
Are Minority Women Sociologists in Double Jeopardy?

STEPHEN KULIS AND KAREN A. MILLER

We examine whether minority women in academic sociology face disadvantages that exceed those that would be expected by simply compounding the disadvantage of being a woman with that of being nonwhite or Hispanic. In a national survey of sociology departments, evidence of such "double jeopardy" appears in minority women's severe underrepresentation among full professors, in both very small and very large departments, in undergraduate programs, in the Northeast, and in public institutions. Minority women are somewhat better represented among graduate students, but disadvantaged relative to minority men in their share of financial support. A pool of doctoral students now exists from which minority women faculty may be recruited, but these women appear to be leaving faculties faster than they are being replaced.

Since the 1960s, women in academic sociology have inched slowly toward equity with men; progress for minorities has been even slower, and may have stalled in the 1980s (Kulis, Miller, Axelrod and Gordon 1986a,b; 1987; Kulis 1988; Miller, Kulis, Gordon and Axelrod 1988a, 1988b). Both women and minorities still suffer from underrepresentation within the discipline, particularly at the higher levels of academic rank and tenure. In this paper we analyze the extent to which *minority women* in academic sociology experience "double jeopardy"—disadvantages exacerbated by membership in both disadvantaged groups.

It is generally recognized that minority women within academia do indeed experience multiple difficulties (Carroll 1973; Alperson 1975; de Joie 1977; Menges and Exum 1983; Theodore 1986; but see Epstein, 1973, for an alternative view of how the "multiple negative" can have positive effects for a few exceptional black women). One important question involves in what ways and at what

Stephen Kulis is assistant professor of sociology at Arizona State University. His research interests include intergenerational family structure, social support across the life course, and U.S. antipoverty policy. He is currently collaborating on a longitudinal study of institutional predictors of the pace of affirmative action for women faculty in sociology. Karen A. Miller is associate professor of sociology at Arizona State University. Her major research interest is in the area of work and personality. She is collaborating on a longitudinal study of women and minorities in U.S. sociology departments. Address correspondence to Department of Sociology, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287-2101.

points of the academic career minority women appear to be most disadvantaged. Menges and Exum (1983) found that, compared to nonminority women and minority men, minority women are the least well represented group among tenured academics. Minority women are frequently called upon to represent *both* women and minorities as tokens on various committees; these double assignments take time and energy from work more directly related to scholarship and career success (Theodore 1986, p. 202; de Joie 1977). The legitimacy of scholarship on minority women's issues tends to be questioned on grounds of both race and sex (Theodore 1986, p. 50). Carroll (1973) and de Joie (1977) examine the psychological difficulties experienced by minority women academics as a result of their isolated and marginal positions. Many other studies document the difficulties of women and of minorities, examined as separate groups, in achieving success within academic careers. There is some consensus that affirmative action has aided white women and minority men considerably more than minority women (Carroll 1973; Alperson 1975; de Joie 1977).

Minority women are incorporated into academic sociology through complex interactions of individual, departmental, and institutional decisions, each of which is influenced by prevailing economic, social and political conditions. Little is known about the factors that lead minority women in particular to seek advanced training in sociology and later pursue an academic career. Minority women occupy an uncertain position within countervailing trends in sociology, and in academia generally. First, it is unclear whether minority women have participated equally with white women in the slow process by which the profession of sociology is becoming "feminized." With women now comprising the majority of graduate students in sociology, and, in some recent years, the majority of new sociology Ph.D's (Coyle 1986), minority women might be expected to confront diminishing obstacles due to their gender. In the last decade, however, the participation of minorities as undergraduate and graduate students in sociology has levelled off or declined (Kulis, Miller, Axelrod and Gordon 1986a). This second trend reflects sharply increasing tuition costs and the withdrawal of federal funds for grants and work-study jobs, which may discourage minority students of modest means from undertaking or completing a college degree. And those who do persist in their studies may be drawn increasingly to the more certain employment and financial prospects of professional rather than liberal arts degrees.

