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Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the last decade, Black women have made advancements as students, graduates, educators, and leaders in higher education, in spite of many challenges along the academic pipeline (Aguirre, 2000; Collins, 2009; Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009; Gregory, 2001; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Mabokela, 2007; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Turner, 2002). Yet, despite these advancements, Black women continue to be underrepresented at management levels of administration in institutions of higher education, relative to their numbers in the United States (US) population (Aguirre, 2000; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Jackson, 2003, 2004; Stanley, 2006).

Recent figures show that although women accounted for almost 54% of the overall workforce in institutions of higher education in 2007, Black women accounted for 12%, while White women accounted for over 72% of the overall academic workforce (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2010). During this same period, women accounted for almost 53% of leadership positions within executive, administrative, and managerial ranks, yet a disproportionately low number of Black women held those positions (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2010). In 2007, only 11% of women working in executive, administrative, and managerial positions in institutions of higher education were Black (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2010). The proportion of women in academic leadership, and in particular, Black women in academic leadership, declines as position and authority increase (Dean, 2009). This decline can be seen in the
underrepresentation of Black women in specific administrative positions such as dean, provost, and vice president (Melendez, 2004).

However, irrespective of these low numbers, a select group of Black women have advanced through the administrative pipeline in higher education, and currently occupy managerial and administrative positions in a number of institutions across the United States. Research highlighting this group of women and their career choices is limited. To that end, this study sought to identify and examine the personal and professional factors that impact the career decisions of Black women in management level positions in institutions of higher education in the US.

Statement of the Research Problem

Institutions of higher education have been faced with many challenges during the 21st century. Demands to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse society, the changing status of employment in higher education, and an impending wave of academic retirements, are just a few of the difficulties facing colleges and universities today (Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; Miller, 2010; Moses, 2009). The American college landscape is changing. College and university campuses now include many more first-generation and low-income students than ever before, and international students whose first language is not English (Seurkamp, 2007). The number of students of color has risen, and institutions of higher education have been confronted with the responsibility to address the needs of a more diverse group of students. In addition to changing student demographics, an increasing proportion of part-time and full-time contingent faculty are filling positions at colleges and universities, as institutions make an effort to meet
financial pressures. Furthermore, college presidents, senior administrators, and faculty leaders are retiring at a rapid rate, and this trend is expected to continue (Miller, 2010).

In order to meet these challenges, it is imperative that educational leaders find ways to address the need for diverse leadership growth. Increased diversity in employment is often one of the principal objectives noted in universities’ strategic plans (Cleveland, 2009). Institutions have begun to focus attention on the recruitment and retention of Black female faculty, yet little attention has been placed on the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black female administrators (Jackson, 2004; Turner & Myers, 2000). Historically, little attention has been given to Black women in management levels of administration in higher education (Rusher, 1996).

During the last decade, researchers have documented the personal and professional challenges that Black women face in education (Carter-Black, 2008; Collins, 2009; Gregory, 2001; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002). Most of this research has focused on the barriers that Black women encounter as students, faculty, and staff in institutions of higher education (Carter-Black, 2008; Gregory, 2001; Jayakumar, 2009; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001). However, there is a scarcity of literature highlighting the unique perceptions and experiences of Black women in academic leadership (Benjamin, 1997; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Relatively little research can be found on Black women pursuing professional careers in higher education, especially those employed in administration, rather than teaching. Further, existing research has failed to explore the intersection of the personal and professional lives of Black women (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). The personal and professional factors that play a role and
influence the career choices of Black women are not typically addressed (Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009).

Black women are a growing presence within academia; nevertheless, they remain a mystery to others in their institutions (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). Bell and Nkomo (2001) suggest that many White colleagues of Black women know very little about their colleagues’ cultural, personal, professional, and career experiences. Due to the complex intersection of their gender, race, and social identification, Black women often encounter unique challenges throughout their careers. Existing research and scholarship on Black female academics has done much to highlight the institutional and social challenges Black women must overcome to succeed in institutions of higher education (McDemmond, 1999; Turner, 2002). Within academic institutions, Black women commonly lack social and organizational support, trust, access to information, formal and informal networks and career advice, and sometimes even face isolation from other women within their institutions (Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Collins, 2009; Myers, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2002). Black women working in institutions of higher education often experience discontentment due to negative stereotypes regarding their academic and professional ability and frequently encounter barriers to tenure, promotion and salary increases (Crawford & Smith, 2005; Myers, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2002). The research literature further suggests that Black women often experience marginalization, suppression, and exclusion within the ranks of higher education, which may impede their overall advancement to administrative leadership positions (Carter-Black, 2008; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Jayakumar, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002).
Although the institutional and social factors identified may serve as obstacles to the career advancement of Black women in higher education, the reasons for a great number of Black women not ascending to higher management level positions transcend those factors. Bell and Nkomo (2001) assert that an individual juncture of personal, family, and community values often guide the career paths that Black women pursue, forcing Black women to “negotiate between their personal and professional lives” (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009, p. 3). According to the Association for the Study of Higher Education [ASHE] (2009), a substantial number of Black women who have been able to overcome institutional and social barriers, and indeed possess the currency to climb the academic career ladder, are deliberately choosing to remain in their current management positions due to various personal and professional factors.

The personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education comprise an important gap in both the academic and career development literature. If educational leaders are to successfully increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is imperative to understand the reasons why a number of Black women at institutions of higher education are choosing to remain in their current management positions, opting not to advance to higher-level positions.

Theoretical Rationale

Numerous research studies have applied career development theories to examine the career decisions of women (Crozier, 1999; Crozier & Dorval, 2002; Fitzgerald, Fassinger, & Betz, 1995; Richie, Fassinger, Linn, Johnson, Prosser, & Robinson, 1997; Super, 1975). One of the first theorists to address women’s career development and
acknowledge the need to examine the different career experiences between men and women was Super (1975). Super’s research in the late 1950s acknowledged that the career paths of women are generally different from those of men. His model also took into consideration the role of the environment in shaping individual self-concepts, and considered the central role of family life and its impact on women’s careers. Consistent with Super’s (1975) research, Fitzgerald, Fassinger, and Betz’s (1995) examination of career choices and career orientations suggested that the career development of women is unique, due to an intersection of work and family responsibilities. Fitzgerald, Fassinger, and Betz (1995) argued that “the history of women’s traditional roles as homemaker and mother continue to influence every aspect of their career choice and adjustment” (p. 72).

Crozier (1999) proposed that relational identity influenced the multiple roles for which women are responsible, the stages of their career development, career choices, the overall career decision-making process, and personal definitions of career success. Crozier and Dorval (2002) further contended that values such as achievement, concern for the environment and others, financial success, responsibility, sense of belonging, and spirituality are central for women in order to feel a sense of satisfaction in their careers.

Similar to these studies, but centered on Black women, Richie, Fassinger, Linn, Johnson, Prosser, and Robinson (1997) conducted a study on the career development of high achieving African-American women, grounded on their personal experiences. Richie et al. (1997) stated that despite their persistence and efforts to overcome obstacles, African American women faced barriers, lack of opportunities, and personal challenges caused by racism and sexism.
While these studies are important in recognizing the unique factors that influence the careers paths of women, they fail to consider other underlying internal factors that may influence the career decisions of Black women who work in higher education. Because little is known about the combined effects of racism and sexism on career development and the career choices of Black women, the extent to which existing theories and models accurately describe the experiences of Black women remains uncertain, as does the degree to which current valuation tools accurately measure the perceptions and experiences within these populations. In an effort to address this gap in the research, this study identified and examined the personal and professional factors that impact Black women who work at institutions of higher education, by drawing upon Schein’s career anchor theory (1990/1996).

Career anchor theory was designed to promote a better understanding of how professional careers evolve, and how people discover the values that are most important to them within their careers (Schein, 1990). Values are an important component of an individual’s sense of identity (Josselson, 1987). Career anchors provide insight into how the self-concept or self-image of an individual develops around his or her career, and becomes a guiding force when making career decisions (Schein, 1990). “As people accumulate work experience, they have the opportunity to make choices; from these choices they begin to ascertain what they really find important” (Schein, 1990, p. 18).

Career anchor theory has been chosen as the basis for this study because of its relevance across a wide range of careers. Career anchor theory also was selected because of its breadth and inclusion of both traditional career values such as security and stability, as well as more modern career values such as dedication to service and lifestyle balance.
These values have been identified as important considerations in the career choices of Black women (Gregory, 1999). Although Black women have been included in prior studies (Quesenberry & Trauth, 2007), they have not been studied as a distinct group, to determine if the categories or phenomena related to career anchors described by Schein are applicable. Identifying and understanding career anchors can offer great insight into the career decisions of Black women. These anchors are the “one element in a person’s self-concept that he or she will not give up, even in the face of difficult choices” (Schein, 1990, p. 18).

The next section summarizes the major elements of career anchor theory and the related theoretical frames that have been applied to support this study.

*Career anchor theory.* Career anchor theory focuses on the internal career of individuals, and offers a means to understanding career motivation. An important aspect of a person’s internal career is his or her career anchor (Schein, 1990, 1996). Schein (1990, 1996) defines a career anchor as a collection of self-perceived skills, personal motives, and values that a person develops over time, and once developed; these anchors shape and guide the career choices of that person. Career anchors provide a vision of the one thing that is most important to a person, the one thing that a person is not willing to sacrifice for their career (Schein, 1996). The internal factors that influence career decisions often differ based on the desires, experiences, interests, and needs of an individual. Schein and Van Maanen (1977) further state that an individual’s internal career is the individual’s own subjective idea about their professional life, and their role within it.
Based on Schein’s first longitudinal study in 1968, and his career history interviews of several hundred people across various professions, Schein identified eight internal factors that are believed to influence career decisions. These career anchors include autonomy/independence, entrepreneurial creativity, general managerial competence, lifestyle, pure challenge, security/stability, service/dedication to a cause, and technical/functional competence. Schein (1990) defined each of these eight career anchors as described below.

Autonomy, also recognized as independence, is primarily what motivates individuals to seek work situations that are generally free of organizational constraints. People with a strong autonomy/independence career anchor typically prefer to set their own work schedule, and they are willing to forgo opportunities for promotion and career advancement in order to have more freedom. Entrepreneurial creativity refers to the need that individuals have to develop or create something on their own. People linked to the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor tend to be easily bored and prefer to move from one project to the next. These people are more concerned with initiating new ideas than in managing established ones. General managerial competence is primarily what excites a person to analyze and solve problems. People with a strong general managerial competence career anchor enjoy harnessing people together in an effort to achieve common goals. Lifestyle refers to the need to balance career with daily life. People linked to the lifestyle career anchor are highly concerned with issues such as family, household, and childcare. These particular people seek out organizations that have strong family values and work-life balance programs. Pure challenge is primarily what motivates an individual to overcome major obstacles in the workplace. Individuals with a strong career
anchor for pure challenge enjoy solving unsolvable problems, and they define their career in terms of a daily struggle with strong competition in which winning is most important. These people are very single-minded, and become easily frustrated with those who do not share their same desires and ambitions. Security, also recognized as stability, refers to overall job security and long-term stability with one single organization. Individuals linked to a strong security/stability career anchor are willing to conform to norms and become fully acclimated into the organization’s culture. These particular people tend to dislike or are unwilling to travel or relocate for their career. Service, also recognized as dedication to a cause, consists of a drive to improve the world in some way. People with a strong service/dedication to a cause career anchor seek to align work with personal values in order to help society. These people are more concerned with finding careers that align with their values, rather than their skills. The final career anchor, technical/functional competence, is primarily what excites an individual with the opportunity for advancement in their technical or functional area of competence. These particular people thrive in an environment that allows them to work specifically in their area of expertise. A complete summary of Schein’s (1990) eight career anchor definitions is presented in Appendix A.

Schein’s development of career anchor theory has been built on the assertion that people typically begin their professional lives in young adulthood, through a process of exploration (1990). It is during this time that they begin to uncover initial interests, values, and motives. For each person, prevailing themes emerge as they determine how to balance family, work, and other personal commitments. Schein suggested that career anchors develop over time, through various life and professional experiences, as an
individual begins to discover what they are good at, what they like, and what they truly find important in life and in work. These skills, motives, and values gradually develop into an individual’s self-concept, which functions as an anchor, a stabilizing force that guides that individual’s career decisions (Schein, 1990). Schein (1990) posits that such development typically requires up to ten years or more of actual work experience. “As people accumulate work experience, they have the opportunity to make choices; from these choices they begin to ascertain what they really find important” (Schein, 1990, p. 18).

For purposes of this study, career anchor theory provided the theoretical framework for identifying the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. Like all women who work outside of the home, Black women must confront the choice of whether they will be defined by their career, or by their personal life (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). “These two separate orientations represent the extremes of choices available to women” (Bell & Nkomo, 2001, p. 191). Therefore, based on the purpose of this study, career anchor theory provided an appropriate framework for conducting research to identify and examine factors that may influence the career choices of Black female administrators.

Significance of the Study

The personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in higher education represent a significant gap in academic research. This study is significant because it adds to the existing body of knowledge relating to career anchor theory. The study also adds to the body of knowledge because it focuses on a unique population of administrators in higher education. Specifically, this study
identifed and examined the self-perceived career anchors, and internal factors that impact the career choices of Black women who work in management level positions at institutions of higher education. Within this research context, this study investigates the relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience in higher education; (e) years of administrative experience in higher education; (f) current position at institution; (g) department or principal area of current position; and (h) institution type. The study also investigates the relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level positions at US institutions of higher education, and the decision to remain in their current management positions.

This study also informs professional practice by identifying the personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black women in higher education. This study provides Black women who work in higher education with an understanding of the possible factors that may influence their career choices. It also provides information for Black women who may be seeking to enter or advance in higher education careers. Understanding the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education is also valuable to educational leaders as they seek to find ways to increase diversity at their institutions. This study further provides an opportunity to inform institutions on ways to be more inclusive, and to share best practices for recruiting and retaining Black female management level administrators.
**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education. While career anchor theory has been studied in many organizations and across many disciplines, there has been very little, if any, research conducted on the career anchors of Black women who work in higher education. This study focused on identifying and examining the career anchors that contribute to the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. While Black women, as a group, have been advancing through the academic pipeline as students, graduates, and educators in higher education, they remain underrepresented in management level administrative positions. Understanding the personal and professional choices of Black females in management positions is critical as educational leaders address the current challenges facing institutions of higher education today. It is important to note that the purpose of this study is not to denigrate Black women who do not pursue careers or advancement in management in higher education.

**Research Questions**

This research study sought to identify and examine the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work in management level administrative positions at institutions of higher education. The research was organized around the following key questions:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?
Research Question 2 (RQ2): Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?

Research Question 3 (RQ3): Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and institution type?

Research Question 4 (RQ4): Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and work-related characteristics including (a) current position at institution and (b) principal area of current position?

Research Question 5 (RQ5): Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

Definitions of Terms

Administrator: a person in managerial or policy-making capacity (Jackson, 2001).

Black: an individual with origins from any of the Black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicate their race as African American, Black, or Negro (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).
Black Feminist Thought: a theory that unifies and validates the intersecting characteristics of race and gender that are uniquely experienced in the lives of Black women (Henry & Glenn, 2009).

Career: the term is used interchangeably with professional life.

Career anchor: “that one element in a person’s self-concept that he or she will not give up, even in the face of difficult choices” (Schein, 1990, p. 18).

Career orientations: pattern of job related preferences that remain generally stable over a person’s professional life (Schein, 1990).

Career Orientations Inventory (COI): a questionnaire using six-point Likert-type scale items to measure career anchors (DeLong, 1982).

Internal Career: a person’s own individual idea about their professional life and their role within it” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). It incorporates factors that focus on competency in the workplace, personal and family values, and individual needs. “In the context of career anchors, career includes how any individual’s work life develops over time and how it is perceived by that person” (Schein, 1990, p. 9).

Marginalization: involves an issue or situation that places a person or people outside the control and supremacy that exists within an institution (Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

Management level positions: executive, administrative, and managerial employees whose position requires overall leadership of the institution or department, division or subdivision thereof (Li, 2006). As listed in the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (2010) management level positions include, but are not limited to, senior executive and chief functional officer, academic dean, associate/assistant dean, provost,
associate/assistant provost, vice president, assistant/associate vice president, department chair, and director/program director.

