

A Nationwide Study of Faculty Diversity in Business Schools: Perceptions of Business Deans

Farrokh Moshiri
California State University, Fullerton

Peter W. Cardon
University of Southern California

Faculty diversity in business schools is an important way to foster student success, improve national economic competitiveness, and ensure societal fairness. Yet, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and other ethnic groups are underrepresented among faculty members in business schools despite decades of attention to this issue. As a result, we conducted this study to learn what business deans think about underrepresentation of various ethnic groups and related causes.

Literature Review

While there are quite a few studies, articles, and presentations that have addressed the issue of faculty diversity (or lack thereof) in higher education (Buttner, Lowe, & Billings-Harris, 2007; Chen & Yang, 2013; Gater, 2005; Lee, 2010; Lindsay, 1999; Levsen, Goettel, Chong, & Farris, 2001; Lynch, 2013; Minor, 2013; Roy, 2013; Stanley, 2006; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008; Weinberg, 2008), there are only a handful of studies which have focused specifically on diversity among business school faculty. Over the past few decades, just a few studies of faculty diversity in business schools have been published. Moskowitz (1994) estimated the percentage of African American faculty at less than 2 percent and noted that a number of prestigious business schools (such as the University of Chicago, Carnegie Mellon, and Cornell) had no African American faculty members. Levsen, Goettel, Chong, & Farris (2001) conducted a national survey of 125 AACSB accredited business schools and found there were only 18 (4.3 %) African Americans and 5 (1.2%) Hispanic Americans in leadership positions among 415 respondents.

The JBHE Foundation (2002) shed some more light on the severity of the underrepresentation problem. The article stated that there were no African American tenured faculty members at 14 of the top 25 business schools; in particular, there were no African American faculty members at Yale or Berkeley. Furthermore, the overall percentage of Black faculty in 2002 was only 2.5% of total faculty members in these universities and that represented a .2% decline from 1999. A study by Buttner, Lowe, and Billings-Harris (2007) focused on the causes of underrepresentation of faculty of color by similarly surveying business school deans at 658 AACSB business schools. They discovered that only 2% of 143 respondents were Hispanics and 9% were African Americans. A 2013 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* summarized the situation as such: “The results of decades of efforts to increase faculty diversity...has been disappointing” (Roy, 2013).

Interestingly, the AACSB (2015) regularly collects and publishes data about ethnic representation in business schools. The 2013-2014 data collected by AACSB from approximately 650 AACSB accredited schools in the United States shows that African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans have made very little gain among full-time business professors at AACSB schools (see Table 1). The AACSB data paint a grim picture of underrepresentation of African American, Hispanic American, and Native American faculty members in AACSB accredited business schools. Compared to their percentage of the U.S population at 13.2% in 2013, African Americans continue to represent only 4% of all full-time business faculty. Even worse, Hispanics at 16.3% of total population account for just 2.4% of full-time business faculty members. American Indians at 1.2 % of total population are underrepresented, but not as severely as African Americans and Hispanic Americans.

Table 1.

Data on Full-Time Business Faculty by Race/Ethnicity in Relation to Population at Large

| Race/Ethnicity | Number of Business Schools ^A | Number of Faculty ^A | Percent of Full-time Faculty ^A | Percent in Entire Population ^B |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 351 | 151 | .5 | 1.2 (a) |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 487 | 4,393 | 16.0 | 5.5 (a) |
| Black, Non-Hispanic | 442 | 1,147 | 4.2 | 13.2 (a) |
| Hispanic | 416 | 711 | 2.6 | 17.1 (b) |
| White (not Hispanic) | 500 | 20,612 | 75.0 | 62.6 (a) |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown | 295 | 452 | 1.6 | |
| Two or More Races | | | | 2.4 |
| Total Faculty (Reported in Ethnicity Section) | - | 27,466 | 100.0 | - |

Note. ^A Based on AACSB data for 2013-2014 and does not include faculty members without a reported ethnicity and available at <http://www.aacsb.edu/en/knowledge/data/frequently-requested/faculty/full-time-faculty-by-race.aspx>; ^B Based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates for 2013 and available at <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>; (a) includes persons reporting only one race; (b) Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories.

