Faculty of Color Reconsidered: Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship

Anthony Lising Antonio

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 73, No. 5. (Sep. - Oct., 2002), pp. 582-602.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-1546%28200209%2F10%2973%3A5%3C582%3AFOCRRC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z

The Journal of Higher Education is currently published by Ohio State University Press.

Anthony Lising Antonio

Faculty of Color Reconsidered

Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship

The status of faculty of color[1] has been of concern to many in American higher education since the 1960s. The consciousness provided by the Civil Rights movement of that decade led to efforts to diversify higher education at all levels, from the student body to the faculty ranks. In the proceeding decades, we have witnessed steady growth in the racial and ethnic diversity of the college student population, and recent trends illustrate unprecedented rates of growth. At the University of California, for example, just 70% of all undergraduates were white in 1984, and six years later this proportion had dropped further to less than 60% (University of California, 1991). Nationwide, college enrollments are currently 11.0% African American, 8.7% Latino, 6.1% Asian American, 1.0% American Indian, and 73.1% white[2] (Snyder & Hoffman, 2000). Similar trends of diversification among college faculty, unfortunately, have not materialized. For example, in 1983 whites still composed approximately 91% of all full-time faculty. Ten years later the representation of white faculty had decreased by just 3 percentage points, to 88% (Carter & Wilson, 1997).

The slow progress being made by higher education to diversify its faculty has been widely recognized, and much research and debate have

An earlier version of this article was presented at the conference, "Keeping our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color in Higher Education," at the University of Minneapolis in 1998. The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and Helen S. Astin for her support of this project.

Anthony Lising Antonio is assistant professor of education and assistant director of the Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research at Stanford University.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 73, No. 5 (September/October 2002)

been focused on the factors that may be stifling efforts for increasing minority representation. These factors include: a small and decreasing pool of minority PhDs (Jackson, 1991; Mickelson & Oliver, 1991; Solmon & Wingard, 1991; Turner, Myers, Jr., & Creswell, 1999; Washington & Harvey, 1989); disproportionate tenure rates and rates of pretenure departure (Finkelstein, 1984; Menges & Exum, 1983); the persistence of racist perceptions on institutional and individual levels that restrict access and impede the professional progress of faculty of color (de la Luz Reyes & Halcón, 1991; Harvey & Scott-Jones, 1985; Jackson, 1991; Turner & Myers, Jr., 2000); the devaluation of the qualifications of minority PhDs not trained in the most elite, prestigious colleges (Mickelson & Oliver, 1991); and the difficulties of surviving in a predominantly white academy due to poor mentoring, disproportionate advising and service loads stemming from frequently being the only faculty of color in a department, an isolating work environment, and the lack of scholarly recognition given to research focusing on ethnic minority populations (de la Luz Reyes & Halcón, 1991; Frierson, 1990; Garza, 1988; Tack & Patitu, 1992; Turner & Myers, Jr., 2000; Turner, Myers, Jr., & Creswell, 1999; Washington & Harvey, 1989).

Unlike these issues of recruitment and retention, which primarily focus on barriers and obstacles to faculty diversity, the value of faculty of color to higher education has not been subject to the same volume of research and debate. How do faculty of color uniquely contribute to the enterprise of American higher education? Some scholars contend that faculty of color are essential for higher education, because they provide students with diverse role models, assist in providing more effective mentoring to minority students, are supportive of minority-related and other areas of nontraditional areas of scholarship, and give minorities a greater voice in the governance of the nation's colleges and universities (de la Luz Reyes & Halcón, 1991; Green, 1989; Mickelson & Oliver, 1991; Washington & Harvey, 1989). Others view the full representation and participation of faculty of color in the academy as essential to creating diverse and pluralistic colleges and universities (Green, 1989; Turner & Myers, Jr., 2000). While contributions to mentoring, role modeling, and governance are important to note and document, continued slow growth in the proportional representation of faculty of color in an era witnessing the dismantling of race-based affirmative action in higher education suggests that their contributions need to be reconsidered from a new perspective. In this study, I explore the value of a diverse faculty within an area most central to faculty life–scholarship.

In looking to the future of the American professoriate, I take the advice of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and

operationalize a broader conception of scholarship that encompasses the discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge (Boyer, 1990). My primary question is: How do faculty of color and white faculty differ with respect to their involvement in and commitment to each of these four views of scholarship? In addressing this question, I hope to broaden the discussion regarding diversity in the professoriate in three ways: (1) focusing on the value of faculty of color to American higher education rather than barriers to their participation; (2) invoking scholarship as the central area of concern in academe; and (3) employing the expanded definitions of scholarship recommended by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Scholarship Reconsidered: Four Views of Scholarship

In 1990 Ernest Boyer drafted a report that captured and re-focused an emerging national debate on the subject of scholarship. In *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate,* Boyer documents how, in the last 50 years, the notion of scholarship has become narrowly conceived in terms of basic research and publication activities at the same time that the mission of American higher education continues to expand and become more multifaceted. The work of the professoriate, initially focused on the development and preparation of individuals for civic leadership, has fallen prey to the hierarchical and competitive lure of prestige defined solely by the research mission. The emphasis on undergraduate education and the service functions of the university has diminished in deference to research activities. And as Burton Clark (1987) has noted, disciplinary-based relationships among faculty across institutions have become stronger at the expense of local relationships within institutions and with surrounding communities.