Professional life: the term is used interchangeably with career.

Underrepresented: a group of individuals who are insufficiently represented based on their numbers in the general population.

Chapter Summary

Although Black women have made advancements as students, graduates, educators, and leaders in higher education, they continue to be underrepresented at management levels of administration. As institutions of higher education face challenges in meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse society, the changing status of employment, and the impending wave of academic retirements, academic leaders will need to find ways to address the opportunity for the leadership growth of Black women (American Council on Education [ACE], 2009; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; Miller, 2010; and Moses, 2009). If educational leaders are to successfully increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is essential to understand the skills, motives, and values that Black women consider important when making their career choices. This study provides a framework for understanding the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. This study focuses on Black women who are already in management level positions at higher education institutions.

The next chapter provides a review of the literature with a focus on research relevant to this study. The chapter includes a historical overview and exemplars of Black women in higher education, a summary of the educational attainment of Black women,
the personal and professional challenges faced by Black women within institutions of higher education, and the career development of and career pathways for Black female administrators. The next chapter also includes summaries of the research on Black feminist theory, career anchor theory, and the career orientations inventory.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

Research during the last decade has indicated that while Black women have been applying to and graduating from college, and entering the academic workforce at increasing rates, they continue to be underrepresented in management level administrative positions in institutions of higher education (Aguirre, 2000; Collins, 2009; Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen & Han, 2009; Mabokela, 2007; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002). Although the institutional and social factors identified may serve as obstacles to the career advancement of Black women in higher education, the reasons for which a great number of Black women are not ascending to higher management level positions may go beyond those factors. Bell and Nkomo (2001) assert that an individual juncture of personal, family, and community values often guide the career paths that Black women pursue, forcing Black women to “negotiate between their personal and professional lives” (Dean, Bracken & Allen, 2009, p. 3). According to the Association for the Study of Higher Education [ASHE], (2009), a substantial number of Black women who have been able to overcome institutional and social barriers, and indeed possess the currency to climb the academic career ladder, are deliberately choosing to remain in their current management positions due to various personal and professional factors.

To address the personal and professional factors that influence the career choices of Black women who work at institutions of higher education, a review of previous
literature is presented. This chapter provides an understanding of the contextual, research, theoretical, and methodological frameworks used to examine the research questions for this study. To that end, this chapter is presented in four sections. The first section, *Contextual Framework*, places the study in context by providing a historical overview and exemplars of Black women in higher education during the last century. The second section, *Research Framework*, provides summaries of research on the: (a) educational attainment of Black women during the last several decades; (b) personal and professional challenges faced by Black women within institutions of higher education and; (c) career development of and career pathways for Black women who work in higher education. The third section, *Theoretical Framework*, provides an overview of career anchor theory and summaries of recent studies that have used career anchor theory in multiple organizational settings, along with an overview and summary of research discussing Black feminist theory. The fourth section, *Methodological Framework*, provides a summary of the various methodological designs employed by studies using career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory.

*Contextual Framework*

*Historical overview and exemplars of Black women in higher education.* Black women have a rich history in education at all levels (Gregory, 1999). Traditionally, Black women have been attracted to the education profession due to their desire to make a difference in the lives of others (Gregory, 1999). In an effort to recognize the roles of Black women in higher education, it is first important to understand the history of Black women leaders in education over the last century. These women are significant, in part, because they established such a rich tradition of leadership in higher education.
During the 1900’s, Black women began making extraordinary accomplishments within higher education. One of the early leaders, Anna Julia Cooper who was among the first Black women to earn a Ph.D., established Frelinghuysen University in Washington DC, an evening college for working adults. Dr. Cooper later served as the institution’s President. Another early leader, Mary McLeod Bethune founded the Daytona Educational and Industrial Training School in 1904, an institution specific to the education of young Black girls. Still in existence today, the Daytona Educational and Industrial Training School is now known as Bethune-Cookman University, a recognized Historically Black Institution (HBI) with a United Methodist tradition that offers baccalaureate and master’s degrees (Bethune-Cookman University, 2008). June Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander of the University of Pennsylvania, Eva Beatrice Dykes of Radcliffe, Georgiana R. Simpson of the University of Chicago, and Anna Julia Cooper were among the first Black women to earn Ph.D. degrees in their respective fields during the 1900’s (Schiller, 2000). In 1924, after graduating with her doctorate degree, Sadie Alexander went on to become the first Black woman to enroll at the University of Pennsylvania School of Law. She graduated in 1927 with honors and was the first Black woman to gain admission to the Pennsylvania State Bar. Alexander was the first Black woman to hold both a Ph.D. and a J.D. degree (Schiller, 2000). Georgiana R. Simpson was the second Black woman to earn a Ph. D, awarded from the University of Chicago. In the same year, Eva Beatrice Dykes was the third Black woman to achieve this distinction from Radcliffe University, now known as Harvard University (Schiller, 2000; Ware & Braukman, 2004). Additionally, Mamie Phipps Clark became the first Black woman to earn a Ph.D. in Psychology from
the New York City Ivy League institution, Columbia University in 1943 (Littlefield, 1997).

In addition to accomplishing educational achievements, Black women also began setting precedents as leaders in higher education during the mid to late twentieth century. In 1955, Willa Player became the president of Bennett College, making her the first Black female college president (Littlefield, 1997). In 1976, Mary Francis Berry became the first Black woman to lead a major research university, serving as the chancellor of the University of Colorado (Littlefield, 1997). Shortly after, in the 1987, Johnetta Cole became the first Black female president of Spelman College. Further, during the 1980’s, Marian Wright Edelman joined Spelman College, as the first Black female trustee of an HBCU and Niara Sudarkasa, after being appointed as the first Black female assistant professor of anthropology at New York University, became the first Black woman to serve as president of Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. Between 1990 and 2007, approximately 26 Black women were appointed to various presidencies, including Dr. Marguerite Ross Barnett of the University of Houston, Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Dr. Ruth Simmons of Brown University. The individual women noted above exemplify the rich history of Black women in higher education, and the rich tradition of leadership that Black women have achieved as students, graduates, educators, and leaders in higher education.

Research Framework

It is important to provide the framework for this research in order to understand the career paths of Black women toward leadership roles in academic institutions, and recognize the educational background, the personal and professional challenges
experienced, and career development of Black women in higher education. This section, Research Framework, provides a summary of research on the: (a) educational attainment of Black women during the last several decades, (b) personal and professional challenges faced by Black women within institutions of higher education, and (c) career development of and career pathways for Black women in institutions of higher education.

*Educational attainment of Black women.* The educational attainment of Black women has increased over the last century (Moses, 2009). Noble (1988) noted that during the twentieth century, Black women entered higher education as students in unparalleled numbers, in part, due to the fact that they have been one of the fastest growing populations in higher education over the last several years (Bell, 2010). From 1980 to 1990, the enrollment of Black women in higher education rose more than 35 percent, with an increase in the number of Black female students from 563,100 to 762,300 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). Between 1990 and 2005, the growth in the college enrollment of Black women continued. During that period, there was an additional increase of 80 percent, bringing the total number of Black female students to well over 1.2 million by 2005 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). The growth in the number of Black women earning undergraduate degrees between 1990 and 2005 was 117 percent, increasing the number of Black female undergraduates from 41,575 to 90,312 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). The number of Black women earning a graduate degrees increased by 262 percent during the same fifteen year span from 1990 to 2005, increasing the number of Black female graduates from 10,700 to 38,749 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). During the same time period, the percent of advanced graduate degrees awarded to Black women more than doubled,
increasing the number of Black female doctoral graduates from 651 to 2,007 by 2005 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

Recognizing the educational attainment of Black women without highlighting their experiences as students and graduates would be remiss. While Black women have been applying to and graduating from institutions of higher education in increasing numbers, it has not been without difficulty. Despite academic advancements, overall, Black women still face challenges as they attempt to navigate educational and career pathways in higher education (Jackson, 2000; Turner & Myers, 2000). The personal and professional challenges that Black women face in institutions of higher education offer further insight into the factors that impede the overall career advancement of Black women in management levels of administration.

*Personal and professional challenges of Black women in higher education.* Black women have participated in higher education for well over one hundred years and have made considerable progress in gaining access to leadership positions; but that progress has not been devoid of challenges and obstacles along the way (Collins, 2009; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002). As students, faculty, or staff, whether employed at community colleges or four-year universities, much of the literature available has drawn similar conclusions regarding the challenges faced by Black women in US institutions of higher education. Research studies by Sulé (2009), Jean-Marie, Williams, & Sherman (2009), Stanley (2006), and Turner and Myers (2002) reveal that overall, institutions of higher education are unwelcoming and unsupportive of Black women.
In an examination of Black female graduate students in predominantly-White institutions, Sulé (2009) explored how Black female students are socialized into academic careers as graduate students. During a two-hour semi-structured interview with 12 Black female master and doctoral students, Sulé (2009) found that the students frequently experienced isolation, lack of faculty and peer support, and exclusion within their graduate programs. Likewise, female faculty who work in institutions of higher education expressed similar challenges. Turner and Myers’ (2000) interviews with female faculty of color uncovered feelings of marginalization and isolation, unsupportive work environments, and the existence of the good old boys club.

Based on the prevailing scarcity of Black women occupying diverse leadership positions in higher education, these challenges appear in various ways. It is not uncommon for Black female faculty to be the only woman of color in their academic department, or perhaps just one of a few others within the institution (Cleveland, 2009). The women in Turner and Myers’ (2000) study felt that there was an overall lack of formal and informal networks, mentors, role models and confidants, forcing Black women to face obstacles and exclusion alone, and without guidance and support.

Stanley’s (2006) *Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence inPredominantly White Colleges and Universities* conducted an ethnographic study to review the experiences of 27 faculty of color who work at predominantly-White institutions. The participants in the study represented a variety of academic institutions, ranks, and disciplines, as well as a variety of demographic identifiers. Six themes emerged that faculty felt were important to working in their respective institutions. The themes included institutional and social factors relating to the teaching experience,
mentoring, collegiality, service opportunities, personal and professional identity, and racism. In addition, the themes also offered recommendations for the recruitment and retention of faculty of color in higher education, consistent with the literature. The recommendations suggested having an administrator on campus that understands best practices for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, having administrators make certain that there is a strong effort put forth among department chairs and deans to recruit and retain faculty of color, and providing formal and informal networks to encourage a sense of community among all faculty.

Further highlighting the experiences of Black women who work in administrative ranks in higher education, Jean-Marie, Williams, and Sherman (2009) examined the life history of twelve Black female leaders at both historically Black and historically White institutions. The women selected for the study included an array of leaders, including a president, vice president, vice chancellor, academic dean, university attorney, and an executive director. Through uninterrupted, semi-structured interviews, participants were asked to share their life stories by reflecting on their professional experiences. Based on the narratives, the study highlighted key perceptions and experiences shared by the women. The perceptions and experiences of the women included similar educational backgrounds of participants, similar personal and professional experiences while growing up in the south during the Civil Rights Movement, and similar challenges in terms of gender and racial discrimination.

While the institutional and social factors discussed in these studies serve as challenges to the career advancement of Black women who work at institutions of higher education, the reasons that Black women are underrepresented in management level
administrative positions may go well beyond these institutional and social impediments. As Black women enter and advance in institutions, they often face challenges related to balancing their careers along with their family and community commitments (Hensel, 1997). In an article written by Hensel (1997), she indicated that: “The biggest barrier to women’s advancement in academe is a lack of a supportive environment for combining family and work” (p. 38). Balancing family and work, while difficult for all women, tends to be even more challenging for Black women (Greene 2000). Gregory (1999) argues, “Historically, Black families have had different family structures than most other cultures” (p. 4). Hensel (1997) suggested that because most Black women balance careers, family, community, and church commitments, it might be more difficult for them to consider moving into administrative positions due to the time commitment of these obligations. The commitment, consequently, defines their time for professional development, focus on their aspirations, and their pursuit of career advancement opportunities.

The research literature suggests that many Black women feel that they have a commitment to their family and to their community that is equivalent to or transcends their commitment to their job (Gregory, 1999). In order to find a balance between their personal and professional lives, Black women count on continued support from their family members, their community, and their church. “Family support and community involvement, particularly in church-related activities, were cited as important factors supporting the career decisions of black women in higher education” (Gregory, 1999, p. 17).
In reviewing these studies, it is clear that factors such as gender and race, along with factors such as family and community, can all be seen as an influence on the career decisions and career pathways of Black women who work at institutions of higher education.

In a further examination of the factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in colleges and universities, the next section discusses the career development of and career pathways for Black women and reviews studies that are important to understanding how Black women make career decisions.

**Career development of and career pathways for Black women in higher education.** Within institutions of higher education, the overall growth in the number of Black women earning advanced degrees appears to have translated into an increase in the number of Black female faculty as well (Bush, Chambers & Walpole, 2009). From 1995-2005, the number of full-time Black female faculty at institutions of higher education rose 30 percent. During this same period, the number of Black women within the faculty ranks of lecturers and instructors increased 40 percent and 35 percent, respectively (Bush, Chambers, & Walpole, 2009). Although there was an increase in the percent of Black women earning advanced degrees, and entering the faculty pipeline, the number of Black women working or advancing in leadership positions did not increase, especially those in management level administrative positions (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics [NES], 2010). The research literature suggests that Black women entering academic careers are less likely to receive tenure or promotions (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009). Given this disparity, it is important to understand the career development of and career pathways for Black women in higher education, especially
with so many institutions expanding part-time and non-tenured track positions (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2010). In 2007, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (2010), 69 percent of faculty members in institutions of higher education were working in part-time or full-time, non-tenure track positions. Many of these faculty members were women and persons of color (Miller, 2010).

In one of the first seminal studies of Black female college administrators, Mosley (1980) surveyed 120 participants attending the 1975 Summer Institute of Educational Management at Harvard University. Mosley’s (1980) research focused on examining the number of Black women who occupied administrative positions in predominantly-White institutions, the type of administrative positions the participants held, and the general status of the Black women within each of their respective institutions. She was also interested in understanding the personal and professional characteristics of the Black female administrators, and the barriers and pressures they faced as Black women in higher education. In her findings, Mosley (1980) discovered that the majority of the Black female respondents were working in staff positions, with little to no decision-making authority or power. She also found that overall; the women in the study did not feel optimistic about their careers, or career advancement opportunities at their institutions.

Rusher (1996) further extended the research on Black female administrators by conducting one of the first in-depth studies that focused on the recruitment, retention, and promotion of 154 Black female administrators to the position of dean or above. Rusher’s (1996) research sought to identify both the internal and external factors that impact the recruitment, retention and promotion of Black women in administration. Although
Rusher did not find any significant relationships between the type of education background of participants and the number of years participants worked in their current position, she did find a significant relationship between the type of institution in which participants worked and the number of years working in higher education. Further, to identify common factors in the social development of Black female presidents in higher education, Bowles (1999) explored three areas: family, community, and education in an effort to determine how each of the areas affected the career decisions of Black female presidents with regard to their professional goals. In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the factors and to understand the presidents’ motivations for seeking and accepting advanced career positions, Bowles (1999) found that the women’s decisions to become college president were a conscious combination of thorough decision-making and acceptance of opportunity. The study further revealed that mentors and positive role models appeared to be the primary factors that influenced the career decisions of the participants in the study. In the three areas of family, community, and education, Bowles indicated that factors such as socioeconomic status, and marital status had no direct impact on the participants’ career decisions. Secondly, she pointed out that for most of the presidents interviewed, both church and community had a positive impact on their decisions. Lastly, Bowles indicated that early education did not provide a positive incentive for career advancement, except in cases where a mentor was present. In general, mentors were deemed central to the professional career growth of the women in the study.