While these human capital factors have influenced the "supply" of minority and women candidates for academic positions in sociology, another set of mixed trends within the profession has shaped the "demand" for them. Academic sociology has experienced a decade of contraction or stagnation, at least up to the mid-1980s. Faculties generally have ceased to grow, and student enrollments, both of undergraduate majors, and of graduate students, have declined (Kulis, Miller, Axelrod and Gordon 1986a). In this period minorities and women have secured academic positions generally through turnover processes rather than through the expansion of opportunities. But they may have benefited from a

relatively high awareness and close monitoring of the level of participation of women and minorities within the profession, particularly through its national and regional associations. In addition, coinciding with the gradual “feminization” of the profession, salaries in academic sociology have fallen relative to those in other disciplines, making available job opportunities less attractive to some potential white male candidates. Again, however, it is unclear how these factors have combined to open or close opportunities for minority women.

The level of representation of minority women within academic sociology can be assessed meaningfully only against the backdrop of these trends in supply and demand. Without measuring these dynamics directly, we attempt to characterize aspects of the changing opportunity structure in the profession by, for example, measuring the relative size of the available pool of minority women graduate students, and by comparing the rates at which minority women enter and depart faculty appointments to the corresponding rates for men and for white women. We also directly address an issue that has not been distinguished in the literature on minority women academics, namely whether “double jeopardy” is simply the additive effect of the disadvantage of being female plus that of being a member of a minority group—what we shall term “compounded” jeopardy—or whether there is some extra disadvantage to possessing both devalued characteristics simultaneously—what we shall term “aggravated” jeopardy.

Methods

Data for this study come from a survey of sociology departments across the United States. The population was defined as sociology departments, or “social science” departments which offered sociology courses, in all U.S. four-year colleges or universities. Eligible departments were identified from the 1984 American Sociological Association *Directory of Sociology Departments*. The sampling frame included all such departments from the western United States, and a random sample of the remaining departments across the nation, stratified by the size of the college or university student body and whether or not the department offered graduate sociology degrees.¹ The study carried the endorsement of the presidents of the American and the Pacific Sociological Associations. Ninety-one percent of the eligible departments completed questionnaires, making the properly weighted sample highly representative of the nation’s sociology departments in four-year institutions in 1984.

Chairs of eligible departments were sent questionnaires and asked to list the sociologists currently in their departments, including adjunct and part-time faculty, and to report their sex, race or ethnicity, rank, tenure status and committee assignments. For departments with graduate programs, graduate students were enumerated by sex and race or ethnicity, both for all enrolled graduate students, and separately for those students receiving financial support. The chairs also recorded the sex and ethnicity of faculty who had begun or who had ended appointments in the department within the previous five years.

Although the sample was comprised of 230 departmental entities, most of the following analysis utilizes aggregated data on 1634 sociology faculty members and 1351 graduate students in those departments. Departmental and institutional characteristics (e.g., departmental size, regional location, public/private auspices) are analyzed primarily as contextual variables that apply to individual faculty members. Our analysis focuses on two issues: (1) the correlates of variation in the proportional representation of minority women, by which we mean all nonwhite or Hispanic women, and (2) whether their representation exceeds, matches or falls below the level we would expect from the proportion that is comprised of women and the proportion that is comprised of minorities.

Findings

Both minorities and women are severely underrepresented in academic sociology, comprising, respectively, 11.6 and 24.3 percent of faculty members. If the underrepresentation of these two statuses were simply compounded, we would expect that 2.8 percent of faculty members would be minority women. But they actually comprise a significantly smaller proportion of sociology faculty members, only 1.9 percent (Table 1). Minority faculty are much more likely to be found among male than among female faculty. While white men outnumber minority men by 7 to 1, there are 12 times more white women than minority women. Of the 32 minority women in the sample, a large majority, 75 percent, is black. In all our analyses, this number is sufficient to note results separately for black women as well as together with the small number of other minority women. These consist of an Hispanic, a Native American, and 6 Asian women.² In selected tables, we present results separately for Hispanic and Asian women to illustrate their sparse presence in comparison to Hispanic and Asian men.