In a recent national study, Fairweather (1993) has empirically confirmed the dominance of research-oriented values present in academic departments across the country. Furthermore, Fairweather found faculty compensation to be strongly correlated to publication productivity and high-research/low-teaching activity across institution types and across academic rank. Through compensation, promotion, and the presence of other cultural norms such as keeping time spent with undergraduates to a minimum, the culture of academe continues to define scholarship solely as basic research measured by publication records and acquired research grants, and more significantly, to socialize junior faculty to embrace this definition (Fairweather, 1993; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The consequences of these changes for higher education, Boyer notes, are that students are frequently being shortchanged by an education

shaped by a faculty who are disconnected from the campus community and poorly rewarded for excellent teaching. Faculty, many of whom are drawn to the academy because of their commitment to teaching and service, are finding themselves torn away from those activities to concentrate on the research productivity required for promotion. Furthermore, Boyer says, the nation will ultimately suffer if higher education does not forge stronger connections between the work of the academy and the challenges currently faced by our society. In light of these consequences, Boyer concludes that the "most important obligation" facing American higher education is to break out of a scholarship paradigm narrowly defined by basic research and to take full advantage of the diverse talent of the professoriate:

> We conclude that for America's colleges and universities to remain vital a new vision of scholarship is required. What we are faced with, today, is the need to clarify campus missions and relate the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life. We need especially to ask how institutional diversity can be strengthened and how the rich array of faculty talent in our colleges and universities might be more effectively used and continuously renewed. We proceed with the conviction that if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered. (Boyer, 1990, p. 13)

In expanding our current conception of scholarship, Boyer (1990) proposes a set of four functions: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of discovery is essentially the work of basic research, of pursuing knowledge freely and rigorously for its own sake. Scholarship as it is currently recognized, valued, and rewarded in many institutions is the scholarship of discovery. The scholarship of integration recognizes the value of integrating knowledge and inquiry across disciplines and of providing meaning to specialized knowledge in larger contexts. It is intellectual work that strives to be integrative, interdisciplinary, and interpretive. The third view of scholarship presses the scholar to move beyond the ivory tower to enlist their intellectual work in the service of addressing problems of society. The scholarship of application can be understood as "scholarly service," or service activities tied directly to a faculty member's professional activities. Finally, Boyer elevates teaching to the level of other scholarly activities. Faculty engaged in the scholarship of teaching take time to keep current in the literature of their field, strive for improvement and innovation in their pedagogical practices, and seek to stimulate active learning and critical thinking in their students. Scholarly teaching moves beyond the trans-

mission of knowledge and pursues a common learning ground where the teacher and students jointly transform and extend knowledge.

Assessing the Scholarship of White Faculty and Faculty of Color

Before drawing comparisons with regard to scholarship, it is important to understand how faculty of color fit into the overall landscape of American higher education. Faculty of color are not, of course, a monolithic group. I discuss them as a group in this article in order to compare a small (12%), but significant portion of the professoriate to the majority and assess their value to the profession on the basis of expanding notions of scholarship. While this decision tends to mask the substantial differences among African American, American Indian, Asian American, and Latino faculty, as well as within these groups and among white faculty, the analytical grouping helps to clearly differentiate majority faculty from the slowly growing presence of minority faculty.[3]

According to the latest data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), faculty of color tend to be younger than white faculty. Among full-time instructional faculty, about 28% of faculty of color are less than 40 years old, compared to 20% of white faculty (NCES, 1997). In fact, faculty of color represent almost one-fifth (18%) of all faculty under the age of 40. Correspondingly, while 32% of white faculty are full professors and a lower proportion (22%) hold nontenure-track appointments, among faculty of color just 22% hold the rank of full professor and a *larger* percentage–26%–are not on the tenure line (NCES, 1997). The gender distribution among both groups is about the same (~35:65 women to men). African American faculty, however, are nearly balanced with respect to gender (48% women), and Asian American faculty exhibit the largest imbalance (30% women) (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997).

In the aggregate, faculty of color are similarly distributed across different types of institutions as compared to their white colleagues. Looking at the distribution of each group at the two ends of institutional hierarchy, we find that 27% of white faculty work at research institutions, and about one in five work at public two-year colleges. As might be expected, among faculty of color these proportions are slightly smaller at research institutions (25%) and larger in the two-year sector (22%) (NCES, 1997). It should be noted, however, that these relatively similar distributions mask the fact that Asian American faculty tend to be concentrated in public and private universities while large numbers of African American, American Indian, and Latino faculty work in community colleges (Astin et al., 1997).

White faculty and faculty of color are somewhat differentially distributed across academic fields as well. Compared to white faculty, higher proportions of faculty of color work in education and the physical sciences, but they are less likely than are their white colleagues to work in business, fine arts, social sciences, and the humanities (NCES, 1997).