While it is believed that leadership roles in higher education are generally attained through a well-defined career ladder, Zweigenhaft and Domhoff (2006) argue that there
are generally two pathways to gaining the necessary qualifications to ascend to management level administrative ranks. The first and most noteworthy pathway to leadership in higher education is through the traditional academic track. The traditional academic track generally requires teaching experience, tenure, and some form of leadership experience in higher education. An example of the traditional academic pathway would be a graduate of a doctoral program who starts as an assistant professor and once tenured, moves to associate professor, and ultimately to full professor (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009, Dowdall, 2000). Typically, once the rank of full professor has been achieved, faculty members choose to continue teaching and conducting research, or opt to advance into the university leadership track (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009). Many academics advance from faculty to department chair, to dean, and then to vice president or provost (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009; Dominici, Fried, & Scott, 2009; Dowdall, 2000). “Academic administrators are generally expected to progress through these positions sequentially” (Dominici, Fried, & Scott, 2009, p. 26). It is also expected that faculty not only have a strong record of teaching and service, but also a strong record of academic writing, published research, and speaking engagements (Rolle, Davies & Banning, 2000). However, it has been found that the typical experiences of faculty do not adequately prepare them for the responsibilities required for senior leadership positions (Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009). The second pathway to management level leadership consists of advancing through an administrative pipeline (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009; King & Gomez, 2008). In this pathway, a candidate would typically enter through a mid-level position such as director, and eventually progress to a management level administrative position such as vice president, provost, or chief functional officer. The
second pathway generally requires that administrators have some form of overall academic experience, along with leadership experience within higher education (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). In addition to the experiences noted previously, women’s pathways to leadership often include chairing committees, directing various academic programs, or leading institute centers, for which they often initiate and locate funding individually (Dominici, Fried, & Scott, 2009).

In a recent report published by the American Council on Education (2008), demographic trends suggest that the traditional career ladder to administrative leadership positions in institutions of higher education may need to change. The typical amount of time currently required for advancement is no longer realistic for many individuals pursuing advanced leadership opportunities within higher education. According to the report, only 5 percent of women (45 years old or younger) at 4-year institutions currently hold the kind of permanent positions that typically result in promotion to higher leadership positions. In an exploratory study of female university presidents, Madsen (2007) interviewed ten women who served as presidents or chancellors of public and private colleges and universities to determine if there was a clear path that they had followed to leadership. Of the women interviewed, eight were White, and two were Black. Four of the women were in their fifties, and six were in their sixties. To understand the various factors that influenced the careers of these university presidents, each woman was asked to describe her educational background. Half of the presidents pursued education majors as undergraduates, while six obtained educational doctorate degrees, four earned an Ed.D., five earned a Ph.D., and one was a current doctoral candidate. Madsen (2007) found that the women in the study entered the presidential
ranks from a variety of positions. Five of the participants were provosts, vice presidents or vice chancellors of academic affairs prior to their presidency; two were vice chancellors or presidents of administration and finance; one was the vice president of university relations; another was in a government agency leadership position; and one participant was currently serving as a university president. Further, these women held various positions throughout their careers. Overall, four of the women began their careers as kindergarten-twelfth grade schoolteachers, four started their careers in some form of higher education, one woman came from a non-education business background, and another woman came from a non-educational agency. Prior research suggests that there is no specific career pathway leading to management level administrative positions in high education (Dominici, Fried, & Scott, 2009; Madsen, 2007). Based on this research, it is critical to continue to examine the dynamics of the academic pipeline and the career pathways pursued by Black women in higher education.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study includes both Schein’s career anchor theory (1978) and Collins’ Black feminist thought (1990). Career anchor theory (Schein, 1978) will be the primary construct used to examine the research problem, research questions, and variables in this study. However, the findings of the study also will be examined by applying paradigms consistent with Black feminist thought. Research viewed through the lens of Black feminism helps to frame how the social identities of gender, race, and social class intersect to influence the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. This research provides an additional
theoretical frame to examine the perspectives and experiences of Black women in higher education.

The literature surrounding higher education contains multiple theories, concepts, and ideas that address the underrepresentation of people of color. However, this study focuses on the skills, motives, and values of Black women in particular. As Collins (1990; 2000) explains, Black women form a subordinate group, a group whose experiences are different from those who are not Black and not female. With that in mind, Black feminist thought offers a specific validation of the unique perceptions and experiences of Black women, and provides an additional theoretical context for identifying and examining the factors that influence the career choices of Black women who work at institutions of higher education (Few, Stephens & Rouse-Arnett, 2003). Black feminist thought reflects a distinctive standpoint of self, family, and community (Collins, 1986). As such, Black feminist thought offers an appropriate guiding lens through which to study the career anchors of Black women who work in higher education.

Career anchor theory. Based on a review of the literature relating to this study’s topic, it was determined that an examination of the research on career development theories could inform the researcher’s efforts to understand and address the underrepresentation of Black women in higher education administration. Career development theories provide general explanations on how and why individuals make career plans and chose their careers. Pietrofesa and Splate (1975) asserted early on that “Career development is an ongoing process that occurs over the life span and includes home, school and community experiences related to an individual’s self-concept and its
To distinguish the differences in the overall concept of career, Schein separated the definition of career into two distinct categories, internal career and external career. Schein (1990) defined “external career” as opportunities and constraints that exist when progressing through a particular position or organization. External career pertains to the career paths or stages required to progress successfully in a position or an organization. The concept of career anchors as espoused by Schein (1990) focuses on the internal career. The internal career reflects an individual’s self-concept of work life and how they perceive their role in that life (Schein, 1990). Schein identified three distinct components of self-concept, which in combination constitute a career anchor. The three components are: 1) self-perceived talents and abilities; 2) self-perceived motives and needs; and 3) self-perceived attitudes and values (Schein, 1978). Schein’s (1978, 1990, 1996) exploration of the internal career, through career anchors, highlights “an evolving self-concept of what one is good at, what one’s needs and motives are, and what values govern one’s work-related choices” (Schein, 1992, p. 125). Career anchors, which describe an individual’s skills, motives, and values, are the internal considerations that support an individual’s career decisions.

The concept of career anchors was originally developed from a twelve-year longitudinal study conducted by Schein in 1961. In an effort to study the interaction of the professional events and personal values of managers in various organizations, Schein (1978) tracked an all-male group of 44 graduates from the Master’s Degree Program in
Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology over a ten to twelve-year period. Initial interviews of the participants took place during the second year of the two-year Master’s degree program. The initial interviews gathered information about the participant’s educational and occupational background, origins of interest in business and management, plans for the future, ambitions, work values, and self-concept. In addition, participants completed a survey related to individual values and attitudes. Six to twelve months after graduation, participants were interviewed again, this time at their respective places of work. Three to five years after starting their employment, all respondents were contacted again to complete a questionnaire that focused on their career history, values and attitudes. Ten to twelve years later, final interviews were conducted. During the final interviews, Schein explored participant’s career history since graduation, their perceptions of the present and future, changes respondents saw in themselves, relationships between work, family, and self, and reactions to feedback from the original interviews. The transcripts from the interviews provided qualitative data, from which Schein was able to identify patterns formed over time. Schein later identified these patterns as career anchors (1974). Based on the data collected during this study, five career anchors were initially identified; autonomy/independence; entrepreneurial creativity; general management competence; security/stability; and technical/functional competence.

In recent research, Custodio (2000) conducted a study of the career anchors of Filipino academic executives. This study selected 116 academic executives, including 49 males and 65 females from four colleges and universities throughout the Philippines. The participants included six presidents or vice presidents, forty-six academic and non-
academic deans, and sixty-two department chairs. Using a quantitative methodology, Custodio’s study determined if career anchors were applicable for individuals in the academic field, in the Philippines. The results of this study indicated that respondents possess numerous, mainly independent, career anchors. Consistent with Schein’s career anchor theory, the eight career anchors were apparent among participants: (1) lifestyle integration, (2) sense of service, (3) managerial competence, (4) autonomy, (5) geographical security, (6) entrepreneurship creativity, (7) technical competence, and (8) organizational stability.

In a mixed-methods study of women in the information technology field, Quesenberry (2007) examined the individual career anchors and organizational climate of women employed in the US information technology (IT) workforce and their relationship to career satisfaction and turnover intentions. Quesenberry first completed an in-depth analysis of the literature previously published on the IT workforce, with reference to gender. Next, Quesenberry conducted a qualitative analysis, using existing data from 92 interviews with women in the IT workforce. The findings from the analysis were used to develop an online questionnaire. The survey was administered to and returned by forty women from five specific racial/ethnic backgrounds, and four women who chose “other” as their racial/ethnic background. The average age of the sample respondent was 40 years. Respondents varied greatly with regard to relationship and family status. Results indicated clear evidence of career anchor clusters, which changed over time. Additionally, results indicated that general demographic characteristics did not have a predictive relationship with career anchor alignment, although results were mixed about the predictable relationship between life experiences and career anchor alignment.
After a review of the literature, this researcher determined that Schein’s (1978) career anchor model provided an appropriate framework to examining the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women in higher education.

*Black feminist thought.* Black feminist thought is a theory that unifies and validates the intersecting characteristics of race and gender, as uniquely experienced in the lives of Black women (Henry & Glenn, 2009). As members of two distinct groups - Blacks and women, both of whom have been historically marginalized and oppressed, Black feminist thought provides insight into the overall needs and desires of Black women (Collins, 2004). Instead of using gender, race, or class as an underpinning of these challenges, Black feminist thought supports the idea that gender, race, and social class intersect, and work together. The concept of Black feminism further argues that Black women as a whole possess a unique standpoint on, or unique perspective of their experiences. Due to this, certain commonalities are shared by Black women as a collective. The construct of Black feminism includes ideas that are shaped by Black women, and provides a framework for examining phenomena that are unique to Black women based on self, family, and society (Collins, 1990).

According to Collins (2001), “Black American women in the academy differ in their experiences, backgrounds, appearances, educational levels, demographics, occupations, and beliefs. What connects them all is their struggle to be accepted and respected members of the society, and their desire to have a voice that can be heard in a world with many views” (p. 29). Gender, race, and class are socially embedded phenomena that affect every aspect of life, and as such, provide a critical lens for examining the experiences of Black women who work at institutions of higher education.
This element is important to this research, since it clarifies the need to integrate the personal and professional lives of Black women, which ultimately influence the decisions, and career paths Black women choose.

Black feminist thought is composed of three key elements, all of which help to identify the internal factors that influence the career decisions of Black women. First, Black feminism is shaped by the experiences that Black women have encountered in their lives. Although traditional career development theories offer a framework that is flexible enough to fit the reality of many different groups, Black feminist thought serves as a foundation for addressing the particular perceptions and experiences of Black women that are specific to their gender, race, and social class. Second, the identity of Black women is both an intersection, and a construct, through which Black women share common experiences due to the interplay between their gender, race, and class. As Collins (2000) states “Race and gender may be analytically distinct, but in Black women’s everyday lives, they work together” (p. 269). This particular element is especially important to this study, because it helps to further illuminate the unique personal and professional challenges that Black women face working in higher education, and how these challenges ultimately play a role in their career choices and career decisions. The third element of Black feminist thought advances the idea of an overarching oppression and further enhances the understanding of how gender, race, and social class are in fact part of a historically created system, which characterizes the experiences of Black women. Though diversity and inequality certainly exist among Black women in general, Collins argues that Black women share central experiences that have served to advance the development of a group standpoint. Despite the significance of the distinct perspectives and
There is limited research that accurately highlights the unique, yet common experiences of Black women. A few of the studies are discussed below.

The need to expand the theories of career development in order to add the voices of Black women is described in Alfred’s (1999) study of African American Women in the White academy. In her study, Alfred examined career theory in the context of the similarities and differences of her particular experience as a doctoral student, compared to the experiences of her White female student counterparts. Alfred noticed that her particular experiences were not represented in the discourse of career theories. Alfred challenged the discussion of career theory, inquiring why race, ethnicity, cultural, and gender were not important factors to consider when discussing career development. Next, in Bell and Nkomo’s (2001) examination of the life and career struggles of successful Black women and White women, the authors highlighted that Black women and White women enter their careers from very different directions. Bell and Nkomo noted, “They have followed their own distinct paths-created out of an individual juncture of family background, educational experience, and community values. Racial differences amplify this separation” (2001, p. 2).

Dixon (2005) later contended that diversity in higher education is difficult to attain under the auspices of a dominant culture. She affirmed that the American educational system is designed to promote the assimilation of individuals into the culture and values of the dominant society. This structure of dominant culture has historically posed a challenge to the growth and inclusion of Black women. Many notions of leadership have historically been based upon ideas, values, and beliefs of individuals.
whose life experiences did not necessarily encompass demographic diversity (Parker, 2004).

For the purposes of this research, Black feminist thought offers a theoretical framework that encompasses the multifaceted factors that shape the career experiences and career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. Together, career anchor theory and Black feminist thought provide a perspective for examining the career decisions of Black women who currently work at institutions of higher education. In addition, Black feminist thought offers a means to explore the underlying motivation of Black women who remain in their current management positions and opt not to press forward to higher-level leadership positions.

**Methodological Framework**

*Career anchor theory and career orientations inventory.* This section describes and summarizes several studies that have used career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory as a methodological framework. Research studies using career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory vary greatly in scope, focus, setting, population and research design. The methodological approaches include quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods.

Shortly after completing his first study, in collaboration with DeLong (1982), Schein went on to develop the Career Orientations Inventory (COI), a 48-item questionnaire designed to measure an individual’s career anchors. The first version of the COI evaluated the five initial career anchors. DeLong later suggested the inclusion of three additional anchors, identity; variety; and service. Each of the eight career anchors was then assessed on a four-point Likert scale, using six questions for each anchor.
Revisions and refinements were made after an initial factor analysis. Since then, numerous versions of the COI have been adapted, developed and employed in various studies (Igbaria, Greenhouse, & Parasurnman, 1991; Crepeau, Crook, Goslar & McMurtrey, 1992; Igbaria & Baroudi, 1993; Yarnall, 1998; Jiang & Klein, 1999; Custodio, 2000; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Tan & Quek, 2001; Bridle & Whapham, 2003; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Bester, Phil & Mouten, 2006; Danzinger, Rachman-Moore, & Valency, 2008).

The career orientations inventory tool did not originally focus on career anchors, but on career orientation. Career orientation forms a subset of the larger concept of a career anchor. Career orientation is defined as “the values, needs, attitudes and motives involved in creating a career self-concept” (Schein, 1990). The career anchor differs from career orientation, in that it includes the self-perceived talents of the individual. Career orientation constitutes the collective internal motivators that guide career choice (De Long, 1982, Schein, 1978, 1990, 1996). Although the career anchor theory was originally based on male research subjects, and evolved to include women, the researcher did not find any studies that focused exclusively on Black women.

In a quantitative study conducted by Zerdavis in 1982, 119 community college faculty were selected to participate in an exploratory study to measure occupational self-concepts. The participants in the study included 105 male faculty members and 60 female faculty members, all between the ages of 27-72 years old. Respondents worked in various departments throughout the college. The study also examined the relationships between gender and age of faculty and career orientations. A principal factor analysis was performed using the Kaiser Varimax (1958) rotational scheme to determine whether the
items on the career orientations inventory would factor out and measure the same concept. The results of the study found the career orientations inventory to be a well-designed instrument with high internal validity, and high reliability. The study further used Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients to test the following two null hypotheses: 1) no relationship would exist between gender of faculty and career orientation, and 2) no relationship would exist between age of faculty and career orientation. The study determined that no relationship existed between the gender of the faculty and career orientation. The study also found a negative correlation between age and career orientation. For this sample of faculty, five main career factors emerged: creativity, autonomy, managerial competence, technical competence, and security.

Several recent studies support Schein’s contention that a single dominant career anchor informs individual’s career decisions; namely, the lifestyle anchor. The lifestyle anchor was found to be dominant for individuals in three research studies (Danziger & Valency, 2005; Hardin, Stocks, & Graves, 2001; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). In Danziger and Valency’s (2005) quantitative study, 1,847 Israeli men and women who were enrolled in MBA programs completed Schein’s COI. In this study, lifestyle was found to be the dominant anchor for both male and female. The researchers posited that the result might reflect a growing desire among working adults to balance the lifestyle elements of work, family, and leisure. They also inferred that the cultural value of the centrality of family among Israelis might have contributed to this result. The median age of the participants in the study was 42.5 years, and the sample included 48 percent males and 51 percent females. Overall, the sample participants were more educated than the average Israeli population, with only 31 percent of the respondents lacking an academic degree.
The sample was heterogeneous in terms of age, gender, and type of employment (salaried or self-employed). A hypothesis that women might display a dominant anchor of lifestyle as opposed to men was not supported. The distribution of career anchors revealed that 31 percent of the respondents characterized lifestyle as the dominant anchor. The service, general management and entrepreneurship anchors were infrequent, with each claiming only four to five percent of the sample. The second most dominant anchor was the technical/functional career anchor. Danziger and Valency (2005) implied that the dominance of the lifestyle anchor in their research has implications for organizations concerned about reducing employee turnover, suggesting that flexible work schedules could enhance the work-life balance of employees and assist in employee retention.