Moreover, what little data on the question is available paints a worse situation for faculty of color in business schools than across all other disciplines. In 2003, full-time Black Instructional Faculty in business schools were only 4.5% of all faculty compared to education (7.9%), Fine Arts (6.0%) and all programs (5.6%). The situation for Hispanic faculty was even worse; they constituted only 2.5% of all Instructional Faculty in business schools where as Hispanics comprised 8% of the faculty in Health Sciences , 4.7% in education and 3.5% overall (2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty [NSOPF:04] Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003, 2005).

In the remainder of this literature review, we address several critical issues related to faculty diversity. These issues informed the survey we developed for business deans. We focus on two areas: reasons to promote faculty diversity in business schools and causes of underrepresentation of minority faculty members in business schools.

Reasons to Promote Faculty Diversity in Business Schools

Student success, the ability of the students to function and prosper in “an increasingly complex, pluralistic society,” was listed as one of the benefits of diversity in higher education by the Board of Directors of the American Council on Education (ACE) (American Council on Education (ACE), 2012). The Board asserted that diversity enriches personal growth among students and helps them develop critical thinking skills. The impact of student diversity on student growth has been cited as a compelling point in a variety of court decisions (Liptak, 2014; OnelBriefs, 2003).

However, studies (Chen & Yang, 2013; Gater, 2005; Lee 2010; Lynch, 2013; Weinberg, 2008) have pointed out that simply having a diverse student body does not guarantee success for students of color. Students need to have role models and leaders whom they can associate with and can get them engaged more in their colligate efforts. Gater (2005) argues that diverse faculty can relate better to a diverse student body and can serve as role models for students. Similarly, Chen and Yang (2013) mention that studies have shown that when students were asked about importance of leadership and role models in their success, students “talked at length about teachers who made a difference” who were of the same racial group (Chen & Yang, 2013). Furthermore, Lee’s (2010) study of students’ attitudes and thoughts finds that faculty play a key role in students’ success and non-Caucasian students are dissatisfied with the lack of faculty diversity.

Lynch (2013) opines that “[w]hile students can certainly learn from people outside their own sex, ethnicity and belief system, faculty with similar backgrounds provide stronger role models. Finally, a study by Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood (2008), which synthesized 20 years of research and 252 articles on diversity issues in higher education, argues that a diverse faculty is not only important for students’ success, but it is also important in the initial recruitment of minority students. The importance of diversity in faculty hiring for students’ success is now even more paramount as globalization and immigration have increased the diversity in American society and American colleges and have created an even greater need for faculty role models for students of all ethnic backgrounds (Chen & Yang, 2013).

Besides students’ success, the ACE’s 2012 board statement, also listed national competitiveness as a reason why diversity is important: “Sustaining the nation’s prosperity in the 21st century requires us to make effective use of the talents and abilities of all our citizens, in work settings that bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures” (American Council on Education (ACE), 2012). Similarly, Koprucu (2009) writes that today’s corporate leaders want employees who have “intercultural communication and management skills” (Koprucu, 2009). Simply put, if we do not have a diverse educational environment, we will deny ourselves the talents and abilities of about 35% of our national population and we will risk our international economic competitiveness.

Students’ success and national competitiveness are great reasons to push for a diverse faculty in higher education. However, these are not the only reasons why we should be encouraging diversity in faculty of American Universities. Fairness or social justice is another important reason. The American Federation of Teachers sees diversity as a social justice issue: “We see the process of effectuating a diverse faculty and staff as an essential element in achieving a greater measure of economic and social justice in America.” (AFT Higher Education, 2010). Furthermore, when it comes to equitable or socially just

distribution of academic leadership positions, and not just faculty positions, lack of faculty diversity makes achieving diversity in leadership, virtually impossible. Almost all institutions promote tenured faculty to academic leadership positions from the ranks of their own existing faculty and if the number of minority tenured faculty is low, the number of minority faculty in academic leadership positions will also likely be low. Studies support this logical argument.

Causes of Underrepresentation of Minority Faculty Members in Business Schools

One often cited reason for lack of faculty of color by the deans of business schools (often referred to as the *pool or pipeline argument*) is lack of enough qualified candidates (Levsen, Goettel, Chong, & Farris, 2001) and many believe that even the existing faculty of color are not as qualified as their white counterparts (Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006). Although we have succeeded to diversify our undergraduate population, fewer African Americans and Hispanic Americans pursue graduate studies in business and even fewer are awarded Ph.D.s. In 2005-2006, approximately 22% of college students were Black and Hispanic (AFT Higher Education, 2010). However, a 2008 study showed that combined Black (5.9%) and Hispanic (4.1 %) Ph.D.s accounted for around 10% of all Ph.D.s awarded. (Weinberg, 2008). In 2014, the percentage of Ph.D.s awarded to Blacks was slightly lower at 5.5% of all Ph.D.s awarded, whereas Ph.D.s awarded to Hispanics accounted for 5.1% of the total (United States Census Bureau, 2014).