These demographic, disciplinary, and institutional differences clearly imply that differences in the activities and priorities of faculty of color and white faculty may reflect variation in factors such as age, academic rank, academic department, and institutional type. For example, we may expect white faculty to have more prolific publishing records than their minority colleagues, because they are more likely to be older, hold higher academic ranks, and be employed in research institutions. In the analyses that follow, I examine how faculty of color and white faculty differ with respect to Boyer's four views of scholarship, both from a simple descriptive perspective and after statistically accounting for these variations. Furthermore, because tensions between these four views of scholarship are most acute in four-year colleges and universities, I restrict my examination to faculty employed in four-year institutions.

Data and Measures

To draw a comparison of faculty of color and white faculty I conducted analyses on a database developed from the 1995 Faculty Survey, a triennial survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA (Sax, Astin, Arredondo, & Korn, 1996). This database was selected because of its large, national sample and the large variety of data on faculty behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs. The survey administration targeted the universe of all undergraduate teaching faculty working at regionally accredited, degree-granting (associate degree or higher) institutions. Of the 2700 institutions invited to participate in the survey, 403 agreed to administer the survey to a total of 143,816 faculty members. HERI received 59,933 responses, for an overall response rate of 42%. The analyses presented here are based on the responses of 21,467 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty from 313 four-year institutions selected by HERI to be a nationally representative sample.[4] Two-year college faculty were excluded in the study because of the small institutional sample available for analysis. In all analyses, available weights were used to approximate the results that would have been obtained if the entire population of full-time undergraduate teaching faculty had responded.[5] Details of the data collection and weighting procedures can be found in Sax et al. (1996).

The first objective of this study was to organize the data into mean-

ingful constructs that speak to the four views of scholarship. Composite variables based upon these constructs could then be compared among white faculty and faculty of color. To develop these composite variables, an exploratory factor analysis was performed on variables that measured general work behaviors, uses of different types of pedagogy, personal goals, professional goals, and goals faculty hold for undergraduate education. Using principal components extraction and oblique rotations, I identified one factor associated with the scholarship of discovery and two factors that clearly reflect the scholarship of teaching. Composite variables were derived from these three factors and used as dependent measures in the analysis. The constituent variables for each composite, their associated factor loadings, and the calculated reliability of each measure are listed in Table A1 in the Appendix.

The discovery factor contains four quantified measures of publication productivity, the importance placed on the professional goal of engaging in research, actual time spent conducting research, and the importance placed on "opportunities for research" as a reason cited for choosing an academic profession. As a dependent variable, the composite measure based on this factor is clearly reflective of a strong penchant for the scholarship of discovery, or essentially, a strong research orientation.

The two factors associated with the scholarship of teaching reflect both teaching behavior and an educational philosophy that move beyond pedagogical models of simply transmitting knowledge. The Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy encompasses instructional and evaluation techniques that involve active learning such as collaboration, discussion, experiential learning, and project-oriented work. Faculty scoring high on this composite measure indicate movement toward innovation in their teaching activities. The second teaching factor contains educational goals for undergraduates that emphasize affective, moral, and civic development. Similar to the Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy, the Scholarship of Teaching—Learning is indicative of holding an educational philosophy that is more holistic and does not limit conceptions of teaching to traditional notions of imparting specific areas of knowledge to students. The educational goals in this factor include helping students to develop their personal values, moral character, and self-understanding, and preparing students for family living and as responsible citizens.

It is not surprising that a general survey of faculty such as the triennial HERI Faculty Survey does a fairly thorough job of collecting data regarding the teaching and basic research activities of faculty and that a factor analysis of the 1995 data set only resulted in the identification of usable composite measures pertaining to the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of teaching. Only one item on the HERI survey cap-

tured Boyer's notion of the scholarship of integration, a dichotomous measure of whether the respondent had *taught an interdisciplinary course* in the last two years. This single variable was used as a dependent measure of activity reflective of the scholarship of integration. Admittedly, a single measure cannot adequately capture or even serve as a proxy for many other scholarly activities that involve the bridging of disciplines or for a philosophy of integration that faculty may bring to their work. It is posed here, then, merely as an initial indicator of scholarly practice that is integrative.

There are a small number of items on the HERI survey that reflect the application of knowledge for the improvement of society and in service to the community. The factor analysis showed these items to be weakly associated with other factors, and as a group the variables did not load together on a single construct. The variables, however, do have modest correlations with each other, and a composite measure based on these measures was constructed as an additional dependent variable. The fifth dependent variable, the Scholarship of Application, has an internal consistency (α) equal to 0.63 and consists of five items: holding the opinion that "colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems" (4 pt scale, "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly"), choosing a professorial career because of "opportunities to influence social change" (3 pt scale, "not important" to "very important"), having the professional/personal goals of "providing services to the community" and "engaging in outside activities" (4 pt scale, "not important" to "essential"), and advising student groups involved in community service in the past two years (dichotomous scoring). Again, this variable does not encompass the fullest meaning of Boyer's scholarship of application. There are no items that measure explicit connections faculty make between the knowledge of their field and the community service activities they engage in, for example. However, the items do reflect a faculty member's attempt to extend their professional roles beyond the walls of their institution through community work as well as a value system that implicates the work of the profession with contributing to social change.