Similarly, Marshall and Bonner (2003) conducted a study of 423 graduate students who were enrolled in management courses across several countries and had changed jobs as a result of downsizing. In this study, the lifestyle career anchor was identified as the most dominant career anchor. The lifestyle anchor was primarily dominant across three geographic regions: Australia, Asia and Europe. Furthermore, significant correlations were revealed between culture and the lifestyle career anchor, and age and the lifestyle career anchor. While Schein’s original research in the 1970s did not identify lifestyle as a dominant anchor, this study noted that lifestyle was a dominant anchor across all age groups, excluding the very oldest and very youngest participants. The findings suggest that a significant shift of values and motivations may currently be occurring in the workplace, across all cultures and age groups.

In a quantitative study conducted by Hardin, Morris & Graves (2003) on a sample of US Certified Public Accountants (CPAs), the lifestyle career anchor was found to be
the most dominant anchor as well. The study surveyed 1,140 CPAs from the North Carolina Association of CPAs. The sample was randomly selected from CPAs working in public accounting, governmental accounting, and management accounting. Within this sample, the lifestyle anchor was found to be most dominant within all three primary job settings. As follow-up to the survey, respondents were asked to participate in a brief follow-up interview; 107 complied. The demographic characteristics of the sample included 66% male and 34% female, 69% of who held a bachelor’s degree. The mean age was 39, with a range in age of 23-67 years old. The mean number of years in the position was 6.8 years, and it was reported that 67% of the participants earned between $25,000 and $75,000 annually. The hypothesis that no career anchor would be clearly dominant was not supported in this study. The lifestyle career anchor was found to be the dominant career anchor for 47% of the participants. The researchers proposed that the large proportion of CPA’s demonstrating a primary lifestyle anchor may have been influenced by the current marketing strategies of firms promoting a family-friendly workplace for employees. Given the larger sample size and the median age of the participants, it may be inferred that early to mid-career workers are exhibiting internal drives that involve balancing personal and professional lives.

Divergent from the research noted above, in a study within the information technology (IT) field, data revealed that multiple career anchors influence the career choices and career decisions of women. In a study analyzing the underrepresentation of female professionals in information technology, a combination of career anchors emerged (Quesenberry & Trauth, 2007). While the three most prevalent career anchors that emerged were technical competence, managerial competence, and security, the women in
the study all exhibited a combination of career anchors, which were found to influence their careers.

Career anchor theory aligns well for research on Black women who work in institutions of higher education because this theory focuses on how individuals think about their skills, motives, and values as related to their career choices (Schein, 1990). Somewhat similar to the studies conducted by Custodio (2000) and Quesenberry (2007), the purpose of this research was to understand the career anchors of women in a particular career field. Furthermore, similar to both Quesenberry (2007) and Zerdavis (1982), this research intended to identify the relationship of career anchors to certain demographic characteristics such as: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience in higher education; (e) years of administrative experience in higher education; (f) current position at institution; (g) department or principal area of current position; and (h) institution type.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this research was to develop an understanding of the factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education. It was important to note that based on the research highlighted in this study, the career development of Black women cannot be limited to a traditional career development model because Black women’s career decisions encompass other decision-making factors such as individual skills, motives, and values. The researcher surmised, therefore, that these internal factors must be considered because they may have a unique impact on the career choices and career paths of Black women.
This chapter, *Review of the Literature*, was designed to promote an understanding of the contextual, research, theoretical, and methodological frameworks used to examine the research questions for this study. The chapter was presented in four sections. The first section, *Contextual Framework*, placed the study in context by providing a historical overview and exemplars of Black women in higher education during the last century. The second section, *Research Framework*, provided summaries of the major research on the: (a) educational attainment of Black women during the last several decades; (b) personal and professional challenges faced by Black women within institutions of higher education; and (c) career development of and career pathways for Black women in institutions of higher education. The third section, *Theoretical Framework*, provided summaries of the research on Black Feminist Theory, and recent studies that have used the Career Anchor Theory and Career Orientations Inventory in various organizational settings. The fourth section, *Methodological Framework*, provided a summary of the various methodological designs employed by previous studies using the career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory. Based on the review of the literature and purpose of this study, the researcher determined that research design and methodological framework selected is appropriate for addressing this study’s research questions.

The next chapter describes the overall research design and methodology employed for this study. The chapter provides the research context for the research, identifies the study participants, describes the data collection instrument, and discusses the data collection and analysis processes and procedures.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

This study sought to identify and examine the personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education. According to the Association for the Study of Higher Education (2009), a substantial number of Black women who have been able to overcome institutional and social barriers, and possess the currency to climb the academic career ladder, are deliberately choosing to remain in their current positions. It is important to examine the factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education in order to inform the academic and career development literature. If educational leaders are to successfully increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is imperative to understand the reasons why a number of Black women who work at institutions of higher education are choosing to remain in their current management positions, opting not to advance to higher-level positions.

This chapter provides a summary of the research design and methodology that was used to examine the research questions for this study. This section provides an overview of the research context and study participants, describes the data collection instrument, and discusses the process of the data collection and analysis.

Research Questions

For purposes of this study, the following research questions were developed:
RQ1: What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and institutional characteristics?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position?

RQ5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

This research study collected quantitative, correlational data on Black women who were in management level positions at colleges and universities in the US. Quantitative research was used for this research in order to answer questions about the relationships between the measurable variables in the study. “In a quantitative project, the problem is best addressed by understanding what factors or variables influence an outcome” (Creswell, 2009, p. 99). Correlational research was used to determine the degree of the relationships. The data were collected by means of survey research, using a
questionnaire instrument that identified demographic information and personal and professional factors that influence career decisions. The research design and methodology employed for this study are consistent with quantitative studies that have used career anchor theory as the methodological framework. These studies include Zerdavis (1982), Puryear (1996), Custodio (2000), and Tan & Quek (2001). These studies applied career anchor theory across various organizations and various disciplines. The studies also included individuals representing different races, ages, genders, and countries. Zerdavis (1982) conducted an exploratory study of 119 community college faculty in order to determine if a relationship existed between the gender of faculty and career orientation and if a relationship existed between the age of faculty and career orientation. Puryear (1996) examined the applicability of career anchors to school principals in order to determine whether variables such as age, gender, sex, race/ethnicity, length of time in school administration, certification, level of school, setting of school, and the overall career goals of individual principals influenced career anchors. Custodio’s (2000) study tested the applicability of career anchors for Filipino individuals in the academic field. In an exploratory study, Tan & Quek (2001) determined the different career anchors possessed by Singapore educators, and the impact on the degree of the relationship between teaching, career anchors on intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, and turnover intentions.

Research on career anchors has also been conducted among college student affairs administrators (Wood, Winston & Polosnik, 1985), academic executives from the Philippines (Custodio, 2000), and educators from Singapore (Tan & Quek, 2001). Similar research on career anchors has been done on students and graduates in higher education
institutions (DeLong, 1982; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Slabbert, 1997). Research related to the relevancy of career anchors has been conducted. For example, Zerdavis (1982) assessed the validity of the career orientations inventory among community college faculty. However, the researcher was not able to identify any studies in the research literature that focused specifically on the career anchors of Black women who work at institutions of higher education in the US.

Research Context

The research context for this study consisted of multiple institutions across the US, including two-year public and private institutions, four-year public undergraduate and graduate institutions, and four-year private undergraduate and graduate institutions. To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, a list of the specific individuals invited to participate in this study is not included, but a list of states representing individuals invited to participate in the study is presented in Appendix B.

Research Participants

In an effort to reach exclusively Black women who work at institutions of higher education, the researcher conducted a multi-stage sampling procedure by contacting the president of the member-based American Association of Blacks in Higher Education (AABHE) organization in order to gain support and participation for the study (Creswell, 2009). A multistage procedure is one in which the researcher first identifies an organization, obtains the names of individuals within the organization that meet the criteria, and then samples that population (Creswell, 2009). The AABHE is an individual and institutional member-based organization with sponsorship from colleges and universities throughout the country. This organization was selected as a participant source
because of the organization’s mission, which is related to supporting Blacks who work in higher education. The AABHE, which was originally a component of the former American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), has a rich history of representing Blacks in higher education on a national level. This organization is committed to recognizing the achievements of Black people in higher education. To this end, AAHE has been involved in numerous initiatives focusing on equity and access for Blacks in higher education. In addition, AAHE has played a major leadership role in academia by continuously bringing issues pertinent to Black faculty and staff to the forefront of the larger national academic community.

The president of AABHE provided the researcher with a contact list, and granted permission for the researcher to access and contact members of the organization (see Appendix C). For purposes of this study, the researcher reviewed the contact list and identified the sample for the study. Inclusion criteria were self-identified Black women, who work in higher education. A total of 123 Black women were contacted via email and invited to participate in the study (see Appendix D). The professional titles of the sample were not confirmed prior to launching the survey. Some of the titles, therefore, may have been outdated at the time of the initial contact. For example, the original sample included 7 self-identified students, 23 self-identified teaching professionals, 25 participants without titles but contact information that included a college or university address, nine women with various organizations and business listed, and 59 women with management level administrative titles. The overall survey response rate of women included in the study was 25%.
Based on the open membership model of AABHE, the cluster sample offered a variance in the age, martial/family status, educational attainment, years of experience in higher education, years of administrative experience in higher education, number of years in current position, title of current position at institution, permanent/interim role, department or principal area of current position, and institution type.

Instrument Used in Data Collection

For purposes of this study, a standardized instrument was used. The instrument that was used for this study, the Career Orientation Inventory, was developed by Schein (1990). With the permission of the publisher of the instrument, the researcher added several demographic items to the instrument to help address this study’s research questions. The cross-sectional, self-administered online questionnaire was divided into three parts (Appendix E) and collected during the summer. Part I of the survey, created by the researcher, asked ten demographic questions related to: age; martial/family status; educational attainment; years of experience in higher education; years of administrative experience in higher education; number of years in current position; title of current position at institution; permanent/interim role; department or principal area of current position; and institution type. The researcher used a panel of experts to insure the reliability and validity of the additional demographic items on the instrument. The panel was comprised of an associate dean of education, a current director of a grant-funded program, a former director of graduate admissions, a professor of psychology and statistics, an adjunct professor of business, and an assistant director of undergraduate admissions. Feedback was provided by the panel and modifications were made to the original questionnaire. The demographic survey was modified as follows: Question 1
(Q1), the age ranges listed were removed and a text box added for respondents to list their individual age. Q5 and Q6, the year ranges were removed from each question and a text box added for respondents to list their individual number of years working in administrative positions in higher education and number of years in current position, respectively. Q7, teaching professional was added to the list of positions at institution. This response was added in an effort to filter survey responses appropriately. Q9, enrollment management, was added to the list of departments/principal area of current position. Q11, institution background (i.e. predominately White institution, historically Black college or university) was removed from the questionnaire. Q12, are you willing to relocate if a career advancement opportunity arose was removed. Q13, future career plans was removed and added to Part II of the survey.

Part II originally asked one question that was related to career plans. To increase clarity, “unsure” was added to the response options for Q1; do you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities to a higher-level administrative/leadership position? In addition, to increase alignment and consistency between the study’s research questions and survey items, two new questions were added to part II: 1) If you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, what factors would impact your decision to advance to a higher level administrative/leadership position? 2) If you are unsure or do not plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, what factors would impact your decision not to advance to a higher level administrative/leadership position? For each of the questions, participants were asked to provide a response for each of the career anchors, by order of importance.
Part III of the survey, the Career Orientations Inventory (COI) is comprised of 40-questions originally developed by Schein (1990), which includes five questions that correspond to each of the eight-career anchor themes (Appendix F). The questions are placed randomly throughout the survey. The COI (1990) is a closed-ended questionnaire that employs a continuous six-point Likert scale rating system with 1 indicating a statement is never true and 6 indicating a statement is always true. Likert scale instruments are considered attitude scales that “determine what an individual believes, perceives, or feels about self, others, and a variety of activities, institutions, and situations” (Gay & Airasian, 1997, p. 156). The COI is a self-reporting questionnaire that stimulates a person’s thoughts about their own areas of skills and competence, motives, and values (Schein, 1990). Moreover, the questionnaire identifies the factors or career anchors that influence the career decisions of individuals (Schein, 1990). Permission to use the career orientations inventory was requested and approved by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., the permission granting authority for Schein’s published work (Appendix G).

This study, similar to those previously discussed, employed a quantitative design. Creswell (2009) describes a quantitative design as “a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables” (p. 4). Once tested, variables can then be measured and presented in statistical terms to either support or dispute a theory (Creswell, 2009). Most often, the two common quantitative research designs include surveys and experiments (Creswell, 2009). Survey method was identified as the preferred type of inquiry method for this study, because it is considered an effective way to collect information on a specific population (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005). According to Cottrell and McKenzie (2005), “survey research involves the administration of a questionnaire to
a sample or to an entire population of people in order to describe the attitudes, opinions, beliefs, values, behaviors, or characteristics of the group being studied” (p. 187).

Furthermore, surveys are a time and cost-effective means for collecting data and provide a rapid turnaround as well (Creswell, 2009). This is especially true for studies involving a large sample size and geographic area, such as this study. In addition, it was advantageous to use a quantitative survey approach for purposes of this study, because this methodological approach is consistent with similar studies (Zerdavis, 1982; Puryear, 1996; Custodio, 2000; Tan & Quek, 2001) that used the Career Orientations Inventory.

*Validity and reliability of data collection instrument.* The validity and reliability of a data collection instrument refers to the established consistency and stability of the instrument’s scoring, given varying contexts and times, typically obtained from previous studies (Creswell, 2009 & Huck, 2008). The career orientations inventory which is based on Schein’s earlier research on career anchors, has been field tested, refined and validated by numerous researchers. DeLong (1982) was the first researcher to validate the applicability of the COI instrument. Other researchers (Burke, 1983; Custodio, 2004; Wood, Winston, & Polkosnik, 1985) who conducted studies within varying contexts have also established the validity and reliability of the COI in measuring career anchors.

Career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory have existed for more than 30 years, and have been used by researchers and practitioners across numerous disciplines, in different countries, and with various demographic considerations (Igbaria, Greenhouse, & Parasurman, 1991; Crepeau, Crook, Goslar & McMurtrey, 1992; Igbaria & Baroudi, 1993; Yarnall, 1998; Jiang & Klein, 1999; Custodio, 2000; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Tan & Quek, 2001; Bridle & Whapham, 2003; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ramakrishna &
Several studies have verified that the COI is a well-established instrument with high internal and validity and reliability (Burke, 1983; Custodio, 2004; DeLong, 1982; Erdogmus, 2003; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2002; Wood, Winston, & Polkosnik, 1985). Based on these studies, employing the career orientations inventory to measure an individual’s career anchors was considered reliable and appropriate for purposes of this study. The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the factors impacting the career decisions of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education.

Informed Consent

Participation in this research study was voluntary. Each participant was asked to provide informed consent prior to completing the survey. By selecting an option confirming informed consent prior to beginning the demographic questionnaire, it implied that participants had read the information provided and consented to taking part in the research. A complete review of the informed consent form is presented in Appendix H.

Confidentiality

Participation in this research study was also anonymous and confidential. As an anonymous survey, there is no record of respondents’ identities. Furthermore, the survey did not ask for any information that would identify respondents, other than an email address if participants were interested in receiving an abstract of the completed study. In the event of publication or presentation of this study and research results, no personally
identifiable information will be shared. Additionally, any information that may be provided through the survey or participating institutions will remain confidential.

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

To facilitate the data collection process, a preliminary email was sent to individuals who were identified as members of the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education (AABHE) on June 3, 2011. The initial email (Appendix I) was sent from the president of AABHE and introduced the sample population to the study, highlighted the purpose and benefits of the research, and requested their participation in the online survey. The initial email included an embedded link that allowed participants to go directly to the survey. After the email was sent to all potential participants, a follow-up email was sent 21 days later on June 24, 2011, reminding all participants to complete the survey, if they had not already done so. Because the survey was designed to assure confidentiality and anonymity, the reminder email was sent to all original members from the identified sample population. The survey closed on July 1, 2011, after receiving 44 responses for a response rate of 36 percent. The data analysis procedures were aligned with each research question as follows.