The extent to which minority women face a situation of simply compounded versus aggravated "double jeopardy" varies according to departmental and institutional characteristics. These women occupy the highest percentage of faculty positions in moderately sized departments of 11 to 20 members, and the smallest percentage in very large departments of more than 26 faculty members (Table 1). In departments with fewer than 11, or more than 26 members, there are significantly fewer minority women than we would expect based on the percentages of women, and of minorities, respectively. In departments with 11 to 20 members, however, there are more minority women than expected (although not significantly more). As a result, the minority women in academic sociology appear to be concentrated in these mid-size departments; 56 percent of minority women and 67 percent of black women are found in departments of this size.

The variation in representation by faculty size may reflect an attitude of "tokenism" in hiring and retention practices. Departments of 10 or fewer members may consider themselves too small to recruit minority women. And departments of over 20 members may consider it unnecessary to appoint more than one minority woman, even if it leaves this group quite underrepresented. Analysis at

TABLE 1
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty
by Size of Departmental Faculty

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	FACULTY SIZE					Total N
	All Faculty	1 - 10	11 - 20	21 - 26	27 or More	
White Men	66.0%	63.7%	64.9%	72.1%	70.6%	1072
Minority Men	9.7	9.1	11.6	7.7	9.6	157
(Black Men)	(4.2)	(3.2)	(6.0)	(1.9)	(6.3)	(68)
(Hispanic Men)	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.9)	(1.3)	(1.4)	(27)
(Asian Men)	(3.2)	(3.1)	(3.6)	(4.6)	(1.9)	(52)
White Women	22.4	26.0	19.1	18.9	19.0	363
Minority Women	1.9**	1.2**	4.3	1.3	0.8+	32
(Black Women)	(1.5)	(0.5)	(3.9)	(1.1)	(0.7)	(24)
(Hispanic Women)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1)
(Asian Women)	(0.4)	(0.7)	(0.2)	(0.0)	(0.1)	(6)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Total N	1624	782	408	185	250	1624

Note: In this and all following tables, results are not presented separately for members of minority groups other than Blacks, Hispanics and Asians. These include nine Native American men and an unspecified minority man who are represented as part of the "minority men" category. One Native American woman and another unspecified minority woman are included in the "minority women" category.

Significantly (**p < .01; +p < .10) fewer minority women than expected from the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by faculty size = 30.0 (p < .000).

the departmental level supports this view. Ninety-five percent of departments with 10 or fewer members (weighted n = 185) have no minority women faculty. Somewhat larger departments are considerably more likely to appoint a minority woman to the faculty. In departments with 11 to 20 members (weighted n = 29), 31 percent have minority women faculty. But with additional increases in faculty size, and, presumably, more opportunities to make appointments, the proportional representation of minority women actually declines. Among departments with more than 20 members (weighted n = 16), only 26 percent have minority women on the faculty. Another indication of tokenism is that only 3 departments have more than one minority woman on the faculty, and they are all departments of moderate rather than large size.

Minority women as a group are more highly concentrated in one region, the South, than either white men, minority men or white women (Table 2). Forty-five percent of minority women, and about 60 percent of black women, are located there. The next most regionally concentrated group is minority men, nearly one-third of whom also work in the South. Despite the clustering of minority women, all of whom are black, in the South, their share of faculty positions is less than 3 percent (Table 3). In the Northeast and the West, their proportional representation is less than half of that. In every region of the country there are fewer minority women than expected, based on the respective proportions of minorities and of women, but from a statistical point of view there are significantly fewer only in the Northeast. One reason for this is that faculties in the Northeast have a

TABLE 2
Distribution of Faculty into U.S. Regions, Academic Ranks,
and Tenured Positions, by Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity

	SEX & RACE/ETHNICITY					
	White Men	Minority Men	White Women	Minority Women	Black Women	
REGION						
Northeast	23.0%	27.3%	30.3%	13.3%	0.0%	404
Midwest	29.6	25.6	25.5	29.3	35.1	457
South	30.4	32.2	29.2	45.3	59.7	497
West	17.0	16.9	15.1	12.7	5.3	267
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Total N	1072	157	363	32	24	1624
ACADEMIC RANK						
Professor	43.7	9.2	14.9	4.0	1.8	580
Associate Professor	32.5	31.9	30.6	31.5	25.4	514
Assistant Professor	16.8	22.0	34.9	49.0	55.3	353
Lecturer/Instructor	2.1	0.7	10.9	0.7	0.0	63
Adjunct/Visiting	4.8	6.2	8.7	14.8	17.5	97
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Total N	1063	156	356	31	24	1607
TENURE STATUS						
Tenured	80.7	78.2	50.9	61.0	53.6	1148
Tenure Track	13.3	15.7	27.4	24.7	30.9	265
Not Tenure Track	6.0	6.1	21.7	14.4	15.5	151
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Total N	1032	152	350	31	23	1564

