WOMEN OF COLOR NAVIGATING THE ACADEMY: THE DISCURSIVE POWER
OF PROFESSIONALISM

A Dissertation
Submitted
to the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Corinne Castro
May, 2012

Committee Members:
Dr. Michelle Byng, Major Advisor, Department of Sociology
Dr. Kimberly Goyette, Department of Sociology
Dr. Heidi Grunwald, Deputy Director, Beasley School of Law
Dr. Patricia Roos, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University

ABSTRACT
Women of Color Navigating the Academy: The Discursive Power of Professionalism
Corinne Castro
Temple University, 2012
Doctoral Advisory Committee Chair: Dr. Michelle Byng

This dissertation project examines the professional experiences of women of color faculty to uncover less visible mechanisms of inequality in the academy. It is a mixed-methods study with both qualitative and quantitative components. I address the limitations of past research by revealing how even despite the relative successes of women of color in academia, they continue to struggle daily with professional legitimacy and belonging. My main research question is: *How do women of color faculty at selected public research universities engage with discourses and practices of professionalism?* Professionalism refers to the taken-for-granted and seemingly neutral norms that guide workers in various institutions and organizations such as the university. Researchers have found that professionalization is both a gendered and raced process, where "doing" professionalism often requires one to perform both masculinity and whiteness. Professionalism only recently has been given attention in the literature regarding minorities' experiences of work, but little has been written about either the unique experiences of women of color or how professionalism functions at the university.

The first of three data chapters examines the 2004-5 Faculty Survey from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. The most interesting and important finding from this analysis is that even when controlling for academic rank, women of color are significantly more likely to experience the need to work harder to be viewed as legitimate scholars and professionals. The second and third empirical chapters examine the data from forty in-depth interviews with women of color faculty members in

liberal arts and education fields at four large public research universities on the east coast. One chapter examines how women of color faculty embody the 'professional', and the other chapter discusses how respondents define their professional identities through scholarship, teaching, and service.

In the first interview data chapter, I explore how although ideas about professionalism are indeed taken-for-granted and invisible to most, respondents indicated a shared experience of having to be 'hyper-professional' in many ways in order to be recognized as worthy and legitimate academics. Specifically in this chapter, I reveal how interview participants engage in an array of complex strategies to navigate the academic space, mostly through dress, hair, and other bodywork. In addition, this chapter also uncovers how respondents experienced 'embodied stress,' which included a wide range of emotional and physical health ailments such as depression, anxiety, weight gain, and in some cases strokes and heart attacks. In the second empirical chapter, I examine how women of color faculty attempt to redefine their professional identities through conscious choices about research agenda, pedagogical practices, and service, despite experiences of devaluation and pressures to conform to a 'hegemonic academic professionalism.'

Ultimately, this dissertation research uncovers two major paradoxes for women of color in relation to discourses of professionalism: first, although women of color are increasingly being incorporated into universities, specifically to fulfill the rhetoric of inclusion, they are structurally denied legitimacy as scholars and educators due to the fixed and immutable norms of professionalism. Second and related, although women of color faculty often successfully signal professionality through vigilant control of their dress, emotions, and demeanor, they nevertheless fail to garner professional legitimacy

due the systemic invalidation of their professional priorities. This research contributes to

debates about the experiences of minorities in both higher education and professional

occupations, as well as contributing to policy conversations about diversity and inclusion

in social institutions more broadly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A mis padres, Oscar y Rosa Castro
Para todos sus sacrificios

To my parents,
For all your sacrifices

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Constituting employees as 'professionals' involves more than just a process of re-labelling, it also involves the delineation of 'appropriate work identities' and potentially allows for control at a distance by inscribing the disciplinary logic of professionalism within the person of the employees so labeled...The appeal to professionalism is one of the new softwares of control, one of the techniques that governs at a distance (Fournier 1999, pgs. 290, 293).

At the broadest level of analysis, then, issues of autonomy, power or control, and knowledge are all implicated by how we treat (i.e., create, elevate, or constrain) professions and professionals...despite its often-apolitical appearance, the professional is a deeply political formation that can simultaneously coordinate and deny divisions and hierarchies of labor based on gender, sexuality, race, nation, class, and their complex intermingling (Cheney and Ashcraft 2007, pgs. 150, 163).

Conceptual Framework: Professionalism and the Neo-liberal University

Professionalism refers to the taken-for-granted and seemingly neutral norms that guide workers in various institutions and organizations such as the university (Fournier 1999; Kolsaker 2008). Researchers have found that professionalization is both a gendered and raced process, where "doing" professionalism often requires one to perform both masculinity and whiteness (Cheney and Ashcraft 2007). Professionalism only recently has been given attention in the literature regarding minorities' experiences of work, but little has been written about either the unique experiences of women of color or how professionalism functions at the university (Trethewey 1999). Moreover, the worldwide competition for resources and power is progressively becoming a battle of education, innovation, and expertise, and the academy is no doubt a critical player in the global-economic landscape (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1997).

Mark Olssen's (2002) work on higher education in New Zealand in particular has revealed important insights about the shift from traditional (liberal) to managerial (neo-liberal) models of internal governance of universities. For example, he notes how

research under the traditional model of the past was a venture fundamentally linked to teaching and controlled within universities; however, he argues that research has now transformed under the managerial model of governance into an enterprise separate from teaching and controlled by government and external organizations. Many of the changes associated with the neo-liberal mode of academic governance disproportionately affect women and faculty of color in the academy since they are more likely to be in marginal fields of study with less access to major grants (Stanley 2006c; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000; C. S. V. Turner 2002; Stanley 2007), and/or prioritize teaching, mentoring, and good citizenship, which are progressively undervalued (Urrieta and Méndez Benavídez 2007; Pyke 2011; Porter 2007; Perry et al. 2009; H. A. Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010; Misra et al. 2011; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011; Harley 2007).

As the first epigraph suggests, the push towards increased professionalization of labor is intricately linked to social processes of control and discipline, particularly in the neo-liberal era with its corresponding shifts towards privatization, deregulation, and conservative fiscal policies (Fournier 1999). Although we have yet to fully develop a political sociology of higher education,[1] the U.S. academy is undoubtedly an important social institution to examine professionalism due to the production of high levels of educational attainment and occupational status. More importantly, as the second epigraph indicates, the formation of the professional involves the reification of different power relations, particularly based on race and gender (Cheney and Ashcraft 2007); therefore, an examination of women of color faculty can function to uncover important dimensions of academic professionalism related to on the one hand, important career trajectories via

---

[1]Mitchell Stevens (2009) argues that despite observable structural changes in higher education, we lack a political sociology of higher education and have yet to fully articulate the relationship between the state and higher education.

tenure and promotion, and on the other, to daily interactions and comportment with colleagues and students.

Research Problem: Women of Color Academic Workers

Women of color generally have made significant contributions to the U.S. and world economies in terms of work and labor. In particular, they have made it possible for generations of white middle-class families to build and maintain their wealth and power either directly through child and housework or indirectly through the service economy. Notably, women of color are now making significant inroads in higher-paid occupations and professions, increasingly reaching middle-class status. However, as a new population in many of the more prestigious fields, their daily experiences at work can be a useful and interesting source for examining larger shifts in power and discourse. Specifically, the experiences of professional women of color can shed light on how institutions that only until recently were exclusively white-male spaces have (or have not) reorganized to accommodate the presence of a diverse workforce.

The civil rights policies and second-wave feminism[2] from the mid 20th century were major catalysts for the entrance of women of color into the academy. In addition, the social movements of the 1960s were central to the establishment of academic programs such as Black studies, Ethnic studies and Women's studies, which similarly provided opportunities. However, as much third-wave feminist[3] writing has shown,

---

[2] Second wave feminism emerged in the post-WWII economic boom. The issues at stake during its prominence in the 1960's-70's were sexuality, family, work, and reproductive rights. The works of Simone de Beauvoir (1953) and Betty Friedan (1963) are central to this particular wave of feminism.
[3] Third wave feminism challenged and disrupted the second wave's essentialist and universal definitions of femininity and women. They criticized the over-emphasis of the experiences of upper-middle-class white women, and succeeded in making the experiences of women of color more visible in feminist circles. The edited volumes titled *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981),

women of color continue to struggle greatly with their marginal status in all social and academic spheres, having to constantly assert their voices and unique experiences as both gender and racial minorities (Anzaldúa 1987; Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991; Sandoval 2000).

In the contemporary moment, the academy has experienced much change. Major universities seem more concerned with issues around the status of women and people of color, with the establishment of diversity steering committees, offices of multicultural affairs, and official mission statements praising the value of diverse students, faculty and research interests. Moreover, once marginal programs such as women's studies are slowly moving into the mainstream and becoming more legitimized as PhD-granting departments at select universities. What is significant about these changes is the simultaneous scaling-back of civil rights era policies, such as affirmative action,[4] coupled with the further entrenchment of colorblind racial ideology[5] that has occurred in the last two decades (A. Gordon and Newfield 1996; Goldberg 1994). In addition, due to the increased corporatization of the university through the rise of neo-liberalism, both the academic job market and tenure and promotion expectations have become more rigorous, with an increasing emphasis on publishing, grant writing, and other measurable outcomes (Olssen 2002; Olssen and Peters 2005; Kolsaker 2008). I argue that a close examination of the university professoriate as a "profession" via the lives of women of color produces

and *All Women are White, All Men are Black, But Some of Us Are Brave* (1982) were seminal pieces for the third wave.
[4] Important cases include California's Proposition 209 in 1995 which was a successful mandate to the University of California regents to eliminate the consideration of race and ethnicity in admissions policies. Also, see Supreme Court cases Gratz v. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger in 2003, which significantly challenged and limited race-conscious policies at the University of Michigan.
[5] See Bonilla-Silva (2006), Lewis et al (2000), and Gallagher (2003).

valuable insight into the hidden gendered and racialized processes of the university and the workplace more generally. I will now proceed with the major goals of this dissertation project.

<div align="center">Dissertation Objectives and Research Question</div>

This project addresses the limitations of past research by revealing how even despite modest gains for women of color becoming tenured or university administrators, they continue to struggle daily with professional legitimacy and authority. The primary goal of this dissertation is to examine the professional experiences of women of color faculty in order to uncover less visible mechanisms of inequality in the academy. This dissertation addresses the following question: *How do women of color faculty at selected public research universities engage with discourses and practices of professionalism?* I have observed that a common tendency for social scientists is to focus on populations viewed as "most" disadvantaged by hierarchies of race, gender, sexuality, and class, even sometimes portraying them as victims of oppressive social structures with little to no agency.[6] However, if we look beyond the more obvious social inequalities, it is possible to interrogate how power works more subtly and dispersed (non-centralized) at institutional levels where the populations are seemingly more equal and governance does not involve direct force or coercion.

In this dissertation project, I make this analytic move to examine the lives of women of color academics in order to better understand persistent inequality at the university. Moreover, a focus on embodied experiences, as opposed to just numerical

---

[6] The idea of the "Oppression Olympics" can be instructive to my argument. See Hancock (2007) where she defines this term as "where groups compete for the mantle of 'most oppressed' to gain the attention and political support of dominant groups as they pursue policy remedies, leaving the overall system of stratification unchanged" (p. 68). This can also be applied to research agendas, particularly in the social sciences.

representations, can effectively uncover how discourses of professionalism facilitate and maintain institutional hierarchies of race and gender. Specifically, an embodied experience entails more than simply physiology or biology; rather it includes other socio-cultural readings and manipulations of the body that may or may not successfully signal professionalism. Next, I will highlight the organization of the dissertation and some of the major findings.

<div align="center">Dissertation Organization and Major Findings</div>

Chapters two and three discuss at length and respectively the literature review and methods. Chapters four through six represent the empirical data sections of the dissertation. This project is a mixed-methods study drawing from both qualitative and quantitative data. Chapter four examines the 2004-5 Faculty Survey from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. The most interesting and important finding from this analysis is that even when controlling for academic rank, women of color are significantly more likely to experience the need to work harder to be viewed as legitimate scholars and professionals.

Chapters five and six examine the data from forty in-depth interviews with women of color faculty members in liberal arts and education fields at four large public research universities on the east coast. These chapters are organized by the following central discussions. Chapter five examines how women of color faculty embody the 'professional', and chapter six discusses how respondents define their professional identities through scholarship, teaching, and service. In chapter five, I explore how although ideas about professionalism are indeed taken-for-granted and invisible to most, respondents indicated a shared experience of having to be 'hyper-professional' in many

ways in order to be recognized as worthy and legitimate academics. Specifically in this chapter, I reveal how interview participants engage in an array of complex strategies to navigate the academic space, mostly through dress, hair, and other bodywork. In chapter six, I examine how women of color faculty attempt to redefine academic professionalism through conscious choices about research agenda, pedagogical practices, and service.

In the concluding chapter, I explain how my research ultimately uncovers an important paradox for women of color academics in relation to discourses of professionalism. I conclude in chapter seven that although my respondents actively draw from discourses of professionalism to help them successfully navigate and survive their institutions, these same discourses contribute to the systematic undervaluation of their scholarship and professional priorities. Moreover, I show that women of color faculty, despite parity with their colleagues in education, income, and status, continue to experience liminality and double-consciousness in their professional lives. Lastly, I conclude that as women of color work towards developing their own professional identities, one that better aligns with their personal values and priorities, they encounter institutional resistance and perceive acute de-legitimization as academics.

In chapter seven, I also highlight the theoretical and policy implications of my research. Related to my discussion earlier, I ultimately argue in the conclusion that discourses of professionalism serve as an invisible tool for neo-liberal governance of academic workers, which ultimately maintains the illusion of progress, particularly for racial and gender equity in the academy. Moreover, I suggest that the university should undergo a serious re-evaluation of the academic rewards system for tenure and promotion with particular focus on how certain professional priorities or identities are valued or

devalued. Last, I call attention to the need for all faculty members and administrators to share the responsibility and burden of diversifying universities in order to relieve minority faculty of their disproportionate duties.

CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE REVIEW

During the developmental stages of this dissertation, I searched for past research examining the lived experiences of women of color faculty and found that the majority of relevant discussions on the subject were embedded in the literature on people of color and women more broadly. Although I have encountered a small yet resourceful pool of studies focused specifically on the experiences of women of color faculty, the bulk of this literature review will examine the major issues uncovered by the research on racial and gender minorities[7] within two contexts: *the academy* and *the workplace*. First, what I found central in the discussions about minorities in the academy was broadly framed by the topic of *diversity* and its consequences. Within the conversations about diversity, the literature highlighted legal debates about affirmative action, the persistence of tokenism, and the experience of professional isolation. Also important to the studies on minorities in the academy was the concept of the *racial/gendered tax*, which addresses the unequal burdens women and people of color face with service, teaching, and advising students.

Second, within the context of the workplace, the issue of *professionalism* and its functions was important regarding the experiences of minorities. Specifically, past research uncovered that professionalism is far from a neutral or inconsequential process; rather, professionalism is revealed to be both a gendered and racialized practice that can function to reproduce inequality and acts as an invisible form of social control within a modern neo-liberal global workforce. Also revealed by past research, the process of *embodiment* is important to the experiences of marginal populations in the workplace. In

---

[7] Throughout the literature review, I use the terms "minority" faculty, professionals or workers to refer to women AND non-white populations; both groups continue to be under-represented in most fields, departments, and universities.

other words, past studies found that minorities were often forced to engage in various body practices and performativity in order to meet unspoken and invisible standards of professionalism in the modern workplace. Moreover, women were found to regularly engage in managing their "feminine" traits and presentation of self; researchers found that professional women often walked a thin line of not appearing weak while maintaining an "acceptable" level of femininity that has even become commodified in some workplaces.

Ultimately, the consequences of many of these issues and challenges faced by minorities today as revealed by past studies point to a *crisis of legitimacy* and *persistent inequality* within the academy and other professional spaces. In other words, past research has argued that women, people of color, and especially women of color face a systemic devaluation of their work and scholarship, and a lack of recognition as legitimate professionals. In the end, these practices can negatively affect tenure and promotion and can reinforce the glass ceilings many minority professionals experience in their careers.

As a whole, I found three areas in need of more attention within the dialogues: *theoretical, conceptual,* and *methodological*. Although I will discuss each of these at length at the end of the chapter, I will briefly summarize my arguments. First, as stated earlier, although there now exist studies that specifically focus on the lives of women of color, a severe lack of commitment to the intersectional framework remains: an approach that genuinely recognizes the unique and valuable perspective of women of color.[8] For

---

[8] The intersectional perspective is based on scholarship such as Patricia Hill Collins (2000), Bonnie Thornton Dill and Maxine Baca Zinn (1994), and Kimberle Crenshaw (1991). Intersectionality is an important theoretical development in its ability to highlight *interlocking matrices of domination and oppression*. In other words, the intersectional approach reveals the

this dissertation research in particular, intersectionality is an important tool to advance

the project of understanding the power structures of academy, since the majority of

previous scholarship does not account for multiple lived experiences.

Second in regards to conceptual problems, the literature on the academy and on

the workplace tend to be distinct and rarely in conversation with one another; however, as

I uncovered, the academy is no doubt a professional workplace, and researchers

interested in academic workers need to pay more attention to the scholarship set outside

the university.[9] Specifically, the literature on the academy overwhelmingly focuses on

structural inequalities such as salary and rank; however, what is missing is an

understanding of how academic workers daily encounter the discursive power and

disciplinary practices of professionalism, as revealed through the research on workplaces

outside the university.

Last on the issue of methodology, although most of the past research examined

was undoubtedly empirically rigorous, the majority relied on case studies based on single

institution samples. Case studies are important sources of data, capable of producing

detailed analysis and nuanced explanations of particular groups or social processes;

however, social scientists often seek research that can generate comparisons across many

cases to increase the generalizability of the study, which can ultimately influence

important policy debates. Therefore, studies drawing from multiple and more diverse

sources of data can potentially validate many of the findings from smaller scale or case

---

complexity of multiple identities and lived experience, which disrupts notions of universal narratives. Ultimately, intersectionality is a valuable theoretical tool for understanding how power functions in modern social institutions.

[9] Blackburn and Lawrence's (2002) seminal piece was one of the first to discuss faculty experiences in the workplace; however, this work and the studies they informed were inattentive to the role of professionalism.

study research, particularly within a larger political arena. I will outline the details about data collection and analysis in the methods chapter. The following section will commence the in depth discussion of the literature, starting with the examination of *diversity* within the academic context.

The Academy: Diversity

It is clear that in the post civil-rights and colorblind racist[10] era we live in today, structural policies like affirmative action geared towards redressing racial inequalities have been heavily repealed[11] and replaced with a vague discourse/rhetoric about *diversity* and *multiculturalism*. The multicultural framework that higher education now operates within often promotes inclusivity of diverse people, cultures, and perspectives; nevertheless, multicultural practices are often limited to individualistic and neo-liberal solutions to structural problems, while ultimately reinforcing the devaluation and delegitimization of civil rights era solutions like affirmative action (Goldberg 1994; A. Gordon and Newfield 1996). Researchers interested in the experiences of minorities in predominately white institutions like the academy have explored some of the major consequences of the push for diversity characteristic of the past twenty years. Some of the significant findings include the experience of tokenism, professional isolation, and lack of mentorship.

---

[10] In his critical sociological work, Bonilla-Silva (2006) empirically uncovers how majority populations draw from colorblind racial ideologies and discursive practices in order to avoid and ignore persistent hierarchies of race and white privilege. Critics of colorblindness generally argue that an emphasis on overt or individual-level racism (reflecting Jim-Crow era) obfuscates covert and institutional racism (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Gallagher 2003; Lewis et al. 2000).

[11] Notable cases include California's Proposition 209 successful mandate to the University of California regents to eliminate the consideration of race and ethnicity in admissions policies in 1995. Also, the Supreme Court cases *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* in 2003 significantly challenged and limited race-conscious policies at the University of Michigan.

Rosabeth Kanter's (1993) breakthrough work on the theory of proportions focused on the potential effects of marginality on social interactions and mobility in corporate settings. Kanter coined the term *tokenism*, arguing that the numerical distribution of men and women in the upper reaches of corporations provides different interaction contexts for those in the majority versus those in the minority (p. 206). Kanter's work has been influential to scholars examining the experiences of minorities in the academy. Specifically, researchers have found that although institutional support for recruiting diverse faculty to obtain more racial and gender parity is important and admirable, university administrators need to be wary of treating these faculty members as representatives and/or spokespersons of entire communities and populations, which ultimately creates unjust burdens for minority professors (Aguirre 2000; Stanley 2006a; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000).

Moreover, faculty recruited to meet university mandates to diversify often experience severe *professional isolation* since they are often the only ones (or one of few) of a particular background and/or research focus.[12] Caroline Turner (2002) describes this experience of isolation for women of color faculty in particular, invoking the term *multiple marginality*.[13] In other words, faculty who are minorities based on their gender, race, class, sexuality, and/or ability are more vulnerable to experiences of alienation and marginality in their departments and institutions. The lack of community that many minority faculty discover at their respective institutions can not only create social

---

[12] Although outside the scope of my particular project, it is important to note that the experience of professional isolation is overwhelmingly apparent for minorities in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines.

[13] Turner argues "the more ways in which one differs from the 'norm,' the more social interactions will be affected within multiple contexts. [Therefore] Situations in which a woman of color might experience marginality are multiplied depending on her marginal status within various contexts" (p. 77).

alienation, but can also significantly damage their professional lives especially in regards to collaboration and collegial relationships.

Related to the challenge of professional isolation experienced by diverse academic workers, there is a substantial body of research addressing disparities in *mentorship*, particularly for women faculty in the academy across all disciplines and ranks. Although we cannot deny that academic life for everyone is generally a lonely endeavor regardless of gender and race, research continues to stress the importance of mentorship and community for university faculty (Boyle and Boice 1998). In fact, findings from past studies suggest that adequate mentoring for women faculty produces significant benefits in terms of salary, job satisfaction, and other important outcomes (Gibson 2004, 2006). Even the most seasoned and well-respected scholars could not have succeeded without a strong network of colleagues that provide rich resources and vital information leading to publications, grants, and prestigious positions.

However, many minority faculty members, especially women of color, often contend with the fact that many of their colleagues do not share similar backgrounds, research interests, and professional experiences, which significantly limits their ability to create strong networks of people that can be truly supportive (S. L. Holmes, Land, and Hinton-Hudson 2007; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000). Although the potential for positive cross-cultural/racial/gender mentorship should not be discounted, these relationships can be harder to build and sustain due to issues of trust, paternalism, and hidden biases (Johnson-Bailey and Cervero 2004; Johnson-Bailey and Cervero 2008).

Overall, the issue of diversity has become a popular topic of interest and a source of significant institutional practices in the academy,[14] which has led to progress in creating more equitable conditions for women and racial minorities; however, the movement towards inclusion often comes at the cost of *tokenism*, *professional isolation*, and *lack of mentorship* for minority faculty. Moreover, what is less understood are the negative consequences of incorporating minority faculty with the unspoken expectation that they will take on additional burdens as ambassadors of diversity at their institutions. The next section will explore at length the extra responsibilities women and faculty of color often face, particularly with teaching and service.

The Academy: Racial/Gendered Tax

Drawing from Amado Padilla's (1994) concept of *cultural taxation*, many scholars have uncovered the extra burdens women and faculty of color encounter at their institutions. Specifically, academic workers who are coveted as diversity change agents are often expected to serve on more university and departmental committees, teach the diversity course requirements, and mentor the bulk of the increasing population of minority students (Perry et al. 2009; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000). Similarly, some scholars have revealed a *gendered division of labor*, in which women faculty dedicate disproportionate time and energy towards teaching, service, and student mentoring. Due to unequal reward systems in the academy, activities other than research and publications continue to be undervalued, creating serious barriers for women faculty towards promotion, advancement, and general well-being (Park 1996; Pyke 2011; Misra et al. 2011). In particular, the study by Sandra Acker and Grace Feuerverger (1996) found

---

[14] Some of these institutional practices include major federal funding sources such as the NIH ADVANCE grants and NSF Bridge to the Doctorate programs geared towards increasing minority representation among all ranks in the academy.

repeated narratives by women faculty about 'doing good' as citizens, teachers, and mentors, yet 'feeling bad' since they were aware of a gendered division of labor and disparate academic rewards system. Other research has further uncovered the influence of maternal discourses and "caring scripts" on the experiences of women faculty, particularly related to expectations for teaching, mentoring and service (Maguire and Weiner 1994; S. Acker 1995). Sandra Acker's (1995) work in particular empirically uncovers how female teachers' dedications to their class often goes "beyond the call of duty," such as teaching while ill. She also revealed how many teachers formed "mothering-style bonds" with their students and classroom, often feeling guilt or self-blame when students were failing or when something went wrong during class. As a whole, the research has revealed the presence of a *gendered tax* prevalent in most academic institutions, which ultimately reproduces a hierarchical structure of power and privilege.

Faculty of color have a similar experience with extra demands for committee service and student mentoring and often feel a personal responsibility and duty to diversify their institutions and ultimately give voice to their communities. In fact, some argue that diversity "service" is in fact intellectual work and should be evaluated as such (Brown-Glaude 2008; Hart et al. 2008). However, like their women colleagues, the additional time spent on service does not carry the same value as their research and publication record and ultimately can threaten their tenure and promotion possibilities. Moreover, as more campuses adopt diversity curriculum requirements,[15] minority faculty have the additional burden of teaching these courses. Although the shared perception and

---

[15] The American Association of Colleges and Universities documented in 2000 that 63 percent of colleges and universities report having a diversity education component in their undergraduate curriculum (H. A. Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010).

accepted rhetoric is that minority faculty are better suited to teach diversity courses

simply because of their identities regardless of their actual teaching and research

expertise, research has shown that this practice reinforces white male privilege since they

are not expected to share the burden of creating more diverse institutions and curriculum

(Perry et al. 2009; Stanley 2006c).

Authors Moore et al. (2010) in their research on instructors of diversity courses

argue that institutions have not recognized the *gendered and racialized emotional labor*

involved in teaching courses on sensitive topics like race, gender, and sexuality. Research

has revealed that unlike the assumption that minority faculty are the "experts" on identity

issues, instructors of diversity courses are often met with student resistance and daily

assaults on their authority and credibility (Vargas 2002; Stanley 2006c; Perry et al. 2009).