RQ1: What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?

Data Analysis Procedures: Data related to research question number one was obtained through a summation of the responses to questions 13-52 on Part III of the survey. Participants responded to each survey question using a 6-point Likert scale. The analysis provided descriptive statistics for each of the career anchor theme scores. The highest categorical score identifies each respondent’s dominant career anchor. Mean
scores were calculated for all respondents, along with various measures of variability including minimum, maximum, and standard deviation and the frequency and percentage of the career anchors of participants. These statistical methods were used to provide descriptive statistics, “numbers, percentages, and averages, characteristics of a group of people” (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005, p. 7) for the study. To ensure that the items in the questionnaire were reliable in determining the career anchors of the participants, a reliability analysis was also conducted using Cronbach’s alpha to establish reliability (Huck, 2008).

RQ2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?

Data Analysis Procedures: Research question number two was addressed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were used for Part 1 of the survey, questions 1-5, which included the participants’ responses to (a) age, (b) marital/family status, (c) educational attainment, (d) years of experience, and (e) years of administrative experience. Descriptive statistics were presented on these personal and work-related demographic characteristics of participants.

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and institutional characteristics?
Data Analysis Procedures: Data related to research question number three was measured by conducting Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine if there is a significant relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and the type of institution in which they are employed. The sum of squares (SS), Degrees of freedom (Df), Mean of Squares (MS), F Ratio (F), and Significance are provided.

RQ4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position?

Data Analysis Procedures: Research question number four is obtained through a summation of the responses to questions 7-9 on Part I of the survey, Demographic Questions. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference in career anchor scores, according to two independent measures: position in the institution, and principal area of current position.

RQ5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

Data Analysis Procedures: Research question number five is answered through conducting ANOVA and a chi-squared test. ANOVA analysis is conducted to determine if there is a statistical significance in the differences among the mean scores between the eight career anchor scores of participants according to their plan to pursue career advancement. Analyses between groups and within groups are both provided. A Chi-
square analysis was conducted to determine whether the career anchors and plan to pursue career advancement of participants was statistically significant.

Chapter Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and examine the career anchors of Black women who work in management level administrative positions at institutions of higher education in the United States. This chapter provided a summary of the research design and methodology that was employed for this quantitative study. The chapter also provided the context for the study, identified the participants, described the survey instrument, and discussed the data collection and analysis processes and procedures.

The following chapter presents the results of the data analyses and research questions and overall findings of the study.
Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in management level positions at US institutions of higher education. This chapter presents the self-perceived career anchors of Black women who work in management level positions in institutions of higher education, and the relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of respondents and their demographic characteristics. Further, this chapter provides an analysis of the relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level positions and their decision to remain in their current positions.

Research Questions

This chapter is presented according to five research questions:

RQ1: What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?
RQ3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and institution type?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position?

RQ5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

Data Analysis and Findings

Thirty-one Black women in management level positions at institutions of higher education responded to the self-administered online survey. Among the 31 participants, 27 women responded to all of the demographic questions 1-10 in Part I of the survey, 28 women responded to all career plan questions 11-12 in Part II of the survey, and 26 women responded to all career orientation inventory questions 13-52 in Part III of the survey. Therefore, there are missing responses recorded in the presentation of the results.

Descriptive statistics. Table 4.1 presents the personal demographic characteristics of participants, including age, marital status, and educational attainment. The age of participants was segmented into ranges of 30-39 years old, 40-49 years old, 50 to 59 years old, and 60 years old and above. As observed from Table 4.1, the majority of participants fell within the age range of 50-59 years old (n = 12, 38.7%) and 40-49 years old (n = 7, 22.6%) while four participants did not answer this question (12.9%). Regarding marital status, participants were classified as single, single with dependent
children, married/domestic partnership, married/domestic partnership with dependent children, separated/divorced/widowed/never married. Three participants (9.7%) did not answer this questionnaire item, while 10 (32.3%) of the participants responded that they are married or in a domestic partnership with dependent children. Seven (22.6%) responded that they are separated/divorced/widowed while six (19.4%) participants responded that they are single. For educational attainment, the majority of participants have completed a doctoral degree (n = 14, 45.2%) while six participants have completed a Master’s degree (19.4%). Five participants (16.1%) were enrolled in a doctorate program at the time of the survey.
Table 4.1

*Personal Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years old and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single w/dependent children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic Partnership w/dependent children</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed/Never Married</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree (EdD, PhD)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in Doctorate program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents the work-related demographic characteristics of participants.

Participants were asked about the number of years they had worked in higher education, as well as the number of years spent in administrative positions. This reflected their experience in the field of higher education. The majority of participants had more than 20 years of experience working in higher education \((n = 11, 35.5\%)\) while seven participants
have been working in higher education for 11 to 15 years (22.6%). For the number of years working in administrative positions in higher education, it was determined that majority of the participants worked in administrative roles for 11 to 15 years ($n = 8$, 25.8%). However, when the participants were surveyed regarding the number of years they had occupied their current position, the majority responded with a number of 1 to 5 years ($n = 18$, 58.1%). When participants were also asked about their present position in the institution, Table 4.2 demonstrates that the majority of participants occupied the position of a director ($n = 15$, 48.4%).
Table 4.2

*Work-related Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years working in higher education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years working in administrative positions in higher education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in current position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position at your institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For other work-related demographic characteristics, participants were also asked whether their current position is the permanent role for them. Among the 31 participants surveyed, 25 responded that they are in their permanent roles within the institution (80.6%). For the department or principal area of their current position, 15 participants responded that they are involved in academic affairs (48.4%). Finally, for the institution type, 11 of the participants responded that they work at four-year public undergraduate and graduate program institutions (35.5%) while nine of the participants responded that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Role or Acting/Interim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting or Interim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or principal area of current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Administrative Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year public undergraduate and graduate programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year private undergraduate programs only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year private undergraduate and graduate programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are employed at four-year private undergraduate and graduate program institutions (29.0%).

Data analysis. In order to answer the five research questions posed for this research study, it was important to determine the career anchors of the participants. To ensure that the items in the questionnaire were reliable in determining the career anchors of the participants, reliability analyses were conducted. The Career Orientations Inventory was used to measure career anchors that influence the career decisions of individuals. Career anchors are based on the following eight themes: 1) autonomy/independence; 2) entrepreneurial creativity; 3) general managerial competence; 4) lifestyle; 5) pure challenge; 6) security/stability; 7) service/dedication to a cause; and 8) technical/functional competence (Schein, 1990). Each career anchor theme was measured using five items in the questionnaire. Table 4.3 presents the results of the reliability analyses conducted. It can be observed that the items were reliable in measuring the constructs of the eight career anchor themes (Cronbach’s alpha > .70).
Table 4.3

*Reliability Analysis of Career Anchor Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research Question 1: What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?*

Data related to research question number one was obtained through a summation of the responses to questions 13-52 on Part III of the survey, Career Orientations Inventory. Table 4.4 presents the descriptive statistics for each of the career anchor scores. The scores were calculated as the summation of the five items for each of the subscales. The highest mean score was observed for service or dedication to a cause (Mean = 22.143, SD = 4.688). This is followed by the mean score for lifestyle (Mean = 21.571, SD = 5.080). The lowest mean scores are observed for entrepreneurial creativity (Mean = 14.821, SD = 5.598) and general managerial competence (Mean = 15.643, SD = 5.625).
Table 4.4

*Descriptive Statistics of Career Anchor Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.750</td>
<td>4.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>15.643</td>
<td>5.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>14.821</td>
<td>5.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>21.571</td>
<td>5.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>18.929</td>
<td>6.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>21.500</td>
<td>5.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>22.143</td>
<td>4.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>19.536</td>
<td>4.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominant career anchor for each of the participants was also identified. This was determined through choosing the career anchor with the highest score for each of the participants. Table 4.5 presents the frequency and percentages of the career anchors of participants.
Table 4.5  

*Frequency and Percentages of Career Anchors of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ1 results indicated that all eight career anchor themes identified by Schein (1990), were present among Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education. It can be observed however, that the majority of the participants reflected a career anchor of security/stability ($n = 9, 29.0\%$), followed by service/dedication to a cause career anchor ($n = 6, 19.4\%$), and the lifestyle career anchor ($n = 5, 16.1\%$). The least number of participants were observed to have a career anchor of autonomy/independence ($n = 1, 3.2\%$), entrepreneurial creativity ($n = 1, 3.2\%$), and technical/functional competence ($n = 1, 3.2\%$).
Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?

Research question number two was answered through a series of descriptive statistics. Pearson’s correlation analysis was conducted on questions 1-5 on Part I of the survey, Demographic Questions. Table 4.6 presents the results of the Pearson’s correlation analyses of demographic characteristics and career anchor scores.
Table 4.6

*Pearson’s Correlation Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Career Anchor Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Experience in Higher Education</th>
<th>Experience in Administrative Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = *p*-value < .05

A series of ANOVA were also conducted on questions 1-5 on Part I of the survey, Demographic Questions. Table 4.7 presents the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to age.
Table 4.7

ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.217</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>530.524</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>546.741</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>13.419</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.473</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>827.248</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>840.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>126.619</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.206</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>612.048</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>117.236</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.079</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>567.431</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>684.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>133.722</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.574</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>821.907</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>955.630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>56.671</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.890</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>617.848</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>674.519</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>54.771</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.257</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>537.895</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>592.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>39.945</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.315</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>475.240</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515.185</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 (a) results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of participants and their age range ($p$-value > .05). Thus, there was no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their age.
Table 4.8 presents the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to marital status.

Table 4.8

ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>41.886</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.471</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>559.364</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>144.531</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.133</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>709.898</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>854.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>250.710</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62.677</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>595.398</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>846.107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>128.017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.004</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>568.840</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>187.393</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.848</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>806.464</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>993.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>126.321</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.580</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>554.679</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>681.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>44.138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.035</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>549.290</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>34.917</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.729</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>538.048</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>572.964</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ2 (b) results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of participants and marital status (p-value > .05). Thus, no relationship was demonstrated between the self-perceived career anchors of Black
women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and their marital status.

Table 4.9 presents the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to educational attainment.

RQ2 (c) results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of participants and their educational attainment ($p$-value > .05). Thus, there was no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and their educational attainment.

Table 4.10 presents the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to years of experience in higher education.

RQ (d) results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of participants and their years of experience in higher education ($p$-value > .05). Thus, there was no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their years of experience in higher education.
Table 4.9

**ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Educational Attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>67.502</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.876</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>533.748</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>85.867</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.467</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>768.562</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>854.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>147.845</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.961</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>698.262</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>846.107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>690.000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>112.467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.117</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>881.390</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>993.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>24.110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>656.890</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>681.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.081</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.020</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>561.348</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>50.607</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.652</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>522.357</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>572.964</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10

ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Experience in Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>49.684</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.421</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>551.566</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>166.592</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.648</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>687.836</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>854.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>43.830</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.957</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>802.277</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>846.107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>191.675</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.919</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>505.182</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>46.323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.581</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>947.534</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>993.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>96.449</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.112</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>584.551</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>681.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>100.564</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.141</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>492.865</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>69.440</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.360</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>503.524</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>572.964</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 presents the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to years of experience in administrative positions in higher education.
Table 4.11

*ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Experience in Administrative Positions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy/Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>26.832</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.708</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>519.908</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>546.741</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Managerial Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>62.842</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.710</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>777.825</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>840.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial Creativity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>128.792</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.198</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>609.875</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>118.283</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.571</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>566.383</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>684.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pure Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>97.430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.357</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>858.200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>955.630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security/Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>113.260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.315</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>561.258</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>674.519</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service/Dedication to a Cause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>135.658</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.915</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>457.008</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>592.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical/Functional Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>40.352</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.088</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>474.833</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515.185</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ2 (e) results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of participants and their years of experience in administrative positions in higher education ($p$-value $> .05$). Thus, there is no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and years of experience in administrative positions in higher education. Through the analysis, it was determined that there was no significant relationship between the career anchor scores of participants and their demographic characteristics including age, marital/family status, educational attainment, years of experience, and years of administrative experience.

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and institution type?

Data related to research question number three was obtained by measuring ANOVA. Table 4.12 presents the ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to institution type.

RQ3 results indicated that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores of the participants and their institution types ($p$-value $> .05$).
Table 4.12

*ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor Type</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>39.910</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.303</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>537.942</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>577.852</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>181.862</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.621</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>669.768</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>851.630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>185.226</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.742</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>625.737</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>810.963</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.341</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.447</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>654.326</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664.667</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>62.559</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.853</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>893.071</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>955.630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>25.930</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.643</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>623.699</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>649.630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>118.119</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.373</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>459.881</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>578.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>132.132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.044</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>438.609</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570.741</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position?

Research question number four was answered through MANOVA. Table 4.13 presents the MANOVA for career anchor scores according to title and principal area of current position.

Table 4.13

*MANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Title and Area of Current Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>205.617</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.687</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>327.795</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.414</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>407.074</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.077</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>165.157</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.797</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>342.157</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.440</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>301.700</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.550</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>288.095</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.578</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>255.931</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.281</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ4 results determined that there was no significant difference between the career anchor scores according to the dependent measures: position in the institution, and principal area of current position ($p$-value > .05). Thus, it can be concluded that there was no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and current position.
Research Question 5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

Data related to research question number five was obtained through conducting ANOVA and a chi-squared test. Table 4.14 presents the results of the ANOVA for career anchor scores according to participants’ plan to pursue career advancement.
Table 4.14

ANOVA for Career Anchor Scores according to Plan to Pursue Career Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.583</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>582.083</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.250</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>64.984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.492</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>789.444</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>854.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>30.274</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.137</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>815.833</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>846.107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>40.079</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.040</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>656.778</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>696.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>28.607</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.304</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>965.250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>993.857</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>677.111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>681.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>37.179</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.589</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>556.250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593.429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.440</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>558.083</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>572.964</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ5 results indicated that there are no significant differences between the career anchor scores of participants according to their plan to pursue career advancements ($p$-value > .05).

Table 4.15 presents the results of the chi-square analyses of career anchors and plans to pursue career advancement.

Table 4.15

*Chi-Square Analysis of Career Anchors and Plan to Pursue Career Advancement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Plan to Pursue Career Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $\chi^2$ (14, 28) = 21.743, p-value = .084*

RQ5 chi-square analysis determined that there are more participants who plan to pursue career advancements ($n$ =18) in which the majority of the participants were
identified as having security/stability and service/dedication to a cause as their dominant career anchors. The chi-square analysis further determined that there is no significant relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and their decision remain in their current management positions ($\chi^2(14,28) = 21.743$, $p$-value = .084).

Summary of Results

The research questions posed for this study were answered through gathering the responses of 31 participants included in this study. It was determined that the majority of these participants have a dominant career anchor of security/stability while the least number of participants were identified as having a career anchor of autonomy/independence, entrepreneurial creativity, and technical/functional competence. Through the analyses conducted in this study, it was determined that there is no significant relationship between the career anchor scores of participants and their demographic characteristics such as age, marital status, educational attainment, and years of working in administrative positions. Moreover, it was determined that there is no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and the type of institution in which participants are employed. The MANOVA determined that there was no relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position in their institution. The chi-square analysis also determined that there was no significant relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management
level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions.

The next chapter presents a discussion of the research and study findings. The chapter presents overall implications of the research findings, implications for further research, and implications for policy discussions. The chapter also highlights the limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

Research during the last decade indicates that while Black women have been applying to and graduating from college, and entering the academic workforce at increasing rates, they continue to remain underrepresented in management levels of administration at institutions of higher education (Aguirre, 2000; Collins, 2009; Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Mabokela, 2007; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002). A substantial number of Black women have been able to overcome institutional and social barriers and possess the currency to climb the academic career ladder (Association for the Study of Higher Education, 2009). Yet many Black women are deliberately choosing to remain in existing management level positions, opting not to advance to higher levels in the administrative pipeline.

