

Attitudes, Perceptions, and Preferences of Faculty at Hispanic Serving and Predominantly Black Institutions

As populations in the U.S. continue to shift, we see concomitant shifts in the enrollments of students who make up our higher education institutions. Recent data show that while the populations at elite institutions tend to be stable, less selective institutions are increasingly more likely to enroll a more diverse population of students, including immigrants (Massey, Charles, Lundy, & Fischer, 2003). These population shifts have resulted in institutions that have become known as minority serving institutions (MSIs).

Lane and Brown (2003) maintained, however, that we can not assume that Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) nor Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs) provide either congenial or intimidating campus environments for students. For example, HSIs began serving the Latino population because of geographic location and demographic changes (Benítez, 1998). The institutional missions of many HSIs and some PBIs do not directly address the specific needs of students of color (Contreras & Bensimon, 2005; Lane & Brown, 2003). By contrast, the institutional missions of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) do directly address the needs of African American students (Redd, 1998). Hispanic Serving Institutions were not created under federal law nor with a historical purpose of serving Latino students. Predominantly Black Institutions typically have geographic circumstances that have resulted in their serving Black students. These types of institutions can be called minority serving institutions.

A version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, November, 2005.

Steven M. Hubbard is Clinical Assistant Professor/M.A. Program Coordinator for New York University's Department of Administration, Leadership, and Technology and Frances K. Stage is a professor at New York University.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 80, No. 3 (May/June 2009)
Copyright © 2009 by The Ohio State University

Along with circumstantial shifts, many minority serving institutions also face financial difficulties and report understaffed and underfunded campuses. These challenges may impact the ability of minority serving institutions to successfully benefit their student populations. As funding for higher education grows tighter, we see increased emphases on measurement and accountability (Brown & Lane, 2003). As institutions turn their focus to document value added and achievement of students, they produce studies that assess student views of their learning and their college experiences. Relatively few of these studies examine the attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of the instructors who work with those students.

Faculty attitudes toward students and teaching significantly influence the campus environment. Faculty beliefs, practices, and values can diminish or enhance outcomes for students of color (Bensimon, Peña, & Castillo, 2004). Possible differences between Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) and minority serving institutions raise several questions regarding whether discrepancies exist in the learning environment of undergraduates. Do faculty attitudes at PWIs differ from faculty attitudes at HSIs and PBIs? Do faculty perceptions and preferences about undergraduate students at PWIs differ from faculty at minority serving institutions? How do these characteristics affect the conditions of student learning?

By examining variations in faculty attitudes, opinions about students, and satisfaction with their profession, we explore differences in learning environments for students attending HSIs and PBIs. Results will be of interest to administrators and faculty who seek to optimize the learning environment for college students of color. This paper describes the attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of faculty at Hispanic Serving Institutions and Predominantly Black Institutions. Using the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-99) data set, we compared instructors of these minority serving institutions with instructors from similar institutions that had high enrollments of Caucasian students. Highlighting dissimilarities allows us to understand how campus environments and faculty culture may differ between minority serving institutions and other PWI campuses with similar academic missions. These factors are examined under the framework of campus environments and institutional ethos. Brown and Lane (2003) cautioned against comparing all institutions within large groups when student populations, institutional mission, and educational goals differ. In this study, we attempt to address that issue by grouping institutions according to Carnegie Classification and examining differences across campuses of different population groupings.

For this study, we used the following definitions:

- HBCU Historically Black Colleges and Universities
- PBI Brown (2003) describes as predominantly black institutions those that have a 50% or greater Black student enrollment. For this study, predominantly black institutions were defined as those with 25% or greater Black student enrollment, and included HBCUs.
- HSI For this study Hispanic Serving Institutions are institutions with Latino enrollment of 25% or greater (Benítez, 1998).
- MSI For this study, minority serving institutions include any institutions that are defined above as a PBI or an HSI.
- PWI Predominantly White Institutions are those that do not carry a Historically Black College or University designation and are not a Predominantly Black nor a Hispanic Serving Institution. For the purposes of this study institutions with enrollments of Black and Latino students under 10% of the total were designated as Predominantly White Institutions.

Historically, many postsecondary institutions in the United States were established to improve society, empower its citizens, and promote democratic values. The aim to educate citizens enhanced the diversity of American higher education (Lane & Brown, 2003). Understanding campus environments and faculty attitudes toward undergraduate education helps us examine institutional environments and educational structures to see whether they encourage opportunity for future leaders in our society.