Despite the increased understanding of standpoint epistemology and the value of lived

experience, students continue to seek "objective" presentations of controversial issues

like racism and often discount the viewpoint of non-white faculty as "bias" (Solorzano

1998; Stanley 2006a). Therefore, teaching diversity courses greatly contribute to the

gendered/racial taxation experienced by minority faculty in the academy.

As noted earlier, women of color faculty experience multiple marginality as both

gender and racial minorities in the academy. The small pool of studies focused on the

lives of women of color faculty have noted their experience of "double jeopardy" in

regards to many aspects of their professional lives (C. S. V. Turner 2002; Thomas and

Hollenshead 2001; Robinson and Clardy 2010; Berry and Mizelle 2006; Battle and

Doswell 2004). As Debra Harley (2007) argues, women of color faculty often

symbolically become "maids of academe" due to their heavier expectations for teaching

and service. Not only are women of color faculty more likely to have higher teaching

loads than their colleagues, they are more likely to teach diversity course requirements,

which as noted earlier require substantially more time and emotional labor than other

courses (Vargas 2002; Perry et al. 2009; H. A. Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010). Also, students

from all backgrounds, especially those who are also considered marginal, more often seek

women of color faculty out as mentors, which at least is partially due to the legacy of

women of color as caretakers (Harley 2007; Maxine Baca Zinn and Bonnie Thornton Dill

1994). Last, women of color must contend with higher expectations from university

administrators to serve on committees, which also reflect stereotypes of women of color

as "work mules." Overall, this dissertation seeks to better understand whether the women

of color faculty in my particular study indeed encounter what I see as a "diversity double-

duty" in regards to the expectations and taxation they encounter as both women and racial

minorities. Moreover, I am particularly interested to see if my sample of women of color

faculty experiences the *race/gender tax* as debilitating or whether it is also possible that

some of them find their positions on committees and their mentoring relationships with

students empowering.

Ultimately, the literature examining the *racial and gendered tax* minority faculty

encounter at their institutions suggest that drastic cultural and structural shifts in the

academy will be necessary in order to dismantle the unequal division of labor. In other

words, much of the literature suggests that ALL faculty must share the responsibility for

diversifying higher education, not just women and faculty of color. Additionally, if the

academy truly aims to be an equitable institution, activities other than publications and

research should be similarly recognized for promotion and merit, especially teaching and

service that requires more emotional labor than majority faculty typically experience. The following section will transition into the discussion of the workplace, beginning with the examination of *professionalism* and its consequences particularly for women and people of color.

<div align="center">The Workplace: Professionalism</div>

Overall, this discussion of professionalism in the workplace serves two main objectives that help to frame this dissertation: (1) professionalism is not a neutral discourse or practice, and (2) professionalism is an important social process that functions in the academy as much as other work places. First, research on *professionalism* exposes the taken-for-grantedness of this concept, uncovering the existence of underlying cultural, gendered, classed, and racial assumptions about the professional (Cheney and Ashcraft 2007). Some scholars have put forth the notion that "doing" professionalism often requires one to perform both masculinity and whiteness (Trethewey 1999; Davies et al. 2005). Central to this literature is the idea that claims to professionalism rest on larger societal divisions of labor based on race, gender, and class, particularly reflective of past and present patterns of labor segregation (J. Acker 1990; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). In other words, research has found that the development of discourses of professionalism has relied on the systemic maintenance of women and people of color in menial and service labor sectors (Bariso 2001). Therefore, an examination of discourse and practices of professionalism in the academy should optimally be approached through an intersectional lens with special attention to the political nature of who is deemed a legitimate professional.

Research also reveals that the push towards increased professionalization of labor is intricately linked to social processes of control and discipline, particularly in the neo-liberal era with its corresponding shifts towards privatization, deregulation, and conservative fiscal policies (Kolsaker 2008). It is important to note that within changing academic settings, many institutional practices are increasingly transferred from the private sectors and corporations[16] (Davies and Bansel 2005; Davies and Petersen 2005; Giroux 2002). Moreover, neo-liberal and managerial ideologies limit freedom and autonomy within a more structured and monitored environment compared to the traditional models of institutional governance of the past, which were controlled more through collegial-democratic voting and relations based on trust and freedom of expression (Olssen 2002). Nevertheless, universities continue to function under the guise of academic freedom and shared governance.[17]

Important to this dissertation, some scholars have argued that the notion of professionalism has become a powerful tool for controlling workers "from a distance" and that it is itself a "disciplinary logic" (Fournier 1999). In other words, through intricate negotiations between diverse social actors (i.e. the state, clients, the market), professions establish their own criteria of legitimacy and competency that ultimately defines what is knowledge, what is appropriate personal conduct, and what are valid practices. Therefore, although professionals are often not directly controlled or managed

---

[16] Henry A. Giroux succinctly articulates the state of higher education today: "While the universities are increasingly corporatized and militarized, their governing structures are becoming more authoritarian, faculty are being devalued as public intellectuals, students are viewed as clients, academic fields are treated as economic domains for providing credentials, and work place skills, and academic freedom is under assault" (Interview by C. Cryn Johannsen, Margins of Everyday Life, Friday 22 April 2011).

[17] Examples of faculty recently under attack particularly in regards to academic freedom: Ward Churchill at the University of Colorado Boulder in 2005, Norman Finkelstein at DePaul University in 2007, and William Robinson at the University of California Santa Barbara in 2009.

through any oppressive or sovereign entity, they are constantly negotiating and performing their authority and autonomy in order to maintain their credibility as professionals.

In sum, professionalism is not a neutral or benign social discourse and practice. On the contrary, professionalism is potentially a powerful force operating in many workplaces today, even within the academy. This dissertation particularly aims to uncover through the experiences of women of color faculty whether professionalism reinforces boundaries of inclusion and legitimacy. The next section will examine another important discussion about the experiences of minorities in the workplace, particularly focusing on processes of *embodiment* and how discourses of professionalism can shape decisions about presentation of self.

<div align="center">The Workplace: Embodiment</div>

Past research has uncovered how women engage in daily practices of controlling and disciplining their bodies in order to maintain appropriate markers of professionalism (Davies et al. 2005; Trethewey 1999). These scholars also argue that in order for women to convey professionalism, they must *embody* appropriate professional signals. In other words, these studies highlight the significance of the body and self-presentation as important spheres to perform professionalism, particularly in terms of dress, demeanor, emotions, and collegiality. Angela Trethewey (1999) discusses the notion of *professional bodily displays*, which indicates how processes of social comportment and bodily control in professional spaces support the status quo and dominant social hierarchies. Her particular study suggests that in order to successfully perform and display professionalism and therefore achieve credibility, women are required to continually

engage in strategies of controlling their bodies, whether in regards to curbing their weight or containing their emotions. In particular, she finds that in addition to the field-specific skills and content training, professional women, unlike their male counterparts, must regularly tend to the details of sitting, walking, and moving professionally. In fact, Trethewey found that professional women are keenly aware of the perception of their bodies as excessively sexual, fertile and emotional in the workplace, and may go out of their way to avoid crying in front of their colleagues or be overly discreet at the workplace about their menstrual cycles or other reproductive health issues.

Scholars have also focused on the role of *femininity* in the changing professional workplace of the neo-liberal age. Specifically, research has noted trends towards the feminization of middle management positions. Some have found that newly constructed middle management jobs tend to draw on traditionally recognized feminine traits and behaviors to facilitate and ease larger structural and ideological transitions at the institutional levels (Prichard and Deem 1999). Moreover, qualities such as "emotionality, caring, and introspection" associated with middle class femininity are deemed necessary for managers to oversee and guide workers through large-scale institutional restructuring (Walkerdine 2003). Therefore, evidence suggests that women in the workforce are increasingly caught in tensions between performing professionalism—as associated with white masculinity—and performing their ascribed femininity in order to be upwardly mobile in the changing global economy (Leathwood 2005).

Moreover, although women continue to encounter gender bias in the workplace (i.e. mommy tracks, unequal salary, biological discourses about intelligence, etc.), global ideological shifts and economic restructuring has paradoxically opened a 'market' for

feminine skills. Correspondingly, some research reveals that women today can consciously and deliberately draw from traditional feminine discourses of caring, nurturing, and collaboration to construct their professional identities (Priola 2004). Carole Leathwood (2005) found that discourses of femininity, particularly those related to ideas of women as submissive and passive, function to silence and limit women in professional spaces, yet still hold a potential to be useful in some situations, particularly when jobs are on the line. In other words, some women may strategically defer to traditional feminine behaviors and attributes in order to appease managers and colleagues or simply to remain autonomous and unnoticed during tense periods in the workplace.

In sum, this discussion highlighted first, the literature examining the process of *embodying* appropriate professional signals, and second, how women negotiate their *femininity* within the discursive terrain of professionalism. In relation to this dissertation, these studies suggest that it is possible for my sample of women of color faculty to encounter professionalism as a daily struggle. Ultimately with my data, I hope to uncover whether women of color faculty experience heighten feelings of alienation and taxation within their professional work settings. The proceeding discussion explores further the significant consequences of the challenges minorities face in professional workplaces.

Crisis of Legitimacy and Persistent Inequality

Two major outcomes become apparent through the examination of the literature on the experiences of minorities in both the academic and workplace settings. First, due to constant attacks on the credibility and authority of minority professional workers, we can observe a significant *crisis of legitimacy* within this population. Whether the problems minorities face in professional spaces are due to the perception of their

scholarship as "bias" (Stanley 2007; Harley 2007), or the assumption that they are undeserving benefactors of affirmative action (C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000), or the belief that they simply do not "look" or "act" the part of a professional (Trethewey 1999), the consequence of these daily challenges deny minority workers their earned status as legitimate professionals. Through this denial, minority workers must daily engage in practices such as policing their looks (Costello 2004) or being hyper-vigilante about the presentation of sensitive materials in their classrooms (Perry et al. 2009), which seemingly help them cope and minimize the assaults on their credentials and authority.

Second, the stakes are much greater for minority workers than merely their reputation or identity as professionals. In fact, the denial of professional legitimacy creates a pernicious and *persistent system of inequality*, particularly since this form of exclusion is less visible and very different from the civil rights era practices of discrimination.[18] In other words, since women and people of color are no longer formally excluded from gaining the experience and education required to enter professional workplaces, the subtle devaluing of their accomplishments often occur undetected and have no options for formal recourse. However, despite the subtleties of this new form of discrimination, the consequences for minority professionals can be severe and tangible.

For example, in the academic context, the material outcome for the devaluation of scholarship and research can seriously harm job possibilities, promotion, and merit prospects (C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000; Stanley 2006c). Similarly, if minority faculty members often teach diversity courses that are more likely to be met with student resistance and challenges, teaching evaluations will inevitably suffer and can also

---

[18] For example, see Roos and Gatta's (2009) excellent study on the subtle mechanisms of gender inequities in the academy, where they found qualitative and quantitative empirical evidence of covert gender bias within various institutional policies and procedures.

negatively affect their career (Vargas 2002; Perry et al. 2009; B. A. Davis 2004; Hart et al. 2008). In fact, authors Moore et al (2010) argue that the academy has become split into distinct segmented labor markets. They further argue that minority faculty who overwhelmingly experience "diversity course dumping" often become trapped within a *devalued secondary labor market* characterized by racialized and gendered emotional labor involved in marginalized teaching, service, and research activities. Altogether, the lack of recognition as legitimate professionals experienced by minorities significantly contributes to the prominence of glass ceilings, tenure denials, and lack of professional advancement. The following section will examine some of the *theoretical*, *conceptual*, and *methodological* limitations of the literature discussed in this chapter.

Gaps in Literature

In regards to theoretical limitations, I found that even though the literature reviewed in this chapter has revealed that professionalization is both a gendered and raced process and that the academy is structured by racial and gender hierarchies, there is a serious lack of commitment to the intersectional approach. Therefore, with the exception of a small pool of studies dedicated to the lives of women of color faculty (Battle and Doswell 2004; Berry and Mizelle 2006; Harley 2007; S. L. Holmes et al. 2007; Robinson and Clardy 2010; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; C. S. V. Turner 2002; Vargas 2002), most of the empirical research relies on white female subjects or people of color as a whole. In general, the knowledge garnered through understanding the unique experiences of non-white professional women has not been adequately harvested.

Concerning the conceptual gaps in the literature, I found that other than a few studies set in U.K. higher education institutions (Bariso 2001; Kolsaker 2008; Leathwood

2005; Murray 2006; Priola 2004), the majority of the empirical research examining

professionalism is situated within the contexts of corporate or governmental spheres, and

fails to consider academia as a professional space, particularly in the United States.

However, I argue that research areas about the academy and the workplace should not

remain distinct and would greatly benefit from more cross-discipline conversations and

debates, especially in order to further develop our understanding of how professionalism

functions.

Finally, in reference to methodological concerns, most of the research on the lived

experiences of minority professionals both within the academy and other workplaces rely

on case studies, personal narratives, or autoethnographies,[19] with only a few drawing

from survey research, and almost none on a national or regional scale. In addition, both

the quantitative and qualitative data used in many of these studies are limited to single-

site projects and some were collected over ten years ago. Granted, I recognize there are

important institutional limitations to conducting research on a national scale that includes

various cycles to ensure reliability; nevertheless, more current research is needed that

draws from a comprehensive and diverse empirical data source in order to yield more

fruitful discussions and perhaps have a stronger impact in the policy realm. The next

section will conclude this chapter with how this dissertation project advances the larger

project of understanding the experiences of minority workers.

Conclusions and Research Questions

The literature reviewed in this chapter as a whole provides researchers with

important tools to understand how the academy and the workplace continue to be

---

[19] Autoethnography refers to: "A turning of the ethnographic gaze inward on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of the ethnography, looking at the larger context wherein self experiences occur" (Ellis and Bochner 1996:227).

structured by racial and gendered hierarchies. However, many empirical questions remain about the experiences of marginal faculty at the university. For example, case studies of minorities in the academy reviewed in this chapter have produced a general picture of marginalization, but if we look across university settings, what will change? Also, is it possible that marginalization is an accurate description for some individuals, but an inaccurate characterization of others? More specifically, the assumption revealed in the literature is that the "race/gender tax" is debilitating and harmful, but is it also possible that some faculty find their positions on committees and their mentoring relationships with students empowering? My research will allow us to more fully examine the accuracy of findings of marginalization among women of color faculty in particular by uniquely emphasizing the role of academic professionalism. Therefore, while I may find some evidence in support of marginalization, it is equally likely that the research methods employed in this project will allow me to uncover other unknown experiences for women of color faculty.

Taking into account the limitations and uncertainties of past research examining the professional lives of minority populations, my dissertation attempts to bridge some of these gaps with a focus on the professional experiences of women of color faculty in particular. Ultimately, this dissertation uses the framework about professionalism to understand how women of color faculty specifically experience the academic profession, and seeks to uncover whether they are excluded from the boundaries of academic professionalism. The central research question for this dissertation is as follows: *How do women of color faculty at selected public research universities engage with discourses and practices of professionalism?*

As a mixed-methods project, I draw on two complimentary sources of data to address the guiding question. First, I examine the 2004-5 faculty survey from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). This survey is a rich, nationally representative data set with a high response rate, which ultimately yields a sample of about five hundred non-white women. Second, I draw from forty in-depth qualitative interviews derived from four different public research universities in the Northeast. Altogether, these data sources produce important narratives and empirical findings that offer a unique understanding of the professional experiences of women of color, and more generally, a different perspective on the academy as a professional space.

CHAPTER 3:
METHODOLOGY & DATA

This dissertation examines the discursive power of professionalism in the university by focusing on the lived experiences of women of color academics. By centering the lives and narratives of women of color in this research, I heavily draw from Black and Third World Women feminist epistemological frameworks (M. J. Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Anzaldúa 1987; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991; A. Y. Davis 1998; Mohanty et al. 1991; Sandoval 2000; M. B Zinn and B. T Dill 1994). These frameworks collectively have created analytic spaces in which women of color's subjectivity is central to understanding power. Additionally, by transforming women of color from research objects to research *subjects*, Black/Third World Women epistemologies has re-signified these social and ontological margins as spaces for producing significant theory and political change. This dissertation similarly aims to center women of color academics as research subjects in order to reveal how power operates in the university.

This study focuses on discursive forms of power to reveal persistent inequality at institutional levels that may otherwise remain unnoticed through examinations of structural variables. For example, the use of measures such as educational attainment, salary, or promotion rates continue to produce significant evidence for enduring stratification along race, class, and gender lines. However, when these factors are seemingly equal among groups, particularly in the context of highly professional and elite spaces such as the academy, how can we better understand the issues minorities face, particularly in the post-civil rights/ "post-racial" era? How can we investigate the continuing significance of race, gender, and class in a so-called color-blind, pluralistic, and meritocratic society like the U.S.? This dissertation draws from the Foucauldian

tradition for examining discursive power and practices in order to better understand the mechanisms yielded by institutions to maintain social control and discipline (Foucault 1979; Foucault et al. 1991).

The major challenge for this dissertation was methodological. Particularly, how could this research employ an empirically rigorous design within the discussed epistemological and theoretical frameworks? Qualitative methods are the most obvious fit within the Feminist-Foucauldian tradition, particularly in its ability to center subjects' narratives with close attention to the discursive frames employed by the respondents. However, preliminary research on the subject (as discussed in detail later in the chapter) made clear the potential benefits of a mixed methods approach that incorporates secondary data analysis of a nationally representative survey. I will proceed with a discussion of mixed methods.

<div align="center">Mixed Methodology</div>

Mixed methodological approaches to empirical research in the social sciences are relatively new and consequently often misunderstood. Specifically, mixed methods should not be equated with triangulation or validation techniques; rather, this approach draws from different techniques of data collection (most commonly quantitative and qualitative) to produce layered empirical evidence on one central topic or question. In fact, the major appeal of a mixed methods approach is the ability to integrate multiple sources of data that can mutually illuminate different dimensions of a single research problem, eventually producing a fuller and more complete narrative (Clark and Creswell 2010; Woolley 2009). Since mixed methods is fairly novel, there does not exist one canonized model for design or execution.

However, the issue of integration has become an important and valuable point of methodological discussion and debate within the growing mixed methods literature. Specifically, Robert K. Yin (2006) outlined five procedures that must be integrated in order to meet the definition of mixed methods (as opposed to merely multiple or parallel studies): (1) research questions, (2) units of analysis, (3) samples for study, (4) instrumentation and data collection methods, and (5) analytic strategies. He ultimately argues that if a single study draws from multiple methods using isolated and separate research procedures, the results would be complementary rather than genuinely mixed.

Claire M. Woolley (2009) also discusses the challenges with integration for mixed methods studies within the context of sociology. She highlights the importance of having a rationale for using mixed methods, arguing that this approach is appropriate for particular research questions, specifically, those that ask either 'what' and 'how' or 'what' and 'why' (p. 8). In the end, the majority of the literature on mixed methods asserts one distinct quality of this approach: that the sum of multiple methods is greater than its constituent parts. In other words, each method contributes to a synthesis of evidence, which ultimately provides a fuller more developed and nuanced understanding of a central research problem. In relation to my particular project, I draw on both quantitative and qualitative methods to produce data about how women of color engage with professionalism in the academy (a detailed summary of research objectives will proceed later in the chapter). Ultimately, the use of mixed methods for my dissertation allowed me to examine the professional lives of women of color both on a national broader scope with the survey data, and on a more nuanced and in-depth level with the qualitative interviews, but more importantly, the integration of both components together

reveal an important narrative about academic professionalism as explored in the empirical chapters and the conclusion. Next, I will discuss in detail the preliminary research I conducted on women of color faculty.

Exploratory Research

Starting in the 2006-7 academic year, I embarked on two overlapping projects on women of color in the academy. The first was a quantitative study testing the impact of tenure on overall job satisfaction using data from the 2004 National Survey of Post-Secondary Faculty. The second was a qualitative project interviewing non-white female faculty at one research university. The combined results from the secondary data analysis and the nine qualitative interviews suggested the need to expand the research and develop a design appropriate for a dissertation project. In particular, the exploratory research indicated that mixed methods, integrating both in-depth interviews and secondary data analysis, is the most appropriate design, which has the potential to yield rich data that can address complex, multi-layered, and multi-scaled research problems.

The earlier quantitative study examined the following question: Does achieving tenure have the same impact on job satisfaction for women of color compared to other groups? In accordance with previous research on the impact of tenure on the job satisfaction for women and minorities, this analysis sought to test the influence of tenure on job satisfaction for women of color faculty particularly as compared to other groups. Restults from bivariate analyses, 3-way means comparisons, path analysis and finally multivariate OLS regression, suggested that both race and gender have a strong impact on faculty job satisfaction in the academy. The results ultimately demonstrated that the process of tenure does not improve the job satisfaction for women of color (Castro 2010).

The main goal for the previous qualitative study was to examine the ways women of color faculty navigate through the institutional and non-institutional processes of the academy. I was particularly interested in how they maneuvered their identities within the academic space. From the nine interviews with faculty I conducted, three central themes emerged that posed significant challenges for these subjects: (1) support networks, (2) institutional climate, and (3) workload. All nine cases exhibited both overlapping and varying experiences in the academy along these major themes. My subjects came from various disciplines (i.e. liberal arts, law, sciences), backgrounds (i.e. class or place of origin), and generations (i.e. age or rank). These differences likely accounted for some of the variation in experiences, particularly in respect to the divisions between the hard sciences and all other fields. As will be discussed further in the chapter, I ultimately decided for the dissertation to include only respondents in liberal arts and education departments since the respondents from professional fields or bench sciences had starkly different work environments (gender/racial composition and climate) and professional expectations (work load) that significantly affect their experience of academic professionalism.

More importantly, the data from the interviews showed significant evidence for the embodiment of professionalism. Towards the end of the data collection process of this pilot study, I was able to gather detailed data on the decision-making processes about appearance and presentation.[20] Moreover, gender, race and sexuality manifested through issues of competency, authority, and respect. In other words, most respondents did not claim to experience overt sexual or racial discrimination throughout their careers;

---

[20] Only the last 3 interviews of the pilot study included direct questions regarding presentation of self. The previous interviews only indirectly explored these dimensions.

however, their narratives often included discussions regarding their struggles with being challenged in the classroom by students or not being taken seriously during faculty meetings. Moreover, these experiences often led to conscious decisions about how to lead the first day of class, how to avoid conflict and confrontations with colleagues, or decisions about appearance.

The consequences of my preliminary findings as a whole suggested first, a need for continued development of an analytic framework and research design that uncovers the discursive mechanisms of professionalism. Second, more empirical data was required to systematically look at the connections and relations between institutional structures and the embodied experience of women of color faculty. Correspondingly, a larger sample of respondents was necessary, including faculty of varying ranks and different institutional settings to demonstrate a common professional experience among women of color. However, what I ultimately found missing from conducting two parallel exploratory projects with slightly different focus was the development of one concise story about women of color faculty. Specifically, I found the interviews lacking some larger context, while the study on job satisfaction did not provide the level of nuance I was searching for. In the end, the exploratory research helped me see the explanatory potential of using integrative mixed methods, an approach focused on examining multiple layers of a central question, as opposed to just using multiple methods on the same population or topic. I will now outline the research design of the dissertation project.

Research Question & Design

Ultimately, the findings from the exploratory research along with the review of the literature led to one central research question: *how do women of color faculty at*

selected public research universities engage with discourses and practices of

professionalism? The guiding research question for this study is best examined through a

mixed-methodology approach in order to thoroughly understand the impact of discursive

power. Specifically, my goals for drawing on mixed methodology was two-fold: (1) to

contextualize the place and environment of how women of color faculty experience

professionalism, which draws from a social-ecological[21] conceptual framework—one that

examines multiple dimensions and effects, while recognizing the interrelatedness of

social processes within an environment; and (2) to highlight the multi-scalar[22] nature of

discursive power and practice—including an institutional-macro level (as revealed

through national level data), an individual-micro scale (as uncovered through face-to-face

interviews), but most importantly, a "meso" level where the macro and micro scales meet

and interact (precisely the function of an integrative mixed methods approach).

Ultimately, I draw on data from the 2004-5 faculty survey from the Higher Education

Research Institute (HERI) and data from forty in-depth interviews with women of color

faculty, which I will detail next.

Qualitative Component

The subjects for the qualitative sample are forty non-white female faculty at four

different Carnegie-designated[23] research schools in the Northeast. For each institution

---

[21] The social ecological approach draws primarily from the work of Urie Bronfenbrennar (1979) where he outlined four levels of psycho-social influence: macro-, exo-, meso-, and micro.

[22] Much like the social-ecological perspective, the concept of multi-scalarity brings attention to the different levels of complexity involved in social processes; however, this particular concept has been more heavily used within geography and those who examine urban spaces/cities. For example, "studies that emphasize the role and the influence of the city as a linkage between local actors and the broader decisional process at global, [continental] and national level[s]" (The Social Polis Approach; http://www.socialpolis.eu/the-social-polisapproach/multi-scalarity/).

[23] The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching (n.d.) ranking system for doctoral-granting universities includes institutions that award at least 20 doctoral degrees per year

selected for the study, I received all the proper and required Human Subjects approvals to solicit faculty interviews.[24] In congruence with feminist epistemology, this study relies heavily on in-depth interviews with women of color faculty to formulate an analysis about their challenges, subjectivity, and strategies regarding professionalism. I used a semi-structured interview guide composed of about fifteen to twenty open-ended questions (see Appendix A). The goal for the interviews was to cover a range of themes and maintain a more fluid free-flowing conversation.[25] The questions centered on major themes derived from the scholarly literature reviewed in the previous chapter. Some of these themes included: research and publications, work-family balance, institutional climate, student interactions, classroom experiences, mentorship, and tenure/promotion. In addition, the interviews included a set of questions that related to issues about professionalism, including questions regarding dress, appearance, and other decision-making processes related to self-presentation. These interview topics altogether sought to uncover the effects of discourses and practices of professionalism in the academy.

(excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc., and excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges). The designations include "Research university/very high research activity" (RU/VH), "Research university/high research activity" (RU/H), and "Doctoral research university" (DRU).

[24] Each institution had different Human Subjects requirements to interview faculty. However, the major components to receive IRB approval included (1) research protocol detailing my sample, procedures, instruments, and objectives, (2) letter of consent including two separate forms: one for general participation and another for permission to audiotape (3) an appendix with my interview guide and a copy of my recruitment letter.

[25] When approaching these interviews, I considered the ideas brought to light by James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium in *Postmodern Interviewing* (2003). Using their techniques, I took seriously the idea that interviews are a site of knowledge production, dispelling notions of respondents as passive vessels of answers; rather, by using a postmodern approach to interviewing, I treated my respondents as active, co-constructors of knowledge. For example, during the interview process, dialogue was not simply limited to the researcher asking questions and interviewee answering; on the contrary, more fluid and active dialogue was encouraged, allowing the interviewees to ask questions and go beyond the scope of the interview guide when necessary.

Specifically, questions regarding research and tenure/promotion experiences addressed how respondents negotiated professional standards of knowledge-production within their discipline and institution. In other words, discussions with the interviewees regarding their research agendas and how they have been received and valued by their fields and institutions uncovered the complex negotiations they endured in order to be recognized as legitimate scholars and academic professionals. In addition, the questions related to self-presentation informed how the respondents embodied professionalism with their style of dress, interactions with colleagues and students, and general demeanor. These decisions whether fully conscious or not suggest how interviewees daily encountered and experienced the disciplinary dimensions of professionalism.

Due to the special concerns regarding anonymity, all participants had the option to do the interviews either at their on-campus offices or at other non-disclosed locations like their homes. The option to conduct interviews off-campus gave my respondents more freedom to discuss their experiences and perspectives. Each interview lasted approximately one to two hours. I solicited signed consent to participate from all my respondents, including permission to audiotape. Immediately after each interview, I would administer a two-page survey to my respondents to collect the demographic data used to describe my sample. I will discuss more details about the survey in the proceeding section on interview subjects.

After each interview, I spent roughly one hour documenting the overall encounter. I wrote a general description of how we initially came into contact, followed by the process of setting an actual appointment for the interview. I also incorporated some participant observation methods through documentation of general surroundings,

including descriptions of building, the department and their offices, and their appearance and wardrobe. More importantly, I also recorded observations from the actual interview, documenting our interactions, rapport, reactions and perceptions.

Research Sites

This study focuses on research universities on the east coast for two reasons: first, sampling convenience and regional consistency of institutional cultures. Second, the study focused on the experiences of faculty at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) and therefore will not include Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs). This project will focus only on Carnegie-designated research PWIs in order to maintain consistency of institutional traits, expectations, and climate. Specifically, this project seeks to uncover the expectations of professionalism required within research institutions, which have relatively similar expectations for research, teaching, and service.

To select the universities for this study, I used data from the 2007 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Using their data center, I was able to search for institutions that met very specific qualifications. I used the following parameters for my search: (1) I narrowed the geographical region to the Mid East (DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA), (2) I included only those institutions that are public, four-year or above, (3) I limited the institutions to those that offered doctoral and first-professional as the highest degree (4) I included only schools with the 2005 Basic Carnegie Classification of Research universities, with either very high or high research activity, (5) I narrowed the institutions by degree of urbanization (locale)[26] to include only those in the City (Large, Midsize, and small), or Suburbs (Large, Midsize, and small), and lastly,

---

[26] I included location within the parameters of my research sites particularly to account for quality of living outcomes among my sample.

(6) I limited the search by institutional size to include those with 10,000 students and above. From this initial search, twelve institutions met these criteria, and ultimately four were selected based on accessibility, similarities in student and faculty population size and composition, and finally the size of the potential pool of non-white female faculty.

Table 3.1 Research Setting Profiles, 2010

	University A	University B	University C	University D
Total Students	36,507	37,595	45,185	12,870
Total Full-time Instructional Faculty	1,622	1,613	2,432	480
Student-Faculty Ratio	16:1	18:1	17:1	19:1
Carnegie Research Classification	High	Very High	Very High	High
Degree of Urbanization	Large City	Large Suburb	Small City	Large Suburb
Size and Setting	Large, Non-residential	Large, Residential	Large, Residential	Medium, Residential

The four institutions selected for this study are mostly large research universities (with exception of one medium sized institution) with student populations ranging from about 13,000 to 45,000, and full-time instructional faculty size ranging from 500 to 2,500. Table 3.1 outlines the characteristics of the universities selected for this study. Ultimately, this study compares the experiences of non-white female faculty in different locations in the Northeast. In particular, the design includes universities in both urban and suburban settings within comparable geographic locales in the region. The particular names and details of the universities are not revealed in order to protect the research subjects, who will already be identified by rank, discipline, and race/ethnicity. For future research, I hope to access more detailed institutional information for the selection of research sites. For example, (1) average number of publications required for tenure, (2) average faculty size by department, (3) average teaching load, and (4) rates of tenure and

promotion, all would provide substantial contextual information for assessing appropriate locations for data collection.

Recruitment & Data Collection

To recruit participants for this study, I first reviewed each institution's published university factbook to get a general sense of the gender, race, and ethnic composition of the faculty. Second, I contacted female faculty members via email, followed by phone calls, to those who are identifiable as racial/ethnic minorities through their department websites. In addition, I used informal networks by asking colleagues and advisors for references and by posting research announcements on professional association listservs. Finally, post-interview, I asked my respondents for recommendations of colleagues, acquaintances, and friends who would be interested in participating.

In order to maintain organization and keep track of potential respondents, I created an excel spreadsheet detailing the people I had contacted, recording how I initially identified them, dates of contact, method of contact, etc. As I got further into the recruitment and data collection process, I maintained separate data sheets for respondents who had declined, who completed interviews, who were in the scheduling process, and who had yet to reply to my emails and/or phone calls.

All interviews took place at a location preferred and designated by each respondent. The overwhelming majority of interviews occurred at their campus offices during "regular" work hours, between 9am and 5pm, Monday through Friday. On four occasions, I was invited to the respondents' home for the interviews, and two respondents asked to meet at places outside the home or office: one at a popular restaurant/café in a downtown city area, and another at a "neutral" space at the campus student center.

In general, my use of snowball sampling worked relatively well, eventually yielding the targeted amount of interviews. Throughout the 15 months of data collection, I did inevitably encounter some significant challenges. First and foremost, data collection was considerably restricted to the academic calendar. At the outset of the project, I expected incorrectly that many faculty would be willing to be interviewed during the off-months in the summer and winter. On the contrary, most faculty fell off the radar during these times, presumably to catch up on their own research and personal lives. Despite the great lulls during these times, I did manage to meet my interview goals eventually, even though this translated to very intense and exhausting months throughout the semester that at times involved traveling multiple times a week to different cities.

Another major challenge not unique to this study and typical of this nature of research was the logistics of scheduling and traveling to various locations. Since this project was multi-sited in four different cities/universities, I had to make travel arrangements accordingly. Since I do not own a car, this was particularly demanding. In order to get to each site, I relied on car rentals, Amtrak, and public transportation. I can proudly say that I was able to follow through with all the scheduled interviews at each specified time and location.[27] Only one of my respondents cancelled without notice, and that involved a legitimate family emergency abroad.

A final challenge worth discussing briefly is a general observation about respondents' anxieties and reluctance to be formally interviewed about their experiences in the academy. Although I cannot confirm the reasons why many faculty either declined

---

[27] There was only one exception to this when I was 40 minutes late to an interview due to an earlier respondent being late and a delayed train (and an overambitious interview schedule at two different research sites). Thankfully the respondent patiently waited and was willing to go forward with the interview.

or failed to respond to my invitations, I can at least make an argument based on some of the conversations I had with my respondents. It is very likely that many faculty opted out of the study due to perceived risks of jeopardizing their careers or general anxieties about unearthing past traumas. This observation in of itself highlights the vulnerabilities and precariousness experienced by women of color, further validating the need and relevance of this dissertation project.

What surprised me the most about the interviewing process was the degree to which my respondents would extend themselves and accommodate my needs as a researcher. For example, respondents would often accommodate my schedule to allow for multiple interviews per day/visit. Respondents would offer rides to and from the train station, occasionally treat me to lunch, and other similar courtesies. The most rewarding aspect of this process was the ability to conduct all forty interviews in person, face-to-face, which provided a layer of richness and robustness to my data that otherwise could have been diminished if I did my interviews virtually or over the phone.

Interview Subjects

A total of forty non-white female faculty were interviewed for the dissertation. Since my research question focuses on describing the experiences of women of color, I did not include a white female comparison group. Therefore, I will not be making any conclusions or assessments on how women of color are or are not like white female faculty. In addition, past research on women of color faculty have drawn from samples of 10-20 participants at one institution (C. S. V. Turner 2002; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001); however, the strength of my research is that it is

situated in four different universities, and ultimately included a total of 40 participants (10-15) per institution.

The racial/ethnic categories of the subjects vary, but overwhelmingly my subjects identify as African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinas. Noteworthy, I considered excluding first generation immigrants from this project due to the potential unique affects of the migration experience, which emerged during my pilot study. However, in the end, I did not leave out this group from my sample since first, this decision would have significantly limited the number of potential respondents, and second, the exclusion of first generation immigrants would have eliminated the possibility of finding important overlap between different non-white racial and ethnic groups, which ultimately serves to strengthen this analysis.

Also, the decision to include women with varying racial, ethnic, class and citizenship statuses is consistent with the literature on women of color. For example, Thomas and Hollenshead (2001) make a point to acknowledge that their use of women of color as a unit of analysis is supported by past research that has shown that the experiences of various minority women are similar enough to be grouped together. Similarly, in the study conducted by Margolis and Romero (1998), twenty-six women of color graduate students enrolled in PhD programs in sociology were interviewed. Their sample consisted of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and Latinas, and among this diverse group, three identified themselves as international. Although the participants in my study have varying backgrounds, disciplines, and ranks, I included subjects only in the social sciences, humanities, and education departments.

As a result of the exploratory research described earlier, I believe it was necessary to control for the stark differences in work environment, as well as professional expectations I found between liberal arts and the bench sciences; therefore, I made the decisive methodological choice to only examine academic spaces within the liberal arts or education. In addition, these disciplines are regularly perceived as more progressive and welcoming compared to their science counterparts (Vargas 2002), which can further highlight the perniciousness of institutional inequality. In other words, the decision to narrow recruitment of interview respondents to liberal arts and education departments would enable a more "conservative" examination of inequality since in effect, I would be controlling for extreme or blatant inequities that are still pervasive in more white male dominant spaces like the sciences or business schools.

Ultimately, I interviewed a total of 45 women of color faculty: 9 for the pilot study, and 36 during the official dissertation data collection stage. For this dissertation, I draw from the data of only 40 interviews in total that meet the scope of this project, which excludes five interviews with faculty outside the fields of liberal arts or education conducted during the pilot study. Of the 36 dissertation interviews, I collected 34 demographic surveys that report personal details like age, marital status, dependents, as well as professional activities like course load, grant activity, and hours spent advising students.[28] Table 3.2 displays some basic information about the sample of interview participants used for the analysis of this dissertation. As reflected in the table,

---

[28] The remaining six interview respondents that I did not gather demographic data from included the four respondents from the pilot study, who did not have the survey component of the interview process, and two respondents during the dissertation research stage who declined response to the survey.

approximately half my sample identified as African-American/Black,[29] and reported

being married/committed. About 80 percent of my sample are either assistant or associate

professors and the clear majority are U.S. born citizens.

Table 3.2 Interview Data, Respondent Demographics

Race/Ethnicty[1]

African-American/Black	19	50.0%
Latina/Chicana	7	18.4%
Asian American/Asian	5	13.2%
Native American	1	2.6%
Other	5	13.2%
No answer	1	2.6%

Academic Rank[1]

Senior/Full	6	15.8%
Associate	15	39.5%
Assistant	15	39.5%
Other/Non-tenure track	2	5.3%

Mean Age[2] 44

Mean Years at Institution[2] 11

Marital Status[2]

Single	14	41.2%
Married/Committed	16	47.1%
Divorced	3	8.8%

Citizenship Status[2]

U.S. Citizen	25	73.5%
Naturalized Citizen	4	11.8%
Permanent Resident	4	11.8%

Notes: (1) Totals include respondents who completed a demographic survey, PLUS the 4 individuals from the pilot study, (2) Totals ONLY reflect those who completed a survey and answered the specific question(s).

---

[29] Notably, the predominance of Black faculty may be a product of using pictures to initially identify women of color and/or reflective of regional differences in racial/ethnic demographics.

Interview Data Analysis

After transcription of all forty interviews, I used the qualitative software AtlasTi to code and manage the data. I used an open coding method reminiscent of the grounded theory approach for approximately half the interview data, yielding forty-three codes total (see Appendix B). At this midpoint, I reassessed my coding scheme, particularly in relation to the results from the statistical analysis of the HERI data (details in the proceeding section). I then proceeded with a more focused method of coding for the remainder of the interviews, paying particular attention to themes related to professional belonging and legitimacy. After this process, my top three codes were as follows: "Recognition/Lack of," "Legitimacy/Perceptions," and "Professional challenges," which comprised the bulk of the data analyzed in chapters five and six. In addition, after every coding session, I spent ten to fifteen minutes maintaining a log of memos reporting what I accomplished, whether I made any changes to my coding scheme, and any analytical thoughts I had. These notes along with the memos I wrote post-interview (as discussed in the previous overview of the qualitative component) significantly assisted me with the coding process and helped me develop the outlines of the interview data chapters.

Quantitative Component

Secondary data analysis was drawn from the 2004-5 Faculty Survey from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). The analysis centered on variables that inform three important areas about women of color in the academy: (1) current status and demographics including rank, region, and year of degree completion (2) workload and commitments including teaching and service, and (3) patterns of job satisfaction, mental/physical health, and other

affective variables. Altogether, data within these areas provides a necessary portrait of women of color in the academy, while situating the interview sample in a national context in order to further understand their experiences with professionalism.

The data includes a sample size of approximately 500 non-white women out of about 12,000 total faculty. To properly contextualize the qualitative sample, the dataset was filtered for only respondents who had earned a PhD or equivalent and held an appointment at an accredited, Carnegie-designated research university in the liberal arts or education fields. No hard, bench sciences or professional fields were included. The non-white sample includes eight different racial/ethnic categories: African American/Black, American Indian, Asian American/Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Mexican American/Chicano, Puerto Rican, Other Latino, or Other. Table 3.3 indicates the racial categories and frequencies for the non-white women category used as the focus of my analysis.

Table 3.3: Racial Categories and Frequencies for Sample of Women of Color in HERI Data

	Frequency	Percentage
African American/Black	150	22.4%
American Indian	57	8.5%
Asian American/Asian	206	30.7%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	18	2.7%
Mexican American/Chicana	57	8.5%
Other Latino	99	14.8%
Other Race	83	12.4%
Total	670	100.0%

As a special note, the results reflected in Table 3.3 include all females in each racial category that comprises the woman of color faculty variable; however, for the final

analyses, I excluded cases from each category that identified additionally with the 'white/caucasian' racial category in order to have more exclusive racial categories and to avoid potentially misleading overlap in my sample. Ultimately, this process reduced the total sample size of non-white women to approximately 534 cases.

Data Acquisition

In order to acquire the data from HERI at UCLA, I submitted a formal proposal detailing the purpose of my study, my research questions and hypotheses, methods of analysis, location of study, and approach for disseminating results. In addition, I had to make decisions about the exact variables I planned to use in the analysis. I selected about one hundred variables, many that were within a particular stem of variables such as those reporting general activities of faculty or their different sources of stress. Almost all the variables selected were categorical with some ordinal variables. No identifying variables such as names of universities were included in the proposal. After the proposal was accepted, I was asked to pay a $500 fee and sign a research agreement.[30] The data was sent electronically, and as proposed, it is housed only in my office computer, which has all the necessary security settings to ensure the proper use of the data by only myself.

Bivariate Analyses and Controlling for Rank

For the initial analysis, I first focused on understanding the demographic characteristics of the non-white women in the sample with a series of bivariate analyses

---

[30] The agreement stipulated the following: (1) my approval is to conduct only the research described in my proposal. Any additional research must be applied for and approved by HERI before any research takes place, (2) I was responsible for obtaining local institutional research board approval for my research, (3) I must provide HERI with a copy of my research product (published paper, conference presentation, dissertation, etc.), and (4) the data access is granted for a period of one year from when I actually received the dataset. After a year, HERI required a status update and will grant another year extension if necessary. After two years, my access expired. If I needed to extend access at that time I was required to reapply for another proposal review.

with chi-square tests using the statistical software SPSS. I examined the distribution of non-white women by rank, region, year degree completed, year of current appointment, and marital status. The results were consistent with the literature, in which women of color are generally younger, with the majority completing their degree after the 1990's, and therefore concentrated in the assistant and associate professor ranks.

Secondly, I examined a set of *affective*[31] variables, which included variables about perceptions of legitimacy and considerations for leaving academia. Related to these variables, I explored variables on institutional perceptions, particularly regarding the racial climate, availability of mentors, and perceptions of the tenure process. Last, I analyzed variables that detailed how women of color on average allocate their time through variables on teaching duties, research productivity, and service responsibilities (including student advising). After completing a series of bivariate analyses, I re-examined two specific affective variables using layered chi-square tables controlling for rank: perceptions of legitimacy and considerations for leaving academia. On further review, I recoded the independent variable as 1= non-white women, 2=white women, 3=non-white men, and 4=white men. Subsequent bivariate analyses revealed the distinct intersectionality impact of race and gender.

Multiple Regression

A detailed study of the quantitative analyses showed many of my bivariate relationships to be statistically significant and practically important, and the bulk of my interview data additionally revealed the challenges with legitimacy and sense of belonging. I therefore proceeded with a multiple regression analysis, which allowed me

---

[31] Variables related to moods, feelings, and attitudes as opposed to measurements of numerical representation or other structural variables such as rank and salary.

to control for multiple variables simultaneously on my outcomes of interest. I used the statistical software STATA to run logistic regression for two dependent variables. The first "Perception of legitimacy," which I recoded as a dichotomous variable to indicate whether faculty believed they have to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. The second "Consideration for leaving academia," demonstrates whether faculty have considered leaving academia within the past year. I used dummy independent variables for sex, race, and rank and built my models by incorporating each predictor one at a time to observe the impact of each variable.[32] In this dissertation, I include only one final logistic regression model examining the perception of legitimacy by race, sex, and rank.

As will be discussed at length in the remainder of the dissertation, the different analyses used for this project as a whole from both the quantitative and qualitative components ultimately revealed the multi-scale impact of professionalism on women of color faculty, including larger contextual factors (such as professional duties and institutional perceptions) as well as nuanced embodied experiences (such as disciplining dress, emotions, and demeanor). I now will conclude this chapter with a discussion of the limitations and concerns for the overall project.

<div align="center">Limitations and Concerns</div>

My primary concern with this study was protecting the identities of my respondents. Even with varying precautions employed to preserve the anonymity of my subjects, I was concerned with the precarious status of women of color in the academy. In other words, I deeply considered the fact that many women of color faculty tend to be

---

[32] After finalizing my logistic regression model, I built an additional model of predicted probabilities; however, I will only include the findings in the appendix of the dissertation and not within the chapter itself since it merely reflects the results of the both the descriptive and multivariate analyses.

isolated; thus, they are consequently highly visible in their respective departments. The situation was compounded if they were active in administration or major university committees, which was the case for some of my respondents. Moreover, if any of the participants had actively challenged their status or treatment at the university during some point in their career, their vulnerability in this study exponentially increased. In particular, since such challenges can seriously jeopardized their job status and/or lead to hostility within departments or institutions, the issue of anonymity became crucial due to the greater risks respondents took to discuss and share these experiences with me.

Another methodological concern I encountered at the outset of this dissertation was how to address the issue of researcher subjectivity. I wondered how my positionality as a young Latina graduate student and an aspiring academic would impact the dissertation project. What I learned through my coursework in qualitative methods and in feminist epistemology is that first, being an "insider" in the community that is the subject of study can have both positive and negative effects. As an "insider," researchers can access the populations with more ease through personal networks and snowball sampling; however, some methodologists warn that being too personally close or invested in the research can inhibit the researcher's analytic abilities since they may share many habits or perceptions with their subjects that can ultimately go unnoticed. As sociologists in particular, we are taught to "make the familiar strange," and to not take any social processes for granted as "normal" or "neutral," which is the hardest to achieve when considering your own personal narratives and experiences.

However, what I encountered through the interview process exceeded my expectations. First, since the study focused on the professional experiences of faculty

members, with some serving over twenty years at their institutions, the researcher-subject interactions during the interviews resembled more of a mentoring relationship, rather than one of peers. Across the interviews, I experienced moments where it was clear that my subjects were speaking directly to me, as a woman of color graduate student, rather than as a researcher. Ultimately, the subjects of this study were not merely respondents to a research project, rather they were invested participants in the construction of this dissertation, as though they were my committee members. In the end, I consider this level of active participation from my subjects as a major strength of my project and methodology.

In terms of methodological concerns of this research, I considered some of the debates for evaluating qualitative research (Lincoln and Denzin 2003). For example, according to the nonfoundationalist perspective (J. K. Smith and Deemer 2003), the criteria for inquiry and the pursuit of knowledge is based on moral, political and ethical standards, rather than a set of concerns regarding validity and reliability common in the foundationalist approach or the criteria of plausibility, credibility, and descriptive validity produced by the quasi-foundationalist paradigm. The nonfoundationalist criteria greatly reflect the postmodern/feminist approach to research, in which the construction of objective causal outcomes is not a central, organizing goal. Given these perspectives, the methodological concerns for this particular project fall somewhere between the quasi-foundationalists and nonfoundationalists. In other words, my methodological concerns consisted of both meeting some of the concrete standards put forth specifically for qualitative research, particularly related to overall credibility, while attempting to additionally meet the larger moral, ethical and political criteria for pursuing knowledge.

The ultimate goal of this research is to uncover the daily negotiations and struggles women of color encounter in the academy, making links to broader structural problems of the university and the presence of powerful discourses of professionalism which act to control and discipline women of color faculty.

CHAPTER 4:
CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN OF COLOR
FACULTY NATIONALLY

Although they represent a diverse group in many ways, do women of color in fact have shared lived experiences? Through the crucial contributions of sociologists like Patricia Hill Collins (2000), Bonnie Thornton Dill and Maxine Baca Zinn (1994), more scholarship today acknowledges that lived experience—our day-to-day lives—is a complex product of intersecting social identities. However, most research on minority populations continues to group subjects as 'people of color' or 'women' as if they are universal, homogeneous, non-intersecting categories. We as sociologists and scholars need to acknowledge the theoretical and empirical potential that an intersectional examination can yield. A research agenda that uses an intersectional analysis focusing on the lives of women of color can provide a better understanding of power and inequality in the twenty-first century than one that does not. However, like Choo and Feree (2010) specify, a more productive intersectional analysis is not limited to the inclusion of marginal voices as the object of study. Therefore, although this chapter does center the experiences of women of color faculty, the ultimate objective is to illuminate some of the processes and mechanisms that create fundamentally different professional experiences for faculty who are both gender and racial minorities in the academy, which ultimately reveals the complex ways that power and inequality function in modern social institutions.

I use data from a nationally representative faculty survey from 2004-2005 conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). In addition to providing a context for examining past and future research, I hope this chapter will be a practical

resource for other researchers, university administrators, and higher education policy-makers interested in examining the lives and experiences of women of color faculty in the U.S. This chapter represents the quantitative portion of this larger mixed methodological project examining the professional lives of women of color faculty. The other major component of this research is based on forty in-depth qualitative interviews with women of color faculty and will be the focus of chapters five and six.[33]

LITERATURE

For the most part, the existing literature relevant to the experiences of women of color faculty is embedded in the larger body of research on people of color and women in the academy (Aguirre 2000; S. E. Moore, R. Alexander, and Lemelle 2010; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000; Stanley 2006c). However, a small and emergent pool of scholarship has opened the discussion on the particular work lives of minority women faculty (Berry and Mizelle 2006; S. L. Holmes et al. 2007; Margolis and Romero 1998; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; C. S. V. Turner 2002; Vargas 2002; Vakalahi and Starks 2011). When examining these bodies of work, three themes stand out as relevant to the goals of this chapter. First, the under-representation and isolation women of color often encounter at their institutions. Second, the challenge women of color face with being over-burdened with service, or what I call the *diversity double-duty*. Third, the systemic repeal and de-legitimization of Affirmative Action, which brings into question the authority and validity of women of color's scholarship, pedagogies, and professional accolades. Overall, these professional challenges for women of color faculty can

---

[33] The scope of this chapter will not include detailed discussions of the qualitative findings.

seriously affect their career advancement, and their also general health and well-being (Vakalahi and Starks 2011). I will now elaborate on these burdens in turn.

First, as many researchers have noted, women and people of color continue to be under-represented as tenure-track faculty, especially at the highest levels (full professors and administrators) and at the most prestigious institutions (Aguirre 2000; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000). Given the *multiple marginality*[34] and *interlocking matrices of oppression/domination*[35] experienced by women of color, this population in the academy often encounters extreme isolation and under-representation at their home institutions and sometimes in their discipline as a whole (C. S. V. Turner 2002). The consequence of this isolation often contributes to the lack of available mentors and collaborators, which can have a detrimental effect on career progress, especially promotion (Holmes et al. 2007). Specifically, since the tenure and promotion process continues to lack transparency in most institutions, faculty often cannot be successful without mentors and reliable colleagues to provide them valuable information. More importantly, since tenure and promotion so heavily relies on publications, especially at research universities, supportive colleagues and mentors are vital for the writing process either in terms of potential opportunities for co-authorship, or for providing feedback on drafts before submission to journals or academic presses.