If educational leaders are to successfully increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is important to understand the reasons why a number of Black women at institutions of higher education are choosing to remain in their current management positions. To that end, this study identifies and examines the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work in management level positions at US institutions of higher education. This research examines the self-perceived career anchors and the relationship of the self-perceived career anchors of participants and their demographic characteristics including age, marital/family status, educational attainment, years of experience in higher education, years of administrative experience in higher
education, current position at institution, principal area of current position, and institution type. Additionally, this study examines the relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level positions and their decision to remain in their current management level positions.

To present the discussion of this research, this chapter is organized in three sections. The first section, *Implications of Findings*, presents the results of the research questions and discusses the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study. This section highlights the significance of the findings in terms of both current literature and professional practice. *Implications of Findings* also presents implications for policy discussion, drawing attention to current affirmative action and other hiring practices in higher education. The second section, *Limitations of the Study*, identifies the difficulties and challenges of this research, and highlights the overall limitations of the study. The third section, *Recommendations*, offers recommendations for future research based on the analysis of the study’s findings and the contextual, research, theoretical, and methodological literature presented. This section also presents recommendations for professional practice, presenting ideas for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black women, in particular, Black female administrators in higher education. *Recommendations* also presents suggestions for educational leaders to consider implementing in their institutions, including professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators who work in institutions of higher education.

*Implications of Findings*

This study offers an understanding of the personal and professional factors, the career anchors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work in
management positions at US institutions of higher education. Understanding the abilities, goals, motives, and values of Black women who work at institutions of higher education can help inform educational leaders, researchers, and other Black female academics of the internal factors that may contribute to the underrepresentation of Black women in management level administrative positions. Understanding these personal and professional factors that impact the career decisions of Black women can further inform educational leaders who seek to increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders in institutions of higher education.

For the purpose of this research, the study investigates the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions, and institutional characteristics?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position?
RQ5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and their decision to remain in their current management positions?

To pursue the research questions, this study selected a group of Black women who have advanced through parts of the administrative pipeline and currently occupy positions of leadership across a number of institutions in the US. Participation in this research study was anonymous and confidential. The survey did not ask any specific information that would potentially identify participants. As an anonymous survey, there is no record of respondents’ identities. However, although there is not a record of participants or participant’s institutions, based on the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education’s membership list, 123 women representing 77 colleges and universities in the US were invited to participate in the study.

Institutions on the West Coast including one institution in the states of Washington and Colorado, along with three institutions in California were invited to participate. In the Midwest, one institution each from North Dakota and Kansas were included, two institutions each from Wisconsin, Missouri, Illinois, and Ohio were included, four from Michigan, and five institutions from Indiana were all invited to participate. Southern colleges and universities included seven institutions in Texas, five in Kentucky, four in Alabama and North Carolina, and two in Arkansas; Louisiana; Tennessee; South Carolina; and the District of Columbia (DC), along with one institution each from West Virginia; Mississippi; and Florida. Schools in the Northeast included four in New York, three in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, and one in both New Jersey and Rhode Island. Participants invited to participate in the study also represented a range
of institution types including two-year public and private institutions, four-year public
undergraduate and graduate institutions, and four-year private undergraduate and
graduate institutions. The management level positions occupied by the participants in the
study also varied. The study participants included an associate/provost, associate/vice presidents, deans, an associate/dean, department chairs, several directors, an associate/director, assistants to the vice president, and a
senior department administrator.

Of the Black women invited to participate in the study, 31 women responded to
the survey, 27 women responded to all of the demographic questions 1-10 in Part I of the
survey, 28 women responded to all career plan questions 11-12 in Part II of the survey,
and 26 women responded to all career orientation inventory questions 13-52 in Part III of
the survey.

Implications of Research Question 1: What are the self-perceived career anchors
of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher
education? The analysis for research question one indicates that all eight independent
career anchors, as identified by Schein (1990) are represented among the Black women
who participated in the study. The results of this research, using a Cronbach’s Alpha of >
.70, are consistent with previous quantitative studies that have used Schein’s career
anchor theory as a methodological framework (Zerdavis, 1982; Puryear, 1996; Custodio,
2000; Tan & Quek, 2001). Supportive of Schein’s eight factor structure measured by the
COI, the research findings point out that the participants in this study possess all eight
self-perceived career anchors: 1) autonomy/independence; 2) entrepreneurial creativity;
3) general managerial competence; 4) lifestyle; 5) pure challenge; 6) security/stability; 7) service/dedication to a cause; and 8) technical/functional competence (Schein, 1990).

Career anchors have been identified in the literature as an important consideration to the career decisions of individuals. For purposes of this study, to develop an understanding of the personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black women who work in management positions at US institutions of higher education, career anchors provide insight into the self-concept that Black women develop around their career. While the results of research question number one reveal that no one career anchor has more of a significant effect on the career decisions of Black women at US institutions of higher education than any other career anchor, many of the women in this study indicate that they are most concerned with having a secure and stable career. When asked the survey question, “If you are unsure or do not plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, what factors would impact your decision not to advance to a higher level administrative/leadership position?” By order of importance, 60 percent of respondents indicate that the lack of opportunity for long-term security and stability as most or moderately important to their decision not to pursue career advancement opportunities to a higher-level administrative/leadership position. For respondents planning to pursue career advancement opportunities, 92 percent indicate that the opportunity for long-term security and stability would impact their decision to advance to a higher-level administrative/leadership position. For these women, regardless of their desire to advance professionally or not, security and stability are so important that these factors will influence the decisions they make regarding their career choices (Schein, 1990). As members of two distinct groups - Blacks and women, both of whom have been
historically marginalized and oppressed, the distinct perspective of Black women highlights the overall career needs and desires of this group of management level administrators (Collins, 2004).

*Implications of Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education, and demographic characteristics including: (a) age; (b) marital/family status; (c) educational attainment; (d) years of experience; and (e) years of administrative experience?* The analysis for research question two indicates that while Black women who work in institutions of higher education do possess career anchors, there are no statistically significant relationships between participants’ self-perceived career anchors and their demographic characteristics such as age, marital/family status, educational attainment, years of experience, or years of administrative experience.

In terms of the general demographic characteristics of participants, over 70 percent of the Black women who participated in the study are 40 years old or older, almost 50 percent of the women are married and/or have children, and over 60 percent of the women have completed their doctorate degree or are currently enrolled in a doctoral program. In terms work-related demographic characteristics, over 70 percent of the Black women who participated in the study have over 10 years of experience working in higher education and over 50 percent of the women have over 10 years of administrative experience in higher education. The demographic characteristics of the participants in this study are important to consider in the context of this research. Not only do the demographic characteristics provide a profile of the Black women who participated in the
study, the characteristics of the participants are useful in understanding the results of the research questions and discussing the conclusions drawn from the findings.

The findings for research question two indicate that, of the participants in the study, the majority of the Black women are between the ages of 50-59 years old (38.7%), married or in a domestic partnership with dependent children (32.3%), and have completed their doctorate degree (45.2%). The findings also indicate that the majority of the participants (74.2%) have over ten years of experience working in higher education and more than half of the participants (54.8%) have over ten years of administrative experience in higher education. Schein (1990) suggests that the development of a dominant career anchor requires ten or more years of professional experience (Schein, 1990). It is during this time frame, that an individual gains the opportunity to develop and realize skills, motives, and values. As the individual accumulates a history of work experience, the opportunity to make choices emerges; from these choices, it can be determined what it is really important, and what cannot be sacrificed, even for a career.

While no significant relationship was found to exist between the career anchors of the Black women in this study and their age, marital status, educational attainment, years of experience in higher education, or years of administrative experience in higher education, 58 percent of the participants in the study indicate that they have only been in their current management level position between one to five years. Despite the fact that the majority of the Black women in this study have several years of work experience in higher education and several years of management experience in higher education, this finding indicates that the Black women in this study may have advanced within the last five years, or may have recently changed management level positions.
Implications of Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and institution type? The analysis for research question three indicates that while similar in numbers by institution type (two-year public n=4; four-year private n=3; four-year public undergraduate and graduate programs n=11; four-year private undergraduate and graduate programs n=9), no significant relationship exists between the career anchors of the participants in the study and the type of institution in which they are employed.

Though the results of research question three indicate that no significant relationship exists between the career anchor scores of participants and the type of institution in which they are employed, it is important to consider the type of institutions that Black women in this study represent. While less than 13 percent of the participants in the study indicate that they work at a community college, women and people of color generally make up a large portion of the untenured faculty at community colleges (ACE, 2008). The low number of faculty in tenured or tenure-track positions at community colleges translates to very few Black women in permanent faculty roles that will position them for top-level administrative positions (ACE, 2008). “At four-year institutions, the near universal use of tenure makes it easy to identify faculty who will have the option to pursue future positions of leadership. Faculty who work outside tenure-line positions rarely have permanent status and are generally excluded from the traditional academic career ladder” (ACE, 2008, p. 3).

According to the ACE report, 5 percent of all women 45 years old or younger at 4-year institutions currently occupy the kind of permanent positions that will typically
result in advancement to higher leadership positions. Of the participants in this study, less than 13 percent of the Black women represent 2-year public institutions, while 35.5 percent of the respondents represent 4-year public institutions with undergraduate and graduate programs, and 29 percent represent 4-year private institutions with undergraduate and graduate programs. Of the 35.5 percent of Black women who work at a 4-year public institutions with undergraduate and graduate programs, ten out of eleven of the women (90%) have worked in their current management level position for five years or less. This is compared to six out of ten of the women (60%) who have worked for five years or more in their current management level position at 4-year private institutions with undergraduate and graduate programs.

Implications of Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions and their current position? The analysis for research question four indicates, of the Associate/Assistant Provosts (n = 1); Associate/Assistant Vice Presidents (n = 2); Deans (n = 2); Associate/Assistant Deans (n = 1); Chairs (n = 2); Directors (n = 15); Associate/Assistant Directors (n = 1); and others (n=4) who work in academic affairs, athletics, business or administrative services, enrollment management, external affairs, human resources, information technology, services, or student affairs, no significant relationship exists between the career anchor scores of participants and their current position in their institution. The analysis also indicates that no significant relationship exists between the career anchor scores of participants and the principal area of their current position. Of the Black women in the study, the majority of participants
represent academic and student affairs with 48 percent representing positions in academic affairs and 22.6 percent representing positions in student affairs.

While almost 60 percent of Black women possess the security/stability career anchor, 62 percent of the participants in this study felt as though advancing to a higher-level administrative/leadership position may not allow them to balance their personal and professional obligations. We know from the results of this research and other similar research (Greene, 2000; Gregory, 1999 & Hensel, 1997) noted in this study, Black women often face challenges related to balancing their career, family, and community responsibilities. It could be assumed that women who have children and prioritize their families make "lifestyle choices" that compel them to take adjunct positions or part-time appointments that offer limited resources and opportunities to advance through the administrative pipeline.

Implications of Research Question 5: Is there a relationship between the self-perceived career anchors of Black women in management level administrative positions at US institutions of higher education and their decision to remain in their current management positions? The analysis for the fifth and final research question indicates that no significant relationship exists between the self-perceived career anchor scores of participants and their plan to pursue career advancement opportunities. Like all women who work outside of the home, Black women must confront the choice of whether they will be defined by their career, or by their personal life (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). Of the Black women in the study, 60 percent of the participants suggested that not having the opportunity to serve others would impact their decision to not advance to a higher-level administrative/leadership position.
Traditionally, Black women have been attracted to the education profession because of their desire to make a difference in the lives of others (Gregory, 1995). Consistent with previous research that focused on Black women in academia (citation) and indicative of current professional practice, this finding indicates that Black women are typically concerned with serving students and others who work in their institutions. While the findings of research question five indicate that no significant relationship exists between participants’ career anchor scores and their decision to remain in their current management positions, the overall results indicate that the women in this study who are unsure or do not plan to pursue career advancement opportunities are most concerned with the potential lack of opportunity to provide service to others or dedication to a cause.

Limitations of the Study

As with many studies, there are limitations of this research. This study used a quantitative design, specifically a survey research design. Survey research draws a sample of a specific population, studies that population, and then makes inferences to that population from the study findings (Patten, 2009). Two limitations of survey research are that it is more difficult to collect a comprehensive understanding of respondents’ perspective and the potential for a low response rate (Creswell, 2009).

Use of the career orientations inventory as a survey instrument may also have limited applicability to the sample population. Career anchor theory and the career orientations inventory have existed for well over 30 years and have been used by many researchers and practitioners across various disciplines, in different countries, and with various demographic considerations (Igbaria, Greenhouse, & Parasurman, 1991; Crepeau, Crook, Goslar & McMurtrey, 1992; Igbaria & Baroudi, 1992; Yarnall, 1998;
Jiang & Klein, 1999; Custodio, 2000; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Tan & Quek, 2001; Bridle & Whapham, 2003; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Bester, Phil & Mouten, 2006; Danzinger, Rachman-Moore, & Valency, 2008). However, based on this researcher’s review the literature, the instrument has not been used specifically with or for Black women who work in management level positions at institutions of higher education. Therefore, the unique perceptions and experiences of Black women as reflected in previous studies may not have been captured and reflected accurately.

Methodologically, in order to examine a concept in depth, survey or quantitative methods have the disadvantage of being one-dimensional. To truly understand a theory and its effect on a specific population, ethnographic methods, interviews, in-depth case studies and other qualitative techniques must be explored. In Schein’s booklet, *Career Anchors – Discovering Your Real Values* (1990), Schein advises that the career anchor interview is more reliable than just the results of the career orientations inventory, since it is based on one’s actual biography. He further warns that the COI scores could possibly be biased based on one’s need to see him or herself in a certain manner (Schein, 1990, p. 60). Schein also suggests that an interview provides the opportunity to focus on the actual choices that one makes, their plans for the future, why career choices are made, and how they make an individual feel. This method of inquiry is deliberate, and prompts the individual to examine the reasons for making choices. Conducting a mixed-methods study may have helped to unpack the responses to each of the survey questions, allowing for a more complete and accurate analysis of the career anchors and factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work in higher education.
This research study collected a small sample size \( n=31 \) of Black women who were current or former members of the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education. Therefore, these findings may not represent the majority of Black women who work in institutions of higher education in the US or who work in management level positions. The findings of this research may lack generalizability to a larger population of Black women in management positions at institutions of higher education. When conducting correlational research, sample size is an essential consideration. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (as cited in Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005), the preferred sample size for a correlational study is typically 30. Consequently, this study, which included only 26 women who responded to all career orientation inventory questions in Part III of the survey, may not provide an accurate probability of the statistical significance of the potential relationships addressed in this research. In addition, this study only included Black women who worked in a management level position including Associate/Assistant Provost, Associate/Assistant Vice President, Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean, Chair, Director, and Associate/Assistant Director. The responses of these participants may not be indicative of Black women in other management level positions.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Black women, as a group, are a growing presence within higher education, and have been advancing through the academic pipeline as students, graduates, and educators; yet, they remain underrepresented in management level positions. Many White colleagues of Black women know very little about the cultural, personal, professional, and career experiences of Black women (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). Due to the complex intersection of their gender, race, and social identification, Black women often encounter
unique challenges throughout their careers. Within academic institutions, Black women commonly lack social and organizational support, trust, access to information, formal and informal networks and career advice, and sometimes even face isolation from other women within their institutions (Bell & Nkomo, 2001, 2003; Collins, 2009; Myers, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2002). Black women working in institutions of higher education often experience discontent due to negative stereotypes regarding their academic and professional ability and frequently encounter barriers to tenure, promotion and salary increases (Crawford & Smith, 2005; Myers, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2002). Not surprisingly, these and other obstacles have impacted the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black women into top-level administrative positions in institutions of higher education (Gregory, 2001; Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

As colleges and universities in the US face demands to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse society, the changing status of employment in higher education, and the impending wave of academic retirements, it will be important for educational leaders to find ways to address the opportunity for diverse leadership growth (Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009; Moses, 2009). If educational leaders are to successfully increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is imperative that they understand the reasons why a number of Black women at institutions of higher education are choosing to remain in their current management positions, opting not to advance to higher-level positions.

Based on the results of this study, it is essential that the academic and career development research continue to examine the personal and professional factors that impact the careers of Black women who work in institutions of higher education, in order
to inform and close the gap in the research literature. To close this gap, the following are recommendations for future research.

First, it is recommended that future research be expanded to include a larger sample size of Black women who work in various management and administrative level positions, to determine if the self-perceived career anchors of these women have a similar relationship with the dependent variables identified in this study. This level of research could allow for increased generalizability of the overall findings, and could further determine if a particular career anchor is in fact dominant among Black women who work in higher education administration.