TABLE 3
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty by Region

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	U.S. REGION			
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West
White Men	61.0%	69.6%	65.7%	68.2%
Minority Men	10.6	8.1	10.2	9.9
(Black Men)	(4.4)	(3.7)	(5.6)	(2.3)
(Hispanic Men)	(1.3)	(0.2)	(2.5)	(3.2)
(Asian Men)	(3.3)	(4.1)	(1.9)	(4.1)
White Women	27.3	20.3	21.3	20.5
Minority Women	1.0**	2.0	2.9	1.4
(Black Women)	(0.0)	(1.8)	(2.9)	(0.5)
(Hispanic Women)	(0.0)	(0.2)	(0.0)	(0.2)
(Asian Women)	(1.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.6)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N	403	457	497	267

**Significantly ($p < .10$) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by region = 14.5 ($p < .11$).

higher proportion of women than other regions, which increases the expected probability for minority women, an expectation that is not met in reality.

Like white women and minority men, minority women are less well represented in departments with graduate programs, comprising 1.5 percent of the faculty, than in those with only undergraduate instruction, where they make up 2.4 percent (Table 4). Although minority women are more likely to enter positions that emphasize undergraduate teaching rather than research, they are not found more often in small colleges. Minority women are actually somewhat better represented in colleges or universities with enrollments of 5000 or more than in those with fewer students. They are also better represented in independently operated than in public institutions, despite the possibility of more closely monitored affirmative action procedures in the latter (Table 5). This difference reflects the generally larger size of the sociology faculty in public versus independently spon-

TABLE 4
 Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty by Departmental
 Program and Total College/University Enrollment

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM		ENROLLMENT	
	Undergraduate Only	Undergraduate and Graduate	Under 5000	5000 or More
White Men	61.3%	71.4%	63.5%	67.4%
Minority Men	11.2	8.0	9.1	10.0
(Black Men)	(4.4)	(4.1)	(4.4)	(4.1)
(Hispanic Men)	(2.1)	(1.1)	(1.3)	(1.9)
(Asian Men)	(3.8)	(2.6)	(2.6)	(3.5)
White Women	25.2	19.2	25.7	20.6
Minority Women	2.4**	1.5	1.7*	2.0+
(Black Women)	(1.8)	(1.1)	(0.8)	(1.8)
(Hispanic Women)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.1)
(Asian Women)	(0.5)	(0.2)	(0.9)	(0.1)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N	865	759	530	1620

Significantly (**p < .01; *p < .05; +p < .10) fewer minority women than expected from the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by program = 18.6 (p < .001).

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by enrollment = 5.5 (p < .14).

sored institutions. When faculty size and auspices are jointly examined minority women, both black and non-black, are found to be best represented, comprising over 5 percent of the sociology faculty, in public institutions with 11 to 20 sociology faculty members.

Table 4 points to a paradoxical relationship between the risk of "double jeopardy" for minority women, and women's representation overall. Where minority women comprise the smallest percentage of the faculty, such as in departments with graduate programs, the actual numbers of minority women are *not* significantly fewer than expected, based on the proportional representation of women and of minorities. In departments without graduate programs, minority women are better represented but there are significantly fewer minority women

TABLE 5
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty
by College/University Auspices

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	AUSPICES		
	Public	Independent	Religions
White Men	66.9%	57.4%	78.4%
Minority Men	11.5	6.7	5.3
(Black Men)	(4.9)	(4.4)	(0.3)
(Hispanic Men)	(2.3)	(0.7)	(0.3)
(Asian Men)	(3.9)	(0.6)	(4.7)
White Women	19.7	33.5	15.3
Minority Women	2.0*	2.4	1.0
(Black Women)	(1.8)	(1.3)	(0.4)
(Hispanic Women)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.1)
(Asian Women)	(0.1)	(1.2)	(0.4)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N	1056	367	197