---

[34] Caroline S. Turner (2002) defines *multiple marginality* as the "the more ways in which one differs from the 'norm,' the more social interactions will be affected within multiple contexts. Situations in which a woman of color might experience marginality are multiplied depending on her marginal status within various contexts" (p. 77).

[35] Patricia Hill Collins (2000) describes the term *matrix of domination* as the "overall social organization within which intersecting oppressions originate, develop, and are contained. In the United States, such domination has occurred through schools, housing, employment, government, and other social institutions that regulate the actual patterns of intersecting oppressions that Black women encounter" (pgs. 227-228).

Second, starting in the mid-1990's the concerns about gender inequality in university service began to emerge (S. Acker and Feuerverger 1996; Gibson 2006, 2004; Park 1996). Researchers found that women faculty provide significantly more service and advising roles, engaging in what Acker (1995) termed university 'carework' (Acker 1995; Murray 2006). A recent faculty work-life study at University of Massachusetts Amherst suggests that there exists an "ivory ceiling of service work" where women faculty, especially associate professors, find that unfair/unequal service demands take time from their research agendas which, ultimately, affects their promotion possibilities (Misra et al. 2011).

Faculty of color have similarly experienced a burden with service and mentoring. With the implementation of diversity curriculum requirements at many universities,[36] administration often turns to faculty of color to teach these courses, regardless of whether race is one of their research or teaching areas (Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010; Perry et al. 2009). Joseph and Hirshfield (2011) invoke the concept of *cultural taxation*[37] to describe the burden faculty of color experience in the academy due to the additional responsibilities placed on them. Given the realities regarding service women and people of color face, women of color faculty are even more vulnerable to this racial, cultural, *and* gendered taxation, or what I call the *diversity double-duty*.

Finally, some research has examined the issue of legitimacy and authority regarding to the experiences of faculty of color in the classroom and with colleagues

---

[36] The American Association of Colleges and Universities documented in 2000 that 63 percent of colleges and universities report having a diversity education component in their undergraduate curriculum (H. A. Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010). Such courses may include those about the historical significance of race, or on the immigrant experience in the U.S.

[37] See Amado M. Padilla (1994).

regarding non-mainstream[38] scholarship and/or methodologies (Perry et al. 2009; Aguirre 2000; Stanley 2007; Turner and Myers 2000). Moore et al. (2010) argue that the majority of faculty of color find themselves trapped within a *devalued secondary labor market* structured by the gendered and racialized emotional labor that comes with teaching diversity courses and serving as diversity representatives throughout their institution. The emotional labor often includes daily attacks on authority and credibility in diversity classrooms despite culturally embedded assumptions that instructors of color and women are better suited to teach courses on race and gender (Perry et al. 2009). Moore et al. (2010) additionally suggest that service to diversity education often continues post-tenure. Yet the emotional labor and differential burden that instructors of color at all ranks experience goes unacknowledged.

The research reviewed above creates a solid foundation for other scholars, policy-makers, and administrators to understand resilient structures of inequality in the academy today, particularly based on gender and racial hierarchies reflective of society at large. However, with few exceptions, most of the empirical research fails to fully address the intersectional experiences of non-white women in the academy. The few studies that do focus specifically on the lives of women of color base their analysis on case studies of faculty at a single institution or use the *autoethnographic*[39] technique (Berry and Mizelle 2006; S. L. Holmes et al. 2007; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; C. S. V. Turner 2002; Vargas 2002; Vakalahi and Starks 2011).

---

[38] Non-mainstream refers to research topics and methods that would unlikely be published in top tier journals or receive federal or prestigious foundation grants (i.e. most research on people of color, women, & LGBTQ communities).
[39] "A turning of the ethnographic gaze inward on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of the ethnography, looking at the larger context wherein self experiences occur" (Ellis and Bochner 1996:227).

However, what I find missing is a conversation about women of color in a national context. Ultimately, this chapter attempts to address the following empirical question: *what are the professional characteristics and perceptions of women of color faculty nationally?* The following section will discuss how I attempted to address this question.

METHODS AND SAMPLE

The examination of the 2004-5 HERI Faculty Survey I carried out was predominately descriptive, consisting of mostly bivariate and layered chi-square tables. However, in the end, I did run a few logistic regression models since the descriptive analyses suggested the need for multivariate analysis. The survey data are drawn from faculty in liberal arts or education departments at Carnegie designated Research I universities. The focus of this analysis included all women who identified as African American/Black, American Indian, Asian American/Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Mexican American/Chicano, Puerto Rican, Other Latino, or Other. The subjects of this analysis excludes respondents who identified as both white and another category.[40] For several important bivariate and three way analyses, I included three additional categories for the independent variable (white women, men of color, and white men) to

---

[40] Also, about 43 percent of the women of color in the HERI sample are foreign-born compared to only about 17 percent of all other faculty. The practice of including foreign-born people in groups labeled people of color is a common practice at many state and federal institutions, as well as past research on non-white populations. However, for my future research, I intend to focus on the particular experiences of being foreign-born with a study on professional women of color migrants to the U.S.

make important comparisons and highlight further the significance of the intersectional

lens.[41]

Table 4.1: Academic Rank

	Women of Color Faculty	All Other Faculty
Professor	16.0%	45.6%
Associate Professor	33.9%	26.3%
Assistant Professor	39.7%	21.7%
Lecturer	4.3%	3.0%
Instructor	1.7%	1.2%
Other	4.3%	2.3%
Total	100% (531)	100% (11508)
Chi-Square Value	197.80****	

Notes: p<0.001****; p<0.01***; p<0.05**; p<0.1*

Within the academy, women of color are generally classified as a younger

cohort.[42] Reflective of the larger population[43], the sample of this analysis are over-

represented as assistant professors, counting for about 40 percent of all women of color

---

[41] The final tables include some analyses that use only two categories for the independent variable: women of color faculty and all other faculty. The most significant relationships include the multi-category independent variable described.

[42] Cohort can be indicated by year received highest degree and year of appointment. In this sample, about 63 percent of the sample of women of color faculty received PhDs after 1992 and started their current position after 1997.

[43] According to 2009 data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 39.5 percent of women of color are concentrated in non-tenured ranks compared to the national average of 31.7 percent for all faculty, which is well below the rates for white women (37 percent), men of color (26.4 percent), and white men (25.1 percent).

faculty; furthermore, only 50 percent of women of color are either associate or full professors, while about 72 percent of all other faculty fall into these ranks (see Table 4.1). However, the cohort effect is not the sole underlying factor contributing to the under-representation of women of color as tenured and full professors. Therefore, the analysis that follows will examine variables that can provide a glimpse of the lives of women of color faculty nationally in order to better assess indicators that may impair recruitment and retention, but most importantly shed light on how they experience academic professionalism.

FINDINGS: DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES

Beliefs about Legitimacy

One of the most significant findings related to the central research question of this project is a concern about feelings of legitimacy. Specifically, 46 percent of the women of color sample indicated that they 'to a great extent' have to work harder to be perceived as legitimate scholars compared to only 26 percent of white women, 27 percent of men of color, and 14 percent of white men (see Table 4.2). Therefore, the women of color faculty represented in these data were two to three times more likely to report having to work harder to a great extent to be legitimate. These results imply that despite increased representation and inclusion of women of color faculty at all ranks in the academy, there exists a similar perception of continually having to assert oneself as a legitimate professional to colleagues, students and sometimes entire academic institutions.

Table 4.2: Faculty Beliefs about Legitimacy

	Women of Color	White Women	Men of Color	White Men
Have to Work Harder to be Legitimate				
To a Great Extent	45.5%	26.2%	27.3%	14.0%
To Some Extent	33.5%	34.8%	32.4%	29.1%
Not at all	21.1%	39.1%	40.3%	56.9%
Total	100% (517)	100% (3583)	100% (812)	100% (6818)
Chi-Square Value	661.833****			

Notes: p<0.001****; p<0.01***; p<0.05**; p<0.1*

As noted earlier in the chapter, women of color as a whole and in my particular sample are concentrated and over-represented in non-tenured ranks. By examining the distribution of year degree earned and year of current appointment (see footnote 42), we can infer that women of color are generally a newer population of faculty in the academy. As a result, it is important to re-examine some key indicators of professional identity and determine the degree in which a cohort effect in fact exists. To make this assessment, I ran a series of 3-way analyses using academic rank as a control variable. The results indicated that this was a worthwhile exploration.

Table 4.3 presents the results for respondents, by rank, who believed they had to work harder 'to a great extent' to be perceived as legitimate scholars. In the original bivariate analysis, women of color faculty were significantly two to three times more likely than all other faculty to agree with the statement (see Table 4.2). Remarkably, controlling for academic rank seemed to have little to no effect, the original relationship was replicated in the partial relationships. In general, women of color faculty were still significantly more likely to believe they have to work harder at the Full, Associate, and Assistant professor levels (two to four times more than other faculty), with the

differences remaining statistically significant at p<0.001 (see Table 4.3). At the senior (full professor) rank, 43 percent of women of color believed they had to work harder to be perceived as legitimate scholars, compared to 22 percent of white women, 22 percent for men of color, and 11 percent of white men (see Table 4.3). These results indicate that inclusion and promotion of women of color faculty are not the ultimate solution to solving persistent inequality, rather we need to investigate further into more subtle mechanisms like the *diversity double duty*, as will be discussed at length in the proceeding sections and in chapters five and six.

Table 4.3: Faculty Beliefs about Legitimacy by Academic Rank++

Have to Work Harder to be Legitimate	To a Great Extent	To Some Extent	Not at All	Total
Professor				
Women of Color	42.7%	29.3%	28.1%	100%(82)
White Women	21.8%	30.8%	47.4%	100%(1046)
Men of Color	21.9%	29.0%	49.1%	100%(334)
White Men	11.4%	26.5%	62.0%	100%(3707)
Chi-square Value 172.99****				
Associate				
Women of Color	46.6%	35.2%	18.2%	100%(176)
White Women	26.0%	37.2%	36.8%	100%(1077)
Men of Color	34.8%	28.4%	36.8%	100%(204)
White Men	15.1%	32.0%	52.9%	100%(1672)
Chi-square Value 186.02****				
Assistant				
Women of Color	47.6%	31.7%	20.7%	100%(208)
White Women	26.7%	37.5%	35.8%	100%(1090)
Men of Color	27.8%	41.6%	30.6%	100%(245)
White Men	17.9%	32.2%	50.0%	100%(1113)
Chi-square Value 133.03****				

Notes: p<0.001****; p<0.01***; p<0.05**; p<0.1*
++ Table does not show non-tenure track categories

Desire to Leave Academia

Another important perception of women of color faculty nationally was the effect of academic rank on the variable about leaving academia (see Table 4.4). Specifically, in

the original bivariate analysis the racial/gender groups significantly differed, 36 percent

of women of color faculty consider leaving academia, compared to 32 of white women,

23 percent of men of color, and 20 percent of white men (see Table 4.4). However, when

controlling for academic rank, the percent of women of color indicating they considered

leaving academia remained at about the same level for associates and assistants (38% and

35% respectively) and decreased about 10 percent for full professors (see Table 4.5).

Remarkably, women of color were still significantly more likely to consider leaving

compared to their colleagues, with the exception of the assistant professor level where

white women were slightly more likely (by about 4 percent). Nevertheless, consistent

with other studies, the data imply that for women of color in particular, tenure and

promotion do not grant a solid sense of security, belonging, and satisfaction compared to

their colleagues who do not strongly consider leaving academia (C. S. V. Turner 2002;

Castro 2010).

Table 4.4: Faculty Beliefs about Leaving Academia

	Women of Color	White Women	Men of Color	White Men
Considered Leaving Academe				
Yes	36.3%	31.7%	22.9%	19.98%
No	63.7%	68.3%	77.1%	80.02%
Total	100% (523)	100% (3618)	100% (820)	100% (6847)
Chi-Square Value	217.77****			

Notes: p<0.001****; p<0.01***; p<0.05**; p<0.1*

Table 4.5: Desire to Leave Academia by Academic Rank++

Considered Leaving Academia	Yes	No	Total
Professor			
Women of Color	26.8%	73.2%	100%(82)
White Women	20.5%	79.5%	100%(1059)
Men of Color	13.2%	86.8%	100%(342)
White Men	13.0%	87.0%	100%(3721)
Chi-square Value 47.26****			
Associate			
Women of Color	37.8%	62.2%	100%(180)
White Women	31.7%	68.3%	100%(1091)
Men of Color	29.1%	70.9%	100%(206)
White Men	24.9%	75.2%	100%(1682)
Chi-square Value 24.19****			
Assistant			
Women of Color	35.3%	64.7%	100%(207)
White Women	39.7%	60.3%	100%(1094)
Men of Color	30.9%	69.1%	100%(243)
White Men	30.7%	69.3%	100%(1123)
Chi-square Value 21.36****			

Notes: $p<0.001$****; $p<0.01$***; $p<0.05$**; $p<0.1$*
++ Table does not show non-tenure track categories

Related to the previous discussions on lack of legitimacy, lack of security, and higher rates of desiring to leave academia, what is most significant is that women of color associate professors are more likely than their full professor counterparts to consider leaving academia: 38 percent of associates considered leaving academia compared to 27 percent of full professors (see Table 4.5). We can assume that since associates came up for tenure more recently, they have particularly vivid sentiments, perhaps even unpleasant ones, about the academy and its processes. In contrast, it is also possible that many more advanced associates feel stifled as their potential for being promoted to full seems unattainable due to increasing standards for publications coupled with greater service expectations for many post-tenure. Particularly for associate women of color, they have likely lost any departmental protection against administrative invitations for diversifying university committees (Pyke 2011; Misra et al. 2011). Nevertheless, despite

some of the observable effects academic rank has on whether faculty considered leaving

academia, women of color comparatively, particularly the tenured faculty, continue to

express more feelings of dissatisfaction and doubt about academia. Again, what these

results might signal is the importance of covert systems of inequality that function in the

academy, particularly those related to the pressures women of color faculty experience

with the push towards diversifying their institutions.

Institutional Perspectives

As noted previously, the women of color faculty sample varies in their racial,

ethnic, and citizenship identities, as well in their tenure status and rank. Despite the

variation, this section discusses how the population exhibited clear patterns in their

opinions and beliefs about their respective institutions, further suggesting a similar

experience in the academy. Although, using the more fine-tuned intersectional lens for

the qualitative data exposed some of the nuanced differences in each narrative, the survey

data examined in this chapter allows us to see specifically how gender and race structures

the academy more generally. For example, women of color faculty are twice as likely as

all other faculty to think their institutions have no respect for diverse values and beliefs[44]

(see Table 4.6). In addition, when examining more closely the differences between

perceptions of racial conflict, we see that 25 percent of women of color faculty agree

some and agree strongly that there is "a lot of racial conflict" at their institution,

compared to only 13 percent of white women, 12 percent of men of color, and 6 percent

of white men (see Table 4.7). These results suggest that women of color are significantly

---

[44] 20 percent of women of color faculty compared to 10 percent of all other faculty strongly
disagreed with the original statement: "There is respect for the expression of diverse values and
beliefs" (see Table 4.6).

more likely to encounter unfriendly or even hostile institutional climates throughout their

academic careers, which can further impact their feelings of isolation and alienation.

Table 4.6: Beliefs and Opinions about the Institution

		Women of Color Faculty	All Other Faculty	Chi-Square Value
Faculty are not rewarded for good teaching		34.2%	28.1%	9.05***
	Total	100% (524)	100% (11292)	
There is no respect for diverse values and beliefs		20.0%	10.0%	53.12****
	Total	100% (520)	100% (11267)	
There is a lot of racial conflict[1]		24.5%	8.7%	145.00****
	Total	100% (519)	100% (11698)	
My department does not mentor new faculty		49.1%	39.1%	24.51****
	Total	100% (521)	100% (11721)	
The criteria for advance/promotion is not cle		41.7%	25.2%	69.50****
	Total	100% (513)	100% (11148)	

Notes: $p<0.001$****; $p<0.01$***; $p<0.05$**; $p<0.1$*; [1] The percentage includes respondents who "agree somewhat" and "agree strongly" with the original statement; [2] The percentage includes respondents who "disagree somewhat" and "disagree strongly" with the original statement.

Table 4.7: Faculty Beliefs about Racial Climate

	Women of Color	White Women	Men of Color	White Men
There is a lot of racial conflict				
Agree Strong	6.4%	1.8%	1.8%	0.7%
Agree Some	18.2%	11.5%	10.2%	5.1%
Disagree Some	35.3%	39.9%	36.0%	31.3%
Disagree Strong	40.1%	46.7%	52.0%	62.8%
Total	100% (516)	100% (3537)	100% (814)	100% (6785)
Chi-Square Value	505.60****			

Notes: $p<0.001$****; $p<0.01$***; $p<0.05$**; $p<0.1$*

These drastic differences between women of color and all other faculty about perceptions of racial conflict may be a result of divergent definitions of the term. In a post-civil rights era, commonly held and lawfully enforced definitions about racial or sexual discrimination involve overt acts of misconduct from one party against another. This popular discourse mistakenly ignores the less visible and covert 'micro-aggressions'[45] or 'micro-inequities'[46] experienced by most marginalized communities. In addition, widespread notions about diversity and multiculturalism are often limited to ideas of numerical representation and cultural sensitivity. Therefore, societal understandings and practices regarding discrimination and diversity together can create pervasive and unchecked colorblind racism that often contributes to people's inability to perceive racial conflict, even among liberal, well-educated, and well-intentioned academics (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Brown 2003; Lewis, Chesler, and Forman 2000; Gallagher 2003).

Important patterns were also observed regarding faculty perspectives on mentoring and promotion. Specifically, women of color faculty were significantly less likely to believe that departments mentor new faculty well. Similarly, they were less likely to perceive promotion criteria as clear (see Table 4.6). Given the critical importance of both mentorship and transparency of promotion criteria and processes (Aguirre 2000; Boyle and Boice 1998; Gibson 2004, 2006), women of color seem to be at considerable risk for tenure-denial given the multiple challenges they already face with systemic undervaluing of their scholarship, teaching, and service (C. S. V. Turner and Myers 2000; C. S. V. Turner 2002; Thomas and Hollenshead 2001; Stanley 2006b). What

---

[45] Microaggressions could take many forms as both verbal and non-verbal assumptions about and lowered expectations for people of color within social or academic settings (Solorzano 1998; Solorzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000).
[46] See Roos & Gatta (2009).

these findings suggest are differential experiences for women of color in the academy, some of which have detrimental effects for advancement. Moreover, these results shed light on the institutionalized inequalities inherit in academic promotion. Ultimately, I argue that these findings indicate the need to re-examine and eventually alter tenure policies and practices.

Table 4.8: Teaching, Research, and Writing Activities

	Women of Color	White Women	Men of Color	White Men
Taught an Ethnic Studies Course				
Yes	34.9%	11.2%	20.4%	5.9%
No	65.1%	88.8%	79.6%	94.1%
Total	100% (450)	100% (3196)	100% (692)	100% (5950)
Chi-Square Value	520.63****			
Taught a Women's Studies Course				
Yes	23.2%	20.9%	2.5%	2.0%
No	76.9%	79.1%	97.5%	98.0%
Total	100% (445)	100% (3241)	100% (673)	100% (5908)
Chi-Square Value	1.11****			
Res/Write on Racial/Ethnic Minorities				
Yes	61.4%	31.9%	36.4%	17.8%
No	38.6%	68.1%	63.6%	82.2%
Total	100% (443)	100% (3168)	100% (698)	100% (5883)
Chi-Square Value	601.03****			
Res/Write on Women and Gender				
Yes	48.3%	41.0%	18.1%	12.4%
No	51.7%	59.0%	81.9%	87.6%
Total	100% (431)	100% (3239)	100% (657)	100% (5794)
Chi-Square Value	1.11****			

Notes: $p<0.001$****; $p<0.01$***; $p<0.05$**; $p<0.1$*

Duties and Commitments

Women of color are more likely to teach, write, and research in areas less valued[47] in terms of the most prestigious funding and publishing sources. In fact, women of color are about two to three times more likely than all other faculty to research and write on issues faced by racial and ethnic minorities and two to four times more likely than their male colleagues to research and write about women and gender issues[48] (see Table 4.8). The irony is that although research examining race, gender, and international issues are considered cutting edge scholarship in some respects, the academic rewards system at most institutions does not acknowledge the additional work and/or challenges encountered by most of these scholars, which ultimately can harm their hiring and promotion possibilities.

According to the HERI data, women of color continue to disproportionately carry the burden of diversifying the academy, what I refer to as the *diversity duty*. They were nearly six times more likely to have taught an ethnic studies course and almost twelve times more likely to have taught a women's studies course compared to their white male colleagues[49] (see Table 4.8). In other words, although the academy has recognized the need to diversify their faculty and student populations and have acknowledged the importance of implementing a multicultural/heterogeneous curriculum, the responsibility

---

[47] The actual process of valuation and devaluation in the academy is complex; however, one important source is the ranking system of journals, which has been critiqued for potential bias. Stanley (2007) has written on the biases with the editorial processes, which is another related mechanism of devaluation.

[48] The women of color sample who reported to research and write on women's and gender issues were only slightly higher (about 7 percent) than their white women colleagues, which accounts for some of the small chi-square (see Table 4.8).

[49] The difference was smallest between the women of color and white women sample that reported to have taught a women's studies course, which accounts for some of the small chi-square (see Table 4.8).

continues to rest on people of color and especially women of color to carry out these mandates and do the heavy lifting of institutional change. Second, as past research indicates, classes that deal with sensitive and often controversial discussions about race, ethnicity, and gender are generally more challenging to teach due to student resistance, misperceptions of instructor bias, and prominent discourses of colorblind racism (Vargas 2002; H. A. Moore, Acosta, et al. 2010; Perry et al. 2009; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011; Bonilla-Silva 2006). In the end, the *diversity double-duty* can have serious personal costs for women of color faculty, such as negatively impacting scholarship production or even faculty's emotional/physical well being as will be discussed in detail in chapters five and six.

Table 4.9: Hours per week spent on activities

Hours	Women of Color Faculy				All Other Faculty				Chi-Square
	0-8	9-20	21-45+		0-8	9-20	21-45+		
				Total				Total	
Research & Scholarly Writing	51.6%	33.7%	14.7%	100%(469)	45.9%	38.5%	15.6%	100%(10735)	6.13**
Preparing for Teaching	42.7%	48.8%	8.5%	100%(471)	48.0%	45.5%	6.5%	100%(10784)	6.39**
Advising/Counseling Students	88.4%	10.9%	0.6%	100%(475)	92.2%	7.6%	0.2%	100%(10780)	10.65***[a]
Household/Childcare Duties	52.7%	30.3%	17.0%	100%(459)	55.7%	32.8%	11.5%	100%(10243)	13.02****
Communicating via Email	67.3%	30.0%	2.7%	100%(474)	76.1%	23.0%	0.9%	100%(10707)	30.83****[a]
Other Administration	89.4%	8.1%	2.5%	100%(432)	84.0%	12.3%	3.7%	100%(10068)	8.85**

Notes: $p<0.001$****; $p<0.01$***; $p<0.05$**; $p<0.1$*; (a) 1 cell has expected count less than 5.

Last, when examining the variables reporting how faculty members allocate their time per week, [50] we can observe subtle, yet expected differences (see Table 4.9). For

---

[50] Important to note is that I recoded the variable from 9 to 3 categories for simplicity of presentation, which surely accounts for a loss in the nuances of the data and likely contributes to the more subtle differences.

example, when looking at the first column of the table, we observe that about 52 percent of women of color faculty spend only 0-8 hours per week on research and scholarly writing compared to 46 percent of all other faculty. On the other hand, about 43 percent of women of color report spending 0-8 hours per week on preparing for teaching compared to 48 percent of their colleagues. Last, 88 percent of women of color faculty spend 0-8 hours per week on advising/counseling students compared to 92 percent of all other faculty. Overall, what this analysis suggests is that the sample of women of color faculty reports spending less time per week on research and writing and more time teaching and advising students. These small yet statistically significant differences observed in time allocation per week suggest that since women of color are often burdened with teaching and service, their research and writing productivity suffers. Like many of the studies cited at the start of the chapter, the data suggests that due to unequal distributions of service and teaching expectations, women of color are more vulnerable to tenure-denials and "ivory ceilings" at research institutions (Misra et al. 2011; Pyke 2011; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011).

FINDINGS: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Since the results from the descriptive analyses revealed statistically significant and substantially important relationships, I was encouraged to pursue a multivariate analysis in order to have a clearer picture of some of the significant mechanisms shaping professional perceptions of women of color faculty nationally. I decided to start with linear regression using the variable: "Have to Work Harder to be Legitimate" as an ordinal dependent variable. This particular variable has three categories: "Not at all"; "To some extent"; and "To great extent," yet was not a good candidate as a dependent

variable for linear regression because it is positively skewed with 47.5 percent of all respondents selecting "Not at all." I also considered the variable: "Still Want to Be Professor?" as an ordinal dependent variable for linear regression; however, this variable is even more skewed than the previous with 55.9 percent of respondents selecting value: "Definitely yes."

I finally conceded with the necessity of using logistic regression since the majority of the possible outcome variables are categorical. I recoded the variables: "Still Want to Be Professor?" (1= "Yes"; 0= "No") and "Leave Academia" (1= "Yes"; 0= "No") as dichotomous for the analysis. In the end, after running several models, I selected the variable: "Have to Work Harder to be Legitimate" (1= "Work harder to some or great extent"; 0= "Do not work harder at all") to use as my primary dependent variable for the final logistic regression model since it most reflects the core of the findings from the descriptive analyses. My independent variables in my regression model are dummy variables for race (1=non-white; 0=white), sex (1=female; 0=male), and academic rank (1=Professor, 0=all others; 1=Associate, 0=all others; 1=Assistant, 0=all others) with the constant being white male non-tenure track faculty. I built my models by incorporating each predictor one at a time, including the sex/gender interaction term,[51] to observe the impact of each variable. Ultimately, Table 4.10 reports the final regression model for legitimacy by race, sex, and rank.

---

[51] I also created an interaction term to represent the experiences of non-white females (sex and race). Ultimately, I did not include the sex/race interaction term in the final model because it failed to add any explanatory power since the effect of these variables are better understood as additive rather than interactional in the statistical sense.