Two factors identified in the factor analysis are used as independent variables in the multivariate analyses to control for personal value orientation. These are also shown in Table A1. *Social change orientation* is a measure of a faculty member's general attitude toward their role in influencing social change, independent of their status as a faculty member. This composite variable, for example, includes personal goals for influencing social values, influencing politics, promoting racial understanding, and cleaning up the environment. Rather dissimilar to having a strong social change orientation is having a *status orientation.* In addi-

tion to goals for financial success, faculty members with a strong status orientation hold goals for personal recognition and prestige in their field.

Univariate and Multivariate Comparisons

Univariate comparisons were made by examining the distributions of each of the constituent measures of the five dependent variables (Scholarship of Discovery; Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy; Scholarship of Teaching—Learning; Taught an Interdisciplinary Course; Scholarship of Application) among faculty of color (n = 2345) and white faculty (n = 19122). In addition to examining mean differences, I also report proportions to better illustrate any differences between the two faculty groups. Once this detailed picture is presented, I investigate whether any overall differences in these four areas of scholarship can be explained by variations in the way faculty of color and white faculty are distributed across gender, age, discipline, or institutional categories. Specifically, I calculated the correlation between faculty of color status (2 = faculty of color, 1 = white faculty) and each of the five dependent variables and compared that value with a series of partial correlations. The partial correlations measure the same relationship after controlling for variations in demographic characteristics, personal value orientation, academic department affiliation, and institutional control (public or private). To further control for differences among faculty due to the type of institution in which they work, I divided the sample by Carnegie classification institution type (research universities, doctoral universities, comprehensives, and baccalaureate colleges) and calculated each set of correlations separately. The strength of these relationships provides us with an indication as to the role of faculty of color in contributing to broadening conceptions of scholarship in higher education.

Partial correlations were calculated by using blocked, ordinary least squares regression routines. The control variables chosen were based upon differences between white faculty and faculty of color reported in the descriptive studies referenced above. Demographic controls include age, gender, nativity status (U.S. born), and academic rank. Older, male, and non-U.S. born full professors, for example, tend to have more published works and be more research-oriented (Sax et al., 1996). Having a status orientation is also associated with research activities, whereas having a social change orientation is consistent with the use of student-centered pedagogy and being focused on the affective, moral, and civic developmental goals for students. In the same way, faculty working in physical science and humanities departments are less likely to be engaged in applied "service" activities, whereas those faculty in education

are more likely to be so engaged (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000). There are also departmental differences in publishing behavior (faculty in the physical sciences tend to publish more than those in education or business, for example). Controls for departmental affiliation include seven variables marking membership in Business, Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, Life Science, Physical Science, and Social Science departments. And finally, controls for employment at private versus public institutions were also employed. All of the variables (and their scoring) used in the multivariate analyses are listed in Table A2 of the Appendix.

Results

Variables reflective of the Scholarship of Discovery are tabulated for the two faculty groups in Table 1. In terms of basic research productivity, white faculty appear to be slightly more prolific than faculty of color in terms of publishing journal articles, book chapters, and books. The two groups look similar with respect to the number of publications and performances presented in the last 2 years and the usage of funds for conducting research. The largest differences among measures of discovery, however, favor faculty of color. Compared to white faculty, faculty of color are much more likely to place a high degree of personal importance on engaging in research activities, spend more time per week engaged in research and writing, and feel that the opportunity to pursue research was a very important consideration in choosing a career in academe. In other words, it appears that white faculty have produced more research as measured by a traditional count of journal and book publications, whereas faculty of color spend more time conducting research and more strongly associate the work of research with their profession.

Table 2 compares the two groups of faculty on items measuring the Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy. In six of the seven measures of pedagogy, there are no statistically significant differences in their usage by faculty of color and white faculty. Faculty of color, however, are slightly more likely to utilize student presentations in their classes.

For this study, the scholarship of teaching was also measured philosophically, primarily in terms of each group's educational or learning goals they hold for students. As shown in Table 3, faculty of color are much more likely than are white faculty to place high importance on the affective, moral, and civic development of students. In fact, faculty of color surpass the commitment of white faculty in every one of the eight goals examined in this study. The largest differences are evident in the importance faculty place on emotional and moral development and the value of experience outside of the classroom. Faculty of color, for example, are about

TABLE 1

The Scholarship of Discovery

	Percentage (Mean)		T-test for Means	
	Faculty of Color	White Faculty;	*t, df*	*p*
No. of articles published in journals (>10)	31.6 (3.53)	34.5 (3.66)	3.07, 20914	*
No. of chapters published in edited volumes (>10)	4.2 (1.91)	5.1 (2.00)	3.19, 2645	*
No. of books, manuals, monographs published (>2)	15.9 (1.69)	18.8 (1.79)	4.68, 2755	**
No. of publications/performances in the last 2 years (>10)	8.8 (2.67)	8.2 (2.61)	−1.89, 20824	ns
Professional/personal goal: engage in research (very important/essential)	77.3 (3.19)	63.9 (2.89)	−14.76, 3024	**
Hours per week spent doing research/scholarly writing (12 or more)	26.8 (3.48)	20.8 (3.14)	−8.28, 2687	**
Reason to choose profession: opportunities for research (very important)	60.7 (2.54)	46.8 (2.32)	−15.33, 3088	**
Used intra-or extramural funds for research;	56.1; (1.56)	54.3 (1.54)	−1.53, 2629	ns

ns = nonsignificant
**$p < 0.001$. *$p < 0.01$.