*Significantly ($p < .05$) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by auspices = 49.5 ($p < .001$).

than expected. In the latter type of department women comprise a relatively large portion of the faculty, over 27 percent, but they are overwhelmingly white women. In these departments there are almost 5 times more men than women among the minority faculty, but there are more than 10 white women for every minority woman. The more equitable sex ratio in these departments is not accompanied by an equally improved racial and ethnic balance. The same point applies to differences between religious and public institutions (Table 5). The religious have proportionally fewer minority women, but only the public departments have significantly fewer minority women than expected. This is because both the percentage of women and of minority faculty is higher in public than in religious departments, so far more minority women would be expected in the public departments. Religious departments closely match the tiny number of minority women faculty that their small proportions of women and of minority faculty would lead us to expect.

The underrepresentation of minority women is especially acute among full professors, where they comprise only a fraction of one percent. At the lower rank

of assistant professor, they account for more than 4 percent (Table 6). Unlike white women, minority women are quite rarely appointed to lecturer, instructor, or adjunct positions. Nevertheless, minority women hold lower average academic rank than either white women or men (Table 2). Only 4 percent of minority women (and less than 2 percent of black women) are full professors, compared to 15 percent of white women, 39 percent of minority men, and 44 percent of white men. About half of minority women are assistant professors, and a substantial proportion, 15 percent, have irregular positions as adjunct and visiting professors. There is a revealing anomaly in the tenure rates of minority women (Table 2). They are 17 percent less likely than minority men to be tenured, but they are more likely to have tenure than white women. Curiously, only 36 percent of

TABLE 6
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty by Academic Rank

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	ACADEMIC RANK			
	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer/ Instructor/ Other
White Men	80.1%	67.2%	50.7%	36.1%
Minority Men	10.5	9.7	9.7	1.7
(Black Men)	(4.6)	(2.7)	(5.2)	(1.0)
(Hispanic Men)	(1.7)	(2.2)	(1.1)	(0.7)
(Asian Men)	(4.1)	(3.1)	(3.4)	(0.0)
White Women	9.1	21.2	35.3	61.9
Minority Women	0.2*	1.9	4.4	0.3
(Black Women)	(0.1)	(1.2)	(3.8)	(0.0)
(Hispanic Women)	(0.0)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.0)
(Asian Women)	(0.1)	(0.7)	(0.3)	(0.3)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N	580	514	353	63

Note: other ranks include visiting, adjunct and emeriti professors.

*Significantly ($p < .05$) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of Faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Chi-Square for joint sex and race/ethnicity by rank = 191.1 ($p < .001$).

minority women are full or associate professors, but 61 percent of minority women have tenure. Tenured assistant professors are normally quite rare; only 8 percent of all tenured faculty occupy this rank. But 58 percent of the tenured minority women are assistant professors. Even when tenured, most minority women remain at low academic ranks. Is this a positive reflection of affirmative action in tenure decisions, the extension of job security to those who have not yet established the scholarly record necessary for promotion to higher rank? Or is the extension of tenure a recognition of extraordinary committee service, which also impedes scholarly production and diminishes prospects for promotion? Or is this merely discrimination in promotion, a grudging extension of tenure without its usual rewards?

Our data cannot resolve all of these questions, but some of our data is consistent with the second explanation above. Minority women bear heavy committee responsibilities (Table 7). Both those who are tenured and those who are tenure track are far more likely than men, white and minority, to serve on two or more

TABLE 7
Percentage of Faculty (Excluding Chairs and Administrators)
with Two or More Committee Assignments, by Tenure Status
and Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	TENURE STATUS		
	Tenured	Tenure Track	Not Tenure Track
White Men -N-	65.6 -530-	58.3 -121-	17.2 -40-
Minority Men -N-	61.9 -72-	79.6 -21-	4.0 -5-
Black Men* -N-	58.5 -31-	91.1 -9-	0.0 -3-
White Women -N-	74.5 -111-	47.5 -71-	12.6 -52-
Minority Women -N-	73.3 -13-	85.7 -8-	0.0 -1-
Black Women* -N-	100.0 -8-	84.8 -7-	0.0 -1-

*Disaggregated results for Hispanic and Asian men and women are not presented. Their numbers are too few to generate meaningful percentages.

committees. Among those who are tenure track, for whom burdensome committee duties may present an obstacle to the attainment of a promotion in rank, minority women are almost twice as likely as white women to have multiple committee duties.