Table 4.10: Logistic Regression of Legitimacy by Race, Sex, and Rank

Dependent Variable:
Do you have to work harder to be perceived as a legitimate scholar?

	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Race	0.68****	1.98****
Sex	0.62****	1.86****
Professor	-0.68****	0.51****
Associate	-0.27***	0.76****
Assistant	-0.18**	0.84**
Constant	0.18**	
Pseudo R squared	0.0412	

Notes: p<0.001****; p<0.01***; p<0.05**; p<0.1*

The results of the logistic regression are not surprising by any means. Specifically, we can observe that being non-white and female has a significantly strong positive impact on the dependent variable. In other words, non-white faculty are more likely (OR=1.98, p<0.001) to believe they have to work harder to be perceived as legitimate scholars compared to their white colleagues, while female faculty are also more likely (OR=1.86, p<0.001) than males to believe they have to work harder. These results coincide with my overall argument that women of color in particular experience denials to their legitimacy and authority as professionals in academia. Furthermore, the effects of academic rank were much more subtle. Specifically, being on the tenure-track has a negative impact on the dependent variable, with professors having the strongest and most significant effect when examining the coefficient. In other words, those on the tenure-track are much less likely to believe they have to work harder to be perceived as legitimate. Full professors in particular are the least likely (OR=0.51, p<0.001) to believe

they have to work harder compared to their non-tenure track colleagues. In effect, for most faculty, tenure and promotion allows for a more secure sense of self as a professional. However, this model ultimately fails to reveal how the tenure and promotion process does not significantly improve the perceptions of legitimacy for women of color faculty in particular as uncovered by the results of the three-way analysis presented in Table 4.3.[52]

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The population of women of color faculty remains marginal in the academy.[53] Although a significant growth has occurred in the number of women of color conferred doctoral degrees and acquiring tenure track positions, particularly since the 1990's, the academy is far from being a transformed U.S. institutional system. On the contrary, the academy's standards and definitions of the profession have remained stable despite newcomers' attempts to re-articulate and redefine the culture of the academy and despite national engagement with the diversity challenge. This chapter has accomplished two primary objectives: first, this chapter describes some of the professional priorities for women of color faculty in terms of teaching and research, and furthermore what institutional challenges they encounter with their professional lives. Second and most important, these findings ultimately reveal modern mechanisms of systemic inequality, in which institutions like the academy maintain disparities through subtle practices of the *diversity double duty* and unfair rewards systems that favor certain types of professional priorities.

---

[52] See Appendix C for table and graph on predicted probabilities as well.
[53] Refer to footnote #43 for the 2009 NCES data on national distribution of non-tenured faculty.

The data analyzed here suggests that women of color faculty as newcomers to the academy do not experience a smooth path of socialization into the hegemonic culture, values, and discourses of the academy. On the other hand, women of color continually redefine what it means to be a professional through their scholarship, teaching, and commitments. In other words, women of color faculty often shape their professional priorities to align with their person values and beliefs, despite going against the grain of their discipline. However, it is evident that the academic culture has not been effectively transformed by the presence of a growing number of minority faculty who challenge the established norms about what it means to be an academic professional (Tierney 1997). Unfortunately, women of color faculty have met several significant institutional challenges including their shared perceptions about the lack of legitimacy, the contentious racial climate, and the unequal academic rewards system.

Moreover, attention to affective[54] realities significantly expands our understanding about women of color in the academy regarding the importance of embodied[55] experiences. Being an academic involves considerably more than simply excelling in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In fact, dominant groups in academia are likely to take the academic culture and environment for granted. The fact that the legitimacy of majority faculty as professionals likely goes unquestioned for the duration of their careers makes their race through academia more like a moving walkway and less like an obstacle course as experienced by women of color.

---

[54] Variables related to moods, feelings, and attitudes as opposed to measurements of numerical representation or other structural variables such as rank and salary.
[55] The process of embodiment refers to more than the biological, physical human body; rather in this study it includes dimensions of presentation of self, mental health, and social well-being.

Ultimately, the findings in this chapter reveal some of the complexities women of color encounter with professionalism in the academy. Namely, although women of color are increasingly incorporated into the academy and sometimes favored by university administration as agents of change and diversity, there exist powerful pressures to conform to the established values and practices of hegemonic academic professionalism.[56] These pressures and contradictions are often obfuscated by the pervasive rhetoric about multiculturalism, academic freedom, and faculty autonomy. Moreover, as women of color academics work towards developing their own professional identities that better aligns with their personal values and priorities, they encounter institutional resistance and are systematically de-legitimized as academics. In the end, these unfair practices and systems are antithetical to the purported goals of the academy, and more importantly, suggests that increased representation of minorities will not alleviate social inequality. Rather, we need to critically examine and ultimately change academic cultures that covertly reproduce white patriarchal power structures and silence those left in the margins.

---

[56] This term refers to a type of professionalism that relies on traditional, western-centered, or neo-liberal sources of knowledge, research methods, pedagogies, and ethics.

CHAPTER 5:
HYPER-PROFESSIONAL BODIES: HOW WOMEN OF COLOR FACULTY
EMBODY THE 'PROFESSIONAL'

In the previous chapters, I have established several key points that are important

for the discussion that follows. First, in the review of the literature, I argue that

professionalism is an important discursive practice in the academy that covertly shapes

our understandings of who is a legitimate scholar. Second, I assert that attention to bodies

and embodied experiences of marginalized populations, especially women of color, have

the potential to reveal pervasive structures of inequality in the academy. Last, in the

analysis of the 2004-5 faculty survey from the Higher Education Research Institute

(HERI), I found women of color faculty disproportionately carry the responsibility of

diversifying their universities through their teaching and scholarship, what I call the

diversity double-duty. Yet despite symbolic pressures to diversify the university that have

helped to increase representation of minority faculty, according to my analysis, women of

color are significantly more likely to believe they have to work harder to be perceived as

legitimate scholars compared to their colleagues, and ultimately share a stronger desire to

leave academia.

The empirical question addressed in this chapter is the follow: *how do women of

color faculty embody professionalism?* This chapter is based on the analysis of forty in-

depth, individual interviews with women of color faculty in liberal arts or education

fields at four different research universities on the east coast. The chapter centers on two

discussions: first, on the concept I call *hyper-professional presentation of self*, and

second, on the issue of *embodied stress*. Ultimately, I conclude that first, women of color

faculty engage in 'hyper-professional' practices through conscious decisions about dress,

speech, emotionality, and behavior in order to navigate academic professionalism in the workplace. Second, the expectations that they will conform to the academy's definition of professional in combination with blatant and subtle assumptions about their professional legitimacy experienced by women of color faculty often manifests into significant physical and/or emotional problems.

The concept of *hyper-professionality* describes an important coping mechanism the women of color faculty I interviewed developed to combat attacks on their professional legitimacy. Specifically, the focus on hyper-professionality will ultimately highlight the tensions in the professional experiences of women of color in two ways: first, to expose the existence of a dominant definition of academic professionalism, and second how women of color are assumed to lack the qualities necessary to be a legitimate academic professional. Ironically, due to their structural placement in the academy (i.e., via the *diversity double-duty* from Chapter 4), women of color faculty may indeed fall short of the standards for academic professionalism, yet in the process redefine what it means to be a professional in academia. In many respects, interview participants engaged in hyper-professionality as a suit of armor for the low-wage battles over being a legitimate academic.

The first half of this chapter will focus on the *hyper-professional presentation of self*. Through the interviews, I found two significant realms of manifestation of this type of presentation of self: first, the *physical* manifestations, which involve decisions about dress, hair, and body adornments, and second, the *bodily* manifestations, which includes the policing of speech, behavior, emotionality. The second half of this chapter will center on the issue of *embodied stress*—the toll of hyper-professionality. This particular

discussion will examine first, *emotional fatigue* as observed through experiences of strained personal relationships and in some cases, nervous breakdowns. Second, I will talk about *physical stress* as manifested through commonplace symptoms like weight gain, acne, or chronic diseases, and in some instances, major ailments like strokes, heart attacks, or reproductive problems. To begin, I will briefly return to the relevant literature on *professionalism*, *presentation of self*, and *racial disparities in health*.

Literature

Past research reveals how women engage in daily practices of controlling and disciplining their bodies to maintain appropriate markers of professionalism. Scholars have argued that in order for women to convey professionalism, they must embody appropriate professional signals. Moreover, these scholars suggest that "doing" the professional often requires one to perform both masculinity and whiteness (Cheney and Ashcraft 2007; Davies et al. 2005; Trethewey 1999). Angela Trethewey (1999) found in her study that to successfully perform and display professionalism and therefore achieve credibility, women are required to continually engage in strategies of controlling their bodies, whether in regards to curbing their weight or containing their emotions. She finds that in addition to the field-specific skills and content training, professional women, unlike their male counterparts, must regularly tend to the details of sitting, walking, and moving professionally.

This chapter expands the past work on embodying professionalism in several ways. First, unlike past research, this analysis centers on the experiences of women of color, thereby drawing on an intersectional framework to better examine how professionalism is both a raced and gendered process. Second, this discussion will

uncover how professionalism functions within the academic workplace, a space often ignored in past research that tends to focus on corporate spheres. Last, this chapter goes beyond the case-study approach dominant in past research, and relies on a multi-sited methodology where interview data was derived from four different universities.

The concept of self-presentation has been an important topic of research and theoretical debates in sociology for over a century. Starting with Charles Horton Cooley (1902) followed by George Herbert Mead (1934) and Erving Goffman (1959), the approach was dominated by symbolic interactionists who focused on the making of social selves. From here, a more contemporary genealogy of work emerged in sociology and social psychology focused on individual presentation strategies in varying social contexts. However, what is lacking from the micro-sociological approach is first, the recognition of the body. Specifically, this perspective relies on and maintains the self/body dichotomy inherent in most western social theory and philosophy. Until just recently, sociology more broadly has failed to acknowledge the body as an important text for investigation (B. S. Turner 1996). Second, symbolic interactionists also fail to distinguish larger, structural factors, beyond the social interaction of individuals with their reference groups.[57]

On the other hand, my particular project, while recognizing the continuing significance of self-presentation particularly within the context of academia, focuses less on the micro-interactions between actors, and rather on how women of color in particular construct an embodied presentation of self in response to larger systemic mechanisms of devaluation and de-legitimization. Despite the deficiencies of the symbolic interactionist

---

[57] The exception to this criticism would be the scholarship produced within the "structural symbolic interactionism" perspective like the works of Kuhn and McPartland (1954) and Stryker (1980).

method, an important aspect of self-presentation as developed by Goffman (1959) is the "dramaturgical" approach. For Goffman, the core structures of the self can be examined in terms of performance. These theoretical contributions have made possible my investigation of how women of color faculty make decisions about their appearance and presentation in order to "perform" professionalism in academia.

Relative to the discussion in the second half of the chapter on embodied stress, I draw from a critical body of literature examining racial disparities in health. Although this research has come a long way from arguments of biological deficiencies, a lot of controversy regarding explanatory factors for higher rates of mortality and morbidity among communities of color in the United States persists. In addition, there continue to be debates about how much of the observed racial differences in health outcomes are in fact due to variation in socioeconomic status (SES) indicators such as education, income, and occupation. Most of the recent health literature concludes that SES can explain most of the racial disparities in health, where groups with the lowest SES suffer from greater chronic health problems regardless of race. However, other scholars have argued that social mobility has not eliminated health risks for people of color (Williams 1999). In other words, some argue that middle class communities of color continue to be threatened by significant health concerns, particularly due to experiences of social isolation, marginalization, and workplace discrimination (Feagin, Early, and McKinney 2000).

More recent health research has acknowledged the importance of drawing from an intersectional framework to better understand how gender, race, and class together impact health outcomes (Mullings and Schulz 2006). Through this approach, some scholars have uncovered important socio-historical contexts that are crucial for understanding the health

conditions of women of color in particular. For example, Leith Mullings (2005)

developed a model called the "Sojourner Syndrome"[58] to reveal the unique constraints,

choices, and risks black women encounter in various spheres of their lives such as

housing, employment, and kinship. Important for my study, Mullings observed that the

middle-stratum workers in the study experienced a set of unique stressors in the

managerial and professional occupations, which were often predominately white

spaces.[59] Cheryl L. Woods-Giscombe (2010) developed a similar model called the

"Superwoman Schema"[60] for understanding women of color's experience with stress and

health. In her study, she outlined the various contextual factors important to the

development of the Superwoman role which include: "[the] historical legacy of racial and

gender stereotyping or oppression; lessons from foremothers; a past personal history of

disappointment, mistreatment, or abuse; and spiritual values" (p. 675). In all, these

contributions of health scholars on the specific issues women of color face greatly reflect

the findings from my particular study. However, my discussion on *embodied stress*

expands the conversation to include the narratives of professional women from multiple

---

[58] "The 'Sojourner Syndrome,' then, is a metaphoric model intended to speak not only to a public health audience but also to the subjects of our research— African American women—about their lived experience. It allows for the recognition and naming of issues that are frequently unlabeled. It is an attempt as well to bridge the gap between critical medical anthropology and public health models by demonstrating the ways in which the intersections of race, class, and gender hierarchies are 'embodied'" (p. 87).

[59] "A young professional couple stated that they worked around White people all day and that this could be very stressful: their perceptions of stressors ranged from White colleagues wanting to discuss every crime African Americans are accused of committing to the use of the 'n' word in their presence" (p. 85).

[60] "Participants' characterizations of the Superwoman role were grouped into five major topic areas: obligation to manifest strength, obligation to suppress emotions, resistance to being vulnerable or dependent, determination to succeed despite limited resources, and obligation to help others" (p. 672).

racial and ethnic backgrounds within the particular context of academia. The remainder of the chapter will focus on the major empirical findings and results.

<div align="center">Hyper-Professional Presentation of Self: Physical</div>

One of the most readily apparent physical aspects of self-presentation is dress. The process and decisions about dress for my respondents were central to their everyday professional lives. Although there was variation in how my respondents specifically described their process of "looking professional," the women of color I interviewed would without exception initially refer to how they dress. The narratives about dress had clear overlap and similarities, yet varied on a spectrum of conservative to casual. I found at one extreme, some respondents fell into the habit of dressing very formally in full suits and heels, particularly on teaching days or for faculty meetings. At the other end, respondents were more casual, wearing slacks, blouses, and comfortable shoes. There was only one participant, an African American assistant professor, who expressed that she did think too seriously about her dress, yet she made it clear that presentation matters. She states the following in response to my question about "looking professional":

> That's kind of a hard question to answer. I guess it requires carrying yourself in [a] way that shows that you have a kind of authority and confidence about [what] you're doing. I'm not one who's big on [the idea that] you have to look a certain way. [I don't think] you have to wear a suit, you have to wear the heels, and carry the briefcase or anything like that, 'cause we're in academia. We're not paid enough to do all that. Clearly presentation is very important, and wherever you are, you have to put your best foot forward in order for people to listen to you ("Hannah").

Unlike the rest of my participants, Hannah did not seem to have a strong narrative about professional dress, and she particularly did not see a need to wear suits or heels; nevertheless, she without a doubt acknowledges the importance of presentation of self,

particularly as related to the process of demeanor and "carrying yourself" (which is the focus of the following section).

On the other hand, below is a quote from another African-American assistant professor about her very calculated decisions about dress and appearance:

> Because I do have a jovial kind of personality, and because I am short in stature, and because I am black, and because I am a woman, and for all the reasons, I wear a suit to work…I like suits actually because I think it puts me kind of in that professional mode. I also wear my hair back in a bun. It's a very conservative kind of look. You know, it's like that librarian look, and I never really wear my hair down [in] or out [of] the class, and I think that gives me more of a serious look, especially because I am so lighthearted. I have to do everything I can to overcompensate, so I always wear a suit. I wear suits Tuesdays and Thursdays, and my hair is always kind of conservative [in a] way. And I think that probably portrays some sense of quote unquote "professionalism" to my undergraduates in particular and maybe to my colleagues ("Amanda").

Through Amanda's narrative, we can clearly see that her decision to wear a formal suit is an integral part of her professional identity. In Goffman's terms, we can say that the suit and heels become the necessary costume for her performance of professionality. More important to the objectives of this project, we can observe that Amanda undoubtedly understands that as a young, friendly, black woman, she needs to "overcompensate" in many ways to ultimately be perceived as a legitimate professional by her students and colleagues. Her narrative acknowledges that if she fails to engage in hyper-professional practices regarding her looks, she runs a serious risk of not being taken seriously in the workplace.

Shifting back to the spectrum of dress discussed earlier, I observed that even at the casual end, there seems to be clear rules about what NOT to wear. One example is the strict "no blue jeans" practice shared by the overwhelming majority of the faculty I interviewed. During many of the conversations I had with respondents about their "no

jeans" policy, it became clear that race and gender were playing a significant role in this

decision process. In general, during most discussions about dress, my respondents often

referenced several of their colleagues as a point of comparison. When we specifically got

to the issue about casual dress and wearing jeans, practically without fail, interview

participants would refer to their white colleagues, especially men. Below is just one

example from an African-American associate professor,

> I remember as a grad student, we were going to our national meeting, and one of
> my fellow white grad students said, "what are you wearing?'' I'll never forget
> this, I was like, "I haven't decided yet," and he's like, "I think I'm just gonna err
> on the side of youth and wear jeans and sneakers." And I remember saying to
> him, "I don't have that luxury." I just don't because you and I walk into a room,
> you have jeans and sneakers, and I can be dressed to the nines in a four hundred
> dollar suit. I can only hope that they focus on my credentials and not my suit [as]
> being a distraction, for better or for worse, and instead focus on what I'm saying
> ("Katrina").

Katrina's statement about not having the "luxury" to wear jeans and sneakers

indicates her sense of marginalization within professional settings. She is painfully aware

that she is vulnerable to disregards of credentials and denials of authority as a scholar if

she fails to properly embody the physical signals of professionality. However,

noteworthy is the fact that she can also go too far. For example, if her clothes are too

expensive or mirror that of the white male corporate executive, she runs the risk of

distracting people from her credentials. Much like the other participants, Katrina's

narrative about difference in dress among her colleagues often paralleled racial and

gender differences, and more specifically mirrored hierarchies of privilege. In other

words, according to the women of color I interviewed, it was clear to them whom in their

departments could "get away" with dressing casual. Mary, an African-American senior

faculty member, explains her thoughts:

It's amazing how a male can come in with a wrinkled shirt and dungarees and get respect. Don't let [an] African American or a female try it. So there is a look you have to have I think that's different. I tease my colleagues about it all the time. They wear a rough ride shirt and jeans and sneakers and get in front of a class and not a problem. A female, she'd be perceived totally different. If an African American or Latina did, oh my gosh. So there are different standards I think. I dress the part. The days that I taught, I made sure I dressed the part. In fact, students being what they are, I get comments like "you never wore the same suit twice." I mean they observe stuff like that. Isn't that ridiculous? You think they'd do that with a guy? So there's certain standards you have to maintain I think that are different for people of color ("Mary").

In the end, interview participants like Mary had no doubts that their white colleagues, particularly the men, would be taken seriously as professionals and scholars even if they entered the classroom or conference meeting wearing the same tattered clothing they wear everyday. Moreover, regardless of what their colleagues wear, the women of color I interviewed like Mary were very aware of the scrutiny they endure regarding their appearance and share a sense of constantly being on display with their students and colleagues. This ultra-visibility significantly adds to their decisions to engage in hyper-professionality.

Another important practice participants often mentioned regarding dress was avoiding clothing that could be perceived as "revealing" or "provocative". Our discussions about clothing frequently included a clear consciousness about the cut or tightness of their blouses or the length of their skirts and dresses. Across the board, the participants made great efforts to minimize the appearance of their breasts, legs, and buttocks. For example, Jenny, a young, Asian-American assistant professor explains her thoughts:

I feel like I have to have my own sense of style, but at the same time, it's not so out there, so I have altered it. I'm not so free-spirited. I have altered the way I look at school…I don't think shorts are an appropriate thing to wear to work. So I wouldn't, but I am very careful about how I dress in terms of [trying] not to dress

too provocatively. I'm so very aware of that. If I'm wearing a sweater, how low cut is it or showing too much skin. I'm very aware of that, and I think that's the thing women have to think about but men never have to think about it. But I do think about that, because I know, and I've been in a situation where male students sometimes, even colleagues, in other places, where I don't know where the line is, so I'm much more cognizant about it. That's always been the case. So I just don't want to draw immediate attention ("Jenny").

As we can see, Jenny is extremely cautious about wearing clothing that will not "draw immediate attention." Similar to other respondents, Jenny has put into practice a ritual of policing every article of clothing she wears to work, ensuring it is "appropriate" for the workplace. These practices are tightly connected to cultural and social definitions of "professional" attire, which on the outset are clearly gendered since women often feel a need to hide evidence of their female bodies. Jenny's particular exclamation that she is "not so free-spirited" clearly indicates how she has experienced the need to have a controlled performance at all times. However, women of color have multiple layers of concerns regarding dressing too provocatively. Specifically, since women of color have been hyper-sexualized[61] throughout history (Collins 2000; hooks 2009; Nash 2004), they become keenly aware of the perceptions of their bodies and sexuality, adding another important dimension to their hyper-professional practices.

One last element of the *physical* manifestations of hyper-professionality is regarding hairstyle and body adornments. I found that for the black women faculty I interviewed, hair was a particularly salient narrative in reference to a professional look. If we return to Amanda's narrative, she states, "I also wear my hair back in a bun. It's a very conservative kind of look. You know, it's like that librarian look, and I never really

---

[61] Jennifer Nash (2004) states: "In public debates about low-income mothers and their rights to reproduce, the public nature of all black female bodies becomes apparent. In this context, the image of the 'lazy welfare mother' and 'the licentious Jezebel' coincide to form an image of a hyper-sexual, hyper-fecund, hyper-reproductive black woman whose sexuality must be regulated in order to maintain the fiscal health of the state" (p. 321).

wear my hair down [in] or out [of] the class, and I think that gives me more of a serious

look, especially because I am so lighthearted." Like Amanda, many of the other interview

participants described how they used particular hairstyles to convey a message of

professionality. The literal and figurative act of 'letting your hair down' in the workplace

seemed to be something participants actively avoided. Although we can say that women

regardless of race understand the importance of hair for a professional look, many of my

respondents signaled the particular issues they faced as women of color. For example, the

following is a narrative from an African-American associate professor:

> I wear makeup, and I'm [usually] the only one with berry tones on my lips and
> mascara in the room, which is me. But I think all women deal with the men or
> people in power expecting [how you should] look like, but for black women, I
> think the hair issues add another dimension. Because I do think that the university
> continues to be intimidated by black natural hairstyles, whether it's the curly look,
> the locks, the cornrows. I think that's the added dimension that other people don't
> have ("Caroline").

In Caroline's narrative, it is apparent to her that black women have a unique challenge

with decisions about hair, and she is keenly aware that particular styles can hinder

perceptions of professionalism among her colleagues, even if they have positive or

neutral cultural meanings in her own community. Moreover, Caroline's narrative also

suggests that her preference to wear makeup at times can draw more attention among her

colleagues than she would prefer, especially since she often finds herself as the only

black female in the workplace.

Karen, an African-American assistant professor, not only acknowledges the

differences black women experience in regards to garnering professional legitimacy

through appearance, she converts this reality into teachable moments, especially for her

students:

I love that I wear my hair natural, because again, there's almost this assumption that comes with that. When they hear me talk, and they hear me talk about certain subjects, [it] creates some of that dissonance for them to say, "Oh, we can't say that this is the box she fits into because, in fact, she is showing how complex she is." That goes for any student because I think black students as well have a tendency to fall suit into what are some of the representations that are most consistent about blacks in the media, and so they make an assumption that we are all a particular way. And so, the fact that I present a perspective that's different from that, I think gives them, shows them, again, the complexity of individuals, but I think it also works to help them understand some of where I'm coming from or the literature that I'm presenting ("Karen").

As we can see, Karen is extremely conscious of how she is read in the academy by wearing her hair natural. She understands that others will make grand assumptions about her simply because of her choice of hairstyle. However, it is clear that Karen uses this particular challenge as a way to engage her students in the politics of difference and as a vehicle to dispel commonly held stereotypes, even among her own community.

In the end, the physical markers of dress, hair, makeup, etc. have the potential to either affirm or deny professionalism in the academic workplace. For women of color faculty in particular, they must make careful decisions daily about physical appearance in ways that honors their sense of self, yet simultaneously avoids denials of legitimacy or authority. Belinda, a senior African-American faculty member, states the following in regards to a prompt about whether women of color academics have a different experience with being seen or perceived as professionals:

I think we all, as women of color, find ourselves in between two worlds, at least two (laugh). One of them is a kind of family and communal world in which we express ourselves in one way, and the other is a professional world in which some of that is not necessarily understood or accepted as alien. So it's kind of trying to change yourself and make yourself fit that world, and then people seeing you as…the whole range of things, from the way you wear your hair, the kind of jewelry, how much jewelry you wear, or an accent if you have an accent, or all of those kinds of things that make you an outsider in a way. And I do think people have to negotiate that. And I think that's particularly true of women of color. As well as the assumption that colleagues may have that, "well, you're a woman of

color, so you've had this kind of experience." [But] I can't assume that because you're black, you came from the ghetto, or because you're Latino, you speak Spanish fluently. So I think that we're always kind of coming up against that, and sometimes it's blatant, but a lot of times it's very subtle ("Belinda").

Belinda's perspective highlights the dualities and compromises women of color faculty often encounter with how academia reads their physical bodies. She notes that wearing particular cultural markers through dress, hair or jewelry can lead to deep-seated assumptions about women of color that in turn may threaten their status as legitimate professionals. However, as Belinda notes, the markers of professionality or belonging in academia are not limited to physical appearance, rather it can manifest in other powerful forms, like an accent. With these alternative markers in mind, I will now proceed with the discussion about *bodily* manifestations of a hyper-professional presentation of self.

