Review*, 42(5), 394–402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-009-0140-3>
- Hirshfield, L., & Joseph, T. (2012). 'We need a woman, we need a Black woman': Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender & Education*, 24(2), 213–227.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.606208>
- Hirt, J. B., Amelink, C. T., McFeeters, B. B., & Strayhorn, T. L. (2008). A system of othermothering: Student affairs administrators' perceptions of relationships with students at Historically Black Colleges. *NASPA Journal*, 45(2), 210–236.
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1948>
- Hobson, J. (2014). Harriet Tubman: A legacy of resistance. *Meridians*, 12(2), 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.2979/meridians.12.2.1>

- Hodge-Clark, K., Daniels, B.D., & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (2014). Top strategic issues facing HBCUs, now and into the future. In *Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges*, 1–16.
- Holder, A. M., & Nadal, K. L. (2016). Systemic and workplace microaggressions and the workplace. In E. L. Short & L. Wilton (Eds.), *Talking about structural inequalities in everyday life: New politics of race in groups, organizations and social systems* (pp. 47–63). Information Age Publishing.
- Holmes, S. L., Danley Land, L., & Hinton-Hudson, V. D. (2001). Race still matters: Considerations for mentoring Black women in academe. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124–138.
- hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. South End Press.
- Jackson, L. D. (2008). *The importance of mentoring African American women administrators at selected Historically Black Institutions in the state of Mississippi* (Publication No. 3329828) [Doctoral dissertation, Capella University]. ProQuest.
- Jarmon, B. (2001). Unwritten rules of the game. In R. O. Mabokela & A. L. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent Black women scholars in higher education* (pp. 175–181). Stylus Publishing.
- Jean-Marie, G. (2006). Welcoming the unwelcomed: A social justice imperative of African-American female leaders at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Educational Foundations*, 20(1–2), 85–104.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1967). The American Negro college. *Harvard Educational Review*, 37(1), 3–60. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.37.1.k3295t48l48612h2>
- Johnson, B. J. (2001). Faculty socialization: Lessons learned from urban Black colleges. *Urban Education*, 36(5), 630–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901365007>
- Johnson, G. M. (2009a). What is it that satisfies faculty? Rank as a consideration in factors related to job satisfaction. *Association for Institutional Research*.
- Johnson, H. L. (2017). Pipelines, pathways, and institutional leadership: An update on the status of women in higher education. *American Council on Education*.
- Johnson, K. A. (2009b). Gender and race: Exploring Anna Julia Cooper's thoughts for socially just educational opportunities. *Philosophia Africana*, 12(1), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philafricana200912110>
- Jones, T. B. (2013). Black female faculty success and early career professional development. *Negro Educational Review*, 64(1/4), 59–75.
- Kaplan, S. E., Raj, A., Carr, P. L., Terrin, N., Breeze, J. L., & Freund, K. M. (2018). Race/ethnicity and success in academic medicine: Findings from a longitudinal multi-

- institutional study. *Academic medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 93(4), 616–622. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001968>
- Kelly, B. T., Gayles, J. G., & Williams, C. D. (2017). Recruitment without retention: A critical case of Black faculty unrest. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 86(3), 305–317. <https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.86.3.0305>
- Khaing, Z., Bhattacharya, J., Price, A., Hamilton, D., & Darity, W. (2017). Women, race and wealth. *Research brief series, Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity and Insight Center for Community Economic Development*, 1.
- Kurnik, C. W., & Baumgartner, R. (2017). Survey design and implementation for estimating gross savings cross-cutting protocol. The uniform methods project: Methods for determining energy efficiency savings for specific measures. *National Renewable Energy Lab*. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1399084>
- Laschinger, H. K. S., & Finegan, J. (2005). Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. *Nursing economics*, 23(1), 6–13.
- Lawrence, J. H., Celis, S., & Ott, M. (2014). Is the tenure process fair? What faculty think. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(2), 155–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2014.11777323>
- Lee, L. J., & Leonard, C. A. (2001). Violence in Predominantly White Institutions of higher education: Tenure and victim blaming. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 4(2–3), 167–186. https://doi.org/10.1300/J137v04n02_09
- LeMelle, T. J. (2002). The HBCU: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Education*, 123(1), 190–197.
- León, R., & Thomas, N. D. (2016). Critical race theory and the cultivation, mentorship and retention of Black women faculty. *American International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(1), 1–16.
- Lloyd-Jones, B. (2014). African-American women in the professoriate: Addressing social exclusion and scholarly marginalization through mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 22(4), 269–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.945737>
- Lockwood, P. (2006). ‘Someone like me can be successful’: Do college students need same-gender role models? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00260.x>
- Lomotey, K. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of African American education*. Sage Publications.
- Louis, D. A., Rawls, G. J., Jackson-Smith, D., Chambers, G. A., Phillips, L. L., & Louis, S. L. (2016). Listening to our voices: Experiences of Black faculty at predominantly white research universities with microaggression. *Journal of Black Studies*, 47(5), 454–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934716632983>