Second, future research could be expanded to include both quantitative and qualitative methods by using a mixed methods approach. This methodological approach would provide for a richer and deeper examination of the perceptions, personal experiences and issues confronting Black women in managerial and administrative positions in higher education institutions. A mixed methods approach would also allow for increased contextualization of the overall findings, not only offering numerical data, but also providing individual and group narratives of the current obstacles and barriers faced by Black women in higher education.

A third recommendation is that future research include teaching faculty, in order to determine if the self-perceived career anchors of Black female faculty are similar to those of Black females in management level positions. Comparisons could then be made to determine if career anchors and future career plans held by those in management level positions are unique, or similar to those held by teaching professionals in higher education.
The final recommendation for future research is to conduct a longitudinal study focusing on Black women in management level positions in higher education. According to Schein (1990), career anchors are a collection of self-perceived skills, personal motives, and values that a person develops over time, and once developed; these anchors shape and guide the career choices of that person. “Too few people have been studied for long enough periods of time to determine how career anchors evolve“ (Schein, 1990, p. 34). A longitudinal study that followed the same participants over an extended period could determine if the self-perceived career anchors of Black women who work in management level positions in higher education remain stable or change over time.

**Recommendations for Professional Practice**

Based on the results of this study, it is important to continue examining and addressing the factors that ultimately impact the career decisions and career paths that Black women choose and why they may opt not to press forward to higher-level leadership positions. It is critical to employ strategies to address the dynamics of the academic pipeline and the career pathways pursued by Black women in higher education. There is no single solution for eradicating the barriers faced by Black women in higher education; nor is there one solution for establishing an open and diverse institution. However, the recommendations presented are a starting point to changing the historic organizational cultures and structures that have been in place for many years.

First, in an effort to increase the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black female administrators in higher education, it is recommended that institutions develop institutional, divisional, and departmental recruitment strategies to locate, attract, and hire Black women. Contacting predominantly Black universities, Black female professional
organizations and academic associations may be a good start for schools looking to enrich their diversity pool. It is also important to train search committees and those involved in the hiring process of new faculty, staff, and administrators on diverse and inclusive search practices. The training should include the development of job postings, interview questions, and hiring processes. For example, introducing a diversity indicator on job postings, such as experience and success working with diverse student populations, or women and faculty of color encouraged to apply has the potential to increase the likelihood of Black women applying for open positions. These types of strategies could help to increase applicant pools and potential diverse hires.

Further efforts to enhance the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black women in higher education could include transparent tenure and promotion information. Programs could be set up to assist and support Black women in understanding and navigating the paths to tenured and advanced positions. “Career development is an important issue for Black faculty women because it may well be the primary means by which these women and other scholars may be retained” (Gregory, 2002, p. 133). Institutions may also want to consider creating career profile databases for all positions including full-time, tenure-track, and tenure positions, and general management level positions. The general level management positions would include but not limited to senior executive and chief functional officer, academic dean, associate/assistant dean, provost, associate/assistant provost, vice president, assistant/associate vice president, department chair, and director/program director.

A final recommendation for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black women in institutions of higher education is that schools institutionalize diversity
structures and develop institution-wide diversity plans for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black female faculty, staff, and administrators. It is suggested that educational leaders re-imagine the tenure and promotion process of Black women and begin to consider more inclusive standards to judge performance, in ways that consider and place value on diverse teaching, research, and service methods.

Recommendations for Institutional Leaders

Institutional leadership plays a key role in promoting opportunities for groups that are underrepresented in higher education. The following recommendations focus on actions that the leadership in higher education institutions can take to take address the underrepresentation of Black women in higher education. The first recommendation targets professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators who work in institutions of higher education. The professional development should include the opportunity for faculty, staff, and administrators to attend dialogues on cultural competence and working with diverse groups, to help individuals understand the general characteristics and dynamics of Black women. It is further recommended that institutions encourage internal divisions and departments to sponsor diverse workshops, talks, and conferences relevant to Black women and establish visiting scholar series specifically on topics related to Black women. These types of professional development initiatives offer all faculty, staff, and administrators the opportunity to learn, understand, and enhance the knowledge of their Black female colleagues’ cultural, personal, professional, and career experiences.

For Black women specifically, it is recommended that the leadership in higher education institutions sponsor programs that support mentoring opportunities and internal
and external professional networks for faculty and administrators of color. It is also suggested that the leadership encourage, support, and promote research on and by Black women to provide increased understanding and acceptance of this unique domain of research.

Lastly, while there may have been an increase in efforts to hire more faculty, staff, and administrators of color in institutions of higher education, Black women continue to remain underrepresented at management levels of administration in institutions of higher education, relative to their numbers in the United States (US) population (Aguirre, 2000; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Jackson, 2003, 2004; Stanley, 2006). To begin to address the need for diverse leadership growth and increase and retain a pool of Black female academic leaders, it is recommended that institutions take a look at the affirmative action plans that are currently in place and determine if current hiring policies and practice are aligned with evidenced based practices, and whether or not the plans have been effective in diversifying both faculty and management level positions.

**Conclusion**

Black women have participated in higher education for well over one hundred years and have made considerable progress in gaining access to leadership positions; but that progress has not been devoid of challenges and obstacles along the way (Collins, 2009; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002). Whether students, faculty, or staff, were employed at two-year or four-year universities, the literature highlighted in this study has drawn similar conclusions regarding the challenges faced by Black women in administrative and management level positions in US institutions of higher education.
Research during the last decade indicates that while Black women have been applying to
and graduating from college, and entering the academic workforce at increasing rates;
they continue to be underrepresented in management and administrative positions in
institutions of higher education. While a substantial number of Black women have been
able to overcome institutional and social barriers, and possess the currency to climb the
administrative career ladder in higher education, many Black women are deliberately
choosing to remain in their current management level positions and opting not to advance
to higher level positions (Association for the Study of Higher Education, 2009).

The personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black
women who work in higher education represent a significant gap in career and academic
research. By identifying and examining the factors that impacting the career decisions of
Black women in management level positions at US institutions of higher education, this
study adds to the existing body of knowledge relating to career anchor theory.

The study expands the body of knowledge and informs professional practice by
addressing the question of why Black women who have progressed past so many barriers
related to race, socioeconomic disadvantages, and gender; do not continue to press
forward to the highest levels of authority in institutions of higher education. Although
this study did not examine the deeper subjective, sociological or demographic reasons of
why so many Black women choose to remain in mid-level positions in academia, it has
opened the door for future research and debate.

This study also informs professional practice by identifying the personal and
professional factors that influence the career choices of Black women in higher
education. This research provides Black women who work in higher education with an
understanding of the possible factors that may influence their career decisions. Likewise, it provides information for Black women who may be seeking to enter or advance their careers in higher education. The study can make a difference in the lives and careers of Black women by seeking out those who have succeeded, and beginning a dialogue with these women regarding their motivation and reasons for choosing to advance. Through this study, the issues confronting Black women have been brought to the forefront. The challenge remains for further research to uncover the factors that distinguish these Black women from those who choose not to seek out responsibility beyond mid-level positions.

Demands to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse society, the changing status of employment in higher education, and the impending wave of academic retirements, all require timely consideration of historic, pressing issues (Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; Moses, 2009). Educational leaders can begin addressing these demands by understanding the perspectives of those impacted by a dominant structure of culture, which has historically challenged the growth, and inclusion of Black women in many institutions.

As we know today, many notions of leadership have historically been based upon ideas, values, and beliefs of individuals whose life experiences did not necessarily encompass demographic diversity (Parker, 2004). This study provides an opportunity to inform institutions on ways to be more inclusive, sharing best practices for recruiting, retaining, and advancing Black female management level administrators. This study should not be seen as the end of a conversation but the start of a different conversation to address the historical underrepresentation of Black women in administrative and management positions in the American system of higher education. It is the researcher’s
hope that this study will continue and expand the dialogue on this most important topic, and move the issues closer toward resolution.
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### Definitions of Career Anchors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Anchor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>Primarily what motivates one to seek work situations that are generally free of organizational constraints. Those with a strong autonomy/independent career anchor wish to set their own work schedule and pace of work; and they are willing to forgo opportunities for promotion and career advancement to have more freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Creativity</td>
<td>Primarily what motivates one to develop or create something that is built entirely on their own. Those linked to the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor tend to be easily bored and prefer to move from project to the next. They are more concerned with initiating new ideas than in managing established ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Managerial Competence</td>
<td>Primarily what excites one to analyze and solve problems under conditions of incomplete information and uncertainty. Those with a strong general managerial competence career anchor enjoy harnessing people together in an effort to achieve common goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Primarily what motivates one to balance career with lifestyle. Those linked to the lifestyle career anchor are highly concerned with issues such as family, household, and childcare. These particular people seek out organizations that have strong family values and work-life balance programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Challenge</td>
<td>Primarily motivates one to overcome major obstacles in the workplace. Those with a strong anchor for pure challenge enjoy solving unsolvable problems and they define their career in terms of a daily struggle with strong competition in which winning is most important. They are very single-minded and get easily frustrated with those who do not share their same desires and ambitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/Stability</td>
<td>Primarily what motivates one with overall job security and long-term stability with one single organization. Those linked to a strong security/stability career anchor are willing to conform and become fully socialized into an organization’s values and norms. These particular people tend to dislike or are unwilling to travel or relocate for their career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Dedication to a Cause</td>
<td>Primarily motivates one to improve the world in some way. Those with a strong service/dedication to a cause career anchor seek to align their work activities with their personal values to help society. They are more concerned with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding careers that align with their values rather than their skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Functional Competence</td>
<td>Primarily what motivates one with the opportunity for advancement in one’s technical or functional area of competence. These particular people generally disdain and fear general management as too political. They thrive in an environment that allows them to work specifically in their area of expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Number of Institutions Invited to Participate in Study by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Invited by State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of States Represented 31  Number of Institutions Invited 77
Appendix C

AABHE Request and Approval for Membership Contact

From: Baldwin, Sheila [mailto:sbaldwin@colum.edu]
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 6:07 PM
To: McKinsey-Mabry, Kimberly I; rtlee@kckcc.edu; poats_lb@tsu.edu; blofton@walton.uark.edu
Subject: RE: Follow-Up: Dissertation Assistance Request

Hello Kimberly:

Please accept my apology for responding so late after your request. We, the AABHE, are more than willing to assist you with your study. I’m sure that we can find a way for you to distribute the survey to our membership, even though our membership list is distributed to others on a very limited basis. Let’s talk about your vision of this partnership.

Always...
Sheila V. Baldwin, Ed.D.
Associate Professor of English
Columbia College Chicago
English Department
600 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60605
312.369.8105 (O)
312.369.8001 (F)
sbaldwin@colum.edu

From: McKinsey-Mabry, Kimberly I
Sent: Thu 2/10/2011 5:33 AM
To: sbaldwin@colum.edu; rtlee@kckcc.edu; poats_lb@tsu.edu; blofton@walton.uark.edu
Subject: Dissertations Assistance Request

Dear Dr. Baldwin, Mr. Lee, Dr. Poats, and Dr. Lofton:

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry and I am a doctoral student in the Executive Leadership Program in the School of Education at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York. I am currently working on my dissertation proposal, which will identify Factors Impacting the Career Decisions of Black Women in Leadership Positions in Institutions of Higher Education. The purpose of the study is to gain a broader perspective of the career decisions and career paths of Black women who work in management level leadership positions in higher education including, but not limited to, senior executive and chief functional officer, academic dean, associate/provost, associate/provost, vice president, assistant/senior dean, department chair, and director/program director.
The reason for my email to you as leadership with the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education, is to ask for your assistance. If at all feasible, I would like to reach out to your membership list as possible participants in this research study. At this time, I am proposing the use of a 40-question survey, which should take participants no more than 15 minutes to complete, confidentially, through an online survey tool, called Qualtrics. Once approved through IRB at St. John Fisher College, I could email the participants myself or forward the email, along with the survey link to someone in your organization to send out on my behalf.

Thank you for your time in reading this email and considering my request. I look forward to hearing from you soon. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns, please do feel free to contact me.

Respectfully Yours,
Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry
Research Investigator
646-772-1757 mobile
kim05983@sjfc.edu
Appendix D

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 10:35 AM
Subject: AABHE Graduate Student

Dear AABHE Colleague:

I invite you to participate in a research study conducted by doctoral candidate Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry, a student in the Executive Leadership Program in the School of Education at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York. The study’s focus is on identifying and examining the factors that impact the career decisions of Black women who work at institutions of higher education in the US. Please note that Ms. McKinsey-Mabry specifically sought the women of the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education as her target population.

The study’s purpose is to explore the personal and professional factors that influence the career decisions of Black female administrators. As a current or past member of the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education, you have been identified as a potential participant for this study. The research method used for this study will consist of one, three-part survey that should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

The study poses no risk to participants and you may decline to answer particular questions, you may also withdraw your participation from the study at any time. All survey responses are confidential and anonymous. When the results of the study are reported, participants will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to infer identity.

Please take a few moments and click on the link below to complete the survey by June 21, 2011. By completing the survey, you are providing informed consent. The survey findings will be available in an abstract by October 1, 2011, per request of the investigator.

Thank you for your time and support. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the survey or the study, you are encouraged to contact principal investigator, Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry at kim05983@sjfc.edu or (646) 772-1757.

Please Follow this link to the survey or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
https://sjfc.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cGQNVQSWNkgdg0Y
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Factors Impacting the Career Decisions of Black Women in Higher Education
Administration Survey

Part I: Demographics

Please select the demographic characteristics that best describe you.

1) Age:

2) Marital/family status:
   ○ Single
   ○ Single w/dependent children
   ○ Married/Domestic Partnership
   ○ Married/Domestic Partnership w/dependent children
   ○ Separated/Divorced/Widowed
   ○ Never married

3) Educational attainment, please check the highest degree earned or current enrollment status:
   ○ Some college
   ○ Associate's degree
   ○ Bachelor’s degree
   ○ Master’s degree
   ○ Doctorate degree (EdD, PhD)
   ○ Currently enrolled in Master's program
   ○ Currently enrolled in Doctorate program

4) Number of years working in higher education:
   ○ 1-5
   ○ 6-10
   ○ 11-15
   ○ 16-20
   ○ 20+

5) Number of years working in administrative positions in higher education:

6) Number of years in current position:
7) Position at your institution:
☐ President
☐ Senior Executive or Chief Officer
☐ Provost/Vice President
☐ Associate/Assistant Provost
☐ Associate/Assistant Vice President
☐ Dean
☐ Associate/Assistant Dean
☐ Chair
☐ Director
☐ Associate/Assistant Director
☐ Teaching Professional
☐ Other (please specify): ____________________

8) Is this a permanent role or are you acting or interim?
☐ Permanent
☐ Acting or Interim

9) Department or principal area of current position:
☐ Academic Affairs
☐ Athletics
☐ Business/Administrative Services
☐ Enrollment Management
☐ External Affairs
☐ Human Resources
☐ Information Technology
☐ Services (food services, janitorial, etc).
☐ Student Affairs
☐ Other (please specify): ____________________

10) Institution type:
☐ Two-year public
☐ Two-year private
☐ Four-year public undergraduate programs only
☐ Four-year public undergraduate and graduate programs
☐ Four-year private undergraduate programs only
☐ Four-year private undergraduate and graduate programs
Part II: Career Plans

Please indicate whether you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities to a higher level administrative/leadership position and rate the factors that would impact your decision.

11) Do you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities to a higher level administrative/leadership position?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure (please explain): ____________________

12a) If you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, what factors would impact your decision to advance to a higher level administrative/leadership position? Please provide a response for each of the following factors A-J, by order of importance to you.