Hyper-Professional Presentation of Self: Bodily

Much like the findings from Trethewey's (1999), I observed distinct patterns from the interview participants regarding how they managed their speech, body language, and emotions to convey professionalism in the workplace. Below are some thoughts from Charlene, an African-American senior professor:

> I think that many black women work very hard to create a public persona that is ultra professional…especially when you reach a certain age. I think younger black women have to fight against the perception that somehow they're not quite as with it, as professional, even as smart because the other people want to take care of them, not so much 'cause the women can't do it. It's how you speak, it's what you say when you speak, it's demeanor, a certain seriousness when you're with colleagues. Especially when you're young, you're fairly new…it is the equivalent of middle class black people who never go out in public unless they're impeccably dressed. It's the same thing. Around the conference tables you're trying to be perfect, that's basically [it]. You're trying really hard to be perfect ("Charlene").

Charlene in her narrative is without a doubt referring to how women of color engage in a hyper-professional presentation of self. Specifically, she invokes the practice of "trying to

be perfect," which involves the constant policing of speech, demeanor, and interactions with colleagues. One can argue that all young female faculty, irrespective of race, are driven to dispel doubts of their abilities due to age or lack of experience. However, these bodily practices are crucial, especially for young women of color, in order to establish their "public personas" in the workplace. Moreover, I assert that young women of color are often infantilized in the workplace to a degree not experienced by their peers, as made clear through Charlene's statement: "other people want to take care of them [young black women]."

Returning back to Jenny's narrative, a young Asian-American assistant professor, we can further see how women of color are in danger of being infantilized. In Jenny's interview, she specifically described being uncomfortable and concerned about senior colleagues "babying" her, especially since she was in the early stages of establishing herself in the department. In fact, Jenny described a particular incident in the halls of her department where her female mentor approached her from behind, physically hugged her, and began "gushing" all the while as Jenny was introducing herself in a consciously professional manner to another senior colleague. Jenny even inquired about this behavior with some trusted colleagues, asking them bluntly, "Do other faculty members touch you? Like rub your back?" She soon realized how being the only young Asian-American female assistant professor in the department impacted her interactions with colleagues. Jenny discussed how she developed ways to navigate her workspace to avoid this type of behavior from others:

> One other strategy I forgot to mention is I've really worked on lowering my voice in class…there's times when I'm talking and it just sounds very high and very young. And so I've worked on actually lowering my voice and speaking in a certain type [of] tone. I know that sounds crazy… And I feel like I hate the fact

that I have to do that, but at the same time, when I do it, it makes life easier. So for me, it's kind of a survival strategy ("Jenny").

Through actively lowering her voice, Jenny is without a doubt engaging in a hyper-professional practice as a way to protect her authority as an instructor and to "make life easier" among her colleagues. To emphasize the point further, in order for Jenny to "survive" in her workplace, she must become hyper-professional; however, many participants were cautious not to appear so to their colleagues and students, walking a very fine line as discussed in the next passage.

Other women of color faculty I interviewed mentioned the importance of speech and tone in reference to acting professional. Selen, a middle-eastern associate professor, described her process of professionalization as follows:

I was observing. I was very careful. I was very careful with my speech, with my behavior, with my attires. I learned… I should probably say I began to speak differently, not my accent. I can't change [that], and I never tried to, but if you speak in [an] authoritative way in the United States, you may have two effects. Either good or bad on your students. You cannot be so much authoritative. You cannot be too relaxed either. You have to find the way in the middle. I realized that students respond better to a faculty member who is friendly, who is entertaining, but at the same time, who keeps the rules in place, so you cannot just speak about the rules and just say, "I don't care. You read this." No, you have to care, so this was my adjustment in terms of my behavior and my policy ("Selen").

Similar to other interview participants, Selen paid very close attention to her manners of speech and behaviors. She eventually developed an authoritative persona and demeanor that was palatable for her American students in order to deflect some of the challenges to authority she experienced both as a woman of color and as a migrant; however, Selen was careful not to appear too authoritative, which would leave her vulnerable to a whole set of other challenges. Much like the other participants I interviewed who were foreign-born, particularly those who received their graduate training in their home countries, Selen

experienced a unique set of challenges for establishing her professional identity in the United States.

First, international migrants must adjust to the particular norms and culture of professionalism that exist in the U.S. academy, which can be starkly different from their past experiences. Second, and more importantly, distinct markers, such as speaking with an accent, can create additional barriers for garnering professional legitimacy, especially for women of color, who must already contend with gendered and racial structures of the academy. Like Selen, since accents and other markers of difference cannot be eradicated or "assimilated", these interview participants, like their U.S. citizen peers, often developed hyper-professional practices in order to receive the respect and professional authority they merit as scholars.

Other than speech and demeanor, the matter of emotions is another important dimension of the bodily manifestations of hyper-professionality. Many of the women of color faculty I interviewed were very conscious of their emotions in the workplace, with most opting to keep this aspect of their humanity away from academia. Below is a narrative about emotions from Susan, an Asian-American associate professor:

> Some of the problems on the home front don't belong here. When I teach my students, even when I'm having a hard time at home, that has to be left at the door. I have this one student in mind who does not make that distinction…she's very emotional. Some people are more emotional than others, but she's very particularly emotional. And everything that's happening at the home front or whatever gets spilled over into the classroom. That's not healthy. Your students don't have to know everything about every little problem you're having at home, with your spouse or with your kids because it's a professional environment. Students are there. They pay their tuition to get some kind of a service in return. And you are there to perform that service. Some people might think I'm coldhearted or whatever, but when it comes to getting the job done and getting things accomplished, I'm almost like [a] knife. You have to have a boundary. You cannot mix those two [worlds] ("Susan").

Susan clearly believes that emotions do not belong in a professional space. Further, not only does she ensure that her emotions "be left at the door," she admits to policing her own students about doing the same. What strikes me most about Susan's narrative is first, the deep internalization of the home-work dichotomy, and second, the subtle denigration of "emotional" women in the workplace. Susan's narrative reveals that despite popular rhetoric about the academy's family-friendly culture, women are still forced to keep their home and work lives separate, even if there is turmoil in the home front that will inevitably affect work. This leads to a second observation about Susan's narrative. Her narrative connotes emotionality as oppositional to "getting the job done and getting things accomplished," which clearly reflects the necessity to police emotions as experienced by my participants.

Returning to Belinda's narrative, an African-American senior professor, we can observe a more complicated relationship with emotionality.

> I think that's part of the thing about being professional, and that's one of the things that can eat away at you. And that is controlling your emotions, and your responses, and sometimes holding your tongue and not saying something that you wanna say. Or figuring out a way to say it that can help you not just win the battle, but win the war. So that it's not just a short term thing, but that you're really thinking, what will the long term impact of this be?...I think that's hard. And I think that sometimes that really forces you to really push down real gut feelings. And things where maybe if you yelled and screamed and got it out, it would be a lot healthier…In your personal life, a lot of times, you need a different kind of control of your feelings, right. I mean you need to be able to express your feelings. You also don't need to be reactive so that you say mean and ugly things to people, but you need to be able to express your feelings in different ways than you would in the work place… I think that made it harder in some ways to be as expressive of the hard feeling. It's not hard for me to be joyous and loving and that kind of thing, but when things hurt or [there is] pain, that's harder sometimes to express ("Belinda").

Belinda's account reveals some of tensions she has experienced with constantly controlling her emotions in the workplace. In Belinda's case, the problems she

encountered were not with her home life spilling into her work life, as Susan and many others lament; rather, it was the opposite. Belinda felt that the habits of "holding her tongue" and policing her emotions in the workplace in turn inhibited her ability to express and communicate pain and troubles in her personal life. Therefore, the complete severing of emotions characteristic of a hyper-professional presentation of self has the potential to create real problems with personal relationships and actually infiltrate one's home life. For Belinda, a "healthier" option would be to have the freedom to deal with emotions upfront, rather than constantly burying and pushing down feelings so as not to ruin her career. In other words, one of the real challenges for many women of color faculty is how to maintain and nurture their emotional health both in the workplace and in their personal lives. In the next section, I will discuss emotional and psychological health in further detail.

Embodied Stress

So far, I have illustrated the concept of *hyper-professionality* through two dimensions of presentation of self: the *physical* and *bodily*. In particular, I have shown how the women of color faculty I interviewed employ various strategies to maintain their legitimacy and authority as professionals. All of the tactics engaged by the interview participants, whether it was dressing in suit and heels, lowering the tone of voice, or controlling emotions, were developed to deflect present or future threats to their status and sense of belonging in academia. For the remainder of this chapter, I will discuss some of the major consequences and hardships endured by the interview participants both as a result of denials to professional authority and for the daily embodiment of hyper-professional practices.

For this last section of the chapter on *embodied stress*, I will divide the discussion into two parts. First, I will describe how many of the women of color I interviewed experienced *emotional fatigue*, particularly in the form of strained personal relationships and sometimes more severe mental health problems such as depression or anxiety disorders. Second, I will discuss how the majority of interview participants reported *physical ailments* at some point during their careers as a result of occupational stress. Most of their accounts of physical illness or poor health were somewhat minor such as weight gain, insomnia, or acne; however, there were several faculty who reported very serious health conditions such as strokes, heart attacks, and reproductive complications.

Overall, what I found most striking in the narratives about stress was the high level of awareness about the real and potential consequences for the acute pressures on their bodies. Although researchers are just beginning to pay attention to occupational stress in the academy, and its particular effects on scholars of color,[62] I found my respondents to be extremely conscious of how they themselves and their colleagues of color are particularly vulnerable and at risk for serious health problems. Given this reality, the virtual silence around these issues in the mainstream debates about diversity in higher education may in fact exacerbate the problems since no resources or outreach has been initiated for either intervention or preventative measures. I will now proceed with the discussion of the major findings.

Emotional Fatigue

A common result of high-levels of occupational stress among my respondents is *emotional fatigue*. The symptoms for emotional fatigue among the interview participants

---

[62] See the newly funded study on "Stress for Success: The Impact of Occupational Stressors on the African American & Latino Professoriate" by Bonnie Thornton Dill and Ruth Zambrana at the Consortium on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity at the University of Maryland, College Park.

varied. For example, if we return again to Belinda's discussion quoted at the end of the previous section, we can observe that how one deals with emotions in the workplace can have a significant effect at home. Again, Belinda states: "In your personal life, a lot of times, you need a different kind of control of your feelings, right. I mean you need to be able to express your feelings." In her case in particular, the constant policing and controlling of her feelings in the workplace greatly strained the emotional health of her personal relationships since in effect, she became re-socialized at work to hold her tongue and contain her emotions. Although Belinda did not make the direct link in the interview, one can tentatively make the assumption that this reality may have factored into the dissolution of her first marriage. Notably, many other faculty, particularly assistant professors, likely engage in similar practices of controlling and hiding feelings in the workplace regardless of their race or gender. However, what is most significant about the experiences of women of color faculty in particular is that like Belinda who is a senior professor, the need to police emotions does not in fact change with promotion and tenure. In fact, the stakes remain high for even women of color senior faculty since they exclusively must combat stereotypes such as the "angry black woman" or the "sapphire" regardless of rank and status (West 1995; Harris-Perry 2011).

Another faculty member I interviewed, Frances, a young African-American assistant professor who is married and has two young children, expressed the following in response to a prompt about how she handles stress:

> I haven't handled it [stress] well. I cried a lot. (laugh) I've cried a lot. I just have not handled it well, but here's another good thing. I decided this is not working for me, being stressed out and wanting to fall in the corner, be paralyzed and not achieve anything. So actually three weeks ago, I signed up for a gym. I'm taking classes. I started running again. I used to run a lot. I haven't done that in years. I started again. A friend said to me last week when he saw me that it was most

relaxed he's seen me in a long time. My going-to-be three year old daughter, since she's been about two says, "Mommy, stop working, get off the computer, get off the computer." Or my son, "Mommy, she just works all the time." When I first came here, and my son was about three, he started really acting out on me. It was bad. It's gotten better, but I think he was really resentful about the lack of attention and that sort of thing. So I am trying to do a lot better, but doing a lot better means losing time to work. So I am stepping out on faith that I will have enough time to do what I have to do to get there, but I'm also fully prepared that I will run out of time. I am not at all confident that I'm gonna finish this book in time ("Frances").

In Frances' narrative, it is clear that first, stress from work has greatly affected her emotional health, which manifests through constant crying and feelings of powerlessness. More importantly for this discussion, Frances reveals during her interview how the demands from work have created turmoil in her relationships with her young children. In fact, she associates the behavioral problems of her son directly with her busy schedule and her inability to give him enough attention. The tone of Frances' narrative is filled both with guilt for not always being there for her children, and defeat for her skepticism about finishing her book which is crucial for her tenure. I argue that this is clear evidence of emotional fatigue. The larger implications for Frances' narrative reveals the delicate relationship women of color have with the tenure process.

Frances conveys concern that if she dedicates more time to maintain her emotional and physical health, like through exercise, and allocates more time to spend with her children, she will not be able to finish her book manuscript, which can ultimately cost her tenure. Although we can safely say that all assistant faculty, regardless of race and gender, fear at some point that they will not make the cut for tenure, I argue that women of color have a more complicated relationship with tenure. In spite of scholarly or pedagogical achievements, women of color's accomplishments tend to be devalued if they fail to conform to rigid academic professionalism; therefore creating the

necessity for women of color to constantly prove their worth through hyper-professional practices. The challenges women of color experience with devalued scholarly production, teaching, and service will be the basis of the following chapter of the dissertation. For now, I would just like to make it clear that the stakes for tenure are often higher for faculty like Frances, specifically as a direct result of racial and gendered expectations of her (in)capability as a scholar that are a direct by-product of past and current national discourses on affirmative action (Heilman, Block, and Lucas 1992; Heilman and Welle 2006).

I will now conclude this discussion of emotional fatigue with a narrative from Anna, a young Latina assistant professor. Notably, her story was one of the most severe among the participants in relation to mental and physical health. Below is a detailed discussion of the conditions she endured during the previous year as she was finishing her dissertation and preparing to transition to her current institution:

> I literally had a nervous breakdown. And so, I was physically ill. And I had to have surgery, but on top of that, I had a complete mental nervous breakdown. And so in the process, I lost my engagement. I was ready to just walk away from it all. So I literally had a nervous breakdown, so I didn't handle the stress very well. And again, there was just so much going on. It [was] a very hostile environment that I did physically become ill. And I was literally hemorrhaging. And the sad part was that it was pretty much for an entire semester, but I was so absorbed with teaching that I literally went to the doctor the day I handed in the grades, and that's when they diagnosed me. I had uterine fibroids. I had to be operated. But they tried to avoid surgery because it can affect the ability to have children later, but so for like four to five months, they were pumping me with different drugs. So I was pumped with hormones, I was pumped with all this stuff, trying to write my dissertation. Then, a few months later, they just couldn't stop the bleeding, so they had [me on] good painkillers. I mean it literally was like someone was stabbing me in the stomach...By that point I became depressed, so I was on antidepressants, and then I was also on anti-anxiety. So there was a point where I was probably taking eight pills a day between all the stuff they were pumping me with to try to stop the bleeding. So physically, [I was] completely deteriorated. Mentally, [I was] completely deteriorated. And I said I was gonna not finish, and then I eventually did because it meant leaving [the state]. And getting out of that

sense, and I had way too much survivor guilt…I was the second Latina to ever graduate in my department, so there was too much pressure to not finish. But I said I'm gonna finish, and then I'm not staying in academia…And I said if I did, it wouldn't be that kind of hostile department, and I wouldn't let it get to that point. So up until now, no, I haven't handled it well stressful wise. I survived. I say I survived ("Anna").

As we can see, Anna had a particularly grueling experience as she was transitioning out of graduate school. For now, I would like to focus on the portions of her narrative related to emotional and mental health. In the following discussion, I will return to Anna's story to tease out the physical health problems she endured. In her narrative, Anna noted several major emotional problems she suffered from: anxiety, depression, and guilt. She described her emotional state as a "complete mental nervous breakdown" and "mentally completely deteriorated." These very vivid descriptors give us a window into some of the extreme situations women of color may find themselves in when confronting "hostile environments" in academia with the added "pressures to finish" as one of the only non-white females to ever walk the halls. Anna's particular experience of marginalization and the pressures associated with being a token Latina in her department is not unique among the women of color I interviewed. Unfortunately for Anna, these emotional battles ultimately cost her not only her engagement, but also her physical health.

In all, the narratives I have presented in this section on emotional fatigue give us just a glimpse into some of the hardships women of color endure in academia. For many, the stress incurred through social isolation, the experience of tokenism, juggling motherhood, and the general tolls of engaging in hyper-professional practices can ultimately lead to serious blows to mental and emotional health. This discussion also highlights how stress is not just one feeling on a spectrum of human emotions, rather stress can be an embodied experience for many. I argue that women of color faculty are

particularly susceptible to embodying stress since their daily lives involve a series embodied practices of signaling professionalism, which can take a grave toll on their health. I will now transition to the last section of the chapter describing physical health.

Physical Stress

Although emotional fatigue has no doubt a debilitating effect on one's daily performance as a professional, the manifestation of physical ailments seemed to be the tipping point for many of the interview participants. In other words, when many of the respondents began to notice major physical symptoms of illness, despite other signs along the way, I believe that was the moment when most finally recognized a need to slow down and reflect on the high levels of stress they were enduring. Although there were some respondents who reported to be in perfect health, the majority of the faculty I interviewed noted some forms of physical manifestations of stress, mostly through minor battles with their weight or loss of sleep.

For example, here is a quote from a senior African American professor in regards to the stress she endures: "It [has] been enormously stressful. I [am] totally out of balance. I've been losing things right and left and misplacing this little key. I mean my officemate, I'm just driving her crazy [with] 'I can't find my key! Help me!' [I'm] losing things: glasses, purses. Just losing things all over the place. [I'm] not sleeping very well ("Camille"). Camille's statement is by no means surprising or uncommon, yet it exemplifies how stress can interfere with everyday physical functioning like memory and sleep, which in the long run can have more serious consequences. Returning to Jenny's narrative from the previous section, she described her battles with weight and makes direct links to the stressors she has endured as a new assistant professor:

In the past year alone, I gained twenty-five pounds. It's stressful. I love it, it's a great job, but at the same time, it's extremely stressful. Obviously the twenty-five pounds tells you how I handle [the stress]. Eating a lot of really bad foods, no exercise. I think I let my body take the brunt of it. I think my social life has taken a brunt of it [too]. I think I have let myself become the brunt of it. Emotionally, spiritually, socially has gotten the short end of the stick. I've led a very lopsided life this past year ("Jenny").

Similar to several other respondents, Jenny's stressors facilitated unhealthy habits like poor diet or lack of exercise. Although losing sleep or weight gain are not in themselves serious physical health ailments, both Camille and Jenny express feelings of unbalance or lopsidedness, which can ultimately compromise mental and emotional health as discussed in the previous section.

Respondents who reported more serious physical ailments compared to those like Camille and Jenny are worthy of in-depth exploration. For example, if we briefly return to Anna's narrative at the end of the last section, she confesses the following: "It [was] a very hostile environment that I did physically become ill. And I was literally hemorrhaging. And the sad part was that it was pretty much for an entire semester, but I was so absorbed with teaching that I literally went to the doctor the day I handed in the grades, and that's when they diagnosed me. I had uterine fibroids." Unfortunately for Anna, her graduate training was a particularly cruel experience that created tremendous amounts of stress on her body. Although the exact causes for uterine fibroids are still disputed in the medical community and is outside the scope of this project, many do argue that stress and poor emotional health play an important role in their development (Laughlin, Schroeder, and Baird 2010). Regardless of the actual causal relationship to stress, for Anna there was a clear connection between her experiences in a hostile environment and the development of the reproductive problems. In the end, we can

without a doubt observe that the diagnosis of uterine fibroids contributed to a whole host

of other problems for Anna, both physical and emotional, that almost led to her quitting

academia altogether.

Lorraine is an African-American senior professor. Like many, her career spanned

over two different institutions. When she was transitioning to her current institution, she

experienced the following major setback:

> I've tried to control [my stress]. I don't have high blood [pressure]. [But] I have a
> really complicated health history where I had a stroke when I was thirty-eight
> right before I went to [my current institution]. And that was one of the things that
> said that maybe we gotta get out of here [my previous university]. [The stroke]
> had a lot to do with stress… because I'm healthy as a horse…I work out. I had a
> stroke swimming laps in the pool…What it came down to was that I evidently had
> a flu and instead of having…like an ear infection, you know or getting strep…It
> somehow got into my blood system. And went into my heart, so it damaged the
> heart. So they didn't know why or how until of course, I go to the ER, they see a
> black woman, they immediately assume I have high blood pressure. If anything, I
> had low blood pressure because I work out all the time… And so, after all of that,
> and so they said, well, you're fine, you're cool, you have to be on these drugs,
> which means you can never have any more children. I said, "oh, thank you." I
> wasn't done. I started late because [I] delayed children. Because I was given a
> hard time because I got pregnant before I got tenure, which is at that time was a
> major no-no ("Lorraine").

Like Anna, Lorraine saw her illness as directly linked to her daily stressors at work. At

her previous institution, she was engaged in an overwhelming load of administrative

duties, constantly juggling the multiple roles she embodied. Unfortunately for Lorraine,

even engaging in an active lifestyle with exercise did not neutralize the stress enough to

prevent a stroke, which is often linked to chronic diseases like high blood pressure.

Although Lorraine considers herself lucky that she did not endure permanent brain

damage or loss of speech, her life was drastically changed forever at the early age of

thirty-eight. Not only did she have to undergo a lifetime of treatment for her damaged

heart, but she had to also face the harsh reality that she no longer could have children. As

Lorraine candidly confessed, she like many of her female colleagues chose to delay

starting a family due to the pressures of tenure. This reality is yet another example of how

the academic professionalism remains rigid and impermeable to change despite the large

influx of women faculty.

Another faculty member I interviewed, Mai, an Asian senior faculty, described

both the physical and emotional tolls her body and those of her colleagues incur due to

stress:

> Every semester has become really unbearable. I can see the way it is eroding
> me…[Stress] really eats up your mind and eats up your enthusiasm. Even going
> back [after a break] you go, "no, no, not another semester. No, not another
> semester." If [my friends] had not been here, I think I would have had a nervous
> breakdown, a major one. I would have purely and simply quit. Just quit. But
> talking to them, and they talking to me, we really did a kind of psychiatric session
> somehow to ourselves… The first seven years were terrible. Scientists will tell
> you it's not possible, but I have developed really gigantic scars…When I began
> [my career here], I had these very tiny scars, but [now] I have gigantic scars on
> the back and the front, and I tell my doctor, you know, I think it's stress…If I
> didn't have my husband, I didn't have these friends, I would have gone really
> crazy, being just mentally disturbed because the stress is soo much, that it eats
> [you] up. You cannot sleep, you cannot eat, and you go to teach…We have these
> cycles, stress-related disorders like gastrointestinal diseases, lack of sleep and that
> kind of thing ("Mai").

For Mai, even though the physical symptoms that have manifested in her body cannot be

scientifically explained, she is convinced that there is a direct link to the amount of stress

she endures semester after semester. Throughout Mai's interview, she emphasized the

exclusion and racism she experienced in her department. In fact, she along with some of

her colleagues of color filed a grievance against the department at some point during her

career. Unfortunately, the investigation that followed did not lead to any action, so the

department continues to be a hostile place for Mai and her colleagues. Mai's discussion

again highlights the serious tolls that many marginalized faculty experience as a result of

daily efforts to conform to academic professionalism and to be accepted as legitimate scholars.

These narratives paint a somewhat grim picture for women of color in academia. However, many of the interview participants do in fact create strategies for survival that fit their unique situations. Like Mai described, many seek solace from colleagues, and if there is enough for a critical mass, form communities of support across departments, disciplines, and sometimes institutions in order to combat the attacks to their general health and well being. For example, Candace, a young African-American associate professor who was newly promoted describes her journey as follows:

> I try to carve out a personal life, and I'm a lot better at that in the last, I wanna say, two years than I was beforehand. I had such high levels of stress in preparing for tenure that I was actually ill. So since that time period, I kind of said, "okay, this is a job." It's a good job, but it's just a job, and I'm blessed to have it, particularly in this economic climate, but it's not my life. So going out with friends, I sing, I look at movies. I watch television. I love being around kids. I try to have a normalcy there, kind of a center. I'm also a little bit more spiritually grounded now in the past couple of years than I have been…I think for scholars of color and women of color in particular, there's a higher level of stress that affects you health-wise. That's not really being discussed outside of women in academia. You know, but you wonder when you see that one person in the department who has forty advisees or undergrads, ten graduate students, and then the next semester, they've been hospitalized. Or when you see senior scholars who have passed at age forty, fifty. The level of stress that you don't recognize, and some of it's internalized because you're trying to just break that level so far as you can. Be all you can be, without taking a break to say, wait a minute. I'm not gonna let this job ruin my life ("Candace").

In this narrative, Candace describes her personal experience with illness due to the high levels of stress involved in the tenure process (she later admitted off the record to have suffered from a heart attack—which was remarkable since she was in her early thirties and had no pre-existing health conditions). She also acknowledges the patterns she has observed with many of her colleagues of color, both men and women, whose health

becomes compromised because of the amount of service they take on coupled with the pressures to go "as far as you can" and "be all you can be." Yet Candace transformed her illness into a catalyst for making necessary changes in her daily routines. In some respects, she had to reorient her identity, creating clearer boundaries for her professional and personal selves. Candace, like many of the other faculty I interviewed, had to constantly remind herself that academia was just "a job" and did not define her as a person. Her declaration at the end of the passage, "I'm not gonna let this job ruin my life" should not be taken as an exaggeration. Rather, Candace's statement is very telling of the fragile and tenuous status of women of color in academia more generally.