- Maranto, C. L., & Griffin, A. E. (2011). The antecedents of a 'chilly climate' for women faculty in higher education. *Human relations*, 64(2), 139–159.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710377932>
- Marbley, A. F., Wong, A., Santos-Hatchett, S. L., Pratt, C., & Jaddo, L. (2011). Women faculty of color: Voices, gender, and the expression of our multiple identities within academia. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 31(1), 166–174.
- Marshall, I., Davis Smith, B., Green, M. T., Anderson, B., Harry, S. V., Byrd, Y. M., Pratt-Harris, N. C., Bolden, E. S., & Hill, S. (2016). Scholarly productivity of social work faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Are h-index scores a suitable measure? *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(1), 95–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1112645>
- Matchett, K. & National Research Council. (2013). *Seeking solutions: Maximizing American talent by advancing women of color in academia: Summary of a conference*. National Academies Press.
- Maxey, D., & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-tenure-track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(4), 564–594.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777375>
- May, V. M. (2009). Writing the self into being: Anna Julia Cooper's textual politics. *African American Review*, 43(1), 17–34.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080335>
- Minor, J. T. (2004). Introduction: Decision making in Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Defining the governance context. *Journal of Negro Education*, 73(1), 40–52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211258>
- Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 261–287). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243610.n13>
- Monroe, J. U. (1968, June 3). *Negro Colleges-Their Outlook*. U.S. News and World Report.
- Moses, Y. T. (1989). *Black women in academe. Issues and strategies*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Myers, C. B. (2011). Union status and faculty job satisfaction: Contemporary evidence from the 2004 national study of postsecondary faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(4), 657–684. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2011.0028>

- Myers, L. W. (2002). *A broken silence: Voices of African American women in the academy*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *2003 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF:04)*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016014.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2016, September). *Higher education general information survey (HEGIS), 'Degrees and other formal awards conferred' surveys, 1976-77 and 1980-81; Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Completions survey" (IPEDS-C:90-99); and IPEDS Fall 2000 through Fall 2015, completions component*.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017a). *The condition of education 2017* (NCES 2017-144). U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017b). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. U.S. Department of Education. Institute of Education Sciences. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/InstitutionByName.aspx?goToReportId=1>
- Ocampo, A. C. G., Restubog, S. L. D., Liwag, M. E., Wang, L., & Petelczyc, C. (2018). My spouse is my strength: Interactive effects of perceived organizational and spousal support in predicting career adaptability and career outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 108, 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.08.001>
- Pabon Lopez, M., & Johnson, K. R. (2014). Presumed incompetent: Important lessons for university leaders on the professional lives of women faculty of color. *Berkeley Journal Gender, Law & Justice*, 29(2), 388–405.
- Parker, P. S. (2004). *Race, gender, and leadership: Re-envisioning organizational leadership from the perspectives of African American women executives*. Routledge.
- Parker, V. E. (2017). *How I got over: A study of the tenure experiences of Black female professors at Predominantly White Institutions*. (Publication No. 4381) [Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College]. LSU Doctoral Dissertations.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.109>
- Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominantly white university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81(1), 82–92. <https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.81.1.0082>
- Prottas, D. J., Shea-Van Fossen, R. J., Cleaver, C. M., & Andreassi, J. K. (2017). Relationships among faculty perceptions of their tenure process and their commitment and engagement. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 9(2), 242–254. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-08-2016-0054>