TABLE 2

The Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy

	Percentage (Mean)		T-test for Means	
	Faculty of Color	White Faculty	*t, df*	*p*
No. of Courses Taught Utilizing (most/all)				
Student presentations	34.3 (2.34)	31.5 (2.28)	−2.87, 2810	*
Group projects	22.5 (2.01)	22.1 (1.98)	−1.50, 20994	ns
Cooperative learning	34.2 (2.27)	32.5 (2.25)	−0.82, 20992	ns
Student evaluations of others' work	13.3 (1.64)	12.5 (1.63)	−0.30, 20926	ns
Class discussions	69.4 (3.10)	66.7 (3.07)	−1.69, 2924	ns
Independent projects	32.0 (2.29)	33.9 (2.33)	2.31, 20990	ns
Experiential learning	16.7 (1.75)	19.4 (1.79)	2.14, 2934	ns

ns = nonsignificant
**$p < 0.001$. *$p < 0.01$.

TABLE 3
The Scholarship of Teaching—Learning

	Percentage (Mean)		T-test for Means	
	Faculty of Color	White Faculty;	*t, df*	*p*
Goals for Undergraduates (very important/essential)				
Help students develop their personal values	60.8 (2.74)	56.5 (2.66)	−4.16, 2813	**
Provide for students' emotional development	43.6 (2.41)	33.1 (2.22)	−9.74, 2818	**
Develop moral character	63.2 (2.84)	53.2 (2.64)	−10.06, 20985	**
Prepare students for family living	20.3 (1.87)	14.6 (1.73)	−7.75, 2777	*
Enhance students' self-understanding	66.8 (2.87)	58.7 (2.70)	−8.53, 2849	**
Enhance the out-of-class experience of students	49.4 (2.50)	38.2 (2.29)	−10.65, 2845	**
Prepare students for responsible citizenship	66.4 (2.85)	59.9 (2.70)	−7.92, 20935	**
Instill in students a commitment to community service	44.1 (2.40)	31.9 (2.18)	−11.23, 2791	**

$^{**}p < 0.001$. $^{*}p < 0.01$.

30% more likely than white faculty to value the emotional development of students and their out-of-class experience as part of their educational charge as teachers. The last two entries in the table further indicate that faculty of color more strongly hold goals for civic development as well.

Unfortunately, the scholarship of integration can only be compared with respect to one item on the HERI survey. Teaching an interdisciplinary course reflects a faculty member's explicit efforts in integrating strands of scholarly knowledge and, in addition, making that integration part of the educational process for students. In this limited expression of the scholarship of integration, faculty of color are more likely to be involved. Forty-four percent of faculty of color and 41% of white faculty report teaching an interdisciplinary course in the previous two years. The difference, though small, is statistically significant ($t = 3.04$, $df = 2564$, $p < 0.01$).

The items reflecting the Scholarship of Application are presented in Table 4. Again, faculty of color outpace their white colleagues in each of the five measures. The largest absolute and relative difference between the two groups is in their motivation for entering the professoriate. Faculty of color are 75% more likely than white faculty to pursue a position in the academy because they draw a connection between the professoriate and the ability to affect change in society. Furthermore, although majori-

ties of both groups believe that *colleges* should generally be involved in solving the problems of society, the difference described with respect to career motivation suggests that faculty of color are more likely to take *personal* responsibility for applying their talents to the cause of social change. Consistent with that interpretation are the results that show faculty of color to be a third more likely to advise student groups involved in community service and 29% more likely to pledge the professional and personal goal of providing services to the community. Although these measures are somewhat restrictive in describing the concept of the scholarship of application, the results of Table 4 suggest that faculty of color are, at a minimum, more strongly oriented to connecting their work as teachers and academics to society and the communities around them.

Overall, it appears that faculty of color can be differentiated from white faculty in terms of their lower publication record with respect to journal articles and books, higher commitment to research activities, stronger support for educational goals that encompass the affective, moral, and civic development of students, and in the more explicit connection they make between the work of their profession and service to society. To what extent are these differences a product of the somewhat uneven distribution (with respect to white faculty) of faculty of color across disciplines and institutions? Do personal characteristics of faculty explain the observed differences?

To shed some light onto these questions, I created additive composite variables for each of the areas of scholarship discussed above (except scholarship of integration) and measured the extent to which faculty of color status is associated with each area of scholarship. Partial correla-

TABLE 4

The Scholarship of Application

	Percentage (Mean)		T-test for Means	
	Faculty of Color	White Faculty	*t, df*	*p*
Professional/personal goal: Engage in outside activities (very important/essential)	51.5 (2.58)	47.8 (2.52)	−3.11, 20765	*
Professional/personal goal: Provide services to the community (very important/essential)	49.7 (2.57)	38.6 (2.37)	−11.33, 2845	**
Reason to choose profession: Opportunities to influence social change (very important)	32.3 (2.09)	18.5 (1.83)	−16.40, 20901	**
Opinion: Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems (agree strongly/agree somewhat)	67.4 (2.79)	63.8 (2.69)	−4.88, 20900	**
Advised student groups involved in community service in past 2 years	49.6 (1.50)	37.4 (1.37)	−10.54, 2560	**

**$p < 0.001$. *$p < 0.01$.

tions reflect the relationship after statistically controlling for demographic characteristics, personal value orientation, academic department, and institutional control (see Table 5). Each successive "model" in the table represents higher order partial correlations.