The Campus Environment

Institutional Ethos

Institutions and, in particular, faculty can serve to enhance or detract from students' views of themselves as scholars. Bandura's and others' work on self efficacy demonstrates that positive faculty beliefs about the abilities of their students as well as their own abilities to teach their students can result in positive student achievement (Bandura, 1986, 1999). Additional research shows that Black students at HBIs are likely to experience more positive attitudes regarding their abilities than are Black students at PWIs (Brown, 1994; Trent & Hill, 1994). Negative attitudes can diminish enthusiasm on the part of learners at the least and at worst, embarrass or intimidate them. Nelson Laird, Bridges, Morelon-Quainoo,

Williams, and Salinas Holmes (2007) found that African American students at HBCUs reported significantly more support, more student–faculty interaction and more gains in cognitive and personal development than African American students at PWIs. By providing classroom experiences that foster participation and encouragement for a broad array of students, faculty can enhance student learning (Stage, Muller, Kinzie, & Simmons, 1998). Taking students who are not well-prepared and working to develop their skills rather than screen them out, institutions can produce proportionately more graduates. Additionally, at institutions predominantly serving students of color, students are more likely to encounter role models who can reinforce aspirations for academic pursuits. By fostering an institutional ethos regarding a belief in the ability of all students to learn, administrators and faculty can help students feel welcomed into the academy and unafraid to explore new learning challenges. By examining attitudes of faculty, we can obtain a “snapshot” of institutional ethos.

Faculty

Most studies of faculty occur within single and selective institutions and tend to focus outside the context of their classroom and their relationships with students. Those few national studies that do exist tend to focus on research publication and career advancement. Additionally, few studies focus on differences across institutional type.

To assess campus environments, many studies have examined the college experience from the student viewpoint, but few have explored faculty attitudes and opinions about undergraduate students and their education. Most recent studies of faculty examined job satisfaction, scholarly productivity, employment status (e.g., tenure), compensation, and attitudes toward their work environment (Clery & Lee, 1998; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Centra, 1993).

In studies of college student outcomes most researchers attempt to take into account student incoming characteristics that make a difference, but seldom include measures of faculty attitudes and perceptions toward teaching and students—an important part of the educational process and the creation of institutional ethos. Institutions and in particular faculty can serve to enhance or detract from students’ views of themselves as scholars. For example, Black students at PWIs have reported skepticism on the part of faculty as well as classmates regarding their abilities to perform college level work (Brown, 1994). In addition, Nelson Laird, et al. (2007) found that African American students at HBCUs are more engaged with faculty than their counterparts at PWIs. However, Hispanic student engagement with faculty are similar at PWIs and HSIs.

Faculty attitudes towards students and teaching significantly influence the campus environment. Their beliefs, practices, and values can diminish or enhance outcomes for students of color (Bensimon, Peña, & Castillo, 2004). Stage and Kinzie (1999), in a study of three institutions, found that not only classroom practices, but also faculty attitudes and institutional ethos combined to promote students' beliefs about themselves as students and to promote classroom success. By examining variations in faculty attitudes, opinions about students, and satisfaction with their profession, we can explore differences in learning environments for students attending minority serving institutions. Results may be of interest to administrators, faculty, and policy makers who seek to optimize the learning environment for Latino and African American college students.

Methods

In order to better understand the attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of faculty at Hispanic Serving and Predominantly Black Institutions, we focused on institutions with higher percentages of Latino and African American enrollments, and we included PWIs for comparison purposes. Institutions with higher percentages of Native American enrollment were not included in this study because the dataset included few faculty from these institutions. Using the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-99) restricted use data set, we compared the responses of instructors of these institutions with instructors from similar PWIs. Describing differences allowed us to understand further how campus environments and faculty culture may differ between HSIs, PBIs, and other campuses with similar academic missions. Specifically we explored the ways in which faculty from HSIs and PBIs differed from other similar institutions (PWIs) based on: (a) Satisfaction with academic career; (b) Perception of teaching and undergraduate students; (c) Satisfaction with instructional duties; and (d) Opinion about the institutional environment.

The NSOPF-99 survey included two questionnaires—the institutional survey and faculty survey. The data set includes information on faculty and instructional staff employed by 819 institutions in the United States (Abraham, Steiger, Tourangeau, Kuhr, Wells, & Yang, 2000). The institutional survey obtained information on the number of faculty employed, tenure policies, retirement benefits, and faculty hires/departures. This faculty survey had seven subsections, which included: employment, career background, institutional workload, job satisfaction, compensation, socio-demographic characteristics, and opinions.

Public and private not-for-profit degree granting institutions receiving U.S. financial aid (N=960) were selected to participate in the NSOPF-99

data collection. Of these institutions, 819 institutions participated in the study by providing a list of faculty for the study. These efforts produced a sample of 19,213 faculty members. Data collection from individual faculty members began in February 1999. Participants chose between completing their questionnaire by mail or via the Internet. Faculty from the sample received emails, telephone follow-ups, and mail to increase the response rate. Of the original 19,213 faculty selected for the study, 18,043 completed and returned the questionnaire—a 83.2 percent response rate (Abraham et al., 2000).

From the NSOPF-99 data set, we selected only full-time faculty with instructional duties who indicated their principal activities as research and teaching. We excluded part-time faculty, administrators, and non-instructional researchers. In addition, we selected faculty from Doctoral, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, and Community Colleges¹. We excluded Research I and II institutions because few of them are minority serving institutions and because the focus of this study was on undergraduate education. With these restrictions, the sample size was 5,870 from 636 institutions. Next, we divided the sample into four categories: (a) Latino enrollment less than 10% (N=5590); (b) Latino enrollment greater than 25% (N=369), (c) African American enrollment less than 10% (N=4855), and African American enrollment greater than 25% (N=735). For comparison purposes, we decided to use the 25% or more student of color enrollment as our definition of Hispanic and African American serving institutions because it is frequently used as the criterion to identify HSIs (Benítez, 1998).