In this section of the chapter, I introduced narratives from various interview participants that revealed the severe tolls of *embodied stress*. In particular, I presented data that showed how high levels of stress can create first *emotional fatigue* in the form of strained personal relationships or severe disorders such as depression, and second *physical stress* in either mild modes such as weight gain and insomnia or even life-altering ailments such as strokes and heart attacks. In all, respondents that suffered the most clearly connected their illness to their experiences of stress in the workplace. Concurrent with the conclusions of previous studies cited at the start of the chapter (Woods-Giscombé 2010; Mullings 2005; Mullings and Schulz 2006), I argue that women of color faculty experience higher risks of developing serious mental and physical complications due to the daily stressors of being tokenized, isolated, and more important for this dissertation, their engagement in hyper-professional practices as described in the first half of the chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I accomplish two major goals drawing from the qualitative interviews with women of color faculty at research universities. First, I present data to describe the process of *hyper-professional presentation of self*. Through the various narratives I present, I show the conscious daily practices that most women of color faculty engage in the workplace for the purpose of maintaining credibility as legitimate professionals. The calculated rituals I describe involve *physical* manipulations through dress, hair, and other body adornments, and *bodily* adjustments of emotions, speech, or demeanor. In the second portion of the chapter, I shift the discussion to a focus on *embodied stress*. In this section, I present multiple narratives that reveal the grave costs and risks many women of color experience with their mental and physical health due to the high levels of stress in the workplace. Some interview participants displayed serious health problems that permanently altered their lives.

In all, this chapter aims to uncover how academia continues to be a risky battlefield for many minority faculty, particularly women of color. I found that women of color faculty consciously build strong suits of armor to combat the subtle devaluation and questioning of their academic professionalism. I argue that in order to make serious change in academia and to genuinely move towards a more inclusive and diverse environment, we must first and foremost be critical of hidden cultures and practices that maintain rigid standards of academic professionalism which continue to reflect white and patriarchal ways of being and knowing. Second and importantly, we must equally distribute the burdens of diversifying among all actors in academia, not just among racial and gender minorities.

CHAPTER 6:
REDEFINING PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES: KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION,
PEDAGOGIES & SERVICE

Producing knowledge and scholarship is a central component of the professoriate.

The intellectual element of being a professional in academia is undeniable, yet

completely taken-for-granted. In this chapter, I will focus on how many women of color

faculty I interviewed used knowledge-production, teaching, and service to express their

personal and political values, pushing against the hegemonic norms of academic

professionalism. In previous chapters, I presented evidence to suggest that nationally

women of color faculty perceive the need to work harder compared to their colleagues to

be viewed as legitimate scholars, even when controlling for rank. I have also uncovered

through the qualitative data how women of color faculty develop a hyper-professional

presentation of self in order to navigate their work environments, which according to the

2004-5 HERI faculty survey are also more likely to be perceived as hostile climates for

women of color particularly. However, in this chapter, I will examine the following

empirical question: *how do women of color faculty redefine their professional identities*

via scholarship, teaching, and service? Ultimately, I found they often encountered acute

pressures to conform to rigid standards of academic professionalism with simultaneous

attacks to their legitimacy as intellectuals and educators.

In our modern global-economic system, knowledge becomes a crucial commodity

for asserting global power and competitiveness. Many scholars have argued that the

university systems in the U.S. have become intricately linked to the functioning of our

economic base, or as Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (1997) call the *triple helix of university-*

industry-government relations. Although outside the scope of this dissertation, I would

like to acknowledge that attention to the role of knowledge-production within the professoriate is necessary to fully understand the experiences of academic workers and can potentially shed light on the present and future status of the U.S. within the global knowledge economy.

Additionally, a focus on knowledge-production is significant from a theoretical perspective since this process is intricately tied to how power functions on a discursive level in the modern era. In other words, from the Foucauldian standpoint, power is yielded and reproduced not through overt force or exclusion reminiscent of the pre-civil rights era; rather, in modern times, power and status rely on the creation of discourses (Foucault 1979). Academics are important producers of discourses (yet not the sole proprietors of knowledge); therefore, the stakes for success can be extremely high for academic workers, with many representing the interests of powerful private and governmental industries within the larger context of the global knowledge economy.

Drawing from the narratives of forty women of color faculty at research universities, I will only hint at some of the political-economic realities of the knowledge-economy as well as the theoretical debates of power-knowledge. Rather, the focus of this chapter is primarily to discuss three important dimensions of professionalism in academia for the women of color I interviewed: scholarship, teaching, and service. I will show in this chapter how my respondents actively redefine their professional identities despite how they may be perceived by their colleagues, discipline, or even tenure and promotion committees. In this chapter, I will discuss how the women of color faculty I interviewed often (1) personalized and politicized their research, (2) developed unique pedagogies, and (3) prioritized mentoring and building community. I will conclude the chapter with a

focused discussion on the consequent devaluation and rigidity of redefining professionalism in the academy. First, I will briefly discuss the relevant literature on the experiences of minority faculty in the academy broadly related to the dimensions of research, teaching and service.

Literature

In their meta-analysis of 252 publications on the experiences and status of faculty of color in the U.S. academy from 1988-2007, Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood (2008) succinctly organize relevant themes with a focus on the departmental, institutional, and national contexts. Their analysis revealed the range of support and challenges faculty of color experience as well as breadth of recommendations for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, all within the three contexts cited above. Among the various themes explored, the dimensions related to research, teaching, and service were particularly salient among all the publications.

In regards to scholarship, the authors found that within the departmental and institutional contexts, the undervaluation of their research interests, approaches, and theoretical frameworks was cited as a common experience among faculty of color throughout their meta-analysis (p. 143). In the national context, Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood concluded that among all the research they analyzed, faculty of color additionally experience delegitimization of their research and methodologies in academic culture, scholarly journals, disciplinary associations, professional networks, and funding entities (p. 146). Another important dimension of the experience of faculty of color in regards to their research was explored by Urrieta and Mendez-Benavidez's (2007) qualitative study on Chicana/o professors. In this study, the authors found that their participants did not see

their research simply as an expected practice of their career, but as form of activism, or "activist scholarship."

Relevant to teaching, much research supports the finding that faculty of color often prioritize the development of diverse and alternative approaches to teaching to honor the presence of multiple forms of knowledge and learning among an increasingly multicultural student population. Hassouneh (2006) reflected on the challenges faculty of color face teaching anti-racist, feminist, and other critical pedagogies at predominately white institutions. She concluded that faculty of color who present alternative perspectives through the curriculum often face challenges that are "personally painful and professionally taxing" due to unsupportive institutional environments, negative student evaluations, and resistant colleagues.

However, the literature on faculty of color also reveals that their alternative approach to teaching is not limited to the content of curriculum, but additionally to the level of student interaction and engagement. In fact, Umbach (2006) through his quantitative analysis concludes that faculty of color significantly contribute to undergraduate student learning and involvement. Specifically, he found that even after controlling for various individual and institutional characteristics, faculty of color were more likely to interact with students, to employ active learning and collaborative learning techniques, to create environments that increase diverse interactions, and to emphasize higher-order thinking activities in the classroom (p. 337).

Lastly, the literature focusing on the experiences of minority faculty in the U.S. academy also reveals a collective desire and passion to serve students and community. Urrieta and Mendez-Benavidez (2007) in their study also found among their participants

112

a shared commitment to social justice and diversity as well as public intellectualism. Moreover, Porter's (2007) quantitative analysis takes a closer look at faculty service by examining the rates of committee participation by type of committee and institution. Although he found small differences in committee participation overall between faculty, he discovered that the largest differences between females and males occur at doctoral and liberal arts institutions. Specifically, female faculty at doctoral universities report serving on about one half more total committees than males (p. 532).

Altogether, the literature cited in this discussion provides empirical evidence that minority faculty do have a shared experience within important dimensions of academic professionalism: research, teaching, and service. However, most of the studies fail to recognize the particular professional lives of women of color faculty, and how the intersections of race and gender can produce both additional challenges and possibilities for change. My study not only remedies this gap in the literature, but also revitalizes the discussion regarding the experiences of minority faculty through a unique focus on the discursive power of professionalism. The empirical results presented in this chapter will ultimately shift our focus from issues of retention and recruitment to how women of color faculty attempt to push against rigid norms of academic professionalism. I will now proceed to the major empirical findings beginning with a discussion of how women of color faculty personalize and politicize their research, followed by sections focused on their pedagogical and mentoring practices.

Personalizing and Politicizing Scholarship

The selection of a research topic is no doubt a complicated process for all academics and scholars. Every individual has a unique narrative about how they ended up

dedicating their careers to Victorian-era poetry or Plato's theory of the republic. Despite the particularities of selecting a focus of study, the women of color I interviewed exhibited distinct patterns of personalizing and/or politicizing their research. I acknowledge that these patterns likely apply to other marginalized and underrepresented groups in the academy, such as scholars who are from working class backgrounds or those who identify as LGBTQ. However, the intersecting identities of women of color academics often place them in particularly vulnerable positions at their institutions, where they often experience devaluation or threats to their authority in multiple areas of their professional lives, especially their scholarship.

When analyzing the qualitative data on the issue of scholarship, I noticed a distinct pattern of how the unique identities of the women of color I interviewed were often reflected in their scholarship. In very complex ways, many of the women of color in my sample have drawn from their personal lived experiences to construct sophisticated research agendas, with some dedicating their entire careers spanning close to twenty years on a particular set of issues. As stated earlier, although I cannot argue that this process of constructing a scholarly repertoire only applies to women of color faculty, I will show in this chapter that the stakes for success are higher for women of color faculty whose research focuses on their own communities of color.

In order to maintain anonymity of my respondents, I will not be able to present all the evidence from the interview data that highlights the links between lived experience and scholarship since I will be forced to reveal important aspects of my respondents' identities. Notably, the overwhelming majority of my respondents are engaged in research that is very distinct and unique. Moreover, since they are likely the only women

of color faculty in their departments, readers may be able to identity the participants

based on the specific research projects, which not only breaks my agreement of

confidentiality with the participants, but more importantly can endanger and alienate the

interview respondents in their respective workplaces. Therefore, I have carefully selected

passages from the interview data that discuss scholarship in broader terms or included

excerpts that I am able to remove the particularities of the topic, yet providing ample

evidence to address how women of color faculty personalize and politicize their research.

In this first passage, "Amanda," who is a young African-American in the early

stages as an assistant professor, discusses her research and how she understands her work

to be perceived by her colleagues.

> I guess we're supposed to be value-free [researchers], right? Well, I'm not. I take
> my personal charge so often… I actually get a lot of flack for studying [this
> community] because people [say] "it's such a small population," "why not study
> that [other] population?"… I'm really interested in my research, and it actually
> gets me up each and every day, and I'm really excited about it…I wanna take a
> slightly different approach. That's my personal charge, so it's what I do. I think
> there's different kinds of [methodologists], and I'm just a little concerned that I
> might be viewed by some of the traditional [methodologists] as kind of watering
> down the discipline or the specialty. It's not explicitly been said, but we're
> interviewing a job candidate right now. They're like, "Oh, she's a traditional
> [methodologist]. We so need that." So, I was like, "Okay" because mine's a little
> bit kind of edgy [methodology]. Am I ghetto-izing the specialty? That's a little
> challenging. I think that when it's all said and done, it may have been a better
> choice to go to a department that wasn't so traditional. It might have been a little
> better for me. I think that I would've probably been accepted a little bit more. Not
> to say that I'm not accepted, but they are definitely [saying about the candidate],
> "one of the strengths about this woman is that she is a traditional [methodologist],
> and she was trained at such and such." And I don't have that same training. So
> when [they say] "she is this," so [that means, I am] not ("Amanda").

Amanda's discussion reveals several important themes. First, in the opening sentence, she

is being frank and unapologetic about her personal motives for pursuing her research

project. She clearly expresses passion for her research and seems personally satisfied

with developing an innovative approach to her scholarship, yet she knows that this is a point of contention, admitting to getting "flack" from her colleagues. Another significant theme that emerged in Amanda's narrative was her discussion about the subtle ways her colleagues devalued her research during a job search within her methodological sub-specialty. During the discussion of the candidates, her colleagues made clear what type of research was considered an asset and deemed a necessity to the department. Through these interactions, Amanda was able to plainly see the boundaries of the field that were deemed legitimate and worthy by her colleagues. The exclamation, "Am I ghetto-izing the specialty?" ultimately suggests her coming to terms with the fact that her own research without a doubt fell outside those boundaries of legitimacy established by her colleagues.

Next, I am presenting a narrative from "Julieta" a young Latina assistant professor whom had just finished her first year at a new institution and department. In this passage, Julieta is discussing the perceptions of her research within her field.

> I do a lot of service for our national organization, and so I think even though I'm a woman [and a] person of color, I think my scholarship and the vigor helps them to see that I'm acceptable in terms of the scholarship. The reality is my work isn't so radical that it's a threat to them. It's probably safe scholarship. I'm using their language. I do quantitative work, and so I'm not a threat to them and I realize that. If I did critical feminist pedagogy or if I did a lot of things more critical, like qualitative inquiries that really are attacks of the academic institution, then I would be a threat to them, and they would probably treat me very differently. So I realize that my research agenda impacts the way people view me and treat me ("Julieta").

Julieta's narrative is interesting in several ways. First, the opening sentence of the passage reveals a keen awareness of the risks she perceives having as a woman of color academic for being accepted as a scholar. If we return back to the concept of *hyper-professionality*, it is clear that Julieta's great amount of service to her professional

116

organization becomes an important mechanism for her to counter potential negative assumptions about her as a woman of color scholar. However, at the same time Julieta is very aware that her scholarship is viewed as "safe" and non-threatening due to her selection of methods and approach.

What I find most interesting about Julieta's discussion is her ability to be simultaneously critical of why she had not encountered challenges with the perception of her research, and on the other hand what particular types of scholarship can unjustly be viewed as problematic or "radical." Her perspective reveals an acute double-consciousness about how to be viewed as a legitimate professional in the academy. In other words, Julieta does not rationalize her successes as a scholar compared to others as a function of individual merit, validity, or innovation. Rather, she is able to look beyond her personal successes to see the larger systems of devaluation in the academy that function covertly under the guise of scholarly professionalism. Her perspective is clearly from the gaze of an outsider looking within, which has the ability to uncover the underlying mechanisms behind important taken-for-granted norms and discourses, such as those about what is valid scholarship.

Next, I present a passage from "Anna," a young Latina assistant professor wh had just begun her first tenure-track position.

> I had a very, very hostile graduate experience, so I wasn't gonna stay in academia unless it was a very supportive environment in terms of the department. So [the department I interviewed for] had an action plan of where they wanted to go, and two, the priorities were race and sexuality, which is what I do. So I said okay, I don't have to convince [them] that's legitimate scholarship, [since they] actually need it. So that was impressive to me, and everyone was very affirming during my talk, and saying that they need that kind of scholarship, and they were excited to have me. So it was actually very weird because other than my committee and my mentor, my work had never been validated. I always had to prove its worth. I had problems getting funding. I was told my research was offensive. So to hear

someone say not only is it good, and it's legitimate, and I wanna engage with it, but that we want it and we need it. I had a little bit of complex after that, I was like "they like me?" ("Anna").

Anna's narrative clearly reveals her struggles with acceptance as a scholar. She refers to her difficult graduate school environment where her work was continually called into question and even labeled as "offensive." Unfortunately, as an academic who chose to engage with issues of race and sexuality in her research, Anna's experiences captured in this passage are not very different from many of her colleagues who pursue similar research agendas. However, Anna as a woman of color has to combat the devaluation of her work simultaneously with a host of other perceived threats to her legitimacy as a professional in the academy, such as those discussed in chapters 4 and 5 as well as in the remainder of this chapter. More importantly, as a woman of color who studies a population reflective of her own identity and community, Anna must combat serious criticisms of her scholarship as "biased" and less valid, or even more pejoratively, as "naval gazing," signaling her research as invalid or inappropriate.

The most interesting part of Anna's narrative was her skepticism about finding a department of scholars who identified her work as important, valid, and necessary. Her exclamation, "they like me?" suggests considerable doubt about the possibility of finding a safe place in the academy to pursue her research without the constant work to "prove its worth." Unfortunately, most of the women of color faculty I interviewed were not as fortunate as Anna in finding a department that unilaterally accepted their scholarship as worthy and important. Rather, most found themselves, like Amanda, intellectually alienated.

The last passage in this section is from "Leanne," an Asian-American associate professor who had just moved to another institution. In this excerpt, we are discussing what she considers her greatest professional challenges.

> I would say that one of the general challenges [I have] experienced has been [that] I came up as a junior person in a department that the chair definitely did not see my field as a valid field…I had three chairs as a junior person, and they were [all] different. But the chair who was the longest in the middle definitely didn't recognize ethnic studies in general as [a] legitimate field. [The chair] clearly had questions and concerns about the quality of the entire academic enterprise, so obviously that's a challenge. I couldn't really see what was in the file. I knew there were things going in the file that reflected those biases though, but what can you do? So that's probably [what] I would say, a major challenge ("Leanne").

Leanne's experience with having multiple chairs who were not supportive of her work is unfortunately common in academia for many junior faculty regardless of race or gender; however, in Leanne's case when a chair obviously views the entire academic subject area of ethnic studies as illegitimate adds a significant barrier for her to be perceived as an authentic professional. Moreover, the composition of tenure and promotion often structurally disadvantages fields such as ethnic studies, which are disproportionately composed of faculty of color, since these newer subject areas are forced to fit the same professional archetype established for traditional and mainstream disciplines. In fact, many faculty in newer fields experience tenure and promotion as though they are trying to fit a square peg in a round hole (J. Butler and Schmitz 1992; J. E. Butler 2001).

Overall, this section highlights how the women of color faculty I interviewed were acutely aware of the suspicions they often encountered about their scholarship or in some cases like Leanne, were well aware that their field as a whole was viewed as illegitimate. With their professional legitimacy on the line, they sometimes knowingly took risks when pursuing particular research agendas in order to not sacrifice their

personal values and objectives; however, many suffered great costs in terms of confidence, self-esteem, overall well-being, and sometimes even their tenure possibilities. Next, I will transition to the discussion of pedagogies, and how the women of color faculty I interviewed often paid a great price for the amount of time and energy dedicated to teaching.

<div align="center">Teaching and Pedagogies</div>

At research universities, the rhetoric about earning tenure suggests that faculty members will be evaluated equally in three areas: research, teaching, and service. However, for those who have spent any time at a research university on the track to becoming an academic, it is easy to see even as a young graduate student that in practice, research is weighed much more than the other two areas. For women of color, this reality can create significant challenges for them professionally in several ways. First, as discussed at length in chapter 4, women of color faculty find themselves structurally positioned to acquire what I call the *diversity double-duty*. This concept reflects the empirical observations of how women of color faculty are significantly more likely to carry the disproportionate burden of diversifying their universities through additional committee service, a heavy load of mentoring, and the onerous task of developing and teaching "diversity" courses. In this section, I will discuss how the women of color I interviewed often found themselves caught in a battle between the actual weight of teaching for tenure at a research university, and the expectations they place on themselves as professionals who equally value teaching and research. The subsequent section of this chapter will discuss the issue of service and mentoring.

The following passage is from "Jenny" who is a young Asian-American assistant professor at her first tenure-track position. This narrative emerged from general discussions about research as compared to teaching.

> It's interesting how scholarship or research is so valued, to a fault where I think teaching is so devalued. And so, these students come thinking, "wow, I'm at a top university," and then they get this crappy education. It's happened to a number of my friends who go to big, prestigious public schools, and they rarely get a faculty member. They get some grad student, right. Then they got a junky education. So I find that really ironic. I'll say [to my senior colleagues], "I got my teaching evaluations [and they] are pretty good, but I would like to improve them, what do you think?" And they're like, "Well, what did you get?" I'm like, "Well, I did above average." And they're like, "if you're above average, that's good enough. That's it. Don't worry about it. You should worry about your research." So I'm constantly socialized to think that you just need to be good enough on your teaching and focus on research. That's hard for me to do ("Jenny").

Jenny is clearly struggling with the professional realities and expectations as an academic at a research university; however, her challenges reflect an internal conflict of values, rather than those of ability or training. Jenny clearly finds a problem with how research universities "devalue" teaching and often fail to provide or reward quality education for their students. Jenny, who is in the early stages of establishing her professional identity, seems conflicted by the fact that her dedication to teaching is not supported by her senior colleagues, and likely not be appropriately rewarded when she eventually goes up for tenure. Ultimately, Jenny, like those who similarly value teaching, must make a hard choice with their career paths: they can either accept the difficult reality of teaching at a research university and shift their priorities, or they can attempt to nurture their own professional identities that reflect their personal values about teaching. One thing is definite, either path will ensue conflict and neither choice will guarantee success, particularly for women of color faculty who encounter struggle within multiple dimensions of their professional identities.

Next is a narrative from "Candace," a young African-American, newly promoted associate professor. The following passage describes some of her pedagogical practices.

> Because I do a lot of popular culture, particularly music, I play music in class. We analyze songs. Even in lectures that seem like that they have nothing to do with music or popular culture, I really use that popular culture vein to look at what's happening politically, socially, and economically in the nation. I most like when students lead their own discussion because it's interesting to see the type of questions they come up with after doing the reading, seeing the film, or hearing the music clip. When they actually catch something in the text that you didn't read or you haven't thought of, you feel like there's an exchange that they're giving you as much as you're giving them. I kind of believe in more hands on learning, rather than just passive, "Okay, you listen to me one day, now what are you going to do with that information the second day" ("Candace").

In this narrative, Candace portrays her pedagogical practices as distinct from the more traditional and "passive" style of lecturing and teaching. She clearly has developed a unique style of teaching that works for her and her students, allowing constant dialogue and interaction with popular culture material as a vehicle to engage current events and class content. Candace's pedagogies are clearly well developed and thoughtful. Moreover, it is obvious that her teaching practices require considerable time and energy to maintain and nurture. However, as discussed earlier, teaching at a research university continues to be devalued and not adequately rewarded. Therefore, Candace, like many of her colleagues who value teaching equally with research, must continually go against the grain of the established academic culture of professionalism. Consequently, faculty members like Candace who prioritize teaching often sacrifice a lot of personal time and quality of living to honor their particular professional identities and simultaneously meet the standards at their institutions.

The following narrative is from "Charlene," an African-American senior professor. In this passage, she is discussing her development as a teacher.

My first teaching experience, like [for] a lot of people, was awful (laugh). My mentor was a white man who was a nice guy. He went away for a conference and because I was black, he figured I could do the minorities in media lecture. [During the lecture] I was literally tethered to this podium because he recorded his lectures, and so there was one wire that was linking me to the amplification system [since] there was 500 people, and another that tethered me to the tape recorder. So I could only move like two feet either direction, and I was stuck behind this podium. The students had been dulled into submission, so they were polite… I don't know exactly why, but it led me to know that I couldn't teach like that white man…What I did was to try to figure out how I was supposed to be teaching. My mother actually was a big mentor in terms of how you teach people. And I went around and looked at people's classrooms, and I saw African Americans using call and response, and I saw women violating the symbols of power and sitting on the table so that they could lean in to their students. That affected me a lot, and so I realized that I already knew how to teach, but there was this model that I was supposed to learn and then had to reject: "the great wise person who stands behind the podium and dispenses wisdom," which is not who I am ("Charlene").

Similar to Candace's narrative, Charlene also seems to define her pedagogical practices as distinct from traditional styles of lecture, which she particularly associates with her past white male mentor. Charlene recounts her first lecture as a defining moment in her career where she knew she "couldn't teach like that white man." Furthermore, she explicitly rejected the model of teaching she observed from her mentors when she realized it was possible to draw from her own cultural knowledge and personal experiences to engage students. I argue that Charlene's pedagogical epiphanies deeply shaped her professional identity for the rest of her career, despite pressures she may have experienced to conform to traditional modes of teaching. However, faculty members like Charlene who find personal satisfaction with highly engaged pedagogical practices often expend significant more time and energy on teaching compared to their colleagues who adopt more traditional styles.

As stated earlier, a dedication to teaching at research institutions can lead to a heavy toll if research productivity does not meet the standards. Ironically, the women of

color faculty I interviewed did not allow their research to suffer due to their passion for teaching; rather, they somehow managed to maintain an equally high level of effort for both research and teaching. However, as discussed in chapter 5, the tolls they paid were often their health, well being, or personal relationships. Overall, women of color faculty believe that, unlike many of their colleagues, they are generally less willing to sacrifice teaching in order to maintain their research agendas, despite their clear understanding of the institutional rewards system. The following section will focus on the topic of mentoring and community-building. In this discussion, I will highlight how the women of color faculty I interviewed gained personal satisfaction with serving their communities, despite some of the immediate costs.

Mentoring and Community Building

So far, I have discussed the particular issues women of color faculty face with scholarship and teaching. Within both dimensions, my interview participants expressed feeling devalued and unrecognized for their achievements. In this section, I focus on the third and last major component examined for tenure at a research university: service. Specifically, I observed that despite the knowledge that the service component for tenure is weighed the least compared to either research or teaching, the women of color I interviewed still placed great value and effort into mentoring and other community-building activities since it often brought a different level of meaning and satisfaction into their careers. Although the immediate cost of these conflicting priorities resulted in significant time constraints, the real costs were the subtle yet damaging critiques of their professionalism.

The first passage I will examine is from "Maggie" who is a young Black assistant professor. Below we are discussing the shifting racial climate at her institution and the contradictions in the rhetoric about diversity in higher education.

> It leaves me a little worried, but it also leaves me a little angry because one of the reasons that I came to this university was because there's a very specific population of students of color [that I want to serve]. At [my previous institution], I was able to work with first generation students, but they were predominantly white, and my position has always been if I cannot teach in [my home country], then I need to be servicing communities of color [in the U.S.]. I mean that in a lot of ways. That is one of my political goals. If I have to be a faculty member in the U.S., then I have to identify constituencies that are meaningful [to me]. And it doesn't mean that I [am] irresponsible to my [other] students, but it means that my political energies are directed and targeted in a very specific way. A lot of the rhetoric around race and questions of diversity that I heard when I interviewed was just that, rhetoric. I say that somewhat harshly understanding that we are in a very specific kind of administrative climate. Some of what had been said back then would have been true at that time, but there has been a significant shift in the wind regarding questions of diversity on the campus ("Maggie").