- Rios-Aguilar, C., Kiyama, J. M., Gravitt, M., & Moll, L. C. (2011). Funds of knowledge for the poor and forms of capital for the rich? A capital approach to examining funds of knowledge. *School Field*, 9(2), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878511409776>
- Rochon, P. A., Davidoff, F., & Levinson, W. (2016). Women in academic medicine leadership: Has anything changed in 25 years? *Academic Medicine*, 91(8), 1053–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001281>
- Romero, M. (2017). Reflections on ‘The department is very male, very white, very old, and very conservative’: The functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Social Problems*, 64(2), 212–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx004>
- Rose, B. (2017). Moving from chasm to convergence: Benefits and barriers to academic activism for social justice and equity. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 27(1), 67–78.
- Ross, H. H., & Edwards, W. J. (2016). African American faculty expressing concerns: Breaking the silence at predominantly white research oriented universities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(3), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.969227>
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 539–556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sosci.2009.04.015>
- Sawyer-Kurian, K. M., & Coneal, W. B. (2018). The double-edged sword of ‘othermothering’ for African American women faculty with families: Essentials for mentor programs at HBCUs. In Cassandra Sligh Conway (Ed.), *Faculty mentorship at Historically Black Colleges and Universities* (pp. 151–178). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-4071-7.ch008>
- Scott, D. W., & Hines, R. (2014). Rethinking and reframing leadership of Historically Black Colleges and Universities: A distributed perspective. *Scientific Research Publishing*, 5(13). <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.513128>
- Sekora, J. (1968). On Negro colleges: A reply to Jencks and Riesman. *The Antioch Review*, 28(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4610893>
- Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). ‘We are all for diversity, but...’: How faculty hiring committees reproduce whiteness and practical suggestions for how they can change. *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(4), 557–580. <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.4.557>
- Shieh, C., & Cullen, D. L. (2018). Mentoring nurse faculty: Outcomes of a three-year clinical track faculty initiative. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 35(3), 162–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2018.11.005>
- Shreffler, M. B., Shreffler, J. R., & Murfree, J. R. (2019). Barriers to advancement of female faculty in higher education: An examination of student evaluations of teaching, work-

- family conflict and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 19(8), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v19i8.2673>
- Sleeter, C. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom*. Teachers College Press.
- Sparrowe, R. T. (1994). Empowerment in the hospitality industry: An exploration of antecedents and outcomes. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 17(3), 51–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109634809401700306>
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256865>
- Tack, M. W., Patitu, C. L. (1992). Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Association for the Study of Higher Education, & The George Washington University*.
- Taylor, E., Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *Foundations of critical race theory in education*. Routledge.
- Thandi Sule, V. (2011). How race matters. Race as an instrument for institutional transformation: A study of tenured Black female faculty. In P. A. Pasque & S. E. Nicholson (Eds.), *Empowering women in higher education and student affairs: Theory, research, narratives, and practice from feminist perspectives* (pp. 147–162). Stylus Publishing.
- Tyler, T., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Whither trust. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 1–15). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243610.n1>
- United Negro College Fund. (2019, May 02). *Where we've been, where we're going: A timeline of HBCU development*. UNCF. <https://www.uncf.org/the-latest/where-we've-been-where-we're-going-a-timeline-of-hbcu-development>
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1997, January 15). *Fact sheet: Religious discrimination*. EEOC. <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/fact-sheet-religious-discrimination>
- Walker, S. A. (2009). Reflections on leadership from the perspective of an African American woman of faith. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 11(5), 646–656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422309352439>
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 233–257. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2003.0079>
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family*. Rutgers University Press.