To measure the preferences, attitudes, and perceptions of faculty from these institutions, we selected 15 questions (measured on a 4-point scale: 4 strongly agree, 3 agree, 2 strongly disagree, 1 disagree) from NSOPF-99 (Table 1). The first four items addressed academic career; satisfaction with the authority to make other job decisions, with work load, with advancement opportunity, and with the job overall. The next four addressed perceptions of students and teaching, satisfaction with the time available to advise students, with quality of undergraduate students, time preferred teaching undergraduate students (as a percentage of total time), and opinion of undergraduate education at the institution (4-point scale expressing disagreement or agreement that the quality of undergraduate education had declined-reverse coded). Three items dealt with instructional duties: satisfaction with authority to decide course content, with authority to decide courses taught, and with time available for class preparation. The final four elicited opinions about their institutional environment, opinion regarding treatment of female faculty, treatment of minority faculty, choosing academic career again, and atmosphere of expression of ideas.

TABLE 1
NSOPF-99 Items

Satisfaction with academic career	Satisfaction with authority to make other job decision Satisfaction with work load Satisfaction with advancement opportunity Satisfaction with job overall
Perception of teaching and undergraduate students	Satisfaction with time avail to advise students Satisfaction with quality of undergraduate students Time preferred teaching undergraduate students Opinion of undergraduate education at institution
Satisfaction with instructional duties	Satisfaction with authority to decide course content Satisfaction with authority to decide courses taught Satisfaction with time available for class preparation
Opinion about institutional environment	Opinion about treatment of female faculty Opinion about treatment of minority faculty Opinion about choosing academic career again Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas

In our analysis, we compared the responses of faculty from institutions with less than 10% Latino enrollment with faculty from those same kinds of institutions with over 25% Latino enrollment and from institutions with less than 10% African American enrollment with faculty from similar institutions with over 25% African American enrollment. Table 2 provides the number of institutions represented for each Carnegie Classification.

Using analysis of variance (ANOVA), we compared the means of the faculty responses from institutions with higher percentages of minority enrollment with those from lower percentages of minority enrollment. For the first comparison we pooled the four intuitional types. Using SPSS we also took a random sample from our first comparison groups to

TABLE 2
Institution Sample Size for Each Carnegie Classification and Students of Color Enrollment Percentage.

Carnegie classification	# of institutions	African American enrollment		Latino enrollment	
		<10%	>25%	<10%	>25%
^a Doctoral & comprehensive	277	199	23	235	11
^b Liberal arts	76	52	12	70	0
Community colleges	283	175	49	190	31

^acombined for subsequent analysis;
^bnot included in final analysis because of low representation of HSIs

equalize group sizes for comparison. We randomly selected 300 from the less than 10% Latino enrollment group (original N=5590), 300 from the greater than 25% Latino enrollment (original N=369), 300 from the less than 10% African American enrollment group (original N=4855), and 300 from the greater than 25% African American enrollment group (original N=735)².

We then proceeded to compare differences based on Carnegie classification. Because of the relatively small numbers of faculty in some cells within the Doctoral and Comprehensive institutions (see Table 2), we combined the analysis for the two classifications and compared the differences based on Latino and African American enrollment. Similar to the first comparison, we randomly selected faculty from the Doctoral and Comprehensive comparison group. For Doctoral and Comprehensive institutions, we randomly selected 150 responses from the less than 10% Latino enrollment (original N=2,879), used the original 131 from the greater than 25% Latino enrollment, 260 from the less than 10% African American enrollment (original N=2,503), and the original 246 from the greater than 25% African American enrollment.

Finally, we compared the differences in faculty responses from Community Colleges based on Latino and African American enrollments. Similar to the other two comparisons, we again randomly selected faculty responses. We randomly selected 250 responses from institutions with less than 10% Latino enrollment (N=1,140), used the original 230 from institutions with greater than 25% Latino enrollment, 350 from institutions with less than 10% African American enrollment (N=1,313), and used the original 329 from institutions with greater than 25% African American enrollment. We did not include a comparison of Liberal Arts institutions alone, because the NSOPF-99 data set did not have a sample of HSI Liberal Arts institutions (see Table 2).

Because NSOPF-99 is a large data set and we are only using a small portion of the data set, the sample's effect size (ES) is an important way to measure the magnitude of the interaction with the dependent variable. The effect size differs from a significance test because the measure is independent of sample size. There are several methods to determine effect size (Cohen, 1988). For this study, we used Cohen's *d* to measure the effect size. Cohen's *d* is calculated by measuring the difference between the two means and dividing by the standard deviation of one of the two groups. Generally, a Cohen's *d* of .2 is considered a small effect size. A Cohen's *d* of .5 is of moderate size, and Cohen's *d* of .8 is large (Cohen, 1988). However, Cohen (1988) and others suggest that these values hold for fields characterized by potent variables and a high degree of experimental control, neither of which

describe higher education research. Cohen suggests that values would be more modest in nonexperimental fields characterizing much of education.