   A. Opportunity to exercise autonomy and independence.
      - 1 - Not important
      - 2 - Somewhat important
      - 3 - Neutral
      - 4 - Moderately Important
      - 5 - Most Important

   B. Opportunity to use entrepreneurial creativity
      - 1 - Not important
      - 2 - Somewhat important
      - 3 - Neutral
      - 4 - Moderately Important
      - 5 - Most Important

   C. Opportunity to use managerial skills
      - 1 - Not important
      - 2 - Somewhat important
      - 3 - Neutral
      - 4 - Moderately Important
      - 5 - Most Important

   D. Opportunity to balance personal and professional obligations
      - 1 - Not important
      - 2 - Somewhat important
      - 3 - Neutral
      - 4 - Moderately Important
      - 5 - Most Important

   E. Opportunity to address a major challenge
12b) If you are unsure or do not plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, what factors would impact your decision not to advance to a higher level.
administrative/leadership position? Please provide a response for each of the following factors A-J, by order of importance to you.

If you plan to pursue career advancement opportunities, please skip this page.

A. Lack of opportunity to exercise autonomy and independence.
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
   - 3 - Neutral
   - 4 - Moderately Important
   - 5 - Most Important

B. Lack of opportunity to use entrepreneurial creativity
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
   - 3 - Neutral
   - 4 - Moderately Important
   - 5 - Most Important

C. Lack of opportunity to use managerial skills
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
   - 3 - Neutral
   - 4 - Moderately Important
   - 5 - Most Important

D. Lack of opportunity to balance personal and professional obligations
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
   - 3 - Neutral
   - 4 - Moderately Important
   - 5 - Most Important

E. Lack of opportunity to address a major challenge
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
   - 3 - Neutral
   - 4 - Moderately Important
   - 5 - Most Important

F. Lack of opportunity for long-term security and stability
   - 1 - Not important
   - 2 - Somewhat important
3 - Neutral  
4 - Moderately Important  
5 - Most Important  

G. Lack of opportunity to provide service to others  
1 - Not important  
2 - Somewhat important  
3 - Neutral  
4 - Moderately Important  
5 - Most Important  

H. Lack of opportunity to use technical or functional skills  
1 - Not important  
2 - Somewhat important  
3 - Neutral  
4 - Moderately Important  
5 - Most Important  

I. Lack of opportunity to use leadership skills  
1 - Not important  
2 - Somewhat important  
3 - Neutral  
4 - Moderately Important  
5 - Most Important  

J. Lack of opportunity to advance to higher level administrative/leadership position  
1 - Not important  
2 - Somewhat important  
3 - Neutral  
4 - Moderately Important  
5 - Most Important
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Career Orientations Inventory

Part III: Career Orientations Inventory

Please rate each of the following, by how true each item is for you in general.

13) I dream of being so good at what I do that my expert advice will be sought continually.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

14) I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to integrate and manage the efforts of others.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

15) I dream of having a career that will allow me the freedom to do a job my own way and on my own schedule.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

16) Security and stability are more important to me than freedom and autonomy.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True
17) I am on the lookout for ideas that would allow me to start my own enterprise.
   ☑ 1 - Never True
   ☑ 2 - Almost Never True
   ☑ 3 - Occasionally True
   ☑ 4 - Often True
   ☑ 5 - Almost Always True
   ☑ 6 - Always True

18) I will feel successful in my career only if I have a feeling of having made a real
    contribution to the welfare of society.
   ☑ 1 - Never True
   ☑ 2 - Almost Never True
   ☑ 3 - Occasionally True
   ☑ 4 - Often True
   ☑ 5 - Almost Always True
   ☑ 6 - Always True

19) I dream of a career in which I can solve problems or win out in situations that are
    extremely challenging.
   ☑ 1 - Never True
   ☑ 2 - Almost Never True
   ☑ 3 - Occasionally True
   ☑ 4 - Often True
   ☑ 5 - Almost Always True
   ☑ 6 - Always True

20) I would rather leave my organization than to be put into a job that would compromise
    my ability to pursue personal and family concerns.
   ☑ 1 - Never True
   ☑ 2 - Almost Never True
   ☑ 3 - Occasionally True
   ☑ 4 - Often True
   ☑ 5 - Almost Always True
   ☑ 6 - Always True

21) I will feel successful in my career only if I can develop my technical or functional
    skills to a very high level of competence.
   ☑ 1 - Never True
   ☑ 2 - Almost Never True
   ☑ 3 - Occasionally True
   ☑ 4 - Often True
   ☑ 5 - Almost Always True
   ☑ 6 - Always True
22) I dream of being in charge of a complex organization and making decisions that affect many people.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True

23) I am most fulfilled in my work when I am completely free to define my own tasks, schedules, and procedures.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True

24) I would rather leave my organization altogether than accept an assignment that would jeopardize my security in that organization.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True

25) Building my own business is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position in someone else’s organization.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True

26) I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to use my talents in the service of others.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True
27) I will feel successful in my career only if I face and overcome very difficult challenges.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

28) I dream of a career that will permit me to integrate my personal, family, and work needs.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

29) Becoming a senior functional manager in my area of expertise is more attractive to me than becoming a general manager.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

30) I will feel successful in my career only if I become a general manager in some organization.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

31) I will feel successful in my career only if I achieve complete autonomy and freedom.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True
32) I seek jobs in organizations that will give me a sense of security and stability.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

33) I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to build something that is entirely the result of my own ideas and efforts.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

34) Using my skills to make the world a better place to live and work is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

35) I have been most fulfilled in my career when I have solved seemingly unsolvable problems or won out over seemingly impossible odds.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True

36) I feel successful in life only if I have been able to balance my personal, family, and career requirements.
   - 1 - Never True
   - 2 - Almost Never True
   - 3 - Occasionally True
   - 4 - Often True
   - 5 - Almost Always True
   - 6 - Always True
37) I would rather leave my organization than accept a rotational assignment that would take me out of my area of expertise.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

38) Becoming a general manager is more attractive to me than becoming a senior functional manager in my current area of expertise.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

39) The chance to do a job my own way, free of rules and constraints, is more important to me than security.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

40) I am most fulfilled in my work when I feel that I have complete financial and employment security.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True

41) I will feel successful in my career only if I have succeeded in creating or building something that is entirely my own product or idea.
   1 - Never True
   2 - Almost Never True
   3 - Occasionally True
   4 - Often True
   5 - Almost Always True
   6 - Always True
42) I dream of having a career that makes a real contribution to humanity and society.
- 1 - Never True
- 2 - Almost Never True
- 3 - Occasionally True
- 4 - Often True
- 5 - Almost Always True
- 6 - Always True

43) I seek out work opportunities that strongly challenge my problem solving and/or competitive skills.
- 1 - Never True
- 2 - Almost Never True
- 3 - Occasionally True
- 4 - Often True
- 5 - Almost Always True
- 6 - Always True

44) Balancing the demands of personal and professional life is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.
- 1 - Never True
- 2 - Almost Never True
- 3 - Occasionally True
- 4 - Often True
- 5 - Almost Always True
- 6 - Always True

45) I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to use my special skills and talents.
- 1 - Never True
- 2 - Almost Never True
- 3 - Occasionally True
- 4 - Often True
- 5 - Almost Always True
- 6 - Always True

46) I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would take me away from the general managerial track.
- 1 - Never True
- 2 - Almost Never True
- 3 - Occasionally True
- 4 - Often True
- 5 - Almost Always True
- 6 - Always True
47) I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would reduce my autonomy and freedom.
   ○ 1 - Never True
   ○ 2 - Almost Never True
   ○ 3 - Occasionally True
   ○ 4 - Often True
   ○ 5 - Almost Always True
   ○ 6 - Always True

48) I dream of having a career that will allow me to feel a sense of security and stability.
   ○ 1 - Never True
   ○ 2 - Almost Never True
   ○ 3 - Occasionally True
   ○ 4 - Often True
   ○ 5 - Almost Always True
   ○ 6 - Always True

49) I dream of starting up and building my own business.
   ○ 1 - Never True
   ○ 2 - Almost Never True
   ○ 3 - Occasionally True
   ○ 4 - Often True
   ○ 5 - Almost Always True
   ○ 6 - Always True

50) I would rather leave my organization than accept an assignment that would undermine my ability to be of service to others.
   ○ 1 - Never True
   ○ 2 - Almost Never True
   ○ 3 - Occasionally True
   ○ 4 - Often True
   ○ 5 - Almost Always True
   ○ 6 - Always True

51) Working on problems that are almost unsolvable is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.
   ○ 1 - Never True
   ○ 2 - Almost Never True
   ○ 3 - Occasionally True
   ○ 4 - Often True
   ○ 5 - Almost Always True
   ○ 6 - Always True
52) I have always sought out work opportunities that would minimize interference with personal or family concerns.
☐ 1 - Never True
☐ 2 - Almost Never True
☐ 3 - Occasionally True
☐ 4 - Often True
☐ 5 - Almost Always True
☐ 6 - Always True

Would you like to receive a copy of the dissertation abstract when the study is complete? If yes, please provide email address or call 646-772-1757 to request a copy.
☐ Yes: ______________________
☐ No
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The 40 COI Items Organized by Career Anchor

Questions 3, 11, 19, 27, and 35 collect information related to the **Autonomy/Independence** Career Anchor.

3. I dream of having a career that will allow me the freedom to do a job my own way and on my own schedule.
11. I am most fulfilled in my work when I am completely free to define my own tasks, schedules, and procedures.
19. I will feel successful in my career only if I achieve complete autonomy and freedom.
27. The chance to do a job my own way, free of rules and constraints is more important to me than security.
35. I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would reduce my autonomy and freedom.

Questions 2, 10, 18, 26, and 34 collect information related to the **General Managerial Competence** Career Anchor.

2. I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to integrate and manage the efforts of others.
10. I dream of being in charge of a complex organization and making decisions that affect many people.
18. I will feel successful in my career only if I become a general manager in some organization.
26. Becoming a general manager is more attractive to me than becoming a senior functional manager in my current area of expertise.
34. I would rather leave my organization than accept a job that would take me away from the general managerial track.

Questions 5, 13, 21, 29, and 37 collect information related to the **Entrepreneurial Creativity** Career Anchor.

5. I am always on the lookout for ideas that would allow me to start my own enterprise.
13. Building my own business is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position in someone else’s organization.
21. I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to build something that is entirely the result of my own ideas and efforts.
29. I will feel successful in my career only if I have succeeded in creating or building something that is entirely my own product or idea.
37. I dream of starting up and building my own business.

Questions 8, 16, 24, 32, and 40 collect information related to the **Lifestyle** Career Anchor.
8. I would rather leave my organization than to be put into a job that would compromise my ability to pursue personal and family concerns.
16. I dream of a career that will permit me to integrate my personal, family, and work needs.
24. I feel successful in life only if I have been able to balance my personal, family, and career requirements.
32. Balancing the demands of personal and professional life is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.
40. I have always sought out work opportunities that would minimize interference with personal or family concerns.

Questions 7, 15, 23, 31 and 39 collect information related to the Pure Challenge Career Anchor.
7. I dream of a career in which I can solve problems or win out in situations that are extremely challenging.
15. I will feel successful in my career only if I face and overcome very difficult challenges.
23. I have been most fulfilled in my career when I have solved seemingly unsolvable problems or won out over seemingly impossible odds.
31. I seek out work opportunities that strongly challenge my problem solving and/or competitive skills.
39. Working on problems that are almost unsolvable is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.

Questions 4, 12, 20, 28, and 36 collect information related to the Security/Stability Career Anchor.
4. Security and stability are more important to me than freedom and autonomy.
12. I would rather leave my organization altogether than accept an assignment that would jeopardize my security in that organization.
20. I seek jobs in organizations that will give me a sense of security and stability.
28. I am most fulfilled in my work when I feel that I have complete financial and employment security.
36. I dream of having a career that will allow me to feel a sense of security and stability.

Questions 6, 14, 22, 30, and 38 collect information related to the Service/Dedication to a Cause Career Anchor.
6. I will feel successful in my career only if I have a feeling of having made a real contribution to the welfare of society.
14. I am most fulfilled in my career when I have been able to use my talents in the service of others.
22. Using my skills to make the world a better place to live and work is more important to me than achieving a high-level managerial position.
30. I dream of having a career that makes a real contribution to humanity and society.
38. I would rather leave my organization than accept an assignment that would undermine my ability to be of service to others.
Questions 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33 collect information related to the **Technical/Functional Competence** Career Anchor.

1. I dream of being so good at what I do that my expert advice will be sought continually.
2. I will feel successful in my career only if I can develop my technical or functional skills to a very high level of competence.
3. Becoming a senior functional manager in my area of expertise is more attractive to me than becoming a general manager.
4. I would rather leave my organization than accept a rotational assignment that would take me out of my area of expertise.
5. I am most fulfilled in my work when I have been able to use my special skills and talents.
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From: Goldweber, Paulette - Hoboken [mailto:pgoldweb@wiley.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 8:42 AM
To: Kim McKinsey-Mabry
Subject: RE: Career Orientations Inventory Permission Request

Dear Kim,

Thank you for your purchase and we look forward to receiving your dissertation.

Best wishes,
Paulette Goldweber
Associate Manager, Permissions
Global Rights
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
ph: 201-748-8765
f: 201-748-6008
pgoldweb@wiley.com

From: Kim McKinsey-Mabry [mailto:kim05983@sjfc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 10:29 PM
To: Goldweber, Paulette - Hoboken
Subject: RE: Career Orientations Inventory Permission Request
Importance: High

Greetings Ms. Goldweber,

I just wanted to take a moment to follow-up with you to inform you that based on your request below, I have made the required purchase necessary to use Edgar Schein’s Career Orientations Inventory for my research and in my dissertation. I will properly cite the material and will forward you a copy of the final dissertation, once it is approved from my institution.

If you agree to the information in this email, please respond accordingly. Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Thank you,
Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry
646-772-1757 mobile
kim05983@sjfc.edu

From: Goldweber, Paulette - Hoboken [mailto:pgoldweb@wiley.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 4:22 PM
To: kim05983@sjfc.edu
Subject: RE: Career Orientations Inventory Permission Request

Dear Ms. McKinsey-Mabrey:

In order to use the inventory as a part of your dissertation, a copy of the most current edition must be purchased. The purchased material may then be used in the as a part of your dissertation research as long as the material properly credited on all reproductions. Once your research has
been completed, a copy should be sent to us as well in order for the permission to be considered cleared.

Thank you,
Paulette Goldweber
Associate Manager, Permissions
Global Rights
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
ph: 201-748-8765
f: 201-748-6008
pgoldweb@wiley.com

From: Kim McKinsey-Mabry [mailto:kim05983@sjfc.edu]
Sent: 08 February 2011 03:03
To: Permission Requests - UK
Subject: Career Orientations Inventory Permission Request

Greetings:

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry and I am a doctoral student in the Executive Leadership Program in the School of Education at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York. I am currently working on my dissertation proposal in which I am interested in identifying Factors Impacting the Career Decisions of Black Women in Leadership Positions in Institutions of Higher Education. The purpose of the study is to gain a broader perspective of the career decisions and career paths of Black women who work in management level leadership positions in higher education including, but not limited to, senior executive and chief functional officer, academic dean, associate/assistant dean, provost, associate/assistant provost, vice president, assistant/associate vice president, department chair, and director/program director. Overall, the purpose of my study is to identify the career anchors of Black women leaders in higher education.

Hence, the reason for my email is to request your permission to use the career orientations inventory (COI) in my research study. This inventory will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request. I look forward to hearing from you soon. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns regarding my study, please do feel free to contact me.

Respectfully Yours,
Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry
646-772-1757 mobile
kim05983@sjfc.edu
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Dear Colleague,

My name is Kimberly McKinsey-Mabry and I am a doctoral candidate in the Ed. D Program in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York. Thank you for your interest in participating in this dissertation research.

The purpose of this research is to complete a doctoral dissertation, which will be published upon completion and available in St. John Fisher College’s Lavery Library. The topic for this study is "An Examination of Factors Impacting the Career Decisions of Black Women in Management Level Positions in US Institutions of Higher Education". The results and findings of the study may be shared at national or state conferences. The researcher has no plans for disseminating the study beyond these venues.

Your participation in this research is voluntary and your anonymity is guaranteed. This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. When the results of the study are reported, participants will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to infer identity. You may choose to not answer particular questions in the survey and you may withdraw your participation from the study at any time.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions or concerns regarding this survey or the study, please contact me at kim05983@sjfc.edu or 646-772-1757.

Informed Consent:  By clicking "yes" the question below and answering the survey questions in part I, part II, and part III of this survey; you are providing informed consent to participate in this study. Do you agree to voluntarily participate in this survey?

☐ Yes

☐ No