The census data (United States Census Bureau, 2014) on population 25 years or older in 2013 also confirms that as we approach advanced degrees, Blacks and Hispanics fall far behind Whites (non-Hispanic). A higher percentage of Blacks (31.26) as a percentage of total of the 24,250,831 Black population (25 years and over) has a high school degree or its equivalent than Whites do (28.71 % of total 140,911,329 White population, 25 years and over) or Hispanics (26.9 % of total 28,948,817 Hispanics, 25 years and over). Yet, only 12.05 % of Blacks and 9.37% of Hispanics graduate with a B.A degree, whereas 20.24 percent of White populations hold Bachelor degrees. By the time students graduate with an advanced degree, only 6.7% of Blacks and 4.3% of Hispanics obtain an advanced degree, whereas 12.1% of the White population obtains an advanced degree. In 2014, of the 3,703,000 Ph.D.s awarded to those 25 years or older, Whites received 2,970,000 (80.2%), Asians received 478,000 (12.9%), Blacks received 206,000 (5.5%) and Hispanics received 193,000 (5.2%).

These statistics indicate several important conclusions: (a) The pool of available Black and Hispanic Ph.D.s has not proportionally expanded, despite all the attention to diversity for the past several decades; (b) Diversification of undergraduate students does not necessarily result in a corresponding expansion in the pool of Black and Hispanic Ph.D.s; (c) The size of the pool of available Black and Hispanic Ph.D.s cannot fully account for the underrepresentation of full-time Black and Hispanic professors. In 2011, these professors accounted for 7% of all full-time instructional faculty and this number lags significantly behind the pool of doctoral awards to Blacks and Hispanics (10% in 2008, 10.7% in 2014). What little data is available after 2004 indicates that blacks account for around 3 to 4% of business school full-time faculty and Hispanics account for around 2% of full-time faculty; (4) As the minority population of the United States continues to become a proportionally larger section of our total population, these statistics indicate that more and more of our population will not obtain the necessary education to assure an adequately diversified national pool of leaders.

Several studies advance the argument that while institutions want diversified faculty, their announced policies and the actual hiring practices are not in alignment (Levsen, Goettel, Chong, & Farris, 2001; Minor, 2013; Roy, 2013; Thompson, 2008; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). Thompson (2008) argues that while institutions want to diversify faculty, there is a “lack of committed leadership at all levels.”

Minor (2013) argues that in most institutions, the senior faculties who are overwhelmingly white decide on who gets hired and who gets promoted and they generally do not consider institution wide diversity goals and policies. Minor also notes that almost all search committees are entirely white. Levsen, Goettel, Chong, and Farris (2001) extend this argument to attribute the low number of minority leaders in business schools to an internal search process dominated by white faculty. Chen and Yang (2013) assert that “people will hire people they like.” Similarly, Cockrell (2006) argues that search committees choose minority candidates who are most like majority white faculty. Therefore, the consensus seems to be that since the background of faculty of color by definition are different from most search committee members who are almost entirely white, and people tend to like people with similar interests and backgrounds, prospects of minority candidates are diminished.

Other scholars identify campus culture as often unwelcoming to minority professors. Stanley (2006) defines campus climate as “culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that make up campus life,” and argues that the existing campus climate is hostile to faculty of color. She uses “multiple marginality,” “otherness,” and “silenced voices” among other phrases to describe the experience of faculty of color in predominately white intuitions. Faculty of color whose narratives are included in Stanley’s book, not only complain about bias from their colleagues (when it comes to evaluation of work, assignments, tenure decisions, and service tasks) but also point out that students in predominantly white institutions challenge their authority more often than their white colleagues. Buttner, Lowe, and Billings-Harris (2007) argue that leaders who advance the pipeline or pool arguments are not as racially aware as leaders who have a greater awareness of racial issues. The latter, attribute the lack of faculty of color to an “inhospitable culture.”