Results

The 15 NSOPF-99 items were used to compare the attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of faculty from MSIs with those from PWIs. ANOVA was used to identify differences based on Latino and African American enrollments. Table 3 presents the results for all faculty selected for this study, from Doctoral, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, and Community College institutions. The far left column of the table identifies the NSOPF-99 item. The next two columns present the response means of faculty from institutions with less than 10% Latino enrollment and greater than 25% Latino enrollment. The next column indicates the significance level of the ANOVA, and the Cohen's *d* measure of the effect size. The next three columns present the same statistical information showing differences in response means of faculty from institutions with less than 10% and greater than 25% African American enrollment enrollments.

As indicated in Table 3, with pooled data from several Carnegie institutional types, few differences existed. Faculty from institutions with higher Latino enrollment preferred to spend a greater percentage of their time teaching undergraduate students than faculty from institutions with lower Latino enrollment ($p < .05$). In addition, faculty from institutions with high levels of Latino enrollments were significantly less satisfied with their authority to decide their course content than faculty from predominantly white institutions ($p < .001$). As Cohen (1988) suggested would be the case for nonexperimental research, the effect sizes were modest at .21 and .20 respectively.

Comparing differences based on African American enrollment produced several significant results. But more positive responses did not always favor similar institutions. Faculty from institutions with higher African American enrollment preferred to spend more time teaching undergraduate students ($p < .001$). However, faculty from institutions with higher African American enrollments were significantly less satisfied with their opportunity for career advancement, less satisfied with the quality of their undergraduate students ($p < .001$), and less satisfied with their authority to decide course content ($p < .001$). The Cohen's *d* indicated relatively small to moderate differences between the two groups.

Institutional type and mission can also impact the attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of faculty members (Boyer, 1987). Therefore, we compared the responses of faculty based on Carnegie Classifications.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Faculty Responses from Doctoral, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, and Community College Institutions.

	Latino Enrollment			African American Enrollment		
	<10% N=300	>25% N=300		<10% N=300	>25% N=300	
NSOPF-99 item (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)
Satis w/authority make job decision	2.98 (0.88)	2.99 (0.89)	0.889 (0.01)	2.96 (0.87)	2.95 (0.92)	0.964 (0.01)
Satis w/work load	2.80 (0.94)	2.90 (0.95)	0.227 (0.11)	2.81 (0.90)	2.89 (0.95)	0.291 (0.09)
Satis w/advancement opportunity	2.97 (1.02)	2.91 (0.97)	0.486 (0.06)	3.02 (0.94)	2.85 (0.96)	0.029* (0.18)
Satis w/job overall	3.23 (0.71)	3.24 (0.75)	0.867 (0.01)	3.19 (0.69)	3.17 (0.73)	0.730 (.03)
Satis w/time avail to advise students	3.09 (0.784)	3.10 (0.795)	0.836 (0.01)	3.04 (0.82)	3.10 (0.86)	0.381 (0.09)
Satis w/quality of undergrad students	2.75 (0.84)	2.76 (0.91)	0.889 (0.01)	2.87 (0.84)	2.63 (0.91)	0.001** (0.29)
Time preferred teaching undergraduatess	51.78 (26.17)	57.37 (27.29)	0.011* (0.21)	54.41 (27.36)	59.33 (28.40)	0.031* (0.18)
Opinion of undergraduate education at institution	2.63 (0.80)	2.62 (0.83)	0.920 (0.01)	2.63 (0.81)	2.73 (0.84)	0.152 (0.12)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide course content	3.72 (0.61)	3.60 (0.75)	0.023* (0.20)	3.79 (0.52)	3.70 (0.60)	0.043* (0.17)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide courses taught	3.34 (0.80)	3.27 (0.82)	0.339 (0.09)	3.43 (0.69)	3.38 (0.74)	0.392 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/time available for class prep	2.99 (0.85)	3.05 (0.85)	0.388 (0.07)	2.97 (0.84)	3.06 (0.89)	0.203 (0.11)
Opinion about treatment of female faculty	3.06 (0.78)	3.11 (0.78)	0.464 (0.06)	3.03 (0.76)	3.05 (0.77)	0.709 (0.03)
Opinion about treatment of minority faculty	3.12 (0.74)	3.09 (0.81)	0.564 (0.04)	3.07 (0.70)	3.03 (0.82)	0.486 (0.06)
Opinion about choosing academic career again	3.38 (0.76)	3.37 (0.80)	0.875 (0.01)	3.33 (0.78)	3.38 (0.77)	0.369 (0.06)
Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas	2.38 (0.82)	2.42 (0.83)	0.488 (0.05)	2.39 (0.81)	2.42 (0.82)	0.650 (0.04)

*= $p < 0.05$; **= $p < 0.01$

Table 4 presents the results of comparing randomly selected faculty from Doctoral and Comprehensive institutions with less than 10% Latino enrollment with faculty from Doctoral and Comprehensive insti-

tutions with greater than 25% Latino enrollment. Similar to Table Three, the left column identifies the NSOPF-99 item. The next two columns present the means and standard deviations of faculty responses from institutions with lower percentages and higher percentages of Latino enrollment. The far right column indicates the significance level of the ANOVA and Cohen's *d* statistic.