- Watkins, P. L. (2018). *Black women faculty: Portraits of othermothering* (Publication No. ucin1535634706111088) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati]. OhioLINK.
- Williams, E. L. (2013). Women's studies and sexuality studies at HBCUs: The Audre Lorde Project at Spelman College. *Feminist Studies*, 39(2), 520–525.
- Williams, J., & Dixie, Q. (2003). *This far by faith: Stories from the African American religious experience*. Harper Collins.
- Williams, L. D. (2001). Coming to terms with being a young, Black female academic in U.S. higher education. In R. O. Mabokela & A. L. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent Black women scholars in higher education* (pp. 93–102). Stylus Publishing.
- Williamson-Lott, J. A. (2008). *Radicalizing the ebony tower: Black colleges and the Black freedom struggle in Mississippi*. Teachers College Press.
- Wolf-Wendel, L. E. (1998). Models of excellence: The baccalaureate origins of successful European American women, African American women, and Latinas. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(2), 141–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1998.11775131>
- Wright, S. & Dinkha, J. (2009). Gendered reality, professional identity, and women of color in higher education. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *When 'minorities are strongly encouraged to apply': Diversity and affirmative action in higher education* (pp. 103–118). Peter Lang Publishing.
- Xu, Y. J. (2012). The similarities and differences in the work experience of women faculty in traditional and nontraditional disciplines. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2012(155), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20022>
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>
- Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (2016). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. In B. Landry (Ed.), *Race, gender and class* (pp. 56–62). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Appendix

Survey Questions

1. This survey intends to investigate the supports used by Black women faculty for career advancement. If you do not identify as a Black woman please exit the survey now. How do you identify in terms of race and ethnicity?

2. How do you identify in terms of gender?

3. What is your current relationship status (select all that apply)?
 - a. I have a partner
 - b. I have a significant other
 - c. I have a domestic partner
 - d. I have a spouse
 - e. I am single
 - f. I do not live with my partner/significant other/spouse
4. What is your current faculty status?
 - a. Professor Emerita
 - b. Distinguished Professor
 - c. Professor
 - d. Associate Professor
 - e. Assistant Professor
 - f. Adjunct Professor
 - g. Adjunct Instructor
 - h. Senior Instructor
 - i. Instructor
 - j. Senior Lecturer
 - k. Lecturer
5. Which academic discipline do you currently work in?
 - a. Education
 - b. The arts or other humanities
 - c. Social sciences
 - d. Natural sciences
 - e. Computer Science, Mathematics, or Statistics
 - f. Medicine and health
 - g. Business

- h. Engineering and technology
6. The institution where I am employed as a faculty member is:
- a. Co-educational
 - b. All-women
 - c. All-men
7. The institution where I am employed as a faculty member is:
- a. Public
 - b. Private
8. What kind of strategies do you use to advance in your career (select all that apply)?
- a. Collaborating with colleagues
 - b. Turning to religion, faith, or spirituality
 - c. Seeking mentors
 - d. Support from family
 - e. Support from networks
 - f. Working harder and smarter
 - g. Going on retreats
 - h. Learning or knowing the unwritten rules
 - i. Getting help with household chores such as cleaning and childcare
 - j. Something else
 - k. I don't use any strategies to advance in my career
9. What safe space(s), if any, do you use that help you advance in your career (select all that apply)?
- a. the Black community
 - b. my own psyche
 - c. extended family
 - d. religion/faith/spirituality
 - e. I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career
 - f. Something else: _____
10. What safe space (s), if any, does your institution provide that help you advance in your career (select all that apply)?
- a. Religious or spiritual
 - b. Group meetings for Black women
 - c. Group meetings for women of color
 - d. the Black community
 - e. I do not use safe spaces to help me advance in my career
 - f. Something else: _____
11. What religious/spiritual factors, if any, help support your career advancement (select all that apply)?
- a. Praying
 - b. Meditating

- c. Reading religious texts
 - d. Attending a house of worship
 - e. Relying on my beliefs in a higher power
 - f. Religious/spiritual factors do not help support my career advancement
 - g. Something else
12. (If faculty member uses religious factors) Which religious/spiritual support, if any, does the institution where you are employed provide that help support your career advancement (select all that apply)?
- a. Prayer space
 - b. Meditation space
 - c. Time to read or reflect on my spirituality
 - d. A house of worship on campus
 - e. The institution where I am employed does not provide religious or spiritual support
 - f. Something else
13. Outside of your institution, do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I do not have a mentor outside of my institution
14. (If faculty member uses an external mentor) Outside of your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?
- a. I have a Black women mentor outside of my institution
 - b. I have a mentor outside of my institution who is a woman of color
 - c. My mentor helps me access publishers
 - d. My mentor helps me promote my scholarship
 - e. My mentor helps me obtain research grants
 - f. My mentor exposes me to professional networks
 - g. My mentor exposes me to social networks
 - h. Through external co-mentoring in an egalitarian system where several people contribute to mentoring one another
 - i. Through having a successful role-model
 - j. Something else
15. Within your institution, do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I do not have a mentor within my institution
 - d. My institution does not provide mentoring opportunities