Turner, Gonzalez and Wood (2008) argue that many minorities who are hired leave academia due to a culture that creates social isolation, that is biased, and that is hostile. Tuitt, Hanna, Martinez, Salazar, and Griffen (2009) note that faculty of color experience overt racism, feel marginalized, and are viewed as affirmative action results. Roy (2013) likens the institutional approach to increasing diversity of faculty to “using a Kleenex at the height of allergy season.” Roy argues that most institutional leaders do not know what is needed to create a supportive climate for faculty diversification.

All of these studies not only point out the inherent issues in the hiring process which have contributed to the under-representation of faculty of color but also point out deficiencies in developing and retaining underrepresented faculty once they are hired. Lack of mentoring, lack of developmental opportunities, and the reality of bi-cultural existence-having to conform to a white culture while living with a different culture at home, and service expectations, add to issues resulting from the inhospitable institutional culture and reduce the retention rates of the under-represented minority faculty.

Methodology

While it's clear that there is underrepresentation of certain ethnic groups—namely, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans—among business school faculties, it's less clear whether business deans perceive the existence of underrepresentation. It's also unclear the reasons business deans attribute to underrepresentation. We developed a survey to learn what business deans think of underrepresented groups.

We compiled emails for deans of 280 business schools in the United States of America. All 50 states were included in the list. We then decided to conduct our study in two stages: a pilot study and a more comprehensive survey. The total responses which we received (55) amounted to a 20% response rate. For the pilot we designed an 11 question questionnaire which focused on African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Americans of Middle Easterner background. While Middle Easterners have not traditionally been included in these types of surveys and no known literature exists to address this group, our experience suggests that they may be an underrepresented group among business professors. The pilot survey was successful based on the reactions of 12 business deans. Based on feedback, we extended the survey to 14 questions with two changes: (a) we added Native Americans; and (b) we made the reasons for underrepresentation become *check all that apply* options as opposed to *check the most relevant reason* options. The appendix contains the final version of the survey.

Findings

We were able to get responses from deans with major variation in the number of tenure-line faculty members. Overall, the vast majority came from colleges with tenure-line faculties of 70 or fewer. (See Table 2 for more detail.)

Table 2.
Number of Tenure Line Faculty Members at Respondents' Business Schools

| | <i>n</i> | % |
|-------------|----------|--------|
| 10 or under | 3 | 5.5 |
| 11 to 20 | 8 | 14.5 |
| 21 to 30 | 6 | 10.9 |
| 31 to 40 | 8 | 14.5 |
| 41 to 50 | 6 | 10.9 |
| 51 to 60 | 7 | 12.7 |
| 61 to 70 | 4 | 7.3 |
| 71 to 80 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 81 to 90 | 5 | 9.1 |
| 91 to 100 | 2 | 3.6 |
| over 100 | 6 | 10.9 |
| Total | 55 | 100.00 |

Business deans reported that their faculties generally had relatively small numbers of typically underrepresented ethnic groups. For example 58.2% of business schools had two or fewer African

American faculty members; 80.0% for Hispanic Americans; 90.0% for Native Americans; and 56.6% for Americans with Middle Eastern backgrounds. However, for the most part, the deans did not feel that Middle Easterners were under-represented among the ranks of their full-time faculty members. (See Table 3 for more detail.)

Table 3.
Number of Tenure Line Faculty Members by Ethnicity

| | <u>African Americans</u> | | <u>Hispanic Americans</u> | | <u>Native Americans</u> | | <u>Americans of Middle Eastern Backgrounds</u> | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|--|--------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % |
| 0 | 6 | 10.9% | 18 | 32.7% | 33 | 76.7% | 15 | 28.3% |
| 1 or 2 | 26 | 47.3% | 26 | 47.3% | 10 | 23.3% | 15 | 28.3% |
| 3 to 5 | 14 | 25.5% | 6 | 10.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 16 | 30.2% |
| 6 to 10 | 6 | 10.9% | 3 | 5.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 11.3% |
| 11 to 15 | 2 | 3.6% | 1 | 1.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.9% |
| 16 to 20 | 1 | 1.8% | 1 | 1.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 55 | 100.0% | 55 | 100.0% | 43 | 100.0% | 53 | 100.0% |

Business deans clearly viewed their faculties as underrepresented as it concerns African Americans (79.2%), Hispanic Americans (84.6%), and Native Americans (73.8%) (see Table 4 for more detail). As Table 5 indicates, business deans primarily view underrepresentation as due to not having enough qualified applicants (African Americans, 54.8%; Hispanic Americans, 61.4%; Native Americans, 90.3%). A significant number of business deans consider qualified candidates choosing other institutions as a problem with African Americans (26.2%) and Hispanic Americans (15.9%). A significant percentage of deans (29.4 %) state that they have not made an effort to recruit Middle Eastern faculty or that there aren't enough qualified candidates (47.1%).