As indicated in Table 4, faculty from institutions with higher percentages of Latino enrollment preferred to spend a smaller percentage of their time teaching undergraduates ($p < 0.05$) and were less satisfied with their authority to decide course content ($p < 0.05$). This may be evidence that administrators from HSIs have more bureaucratic control over faculty decision's concerning undergraduate instruction. However, faculty from schools with a higher Latino enrollment also indicated they would be significantly more likely to chose an academic career again. Cohen's *d* statistic for these differences was slightly more robust than for the earlier comparisons, particularly for the course content item. The Cohen's *d* of 0.34 indicating that the dissatisfaction on that item for faculty from HSIs was meaningfully different from their colleagues at predominantly white institutions.

Table 5 is similar to Table 4; however the comparison is based on African American enrollments. Results from this comparison identified four significant differences. Faculty from institutions with higher percentages of African American enrollment significantly less likely to feel satisfied with their authority to make job decisions (with a moderate Cohen's *d* of 0.21), significantly less satisfied with the quality of undergraduate students (with a more robust Cohen's *d* of 0.31), and were more likely to believe that minority faculty were treated unfairly ($p < 0.01$). However, the Cohen's *d* of 0.11 for that item was very small indicating no meaningful difference. Finally, faculty at predominantly black institutions reported being significantly more satisfied with the time available to advise students (with a moderate Cohen's *d* of 0.20).

For the final analysis, we compared the differences in faculty responses for the Community College classification. Following the similar format from previous tables, Table 6 presents the results of this comparison based on Latino Enrollments and Table 7 presents comparisons based on African American enrollments.

Results indicate that faculty from community colleges with higher percentages of Latino enrollment significantly preferred to spend less time teaching undergraduate students ($p < 0.001$). This teaching preference result differs from Table 3 which indicated that faculty from the pooled group of all institutional types in the study with higher percentages of Latino enrollment preferred to spend more time teaching under-

TABLE 4

Comparison of Faculty Responses from Doctoral/Comprehensive based on Latino Enrollment

Doctoral and comprehensive institutions	Latino enrollment		Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)
	<10% Mean (SD) N=150	>25% Mean (SD) N=130	
NSOPF-99 item			
Satisfaction w/authority make job decisions	2.95 (0.89)	2.94 (0.91)	0.915 (0.01)
Satisfaction w/work load	2.75 (1.02)	2.55 (0.99)	0.100 (0.20)
Satisfaction w/advancement opportunity	2.92 (0.99)	2.89 (1.02)	0.817 (0.03)
Satisfaction w/job overall	3.11 (0.76)	3.02 (0.81)	0.315 (0.12)
Satisfaction w/time available to advise students	3.12 (0.76)	3.07 (0.82)	0.580 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/quality of undergraduate students	2.79 (0.75)	2.77 (0.95)	0.797 (.03)
Time preferred teaching undergraduates	46.28 (24.235)	40.75 (24.565)	0.05* (0.23)
Opinion of undergraduate education at institution	2.63 (0.81)	2.63 (0.87)	0.935 (0.00)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide course content	3.79 (0.56)	3.60 (0.75)	0.016* (0.34)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide courses taught	3.41 (0.69)	3.26 (00.86)	0.110 (0.22)
Satisfaction w/time available for class prep	3.13 (0.75)	3.03 (0.86)	0.340 (0.13)
Opinion about treatment of female faculty	2.95 (0.83)	3.06 (0.81)	0.267 (0.13)
Opinion about treatment of minority faculty	3.02 (0.73)	3.03 (0.91)	0.960 (0.01)
Opinion about choosing academic career again	3.21 (0.87)	3.43 (0.73)	0.029* (0.25)
Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas	2.42 (0.78)	2.38 (0.85)	0.713 (0.05)

*= $p<0.05$; **= $p<0.01$; ***= $p<0.001$

graduates. This result demonstrates that institutional mission and type is important when comparing responses of faculty at minority serving institutions. The Cohen's *d* for this difference was .38 indicating a meaningful difference and the strongest effect size observed in this study. In

TABLE 5

Comparison of Faculty Responses from Doctoral/Comprehensive based on African American Enrollment