The first panel of Table 5 focuses on faculty working in research universities. The simple correlations essentially reflect the results of the item-by-item descriptive analyses. Faculty of color are associated with holding holistic teaching and learning goals, teaching interdisciplinary courses, and being oriented toward the application of their work for social change. Being a minority faculty member is not associated with the Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy and is negatively related to the Scholarship of Discovery.

For each of the statistically significant relationships, the successive controlling of the other independent variables reduces the strength and statistical significance of the association with faculty of color status. For example, demographic characteristics controlled in model 1 appear to "explain" the negative relationship with the Scholarship of Discovery. In the same way, the greater commitment to the Scholarship of Teaching—Learning and the greater likelihood of teaching interdisciplinary courses among faculty of color is evidently due to the value orientation minority faculty tend to hold. Across all 4-year institution types, faculty of color status is weakly associated with both a social change orientation ($r = 0.104$, $p < 0.001$) and a status orientation $r = 0.119$, $p < 0.001$). Even after controlling for differences in value orientation, discipline, and institutional control, however, faculty of color remain positively associated with the measure of scholarship of application.

The second panel of Table 5 displays the results for faculty in doctoral-granting institutions and exhibits fewer differences between faculty of color and white faculty. Faculty of color are again associated with dependent variables that describe support for and involvement in the scholarship of application and broadened goals of student learning and development, and differences in value orientation between the two groups appear to explain these relationships.

The next panel contains similar results. Like their counterparts employed in research institutions, faculty of color within comprehensive universities and colleges are more likely to be involved in and supportive of scholarship reflective of application, integration, and in terms of goals for student learning, teaching. Interestingly, however, faculty of color also more strongly embody the traditional conception of scholarship involving research, writing, and publication within comprehensives, institutions characterized by their lack of doctoral programs. The results further indicate that the positive association between faculty of

TABLE 5

Relationships Between Faculty of Color Status and Measures of Scholarship

Dependent Variable	Partial Correlation with Faculty of Color[a]					
	Simple *r*	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Adjusted R^2
Research Universities I & II						
Scholarship of Discovery (n = 6352)	−0.024*	0.017	−0.009	−0.015	−0.014	0.413
Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy (n = 7559)	0.019	0.015	−0.013	−0.009	−0.009	0.215
Scholarship of Teaching—Learning (n = 7423)	0.055**	0.064**	0.006	0.011	0.012	0.344
Taught an Interdisciplinary Course (n = 7252)	0.031*	0.035*	0.020	0.022	0.022	0.046
Scholarship of Application (n = 6615)	0.093**	0.096**	0.041*	0.043*	0.042*	0.399
Doctoral Universities I & II						
Scholarship of Discovery (n = 1900)	0.018	0.008	−0.023	−0.034	−0.035	0.343
Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy (n = 2346)	−0.009	0.011	−0.023	−0.025	−0.025	0.271
Scholarship of Teaching—Learning (n = 2310)	0.069**	0.081**	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.356
Taught an Interdisciplinary Course (n = 2218)	0.013	0.015	0.003	−0.002	−0.003	0.059
Scholarship of Application (n = 2107)	0.077**	0.087**	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.397
Comprehensives I & II						
Scholarship of Discovery (n = 5714)	0.102**	0.085**	0.051**	0.051**	0.053**	0.250
Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy (n = 7341)	−0.005	0.008	−0.030	−0.023	−0.024	0.223
Scholarship of Teaching—Learning (n = 7199)	0.089**	0.098**	0.044**	0.049**	0.047**	0.318
Taught an Interdisciplinary Course (n = 6826)	0.036*	0.033*	0.019	0.018	0.017	0.036
Scholarship of Application (n = 6517)	0.089**	0.095**	0.024	0.027	0.027	0.378
Baccalaureate Colleges						
Scholarship of Discovery (n = 2590)	0.057*	0.062*	0.019	0.017	0.026	0.210
Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy (n = 3333)	−0.010	0.003	−0.034	−0.021	−0.005	0.209
Scholarship of Teaching—Learning (n = 3272)	0.108**	0.108**	0.045	0.056*	0.059*	0.326
Taught an Interdisciplinary Course (n = 3123)	−0.015	−0.014	−0.028	−0.025	−0.005	0.064
Scholarship of Application (n = 2931)	0.168**	0.166**	0.101**	0.109**	0.101**	0.405

[a]Partial correlations when controlling for: Demographic characteristics (Model 1); Demographic characteristics and personal value orientations (Model 2); Demographic characteristics, personal value orientations, and disciplinary department (Model 3); Demographic characteristics, personal value orientations, disciplinary department, and institutional control (Model 4).