In contrast to their presence among faculty, minority women are nearly as well represented among sociology graduate students as their minority male counterparts, each accounting for about 10 percent (Table 8). Among white graduate students the sex ratio is more unbalanced; 58 percent are female. This places women in the majority among enrolled graduate students. It also means that the expected numbers of minority women graduate students exceed the actual expected numbers by a significant margin. In other words, minority women numerically are on a par with minority men, but are fewer than expected, given that women students are now a majority overall.

Relative to their ability to attract and retain male students, departments are less

TABLE 8
Distribution of Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity
of Enrolled and Financially Assisted Graduate Students

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	Enrolled Graduate Students	Supported Graduate Students	Percent Receiving Support	(N)
White Males	33.3%	34.0%	60.3%	(449)
Minority Males	10.4	11.7	66.1	(141)
(Black Males)	(3.4)	(3.5)	61.8	(46)
(Hispanic Male)	(2.5)	(2.1)	49.7	(33)
(Asian Males)	(4.2)	(5.6)	78.2	(57)
(Native Am. Males)	(0.3)	(0.4)	66.7	(4)
White Females	46.1	43.9	56.3	(623)
Minority Females	10.3*	10.4*	60.1	(139)
(Black Females)	(3.6)	(3.0)	48.5	(49)
(Hispanic Females)	(2.2)	(1.7)	43.8	(30)
(Asian Females)	(3.9)	(5.2)	77.9	(53)
(Native Am. Females)	(0.4)	(0.5)	70.4	(6)
Total	100.0	100.0	59.0%	(1351)
N	1351	797		

*Significantly ($p < .05$) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of students that is minority and the proportion that is female.

successful in drawing minority women than white women into their graduate programs. Financial aid may play a critical role here. Both white and minority women are less likely than their male counterparts to receive financial assistance. 60 percent of minority women graduate students receive financial support, a higher percentage than found among white women, but an even higher percentage of minority men receive support. The discrepancy in financial aid allocations between men and women is especially pronounced among blacks. Although black women are the largest group of minority women graduate students, less than half of them get financial support. An even smaller percentage of Hispanic women receive aid. On the other hand, over three-fourths of Asian males and Asian females receive support, a higher proportion than white students.

As minority women progress through most steps of a career in academic sociology, their proportional representation declines. At the master's level, minority women slightly outnumber minority men, but among doctoral students their numerical predominance reverses (Table 9). In the selection process for entry level, tenure track faculty, the representation of women plunges far below that of minority men, to less than 3 percent. And it continues to decline at the tenured faculty level to less than 2 percent. Among doctoral students, where there is a relatively

TABLE 9
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Faculty
and Graduate Students by Career Stage

SEX AND RACE ETHNICITY	Master's Students	Doctoral Students	Tenure Track Faculty	Tenured Faculty
White Males	31.3%	32.1%	51.9%	72.5%
Minority Males	9.2	15.3	9.0	10.3
White Women	47.9	40.6	36.3	15.5
Minority Women	11.6	12.0**	2.9**	1.6
(Black Women)	(3.9)	(3.1)	(2.7)	(1.1)
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N	658	758	265	1149

**Significantly ($p < .01$) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

high proportion of minority students, and among tenure track faculty, where the proportion of female faculty is relatively high, the numbers of minority women fall far below the numbers that we would expect to see. Among tenured faculty, where both women and minorities are found more seldom, the small percentage of minority women comes close to meeting the expected number.