Table 4.
Business Deans' Perceptions of Underrepresentation by Ethnicity

| | Underrepresented | Not Underrepresented | % Who Say Underrepresented |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| African Americans | 42 | 11 | 79.2% |
| Hispanic Americans | 44 | 8 | 84.6% |
| Native Americans | 31 | 11 | 73.8% |
| Americans of Middle Eastern Backgrounds | 17 | 34 | 33.3% |

Typically, business deans do not consider other issues cited in the literature as obstacles to gaining a more diverse faculty. For example, under 10 percent of business deans consider campus climate, search committee composition, or reward systems as obstacles to gaining better representation of these ethnic groups.

Table 5.***Business Deans' Perceived Reasons for Underrepresentation by Ethnicity***

| | <u>African Americans</u> | | <u>Hispanic Americans</u> | | <u>Native Americans</u> | | <u>Americans with Middle Eastern Backgrounds</u> | |
|--|--------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % |
| There are not enough qualified applicants | 23 | 54.8% | 27 | 61.4% | 28 | 90.3% | 8 | 47.1% |
| There are enough qualified applicants, but they choose other institutions | 11 | 26.2% | 7 | 15.9% | 1 | 3.2% | 2 | 11.8% |
| We haven't made a conscious effort to recruit these candidates | 2 | 4.8% | 6 | 13.6% | 3 | 9.7% | 5 | 29.4% |
| The composition of our search committees are not diverse enough | 1 | 2.4% | 1 | 2.3% | 1 | 3.2% | 0 | 0.0% |
| We fail to retain minority professors because they feel the campus culture is not welcoming | 2 | 4.8% | 1 | 2.3% | 1 | 3.2% | 1 | 5.9% |
| We fail to retain minority professors because they feel their work is not appropriately rewarded | 3 | 7.1% | 1 | 2.3% | 1 | 3.2% | 0 | 0.0% |

Note. Percentages based on number of deans who felt these ethnic groups were underrepresented in their business schools (see Table 4).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Business school deans are clearly aware that Black, Hispanic, and Native Americans are underrepresented among their full-time faculty. The deans do not think that Middle-Easterners are underrepresented among their faculty. Since AACSB, the Census, and other data collection agencies do not specifically collect data on Middle-Easterners, we are not in a position to dispute this opinion. The deans attribute underrepresentation of Black, Hispanic, and Native Americans mostly to the lack of enough qualified candidates. At a distant second, they think qualified candidates choose other institutions. At the same time, few deans believe campus climate, reward systems, and search committee composition contribute to underrepresentation. According to a variety of studies, these latter factors are perceived to be factors that cause underrepresentation by many minority professors. Therefore, it's quite likely

that there is a gap in perceptions about what causes underrepresentation between business administrators and minority professors.

Perhaps what is most needed is a comprehensive study of African American, Hispanic American, and Native American professors and graduate students about what they perceive as the primary barriers to their success in business schools. A representative study (as opposed to case studies) that included each of the underrepresented ethnic groups (prior studies have generally focused on single ethnic groups) would help identify the extent to which a gap in perceptions exists between administrators and minority professors.

Similarly, not only are business deans aware of underrepresentation, they typically have not been able to make dramatic changes in faculty diversity (based on the finding that business deans do feel they've made conscious efforts to gain more faculty diversity). Perhaps it's time to consider out-of-the-box solutions and create different hiring structures while focusing on increasing the Ph.D. numbers among minorities. For example, business schools can hire minority candidates who have earned an MBA into a tenure track position with the condition that they need to complete a Ph.D. in six years. This is similar to Lucinda Roy's article published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in 2013 where Roy suggested the idea for ABDs (Roy, 2013). Universities routinely hire MBAs for part-time, lecturer positions. If these MBA holders are good enough to teach our students on part-time basis, why wouldn't they be qualified to teach the same students on a full-time basis?

An objection to this proposal might be that demands of a full-time teaching load would not permit most prospective faculty to complete their Ph.D. The reality is that most adjuncts have to work at several different institutions and teach more classes currently to earn the equivalent of one single full-time position. One secure, full-time position would actually lessen the work commitment of most adjuncts and allow them to work on a Ph.D.