**$p < 0.001$. *$p < 0.01$.

color status and the Scholarship of Discovery, as well as the Scholarship of Teaching—Learning, is not simply due to racial differences in demographics, discipline, and personal value orientation.

The results for baccalaureate colleges are again, quite similar. Relative to white faculty, minority faculty more strongly display behaviors and values that reflect not only the Scholarship of Discovery, but also the Scholarship of Teaching—Learning and Application. The positive relationship between faculty of color and both the Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Teaching—Learning is particularly interesting. These positive relationships are apparent among faculty employed in comprehensive institutions and baccalaureate colleges despite the fact that the two tend to be competing priorities among faculty in four-year institutions and are negatively correlated $r = -0.22$, $p < 0.001$).

It is important to note that in interpreting these multivariate relationships, a number of limitations need to be kept in mind. First, the dependent variables are imperfect measures of Boyer's four conceptions of scholarship. The faculty survey from which the database was constructed was not developed to measure the four conceptions of scholarship, and consequently, the dependent variables should be interpreted as simply an initial attempt to capture the four views of scholarship. Second, the regression models used to calculate the partial correlations revealed moderate success in explaining the variance of each dependent measure except for the fourth, Taught an Interdisciplinary Course. Broad conclusions regarding the scholarship of integration, therefore, are not possible. Finally, these results represent *patterns* of association across specific types of institutions and do not necessarily capture the nature of relationships at any single institution.

Discussion

In their study of junior faculty, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) describe the norms according to which faculty are currently socialized:

> Good teaching is not particularly valued, and service is often seen as a waste of time. Research is pursued not because of any intrinsic interest, but in order to attain job security. Collegial relationships are sporadic at best and intellectual conversation appears to be on the verge of extinction. (p. 128)

Faculty of color in this study were found to exhibit behaviors and hold values that often counter these norms. In the area of teaching, faculty of color appear to be among the stronger advocates in the academy for expanding their roles as teachers and supporting more holistic educational goals. More often than white faculty, faculty of color in all types of four-

year institutions view their teaching goals as encompassing the moral, emotional, and civic development of students. Faculty of color are also more apt to view the work of their profession as being applied to change in society. Even in the area of discovery, faculty of color were found to appear contrary to expected norms. Though they do not differ significantly in their research activities and commitment to research from white faculty at research and doctoral institutions, they exhibited greater support for the scholarship of discovery in institutions that ostensibly provide the least support for research activities—those *without* doctoral programs.

In recognizing a growing disconnect between the activities of the academy and the needs of society, Boyer (1990) called for a more creative, expansive view of scholarship in the professoriate. The biggest challenge to broadening contemporary perspectives toward scholarship lies in changing the values of the academy, and therefore, the values of the professoriate. The results of this study illustrate that in most cases, it is the value orientation that faculty of color bring to the academy that distinguishes their greater involvement in, and support of, activities reflective of the scholarship of teaching, integration, and application. In addition, it is also their somewhat unique combination of values and philosophies from which higher education can benefit. Faculty of color in comprehensive and baccalaureate institutions offer a commitment to the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application *in conjunction with* a commitment to the scholarship of discovery. This combination can serve higher education as the seeds of transformation for a more integrated, socially responsive educational institution. As potential change agents, then, faculty of color are an important resource for the transformation of the professoriate and the academy.

Whether they are being evaluated with respect to these areas or not, faculty of color seem to be at the forefront in broadening the conception of scholarship. Simply looking toward faculty of color as the progenitors of change, however, will likely result in failure. Tierney and Bensimon (1996) note that transformation in higher education requires a critical discussion of institutional values and philosophy. Such discussions held in the absence of a diverse faculty will be unable to take advantage of the talents, perspectives, and values these faculty have to offer. Faculty of color not only represent a small proportion of the professoriate, they also tend to be younger and untenured. The reward system for faculty in higher education, in supporting the narrow conception of scholarship as research, places faculty of color in a poor position as proponents of change. Reconsideration of the priorities of the professoriate and commitment to transforming them, therefore, involves a reexamination of both the status of tenure and promotion in American higher education and of the continuing status of faculty of color.

APPENDIX

TABLE A1

Composite Variables Derived Through Exploratory Factor Analysis

Scholarship of Discovery (alpha = 0.80)	Factor Loading
No. of titles published in academic or professional journals[a]	0.84
No. of chapters published in edited volumes[a]	0.75
Professional/personal goal: Engage in research[b]	0.70
Hours per week spent on research[c]	0.70
No. of writings/performances published or presented in last 2 years[a]	0.66
Activity in the past 2 years: Used intra-or extramural funds for research[e]	0.65
No. of published books, manual, monographs[a]	0.62
Reason to choose profession: Opportunities for research[d]	0.61

[a]7 pt scale, "none" to "50+"
[b]4 pt scale, "not important" to "essential"
[c]9 pt scale, "none" to "more than 45"
[d]3 pt scale, "not important" to "very important"
[e]dichotomous, 1 = "No," 2 = "yes"