The poor showing of minority women among sociology faculties, even at entry levels, will not shortly improve. An examination of the sex and race or ethnicity of faculty members who were appointed within the last five years, compared to those who left in the same space of time, indicates that minority women actually are losing ground (Table 10). Among the newly appointed faculty, over 4 percent were minority women. This percentage exceeds minority women's current representation, but it still falls well below the number of minority women appointed.

TABLE 10
Joint Sex and Race or Ethnicity of Recent Faculty
Appointments and Faculty Departees, and Ratio of
New Appointments to Departees

SEX & RACE ETHNICITY	Faculty Appointed in Last Five Years	Faculty Leaving in Last Five Years	Ratio of Appointed to Left
White Men	45.4%	57.9%	0.99 : 1
Minority Men	12.4	9.3	1.69 : 1
White Women	37.9	27.0	1.78 : 1
Minority Women	4.3**	5.8*	0.95 : 1
(Black Women)	(2.2)	(2.5)	1.11 : 1
(Other Minority Women)	(2.2)	(3.3)	0.84 : 1
Total %	100.0	100.0	
Total N	1943	1528	

Significantly (**p < .01) fewer minority women than expected based on the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

Significantly (*p < .01) more minority women than expected based on the proportion of faculty that is minority and the proportion that is female.

ments that would be expected given the portion going to women and to minorities. But the problem is not simply that minority women are more than doubly disadvantaged in obtaining appointments. These women also are leaving academe in significantly larger numbers than expected. Minority women account for nearly 6 percent of the faculty who leave positions in sociology departments, which is double the percentage of faculty positions they currently occupy. Across the nation, the numbers of newly appointed minority women do not quite replace those who are departing. The net decline in numbers of minority women sociologists in academe raises a strong possibility that their proportional representation will fall rather than grow in the near future. This is because there is strong net growth in the numbers of white female and minority male faculty. These latter groups are being appointed in numbers that greatly exceed those who are departing, while the number of white men remains virtually constant.

Discussion

In general, our study documents, with detailed statistical data, that minority women do indeed experience double jeopardy in academia. While the fact remains that minority men and white women are still underrepresented in academic sociology, our data show that minority women are even more underrepresented than either group. Apparently minority women are the constituency least effectively incorporated by affirmative action.

This situation appears to have changed little over time. Because the number of minority women faculty has been so small, it is difficult to track trends in their representation over time. The most reliable longitudinal data come from a study of sociology departments in the western United States (Nigg and Axelrod 1981; Kulis, Miller, Axelrod and Gordon 1986a). This study showed that the proportion of faculty who were minority women increased from 1.3 percent to only 1.4 percent between 1979 and 1984.

Comparing women to men within ethnic groups in our U.S. sample, Hispanic women are most underrepresented. The percentage of sociology faculty who are Hispanic men is a staggering seventeen times the percentage who are Hispanic women. Among Asians, the percentage of men is eight times that of women. For blacks, the difference is a ratio of 2.8 men for every woman. (For whites, the ratio is 2.95:1.) These group differences must be taken into account in making generalizations about minority women's situation.

Minority women (mostly black) are concentrated in the South, and are especially underrepresented in the Northeast, at the full professor level, at undergraduate institutions, at public colleges and universities, and in very large or very small sociology departments. Their small proportions in the largest departments may be evidence of tokenism in meeting affirmative action quotas: a sort of "one is enough" syndrome. It is also possible evidence of tokenism that in departments with many women and minorities, very few are minority women, whereas in those

with few women and minorities, both statuses tend to be represented by minority women. Our evidence of tokenism is not definitive, but certainly suggestive.

Our finding that minority women are particularly burdened by committee assignments could also be seen as evidence of tokenism. Committee overload could be one reason for our finding that minority women are leaving faculty sociology positions faster than they are being replaced. This has clear and serious implications for future representation of minority women, particularly at upper academic levels.

Minority women are much better represented among graduate students than among faculty; however, their proportions in graduate school have not increased as rapidly as those for white women. Furthermore, minority women do not receive as high a share of financial aid as minority men. Thus, the prospects for greatly increased proportions of minority women among new Ph.D. recipients are not favorable, and the problem of representation may be further compounded if there are relatively few qualified minority women applicants for entry-level positions.