16. (If faculty member uses an internal mentor) Within your institution, how do formal and/or informal mentoring relationships help to advance your career (select all that apply)?
- a. I have a Black woman mentor at my institution
 - b. I have a mentor at my institution who is a woman of color
 - c. I learn the ins and outs of my institution and/or department
 - d. My mentor helps me access publishers and/or promote my scholarship
 - e. My mentor helps me obtain research grants
 - f. My mentor exposes me to professional networks
 - g. My mentor exposes me to social networks
 - h. My institution provides co-mentoring in an egalitarian system where several people contribute to mentoring one another
 - i. Through having a successful role-model within my institution
 - j. Something else
17. How does communication within your institution play a role in your career advancement (select all that apply)?
- a. Communication within my institution does not play a role in my career advancement
 - b. I receive forthcoming, accurate communication
 - c. I receive timely feedback and adequate explanations
 - d. I receive helpful information about advancement/promotion opportunities
 - e. I receive helpful information about my job performance
 - f. I receive helpful information about the methods behind evaluating employees
 - g. Something else
18. How can your institution improve communication to help in your career advancement (select all that apply)?
- a. My institution does not need to improve communication
 - b. My institution could make more information available
 - c. My institution could utilize more outlets/devices for communication
 - d. My institution could communicate with more people
 - e. My institution could better communicate the methods behind evaluating employees
 - f. My institution could have better communication about my job performance
 - g. My institution could better communicate advancement/promotion opportunities
 - h. My institution could have more timely feedback and better explanations
 - i. My institution could have more forthcoming, accurate communication
 - j. Something else
19. How do you use collaboration within your institution to advance in your career (select all that apply)?
- a. I do not use collaboration within my institution to advance in my career
 - b. My institution emphasizes collaboration
 - c. My institution provides social networks for collaboration
 - d. My institution provides professional groups for collaboration
 - e. My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with Black women
 - f. My institution provides opportunities to collaborate with women of color

- g. I pool resources with others inside my institution
- h. I publish with co-authors from my institution
- i. Something else

20. How do you use collaboration outside of your institution to advance in your career (select all that apply)?

- j. I do not use collaboration outside of my institution to advance in my career
- k. I collaborate through external social networks
- l. I collaborate through external professional groups
- m. I collaborate with Black women outside of my institution
- n. I collaborate with women of color outside my institution
- o. I pool resources with others
- p. I seek external co-authors to publish with
- q. Something else

21. How does your institution use social activism to advance your career (select all that apply)?

- a. The institution where I am employed does not use social activism to advance my career
- b. The institution where I am employed is an outlet to voice concerns about injustice
- c. The institution where I am employed is active in social justice movements
- d. The institution where I am employed works to break down societal structures which oppress Black women and other marginalized groups
- e. The institution where I am employed empowers me to incorporate social activism into my work
- f. The institution where I am employed resists political, social, and legal structures that disenfranchise Black women
- g. The institution where I am employed organizes demonstrations and boycotts
- h. Something else

22. How do you use social activism to advance your career (select all that apply)?

- a. I do not use social activism to advance my career
- b. I voice my concerns about injustice
- c. I am active in social justice movements external to my institution
- d. I am active in social justice movements within my institution
- e. I strive for social justice through my research and scholarly work
- f. I give back in the form of service to socio-economically and politically subjugated communities
- g. I seek legal counsel and/or action when my rights are not upheld
- h. I make formal complaints
- i. I organize demonstrations and boycotts
- j. I inform civil rights organizations and the media
- k. Something else