Doctoral and comprehensive institutions	African American enrollment		Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)
	<10% Mean (SD) N=260	>25% Mean (SD) N=230	
NSOPF-99 item			
Satisfaction w/authority make job decisions	2.98 (0.87)	2.80 (0.99)	0.031* (0.21)
Satisfaction w/work load	2.68 (1.00)	2.71 (0.94)	0.681 (0.03)
Satisfaction w/advancement opportunity	2.97 (1.01)	2.85 (0.99)	0.211 (0.12)
Satisfaction w/job overall	3.12 (0.77)	2.99 (0.76)	0.058 (0.17)
Satisfaction w/time avail to advise students	2.97 (0.84)	3.13 (0.80)	0.035* (0.20)
Satisfaction w/quality of undergraduate students	2.81 (0.87)	2.54 (0.93)	0.001** (0.31)
Time preferred teaching undergraduates	45.63 (25.83)	45.03 (27.15)	0.802 (0.02)
Opinion of undergraduate education at institution	2.60 (0.81)	2.73 (0.95)	0.099 (0.16)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide course content	3.72 (0.64)	3.60 (0.74)	0.055 (0.19)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide courses taught	3.32 (0.78)	3.21 (0.84)	0.119 (0.14)
Satisfaction w/time available for class prep	2.96 (0.84)	3.02 (0.82)	0.429 (0.07)
Opinion about treatment of female faculty	3.07 (0.78)	3.02 (0.78)	0.502 (0.06)
Opinion about treatment of minority faculty	3.06 (0.76)	2.89 (0.85)	0.017* (0.11)
Opinion about choosing academic career again	3.32 (0.83)	3.35 (0.85)	0.706 (0.04)
Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas	2.38 (0.79)	2.36 (0.80)	0.776 (0.03)

*= $p < 0.05$; **= $p < 0.01$

addition, faculty from institutions with higher percentages of Latino enrollment were significantly less satisfied with the quality of undergraduate students and less satisfied with the authority to decide courses taught (with moderate Cohen's *ds* of 0.20 and 0.21 respectively).

TABLE 6

Comparison of Faculty Responses from Community Colleges based on Latino Enrollment

Community college institutions	Latino enrollment		Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)
	<10% Mean (SD) N=250	>25% Mean (SD) N=230	
NSOPF-99 item			
Satisfaction w/authority make job decisions	2.95 (0.92)	3.01 (0.90)	0.465 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/work load	2.97 (0.92)	3.06 (0.90)	0.263 (0.10)
Satisfaction w/advancement opportunity	2.92 (1.00)	2.87 (0.99)	0.580 (0.005)
Satisfaction w/job overall	3.32 (0.74)	3.31 (0.72)	0.865 (0.01)
Satisfaction w/time avail to advise students	3.08 (0.84)	3.05 (0.82)	0.754 (0.04)
Satisfaction w/quality of undergraduate students	2.86 (0.81)	2.70 (0.91)	0.048* (0.20)
Time preferred teaching undergraduates	73.27 (21.20)	65.11 (25.48)	0.000*** (0.38)
Opinion of undergraduate education at institution	2.52 (0.82)	2.65 (0.81)	0.097 (0.16)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide course content	3.70 (0.61)	3.60 (0.74)	0.120 (0.16)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide courses taught	3.44 (0.75)	3.28 (0.84)	0.035* (0.21)
Satisfaction w/time available for class prep	3.02 (0.88)	3.03 (0.86)	0.979 (0.01)
Opinion about treatment of female faculty	3.05 (0.74)	3.13 (0.76)	0.279 (0.11)
Opinion about treatment of minority faculty	3.08 (0.73)	3.11 (0.79)	0.638 (0.04)
Opinion about choosing academic career again	3.46 (0.66)	3.36 (0.81)	0.124 (0.15)
Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas	2.34 (0.75)	2.43 (0.84)	0.210 (0.12)

*= $p<0.05$; **= $p<0.01$; ***= $p<0.001$

The comparison of community colleges was also conducted based on African American enrollment (Table 7). The comparison produced no significant differences between faculty from institutions with higher percentages of African American enrollment and faculty from institutions with less than 10% African American enrollment.

TABLE 7

Comparison of Faculty Responses from Community Colleges based on African American Enrollment

Community college institutions	African American enrollment		Sig. (Cohen <i>d</i>)
	<10% Mean (SD) N=350	>25% Mean (SD) N=320	
NSOPF-99 item			
Satisfaction w/authority make job decisions	3.05 (0.90)	2.94 (0.94)	0.119 (0.12)
Satisfaction w/work load	2.95 (0.96)	3.03 (0.94)	0.279 (0.09)
Satisfaction w/advancement opportunity	2.97 (0.97)	2.91 (0.94)	0.358 (0.06)
Satisfaction w/job overall	3.26 (0.73)	3.31 (0.70)	0.402 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/time available to advise students	3.05 (0.84)	3.11 (0.84)	0.398 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/quality of undergraduate students	2.82 (0.88)	2.70 (0.84)	0.072 (0.14)
Time preferred teaching undergraduatess	68.85 (24.188)	69.06 (23.42)	0.908 (0.01)
Opinion of undergraduate education at institution	2.59 (0.82)	2.64 (0.76)	0.346 (0.07)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide course content	3.66 (0.68)	3.66 (0.64)	0.986 (0.00)
Satisfaction w/authority to decide courses taught	3.42 (0.79)	3.41 (0.75)	0.818 (0.01)
Satisfaction w/time available for class prep	2.99 (0.88)	3.11 (0.91)	0.073 (0.14)
Opinion about treatment of female faculty	3.17 (0.72)	3.11 (0.75)	0.272 (0.08)
Opinion about treatment of minority faculty	3.20 (0.69)	3.10 (0.75)	0.093 (0.14)
Opinion about choosing academic career again	3.37 (0.75)	3.34 (0.74)	0.594 (0.04)
Opinion of atmosphere for expression of ideas	2.39 (0.81)	2.43 (0.75)	0.517 (0.05)