Policy Implications

The ways in which minority women are in a situation of double jeopardy are clear from our findings. First, women in all ethnic minority groups are grossly underrepresented, but Hispanic women are particularly so. Tokenism in its various manifestations should be identified and abolished. The disempowering structural dynamics and destructive psychological effects of tokenism have been well documented (Kanter, 1977; de Joie, 1977). Departments with only one minority woman faculty member should not feel complacent, although there is little argument that one is better than none.

The concomitants of tokenism, such as committee overload, professional isolation, and marginality, are widespread problems and should be monitored and redressed. We appear to be approaching a situation in which minority women are on a par numerically with minority men among graduate students. The challenge is to ensure that forms of encouragement such as financial aid are generously extended to minority women to help them get started in academic careers in sociology. Serious attention must also be paid to why minority women leave sociology faculty positions at a greater rate than other groups. There is more that can be done at every level to incorporate and promote minority women in academic sociology; considerations of equity and of benefit to the field dictate that these efforts should be made.

Notes

This study was funded, in part, by the American Sociological Association, the Pacific Sociological Association, and the University of Oregon Center for Women in Society. However, these organizations are not responsible for the views expressed in the article. We thank Alicia Gonzales for her research assistance.

1. The study design replicated a 1979 survey of sociology departments in the Pacific Sociological Association

region. Included in the sampling frame were all the sociology departments in four-year colleges and universities in 13 western states, and, for the random sample of the rest of the nation, 56 departments which offered graduate degrees, and 56 which offered only bachelor degrees. The sample was stratified to ensure that minority graduate students could be meaningfully analyzed.

2. The unweighted numbers of minority women present the same pattern: 21 blacks, 3 hispanics, 1 Native American, 1 "other" minority, and 10 Asians, 7 of whom were located in California. If the sample were to be given inflated weights to represent the actual number of sociology departments in the United States, the total number of minority women would be estimated to be only 150.

References

- Alperon, Erma D. 1975. "The Minority Woman in Academe," *Professional Psychology*, 6: 252-56.
- Carroll, Constance M. 1973. "Three's a Crowd: The Dilemma of the Black Woman in Higher Education." Pp. 173-185 in *Academic Women on the Move*, edited by A. S. Rossi and A. Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Coyle, Susan. 1986. *Summary Report 1985: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- de Joie, Carolyn M. 1977. "The Black Woman in Alienation in White Academia." *Negro Educational Review* 28: 4-12.
- Epstein, Cynthia F. 1973. "Positive Effects of the Multiple Negative: Explaining the Success of Black Professional Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 912-35.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kulis, Stephen. 1988. "The Representation of Women in Top-Ranked Sociology Departments." *The American Sociologist* 19:203-217.
- Kulis, Stephen, Karen A. Miller, Morris Axelrod and Leonard Gordon. 1986a. "Minorities and Women in the Pacific Sociological Association: Five Years Later." *Sociological Perspectives* 29: 147-76.
- . 1986b. "Minority Representation in U.S. Departments, Part I." *American Sociological Association Footnotes*, 14 (No. 5):3,6.
- . 1987. "Minority Representation in U.S. Departments, Part II." *American Sociological Association Footnotes* 15 (No. 1):9,11.
- Menges, Robert J. and William H. Exum. 1983. "Barriers to the Progress of Women and Minority Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education*. 54: 123-44.
- Miller, Karen A., Stephen Kulis, Leonard Gordon and Morris Axelrod. 1988a. "Representation of Women in U.S. Sociology Departments." *American Sociological Association Footnotes* 16 (No. 4):3.
- Miller, Karen A., Stephen Kulis, Leonard Gordon and Morris Axelrod. 1988b. "Women's Representation Among Graduate Students in Sociology." *American Sociological Association Footnotes* 16 (No. 8): 8.
- Nigg, Joanne, and Morris Axelrod. 1981. "Women and Minorities in the PSA Region: Results of the 1979 Survey." *Pacific Sociological Review* 24: 107-27.
- Theodore, Athena. 1986. *The Campus Troublemakers: Academic Women in Protest*. Houston: Cap and Gown Press.

Copyright of American Sociologist is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.