23. In what ways does your institution or department support your career advancement through valuing your work (select all that apply)?
- a. My institution or department shares the same values that are seen in my work
 - b. My institution or department shows me they value my work by assisting me with grant applications
 - c. My colleagues within my institution or department value my opinions
 - d. My institution or department does not value my work enough
 - e. Something else
24. In what ways could your institution or department value your work more (select all that apply)?
- a. My institution or department could show me they value my work by providing me with more grant and/or contracts
 - b. My colleagues within my institution or department could better show me they value my opinions
 - c. My institution or department could be more friendly toward me
 - d. My institution or department could encourage my accomplishments and support my personal development
 - e. My institution or department values my work enough
 - f. Something else
25. Empowerment is when an employee feels a sense of self-importance, physical energy, and emotional vitality. In what ways do you feel empowered to advance in your career (select all that apply)?
- a. Having opportunities to grow and learn
 - b. Having resources available to me
 - c. Receiving support
 - d. Having access to information
 - e. Through being part of the decision-making process
 - f. I do not feel empowered to advance in my career
 - g. Something else
26. How does your institution's culture empower you to advance in your career?
- a. My institution's culture emphasizes concern for me and my career advancement
 - b. My institution's culture is open, warm, and friendly
 - c. My institution's culture encourages my accomplishments
 - d. My institution's culture supports my personal development
 - e. I identify with my institution's values, assumptions, and goals
 - f. Through community uplift and as a source of Black cultural heritage
 - g. My institution's culture does not empower me to advance in my career
 - h. Something else
27. Which internal and external parties support your career advancement (select all that apply)?
- a. My department head
 - b. Colleagues

- c. Mentor(s)
- d. Friends
- e. Family members
- f. My child or children
- g. My spouse or partner
- h. Someone else

28. How would you rate the administrative disclosure within the institution where you are employed?

- a. There is complete administrative disclosure
- b. There is a good amount of administrative disclosure
- c. There is a fair amount of administrative disclosure
- d. There is not much administrative disclosure
- e. There is no administrative disclosure

29. What are some areas of shared decision-making that faculty are involved with in the institution where you are employed (select all that apply)?

- a. Characteristics of student life connected to the educational process
- b. Faculty status
- c. Research
- d. Method of instruction
- e. Subject matter
- f. The curriculum
- g. Tenure and promotion
- h. Economic policy changes
- i. Layoffs and/or restructuring
- j. Something else
- k. None

30. Do you have a faculty senate in the institution where you are employed?

- a. Yes and our voice is well respected in governing the institution.
- b. Yes and we have some say in governing the institution.
- c. Yes but our decisions are often overturned.
- d. No but we plan on creating one.
- e. No, and there are no plans to establish a faculty senate.

31. Is the faculty senate involved with decision-making in any of the following areas (select all that apply)?

- a. Grading policies,
- b. The reorganization, discontinuance, curtailment, or development of academic programs
- c. Policies for retention
- d. Admissions
- e. Recruitment of students
- f. Degree-granting requirements

- g. Curricular structure
- h. Curriculum policy
- i. Something else
- j. None

32. Do the faculty within your institution partake in collective bargaining?

- a. Yes
- b. No



November 4, 2019

Andrea Del Priore

Re: IRB Study #2020-005

Dear Ms. Del Priore:

At its October 30, 2019 meeting, the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your research proposal entitled, "Supports Used by Black Women Faculty for Career

Advancement at Historically Black Colleges and Universities" as submitted. This memo serves as official notice of the aforementioned study's approval.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol, informed consent form or study team must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You will receive a communication from the Institutional Review Board at least 1 month prior to your expiration date requesting that you submit an Annual Progress Report to keep the study active, or a Final Review of Human Subjects Research form to close the study. In all future correspondence with the Institutional Review Board, please reference the ID# listed above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mara C. Podvey, PhD, OTR
Associate Professor
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

Office of the Institutional Review Board

Presidents Hall · 400 South Orange Avenue · South Orange, New Jersey 07079 · Tel: 973.275.4654 · Fax
973.275.2978 · www.shu.edu

W H A T G R E A T M I N D S C A N D O