Furthermore, under this arrangement, universities can choose to reduce the teaching load (and not the pay) of a candidate by one course a term during the six year process to help them complete the Ph.D. Another possibility is to hire minority MBAs who do not have a Ph.D. for permanent full-time positions, but under a lower category of compensation than those faculty who have Ph.Ds. Again, most universities already practice a variant of this by hiring MBAs who become Continuing Lecturers. However, currently, these candidates are not hired in to the Continuing Lecturer position and can become Continuing Lecturer only after several years of part-time work during which time many leave the teaching profession due to low pay for part-time faculty. The pay for Adjuncts in the U.S is so low that even a British newspaper, *The Guardian*, has addressed the issue (Hall, 2015). Since most of the minority faculty are adjuncts, low salaries might be a significant factor which affects retention of minority faculty who could later be promoted to full-time positions.

Finally, as it is suggested in the literature which we reviewed, business schools need to revisit their search committee guidelines and structure and incorporate diversity goals into the hiring practices directly where legally possible.

References

- AACSB International. (2015). *Full time faculty by race/ethnicity*. Retrieved from AACSB website: <http://www.aacsb.edu/en/knowledge/data/frequently-requested/faculty/full-time-faculty-by-race.aspx>
- AFT Higher Education. (2010). *Promoting racial & ethnic diversity in the faculty: What higher education unions can do*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- American Council on Education (ACE). (2012, 06). Retrieved 06 12, 2015, from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Document/BoardDiversityStatement-June2012.2.pdf>
- Buttner, E. H., Lowe, K. B., & Billings-Harris, L. (2007). Impact of leader racial attitude on ratings of causes and solutions for an employee of color shortage. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 73, 129-144.
- Cataldi, E. F., Fahimi, M., Bradburn, E. M., & Zimble, L. (2005). *National study of postsecondary faculty (nsopf:04) report on faculty and instructional staff in Fall 2003*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics/U.S. Department of Education.
- Chen, D., & Yang, X. (2013). Reaffirming diversity in higher education through faculty hiring: A leadership perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Adult Education Research Conference (AERC)
- Cockrell, K. S. (2006). Solitary sojourn: An American Indian faculty member's journey in academe. In C. Stanley, *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities* (pp. 123-138). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Gater, L. (2005, 03). *Diverse faculty reflects diverse world*. Retrieved University Business website: <http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/diverse-faculty-reflects-diverse-world>
- Hall, L. (2015, 06 22). I am an adjunct professor who teaches five classes. I earn less than a pet-sitter. Retrieved from *The Guardian* website: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/22/adjunct-professor-earn-less-than-pet-sitter>
- JBHE Foundation. (2002). Still treading water: African Americans at the nation's leading business schools. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 36, 109-113.
- Koprucu, S. (2009, 04). Raising global citizens: Focus on cultural competency. *School Business Affairs*, 75(4), 30-32.
- Lee, J. A. (2010). Students' perception of and satisfaction with faculty diversity. *College Studies Journal*, 44(2), 400-412.

- Levens, V. B., Goettel, N., Chong, F., & Farris, R. (2001). Do we practice diversity in business schools? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(4), 167-171.
- Lindsay, B. (1999). Women chief executives and their approaches towards equity in American universities. *Comparative Education*, 35(2), 187-199.
- Liptak, A. (2014, April 22). Court backs Michigan on affirmative action. Retrieved from *New York Times* website : www.nytimes.com/2014/23/us/supreme-court-michigan-affirmative-action-ban-html
- Lynch, M. (2013, July 2). Diversity in college faculty just as important as student body. Retrieved from *Huffington Post* website: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/matthew-lynch-edd/diversity-in-college-faculty_b_3140952.html
- Minor, J. T. (2013). Faculty diversity and the traditions of academic governance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2013(159), 49-61.
- Moskowitz, M. (1994). The best business schools for Blacks. *Business and Society Review*, 88, 43-52.
- OnelBriefs. (2003). *Grutter v. Bollinger*. Retrieved at OnelBriefs website: http://www.onelbriefs.com/cases/conlaw/grutter_bollinger.htm.
- Roy, L. (2013, November 18). Faculty diversity: We still have a lot to learn. Retrieved from *The Chronicle of Higher Education* website: <http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Diversity-Still-a-Lot/143095/>
- Stanley, C. (2006). *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishers.
- Thompson, C. (2008). Recruitment, Retention, and Mentoring Faculty of Color: The Chronicle Continues. *New Directions for Higher Education*, , 143.
- Tuitt, F., Hanna, M., Martinez, L. m., Salazar, M. D., & Griffen, R. (2009). Teaching in the line of fire: Faculty of color in the academy.
- Turner, C., Gonzalez, J., & Wood, J. (2008). Faculty of Color in Academe: What 20 Years of Literature Tells US. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139-160.
- United States Census Bureau. (2014). *Educational attainment of the population 18 years and over, by age, sex, race & Hispanic origin 2014*. Retrieved from United States Census Bureau website: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2014/tables.html>
- United States Census Bureau. (2015). *State & county quick facts*. Retrieved from United States Census Bureau website: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>