*= $p<0.05$; **= $p<0.01$

Discussion

This study examined variations in faculty attitudes, opinions about students, and satisfaction with their academic career across two types of MSIs compared with similar PWIs. We explored differences that faculty

might make in learning environments for those students. Questions explored covered four categories: (a) Satisfaction with academic career; (b) Perception of teaching and undergraduate students; (c) Satisfaction with instructional duties; and (d) Opinion about the institutional environment. Results may be of interest to administrators as well as faculty who seek to optimize the learning environment for students of color.

In general some differences emerged when contrasting these MSIs with other similar institutions. Results indicated that institutional type is an important factor when looking at differences between PWIs and MSIs. At our first level of analysis we pooled all institutions regardless of type (excluding research institutions). We found only a few differences between Hispanic Serving Institutions and those with fewer Latino students suggesting further evidence that HSIs do not have institutional missions that directly serve the needs of the Latino population (Contreras & Bensimon, 2005). Most HSIs became Hispanic serving because of their geographic location and demographic shift of the population. Unlike HBCUs, HSIs do not have the cultural artifacts, institutional missions, or historical rationales of serving Latino students. Therefore, these institutions demonstrate few differences with PWIs.

In contrast, we found more differences when comparing PBIs and those with lower enrollments of Black students (see Table 3) although the differences were small to moderate. A positive result was that faculty at PBIs, more than other faculty, preferred teaching undergraduate students. However, they were less satisfied with the quality of their students, their career advancement opportunity, and authority to make decisions about course content. This pooled sample included several types of institutions (Doctoral, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, and Community Colleges).

When we divided the analysis according to institutional type, we found more specific differences. At Doctoral and Comprehensive institutions, faculty in institutions with large numbers of Latino students preferred to spend less time teaching undergraduates and were less satisfied with their authority to decide course content. Disparities between minority serving community colleges and other community colleges included satisfaction with the quality of students and conditions of faculty service. While community college faculty reported that they preferred to spend a greater percentage of time teaching undergraduates than their peers at Doctoral and Comprehensive institutions, the most significant and strongest effect size tested was the difference between faculty at HSI and PWI community colleges. The community college faculty at HSIs preferred to spend less time teaching undergraduates. This finding, given the mission of community colleges underscores the importance of

considering the role campus ethos plays in the college student experience. Perhaps faculty at HSI community colleges are overburdened with teaching load or unprepared to teach students whose first language is not English. In addition, Bensimon (2005) reported that faculty used deficit oriented attributions to explain unequal educational attainment of Black and Hispanic students.

There were some limitations to our study—we included only full time faculty because we thought they best represented the ethos of the institution. Nevertheless, part-time faculty represent a population that has grown and likely accounts for many of the faculty that undergraduate students encounter. Additionally, we were limited in our ability to study faculty who teach some students; NSOPF-99 did not have data on faculty from Liberal Arts institutions with over 25% Latino enrollment. Additionally, we were unable to compare faculty at colleges with high enrollments of Native American students because of very small numbers of such institutions in the data set. In general effect sizes of the samples were moderate. According to Cohen (1988) fields like higher education that are not characterized by potent variables and a high degree of experimental control produce effect sizes that are expected to be small.

Clearly HBCUs have a positive impact on the education of African American students. HBCUs also provide diversity in the types of institutions that serve college students. Several Liberal Arts institutions had African American enrollments over 25% (many of them HBCUs). By contrast, no Liberal Arts institutions had more than 25% Latino students or Native American students. A wide variety of HBCUs and PBIs provide a wealth of choices for African American students. Unfortunately, Latinos and Native American students remain underserved by the American higher education system.

Recommendations

This research suggests that Minority Serving Institutions—Predominantly Hispanic and Black Serving Institutions should not be grouped into one category for research. Such groupings mask differences based on institutional type and mission, enrollments, faculty attitudes, behaviors, and practices. This study reinforces Brown and Lane's (2003) recommendation that important aspects of individual campuses not be ignored. The differences between MSIs and PWIs that were found in this study indicate that more research is needed to describe how MSIs meet the needs of their students.