Scholarship of Teaching—Pedagogy (alpha = 0.80)	Factor Loading
No. of courses taught utilizing group projects[a]	0.82
No. of courses taught utilizing student presentations[a]	0.77
No. of courses taught utilizing cooperative learning[a]	0.73
No. of courses taught utilizing student evaluations of others' work[a]	0.62
No. of courses taught utilizing class discussions[a]	0.60
No. of courses taught utilizing experiential learning[a]	0.50
No. of courses taught utilizing independent projects[a]	0.48

[a]4 pt scale, "none" to "all"

Scholarship of Teaching—Learning (alpha = 0.88)	Factor Loading
Goal for students: Help students develop their personal values[a]	0.92
Goal for students: Provide for students' emotional development[a]	0.90
Goal for students: Develop moral character[a]	0.85
Goal for students: Prepare students for family living[a]	0.81
Goal for students: Enhance students' self-understanding[a]	0.75
Goal for students: Prepare students for responsible citizenship[a]	0.70
Goal for students: Enhance the out-of-class experience of students[a]	0.60
Goal for students: Instill a commitment to community and to service[a]	0.48

[a]4 pt scale, "not important" to "essential"

Social Change Orientation (alpha = 0.77)	Factor Loading
Personal goal: Influencing social values[a]	0.71
Personal goal: Influencing the political structure[a]	0.71
Personal goal: Helping to promote racial understanding[a]	0.52
Personal goal: Developing a meaningful philosophy of life[a]	0.52
Personal goal: Becoming involved with programs to clean up the environment[a]	0.47
Personal goal: Helping others in difficulty[a]	0.46

[a]4 pt scale, "not important" to "essential"

APPENDIX (Continued)

Status Orientation (alpha = 0.64)	Factor Loading
Personal goal: To be very well off financially[a]	0.82
Personal goal: Obtaining recognition from colleagues[a]	0.74
Reason to choose profession: Occupational prestige/professional status[b]	0.72
Personal goal: Becoming an authority in my field[a]	0.59

[a]4 pt scale, "not important" to "essential"
[b]3 pt scale, "not important" to "very important"

TABLE A2
Variables in the Multivariate Analyses

Demographic Characteristics	
Age	10 pt scale, "<30" to "70 or over"
Gender—female	1 = male, 2 = female
US born	1= no, 2 = yes
Academic rank	4 pt scale, "lecturer, instructor" to "full professor"
Faculty of color	1 = white faculty, 2 = faculty of color
Personal Value Orientations	
Social change orientation[a]	6 item composite scale scored 6 to 24
Status orientation[a]	4 item composite scale scored 4 to 15
Academic Department (dichotomous variables, 1 = no, 2 = yes)	
Business	
Education	
Fine arts	
Humanities	
Life sciences	
Physical sciences	
Social sciences	
Other departments (reference group)	
Institutional Control	
Private (reference group is public)	1 = no, 2 = yes

[a]Composite variable, see Table A1.

Notes

[1]For the purposes of this article, the term, "faculty of color," refers to college and university faculty members who identify as African American, American Indian, Asian American, or Latino.

[2]Enrollment figures for 1997. The proportions are exclusive of nonresident aliens, who make up the balance of the total enrollment.

[3]For a detailed descriptive analysis of African American, American Indian, Asian American, and Latino faculty, see Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin (1997).

[4]For the purposes of this study, the degree to which the HERI data set is nationally representative of four-year institutions was further checked by comparing it with the NSOPF-92/93 (National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty administered by the Department of Education, 1992–93). The distributions of three classification variables (age, gender, and academic rank) were found to be similar among the two databases. A table of these comparisons is available from the author upon request.

[5]Weights were normalized to yield original sample sizes for use in estimating statistical parameters.

References

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 23,* 373–398.

Astin, H. S., Antonio, A. L., Cress, C. M., & Astin, A. W. (1997). Race and ethnicity in the American professoriate, 1995–96. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1997). *Fifteenth annual status report on minorities in higher education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Princeton University Press.

De la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcón, J. J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano academics. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. *Review of Higher Education, 17,* 43–68.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Frierson, H., Jr. (1990). The situation of black educational researchers: Continuation of a crisis. *Educational Researcher, 19,* 12–17.

Garza, H. (1988). The 'barrioization' of Hispanic faculty. *Educational Researcher, 69,* 122–124.

Green, M. (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Harvey, W., & Scott-Jones, D. (1985). We can't find any: The elusiveness of black faculty members in American higher education. *Issues in Education, 3,* 68–76.

Jackson, K. W. (1991). Black faculty in academia. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 54,* 123–144.

Mickelson, M. L., & Oliver, M. L. (1991). Making the short list: Black candidates and the faculty recruitment process. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

NCES. (1997). Digest of education statistics 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Arredondo, M., & Korn, W. . (1996). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1995–96 HERI faculty survey.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Solmon, L. C., & Wingard, T. L. (1991). The changing demographics: Problems and opportunities. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Snyder, T. D., & Hoffman, C. M. (2000). *Digest of education statistics 1999.* NCES 2000–031. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril.* Report No. 4. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Turner, C. S., & Myers, S. L., Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Turner, C. S., Myers, S. L., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *Journal of Higher Education, 70,* 27–59.

University of California, Office of the President. (1991). *Domestic student enrollment tables, 1984–1990.* Oakland: University of California.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white institutions. Report No. 2. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.