Weinberg, S. L. (2008). Monitoring faculty diversity: The need for a more granular approach. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 365-387.

Yoshinaga-Itano, C. (2006). Institutional barriers and myths to recruitment and retention of faculty of color: An administrator's perspective. In C. A. Stanley, *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities*. Boston: Anket.

Appendix of Survey Items

1. How many full time tenured or tenure track faculty do you have in your business school? (1 to 10; 11 to 20; 21 to 30; 31 to 40; 41 to 50; 51 to 60; 61 to 70; 71 to 80; 81 to 90; 91 to 100; over 100)
2. How many of your full-time tenured or tenure track faculty are African Americans? (0; 1 or 2; 3 to 5; 6 to 10; 11 to 15; 16 to 20; 21 to 25; 26 to 30; over 30)
3. How many of your full-time tenured or tenure track faculty are Hispanic Americans? (0; 1 or 2; 3 to 5; 6 to 10; 11 to 15; 16 to 20; 21 to 25; 26 to 30; over 30)
4. How many of your full-time tenured or tenure track faculty are Native Americans? (0; 1 or 2; 3 to 5; 6 to 10; 11 to 15; 16 to 20; 21 to 25; 26 to 30; over 30)
5. How many of your full-time tenured or tenure track faculty are Americans with Middle Easterner backgrounds? (0; 1 or 2; 3 to 5; 6 to 10; 11 to 15; 16 to 20; 21 to 25; 26 to 30; over 30)
6. Do you believe African Americans are underrepresented? (yes; no)
7. If you said YES to the last question, which statements best match why you believe African Americans are underrepresented? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Choices: There are not that many qualified applicants; There are enough qualified applicants, but they choose other institutions; We haven't made a conscious effort to recruit these candidates; The composition of our search committees are not diverse enough; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel the campus culture is not welcoming; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel their work is not appropriately rewarded)
8. Do you believe Hispanic Americans are underrepresented? (yes; no)
9. If you said YES to the last question, which statements best match why you believe Hispanic Americans are underrepresented? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Choices: There are not that many qualified applicants; There are enough qualified applicants, but they choose other institutions; We haven't made a conscious effort to recruit these candidates; The composition of our search committees are not diverse enough; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel the campus culture is not welcoming; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel their work is not appropriately rewarded)
10. Do you believe Native Americans are underrepresented? (yes; no)

11. If you said YES to the last question, which statements match why you believe Native Americans are underrepresented? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Choices: There are not that many qualified applicants; There are enough qualified applicants, but they choose other institutions; We haven't made a conscious effort to recruit these candidates; The composition of our search committees are not diverse enough; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel the campus culture is not welcoming; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel their work is not appropriately rewarded)

12. Do you believe Americans with Middle Eastern backgrounds are underrepresented? (yes; no)

13. If you said YES to the last question, which statements best match why you believe Americans with Middle Eastern backgrounds are underrepresented? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY. (Choices: There are not that many qualified applicants; There are enough qualified applicants, but they choose other institutions; We haven't made a conscious effort to recruit these candidates; The composition of our search committees are not diverse enough; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel the campus culture is not welcoming; We fail to retain minority professors because they feel their work is not appropriately rewarded)

Author Bios

FARROKH MOSHIRI is the editor of *Management Communication: an Anthology* (2012) and the author of *United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East: The Historical Roots of Neo-Conservatism* (2014). Farrokh is currently a Lecturer at California State University, Fullerton.

PETER W. CARDON is an associate professor in the Center for Management Communication at the University of Southern California. He researches enterprise collaboration software, technology-mediated communication, team communication, and intercultural communication. He is the author of *Business Communication: Developing Leaders for a Networked World*.