While we learned of differences in faculty across institutions based on the demographic profiles of students served, more issues could be explored using national data sets. Brown (2003) advised that because of their more explicit mission and history HBCUs not be confounded with PBIs. With this data set we were unable to separate HBCUs from PBIs. Some questions that could be answered through future quantitative approaches include: Are there differences in faculty attitudes, behaviors, and practices between HBCUs and PBIs of similar types? Are there differences in faculty attitudes, behaviors, and practices across PBIs (not HBCUs), and HSIs of similar types?

Qualitative work might include institution specific examinations of the role of faculty in the college student experience. Additionally, questionnaires and interviews with faculty at a small number of institutions exploring similarities and differences in faculty attitudes, behaviors, and practices across institutions with differing missions would be productive. Finally, comparisons of institutional ethos across institutions with explicit missions to serve students of color and those with no such missions might be informative.

The faculty role in college students' experiences has not been closely examined, even though faculty are the most consistent point of contact with students (Hubbard, 2005). Researchers have found that they form an important link to the success of students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991), but in studies of student access and success, students are typically asked only a few cursory questions regarding their relationships with faculty. As resources become tight and faculty experience greater demands on their time, it is important to understand the ways that conditions of faculty work can affect the campus environment and the student experience.

Faculty attitudes, opinions about students, and satisfaction with their profession, form an critical aspect of the conditions under which college students seek to learn. It is important that administrators and faculty who seek to optimize the learning environment for college students of color add this important source of information to their efforts to make campus environments more conducive to learning.

Notes

¹The NSOPF-99 dataset included several Carnegie Classification systems. For this study we used the 1994 Carnegie Classifications.

²After selecting random samples we compared mean responses of the original and random sample groups to the fifteen items that we examined. We found no significant differences ($p < 0.05$).

References

- Abraham, S. Y., Steiger, D. M., Tourangeau, R., Kuhr, B. D., Wells, B., & Yang, Y. (2000). *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Field Test Report* (Technical Report). Washington D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1999). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Benítez, M. (1998). Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Challenges and opportunities. In J. P. Merisotis & E. M. O'Brien (Eds.), *Minority-Serving Institutions: Distinct Purposes, Common Goals* (pp. 57–68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bensimon, E. M., Peña, E. V., & Castillo, C. (2004, November). The cognitive frames which institutional actors interpret inequality in educational outcomes among Black and Hispanic college students. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education in Kansas City, MO.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2005). Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational learning perspective. In A. J. Kezar (Ed.) *Organizational learning in higher education* (pp. 99–111). *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 131. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blackburn, R. T. & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper.
- Brown, M. C. (2003). Emics and etics of researching Black colleges: Applying facts and avoiding fallacies. In M. C. Brown & J. E. Lane (Eds.), *Studying diverse institutions: Contexts, challenges, and considerations* (pp. 27–40). *New Directions in Institutional Research*, no. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, M. C., & Lane, J. E. (Eds.). (2003). *Studying diverse institutions: Contexts, challenges, and considerations*. *New Directions in Institutional Research*, no. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, O. G. (1994). *Debunking the myth: Stories of African-American university students*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Clery, S. B. & Lee, J. B. (2003). *Faculty salaries*. Washington DC: National Education Association.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Contreras, F.E. & Bensimon, E.M. (2005, November). *An equity-based accountability framework for Hispanic Serving Institutions*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Hubbard, S. (2005). Identifying factors that influence student-centered teaching in the undergraduate classroom: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (12), 4317.
- Lane, J. E. & Brown, M. C. (2003). *Looking backward to see ahead: Implications for research, policy, and practice*. In M. C. Brown & J. E. Lane (Eds.), *Studying*

- Diverse Institutions: Contexts, Challenges, and Considerations* (pp. 27–40). *New Directions in Institutional Research*, no. 118. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Massey, D. S., Charles, C. Z., Lundy, G. F., & Fischer, M. J. (2003). *The source of the river: The social origins of freshmen at America's selective colleges and universities*. New Jersey.
- Merisotis, J. P., & O'Brien, C. T. (Eds.). (1998). *Minority-Serving Institutions: Distinct purposes, common goals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., Bridges, B. K., Morelon-Quainoo, C. L., Williams, J.M., & Salinas Holmes, M. (2007). African American and Hispanic student engagement at minority serving and predominantly white institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(1), 39-56.
- Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (1991) *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Redd, K. E. (1998). Historically Black colleges and universities: Making a comeback. In J. P. Merisotis & E. M. O'Brien (Eds.), *Minority Serving Institutions: Distinct Purposes, Common Goals* (pp. 33–44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stage, F. K., & Kinzie, J. (1999). *Reform in undergraduate science, mathematics, engineering, and technology: The classroom context*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.
- Stage, F. K., Muller, P., Kinzie, J., & Simmons, A. (1998). *Creating learning centered classrooms: What does learning theory have to say?* Vol. 26 No. 4 Ashe-Eric Higher Education Report. Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Trent, W., & Hill, J. (1994). The contributions of historically Black colleges and universities to the production of African American scientists and engineers. In W. Pearson & A. Fechter (Eds.), *Who will do science? Education the next generation* (pp. 68–80). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Copyright of Journal of Higher Education is the property of Ohio State University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.