Maggie is very clear and transparent about her political goals to work with students of color. In fact, one of the major reasons for her making a career move to another institution was precisely to work with students of color. However, during her interview she described deep concerns for the changing racial climate at her university, fearing dramatic changes that may lead her to reconsider her institution again. Maggie's narrative sheds light on the professional vulnerability many women of color and other marginalized faculty experience from their administrations, particularly when there is a "significant shift in the wind" regarding race and diversity. In other words, some institutions are more or less accepting of political goals like those held by Maggie regarding community-building; however, dramatic shifts in administration can create a hostile climate for faculty members like Maggie to pursue their own professional priorities.

For the next narrative, we return to "Candace," a young African-American newly tenured associate professor. In this passage, we are discussing her interactions with students and ultimately how her colleagues criticized her level of involvement with undergraduates.

> [Regarding my] interactions with students, I have an open door policy. Literally, [my] students [and] even students who I don't advise just walk in and talk, and often they talk about nothing that has to do with classroom work. I think a lot of that comes from the fact that most of my students or a good portion of them tend to be first generation college students. So they come in to talk about not what's on that paper, but more like, "how do I survive in school?" "I can't pay for the next semester," "I have children, I don't have daycare," "how can I negotiate feeling like I'm not supposed to be here?" That type of everyday life conversation which I have with a lot of my students, and sometimes they tell me a lot more than I need to know. But I like feeling [that] they have a safe place to do that. If [there is] one professor or staff member or someone who you go in and [can] talk to about, "I'm a freshman now, how do I actually get this degree, and can still keep my sanity, and my culture, and my identity?" I like being a small piece of the puzzle. I would say so because when I tell my other colleagues about such and such student just told me this, they were like, "Well, they tell you everything." And it was also kind of noted in print in my first year evaluation. My colleagues noted that I always have students in my office, and they're kind of spinning it as a good thing, but [since] it's a first year evaluation, it was also kind of like [saying] "maybe you shouldn't have so much student involvement, student contact, at the expense of your research" ("Candace").

In this excerpt, Candace clearly expresses personal and professional satisfaction with her high levels of involvement with students. Her "open-door policy" was well received and used by many students, particularly first-generation college students who have particular needs with navigating their education. Candace embraced the idea of creating a "safe place" for students to even discuss non-academic matters. However, she is also well aware of the perceptions many of her colleagues had in regards to the amount of time she dedicated to mentoring and serving students. From the subtle, more passive aggressive comments from her colleagues like "Well, they tell you everything" or the not-so-subtle and direct statements given on her first-year evaluations as an assistant noting the great

amount of student involvement. Ultimately, Candace got the messages loud and clear that her professional priorities for mentoring were not acceptable and furthermore, she needed to better conform with the dominant academic professionalism that valued research first and foremost.

In the following passage, we return to the narrative from "Charlene" who is an African-American senior professor. Here we are concluding our interview with a discussion of what she thought were some of the major challenges women of color faculty face in the academy.

> [The university] ain't recognizing that women, not just black women, but women of color are doing two jobs. [First, we're] taking care of the black students, [but] not just the black students, [also other] racial minority students. And [second] doing the job [all other faculty are] doing too. I thought for a while that [the] university didn't know we were out there until I [was in administration]. [I realized then that] they knew exactly who and where we were and [were] dependent on us to do that unpaid work. And that was an awakening [for me]. I mean, we're truly mules at the university. And they [are] all women of color ("Charlene").

This particular narrative reminds us that prioritizing mentoring in the academy should not be romanticized in any way or viewed as heroic. Rather, Charlene reminds us that women of color faculty who take on the disproportionate burden of mentoring all students of color, despite the personal satisfaction garnered, are in reality undertaking large loads of unpaid and unrecognized labor. More importantly, Charlene's experience in administration opened her eyes to the fact that universities are well aware that women of color are taking on the *diversity double-duty* and ultimately become institutional "mules". Furthermore, Charlene argues that university administrations become dependent on this unpaid work and therefore have an invested stake in maintaining the unequal system of

labor and rewards. In this last section, I will introduce passages from interview

participants that can further highlight experiences of devaluation.

<center>Redefining Professionalism and its Devaluation</center>

So far in this chapter, I have discussed challenges the women of color faculty I

interviewed faced with personalizing and politicizing their research, prioritizing teaching,

and dedicating time and energy to mentoring and community-building. Overall, the main

overlapping finding is that although my research participants have made much effort to

redefine academic professionalism for themselves to better align with their personal

values and priorities, they consistently encounter professional barriers and experience

devaluation. In this section, I will include passages that further display evidence of

women of color who experienced devaluation for their attempts to redefine academic

professionalism.

This first narrative is from "Sonya," a Southeast Asian associate professor. In this

passage, we are discussing how just before she got tenure, she was asked to be the

department's undergraduate advisor, all while juggling other university committee work

and her own professional duties. Although Sonya expressed personal satisfaction with her

service, she encountered great pressures as well.

> I continuously found myself dumped with work, work, work, work, to a point
> where I didn't have the energy or time to do my own research, so [it got] put on
> the back bench. Then a few years ago, I got this real shock because [in this]
> department, we have evaluations every year and the department heads would give
> me not just verbal [evaluations], they [gave us] black and white letters which
> would say "you're doing fine, thank you for doing so much for the department,"
> blah blah blah. But then to my surprise, I got a letter from the dean, which I
> thought was a very threatening letter saying, "your publications have slowed
> down, we're not happy about it, and if you don't finish your book [by] next year
> (or whatever it was), you have to teach more." I was very devastated by that. I
> think I'm a pretty good academic, and personally I was upset and frustrated and

worried that my research was allowed [to go] down because of tying me up with all this work ("Sonya").

In this excerpt, "Sonya" is clearly showing the conflicts she experienced with fulfilling her research expectations after being asked to take on the heavy burden as an undergraduate advisor in her department. Even though she enjoyed working with undergraduates in the advisory role, that extra work was ultimately not taken into account and devalued in the context of Sonya's evaluations. Her narrative shows obvious tones of betrayal that despite all the work she had done for the department and the university, her professional standing was threatened because of her lowered research productivity. Although I am not arguing that women of color faculty in particular should be held to different professional standards of scholarship than their colleagues; rather, I want to highlight two things: first, the expectation that a faculty member who takes on an administrative role will be just as productive in their scholarship as their colleagues who do not have additional service duties is unreasonable. Second, the fact that Sonya in particular was asked to provide such a service, as an un-tenured assistant professor is evidence that she was structurally placed in a vulnerable position when it comes to tenure possibilities and evaluations. Ultimately, her service was first and foremost devalued and overlooked, and despite her willingness to do the work, she was ultimately chastised for not meeting a virtually unattainable goal for her scholarly productivity. Considering Sonya's experience in particular, Charlene's comment about women of color as "mules" of the university seems to ring true, load and clear.

The next passage is from "Mai," an Asian associate professor. In her narrative, we are discussing whether her colleagues are familiar with her work and whether she considers her research to be adequately recognized by her discipline.

I don't care [anymore]. Perhaps you should not adopt my position… In the beginning, I was like this eager beaver, and trying to do everything to really please all the authorities and my colleagues to show them that, "look, I do something really interesting and valuable," but after eighteen years, you can see that they really look down on you. They look down on your research activity, they think you cannot succeed, so you just cut off your intellectual relations with them…It's not just a question of gender or race, it's [also] the atmosphere in [my] department. You don't have people getting together and trying to debate and exchange ideas and telling them which book you think is interesting to read. No. So it's mostly "okay, I am in my field, this thing I do is weird, I don't care." Even outside of [my institution], I don't really care because [I] used to go to conferences. What a waste of time! If you don't push yourself [or if] you're really not aggressive, your presentation will be on the Sunday morning, but the conference is over! At first, I didn't notice this pattern, and I said, "why is it that I always end up on Sunday afternoon or the first day of the conference?" And after a while, I said, "how come these white guys are always right at the very heart of the conference?" After a while, you go, "okay, let's forget it," so I stopped going ("Mai").

In this passage, Mai has clearly given up on trying to be recognized by her colleagues and by her discipline. Her exclamations of "I don't care" or "what a waste of time" suggest deep wounds to her professional identity and ultimate defeat for recognition by the academy. After almost two decades as a faculty member at her institution, Mai has stopped fighting to receive her just acknowledgement as a legitimate scholar and has accepted the fact that her colleagues "look down" on her research. Although she recognizes that the climate of her department is generally not collegial, throughout our interview she discussed a host of experiences where her research in particular was a target of suspicion and depreciation by colleagues and administration. Even going to professional conferences seemed to be a futile task for Mai since she always felt at the margins and devalued. Ultimately, Mai's grim narrative highlights further that despite her attempts to innovate her field with original and alternative research and thus redefine academic professionalism, she encountered serious barriers and devaluation throughout her career.

The last narrative I will present in this chapter is from "Belinda," an African-American senior professor. In the following excerpt, we are discussing what she considers her most significant professional challenges of her career.

> I think inside the academy, the ongoing challenge was having people take me and the work that I do seriously. I think that's an ongoing issue [with] getting people to see that the work we do around race, class, and gender is applicable to thinking about the institution itself and what's going on. It's not just something to celebrate or to show off, but that it's something that means you have to really think and question [what] you're doing on the ground, on a day-to-day basis, and I think that's an ongoing struggle. It's still window dressing for a lot of people. And so that is the other frustration, [that] after doing this as long as I've been doing it, [and] to see that people are fighting some of the same battles again. I think one of the things that's most upsetting in some ways…is some of the stuff that [faculty of color] are [still] coming up against. [With] some of the assaults that they're facing, it just feels like "why are they still having to fight these battles?" Not why, I know why. I mean racism is deep and all of those kinds of things, but it's disheartening that people are still having to fight some of these same battles ("Belinda").

In this passage, Belinda clearly expressed her challenges with the recognition of her scholarship. Interestingly, she also points out the contradictions in the academy related to the rhetoric and practice of race, gender, and class issues. Specifically, Belinda perceives that academics rarely reflect on themselves and often do not interrogate their own daily practices and behaviors in the workplace, which can be contrary to their racial and gender politics on paper. However, the most compelling portion of Belinda's narrative is her deep dissatisfaction with the rigidity of the academy. She plainly states how disheartening it is for her to see the newer generation of faculty of color "fight some of these same battles" of her career. Although Belinda can in the academic sense understand the mechanisms of racism behind her observations, she nevertheless seems to be personally upset and frustrated by what she has observed to be the current state of the academy.

Overall, Belinda's narrative highlights first that despite decades of producing innovative scholarship, she continues to feel that her work is not adequately recognized except as superficial "window dressings." Second, her discussion also calls attention to her commitments to the community of scholars of color in the academy. As a trail-blazing woman of color academic, Belinda's professional identity without a doubt reflects a dedication to community-building and mentoring regardless of whether or not the academy adequately recognizes or rewards this work.

Conclusions

Taken as a whole, I have discussed in this chapter how interview participants redefine academic professionalism by challenging the norms for research, teaching, and service. However, as a consequence, many of the women of color I interviewed experienced subtle yet insidious threats to their legitimacy as academics. Although the particular challenges women of color faculty encounter with their professional identities vary, I argue there is one core phenomenon that grounds their experiences. Specifically, I observed the presence of a powerful and unspoken academic professionalism that has not adequately shifted to reflect the newer populations of women of color scholars at the university. In other words, the women of color faculty I interviewed often struggled to meet the rigid and taken-for-granted expectations at their institutions not due to a lack of abilities or awareness; rather, their challenges in simplistic terms were often due to a conflict of interests and priorities. Whether they adopted a new and innovative approach in their field, politicized or personalized research, dedicated time and energy to developing pedagogical practices, or whether they prioritized mentoring and community-

building, these professional decisions were often met with intolerance and rigidity by colleagues and the institution.

Ultimately, this chapter serves to uncover that the women of color faculty I interviewed were not just passive recipients of academic professional discourses. In other words, although they clearly understand the norms of the academy and what constitutes as acceptable professional choices, they often made active decisions to push against the strict boundaries of academic professionalism in order to fulfill their own career and professional aspirations, despite the consequences. However, as I stated in the previous section, we need to be mindful not to romanticize the actions of my respondents as neither radical protest nor as fearless sacrifice; rather we need to pay close attention to the significant costs many women of color pay in order redefine their own academic professionalism. In the end, it should not be taken lightly that many respondents suffered tremendous blows to their self-esteem and self-worth over the course of their careers due to the constant attacks to their professional legitimacy.

CHAPTER 7:
CONCLUSION

This mixed-methods project examining the professional lives of women of color faculty produced several significant findings in relation to the guiding research question: *how do women of color faculty at research universities engage with discourses and practices of professionalism?* The central concept driving this research is that of professionalism as the taken-for-granted and seemingly neutral norms that guide academic workers on the day-to-day. Furthermore, as Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) and Trethewey (1999) suggest, the concept of professionalism further reveals how this discursive practice subtly reflects white and patriarchal dominance structures. In this concluding chapter, I will introduce three final sections: first, I will highlight the major empirical findings; second, I will discuss the major theoretical contributions of this work; and I will end with a consideration of policy implications.

Major Empirical Findings

As outlined in chapter two, past studies about underrepresented faculty often focused on the legal debates about affirmative action, the persistence of tokenism, and the experience of professional isolation. Some studies also revealed the "racial/gendered tax"—the unequal burdens women and people of color face with service, teaching, and advising students. However, my research uniquely connects these experiences to the discursive power and practices of professionalism, and I further uncover how it is a key mechanism shaping the particular lives of women of color faculty, a population that is particularly vulnerable in the academy due to their status as both gendered and racial minorities.

The three analytic chapters draw on empirical data from both a nationally representative faculty survey and forty in-depth interviews with women of color faculty at research universities to address my central research question. Ultimately, what the data reveal is that women of color faculty encounter two major pressures regarding their professional lives: first, they are expected to fulfill the demands for institutional diversity by undertaking what I call the *diversity double-duty*, and second, they must engage in *hyper-professional practices* in order to successfully signal their legitimacy and belonging in the academy. As a consequence of these expectations and practices, the data revealed the presence of a powerful yet hidden tension to conform to what I call a *hegemonic academic professionalism*. Ultimately, these challenges that my respondents faced in their professional lives manifested as significant *tolls of embodied stress*. In this section, I will discuss at length these four major empirical findings: (1) the diversity double-duty, (2) hyper-professional presentation of self, (3) hegemonic academic professionalism, and (4) the tolls of embodied stress.

The *diversity double-duty* refers to how women of color are structurally positioned to take on disproportionate burdens of diversifying institutions, becoming the "mules" of the university. Both the survey and interview data provide evidence for this phenomenon; specifically, in chapter four, the HERI data reveals that women of color faculty are significantly more likely to teach and write about gender and race issues compared to their colleagues. Teaching and writing about gender and race are particularly burdensome since it involves sensitive and controversial topics that have the tendency to challenge deep-seated assumptions and privileges that often make students and colleagues defensive and uncomfortable.

Moreover, the interview data analyzed in chapter six uncovered how women of color faculty are also more likely to acquire disproportionate loads of mentoring students, especially those who are first generation or underrepresented minorities who have particular needs. Specifically, these particular populations of students more often experience dissonance with their ways of knowing and living and the culture of academia, which continues to reflect white middle class traditions and customs. Therefore, first generation and minority students often seek solace with faculty who can empathize with their challenges and assist them through their academic journey. In all, what these empirical findings suggest is that women of color must first and foremost meet the professional expectations that are placed on every university faculty, yet they are additionally expected to teach the diversity courses, which require significantly more work and emotional energy, and meet the needs of the growing population of underrepresented students.

The second major empirical finding for this project is the *hyper-professional presentation of self*. This concept reflects the practices of suiting up for battle against the attacks to legitimacy. In other words, hyper-professional practices are both protective and survival strategies devised by the women of color faculty I interviewed to navigate their workplace. Examples of hyper-professionality as revealed in chapter five include the careful policing of clothing, hairstyle, and make-up choices to both signal legitimacy as a faculty member and more importantly to not distract colleagues or students from their credentials and authority. Other than these physical markers of hyper-professionality, I found that the women of color faculty I interviewed additionally engaged in what I call *bodily* manipulations. For example, some interview participants discussed at length their

conscious strategies for controlling their emotions, demeanor, and even tone of voice or accent. Many described their experiences with "trying to be perfect" or constantly "holding their tongue," which required daily self-discipline and vigilance of their behavior and presentation of self. However, as will be discussed at length later, the persistent policing of their physical appearance, behavior, and emotions often took a serious toll on their general health and well-being.

A third major empirical finding for this project involves the presence of a *hegemonic academic professionalism*, which refers to the taken-for-granted and stringent norms of professionalism that scholars must abide regarding research, teaching, and service. In chapter six, I discussed at length how my respondents both consciously and unconsciously attempted to redefine academic professionalism through innovative research, creative pedagogies, and dedication to community and mentoring. Although my respondents are fully aware of the expectations and standards for achieving tenure and promotion at their respective institutions, many felt those standards undermined their personal values and goals as scholars.

For example, although teaching is valued less than scholarship at a research university, many of the women of color faculty I interviewed continued to dedicate considerable time and energy in developing pedagogical practices that produce high levels of engagement in the classroom. Respondents often discussed their teaching practices as oppositional to more traditional pedagogies like lecturing, which uphold a clear power dynamic between instructors and students, yet involve less time-consuming preparations. Additionally as revealed in chapter six, one respondent in particular shared her experience of being criticized by colleagues for what was perceived as excessive

student involvement. Although she gained personal satisfaction with her "open-door policy" with students, she had to confront institutional resistance for spending too much time on service and mentoring. Women of color faculty in my sample also experienced devaluation of their academic professionalism via their scholarship. Specifically as discussed in chapter six, women of color who dedicate their research and writing to issues facing their communities are often intellectually isolated or become the sole spokesperson on the topic; yet their work is often undervalued especially in the context of publishing outlets or grant opportunities, which further complicates their relationship with tenure and promotion.

The last major empirical finding from this project is what I term the *tolls of embodied stress*. This concept emerged through the analysis of the interview data in which I observed that the women of color faculty who engage in hyper-professional practices and/or attempt to redefine academic professionalism suffer greatly emotionally and/or physically. In other words, I found that many of my respondents, particularly those who can be considered "trail-blazers" in their institutions or fields, often paid great emotional and physical costs for their dedication to making change—whether on a micro-level with their students or colleagues, or on a larger scale within their disciplines or universities. However, even among the faculty I interviewed that were more interested in just surviving in their workplace experienced serious tolls to their physical and psychological well-being.

The evidence of embodied stress I uncovered ranged from more minor symptoms like trouble with weight, lack of sleep, or adult acne to a few cases of serious mental or physical health conditions. Some of these more severe conditions I observed among some

respondents included depression, anxiety, stroke, heart attack, uterine fibroids, and massive keloid outbreaks. As a whole, interview participants that suffered from embodied stress often reported a direct link to the stressors they were experiencing in their respective workplaces at the time of their illness. Ultimately, I argue that the simultaneous experiences of the *diversity double duty*, the need to engage in *hyper-professional practices*, and the pressures to conform to a *hegemonic academic professionalism* altogether form a particularly heavy physical and psychological toll on women of color faculty. In the proceeding section, I will discuss the theoretical contributions of the empirical evidence presented in this project.

<center>Theoretical Contributions</center>

Much like the conclusions of Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) and Trethewey (1999), I found that professionalism is indeed an invisible and taken-for-granted norm in the academy. Moreover, contrary to popular assumptions that professional academic standards are neutral or benign, I found the discourses of professionalism in practice serve to subtly reproduce hierarchies of inequality in the academy, particularly based on race and gender. The consequences of this observation about professionalism inform the three, key theoretical implications of this research. First, this project uncovers a hidden *paradox of professionalism* in the academy. Second, this research reveals some of the mechanisms behind the *embodiment of professionalism*. Last, this dissertation brings to light the *discursive power of professionalism* in the academy.

Returning to the social-ecological and multi-scalarity frameworks outlined in the methods chapter, the first two theoretical discussions will center on the "meso" (intermediate as opposed to micro) sphere of implications, where I will show how larger

institutional discourses can affect the daily professional lives of marginal faculty. The last discussion in this section will consider the "macro" level of significance, where I will connect discourses of professionalism to larger shifts in the global political economy. Within this framework, I will now proceed with the discussion of the theoretical contributions of this dissertation.

First, I found that although the academy has successfully incorporated the rhetorical language and practices of "diversity," my research uncovers a hidden paradox of professionalism. Specifically, despite the increasing inclusion of diverse peoples and curriculum into the academy, I observed that the boundaries of professionalism have remained rigid and unchanged from the eras when white males alone dominated the universities and the industry of knowledge-production. In other words, although diversity work (in terms of research, teaching, and service) becomes an important dimension of the professional identities of many minority faculty, this work is systematically undervalued and denied legitimacy within the academic rewards system. Therefore, the paradox of professionalism refers to the practice of incorporating diverse academic workers, specifically to fulfill the rhetoric of inclusion, yet structurally deny these same workers legitimacy as scholars and educators due to the fixed and immutable norms of professionalism.

The empirical findings of this dissertation also shed light on the process of embodying professionalism. Drawing primarily from a Foucauldian-Feminist[63] perspective, this project uncovers how marginal populations in the academy, particularly women of color, draw from discourses of professionalism in order to display appropriate

---

[63] See Bordo (2003), McLaren (2002), McNay (1993), and Ramazanoglu (1993).

signals of professionality. In other words, this project reveals how women of color faculty discipline their physicality, behaviors, and emotions in order to be accepted as legitimate professionals. Ultimately, I found another related paradoxical relationship with respect to embodying professionalism. Specifically, my project reveals that although minority faculty often successfully signal professionality through vigilant control of their dress, emotions, and demeanor, they nevertheless fail to garner professional legitimacy due the systemic invalidation of their professional priorities as discussed particularly in chapter six. In addition, as a contribution to the theoretical debates about embodiment, this project empirically shows how discourses are materialized and become inscribed on bodies, further disputing the argument that discourses merely exist within an abstract plane of ideas.

So far in this section, I have discussed the theoretical contributions on a "meso" scale in terms of how discourses of professionalism can affect individual lives and bodies of minority faculty in the academy. Now I would like to tease out some of the macro-level consequences of the discursive power of professionalism. Specifically, I argue that discourses of professionalism serve as an invisible tool for neo-liberal governance of academic workers, which ultimately maintains the illusion of progress, particularly for racial and gender equity in the academy. In other words, the implications of my research suggest that the discursive power of professionalism serves not only to define the boundaries of inclusion and legitimacy in the academy, but also functions to invisibly control all academic workers within the context of a restructured neo-liberal university setting.[64] Returning to the epigraph from Valerie Fournier (1999) cited in the

---

[64] I return to the quote by Henry A. Giroux cited in the literature review to emphasize the current state of higher education today: "While the universities are increasingly corporatized and

introduction, she argues that the "appeal to professionalism" in practice serves as a new technique for governing at a distance. In other words, although the academy is increasingly becoming more structured and monitored under the managerialist ideologies of neo-liberalism[65] (Olssen 2002; Olssen and Peters 2005; Kolsaker 2008), I contend that discourses of professionalism help mask and obfuscate these shifts by upholding the illusion of meritocracy, autonomy, and progress.

Put more simply, despite the increasing incorporation of managerialist practices by universities, such as those related to "measured outputs" or "performance indicators," as necessary components of academic professionalism, these shifts likely occur uncontested for two major reasons: first and foremost, professionalism continues to be taken-for-granted, exists virtually unnoticed, and is often perceived as neutral and non-normative. More importantly, academic professionalism is often wrongly perceived as an objective, value-free standard of behavior in which every academic regardless of race or gender has equal access to embody. Notably, the increasing representation of minority faculty at the university is wrongly equated to the end of racial and gender inequities; however, as my empirical data reveal, the battles and obstacles towards equality do not end merely by opening the doors of academia to minority faculty. I will discuss this issue at length in the policy section of this chapter.

---

militarized, their governing structures are becoming more authoritarian, faculty are being devalued as public intellectuals, students are viewed as clients, academic fields are treated as economic domains for providing credentials, and work place skills, and academic freedom is under assault" (Interview by C. Cryn Johannsen, Margins of Everyday Life, Friday 22 April 2011).

[65] Olssen and Peters (2005) specifically argue the following: "The traditional professional culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate has been replaced with a institutional stress on performativity, as evidenced by the emergence of an emphasis on measured outputs: on strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits" (p. 313).

A second reason why the neo-liberal shifts in the academy arise unchallenged relates to the standard conventions within the dominant and powerful fields at most major universities today. Specifically, fields such as those in the bench sciences, business, or economics, often mirror and easily accommodate (not coincidently[66]) those practices of the neo-liberal university. Unfortunately, academic workers who fall outside these fields (which is also not coincidently where most women and people of color are located) must attempt the impossible task of meeting the modified neo-liberal standards of academic professionalism. Moreover, these academic workers often lack the power and resources to produce any formidable contestation to the managerial shifts at the university. Notably, although I am on the one hand making the claim that academic professionalism is rigid and excludes the professional priorities of minority faculty, I am also making the argument that professionalism in the academy is accommodating to neo-liberal shifts and practices; this contradiction mirrors the inconsistencies of the larger neo-liberal state apparatus (i.e. the adoption of free trade agreements with the simultaneous militarization of the border). More importantly, as academic professionalism becomes more aligned with neo-liberal ideologies and practices, the professional values and priorities of minority faculty will paradoxically become further devalued and trivialized since it does not regularly involve activities with measurable outputs, monetary-gaining ventures, or the formation of industry relations.

---

[66] As Olssen and Peters (2005) state: "Universities are seen as a key driver in the knowledge economy and as a consequence higher education institutions have been encouraged to develop links with industry and business in a series of new venture partnerships" (p. 313). As a consequence, fields in the bench sciences, business, and economics are increasingly the most dominant, powerful, and lucrative at the university since these fields are best suited to foster the "venture partnerships" on a global scale.

On a final note, the empirical findings of this dissertation only indirectly speak to some of the arguments about the divisions of fields at universities since this project focused on faculty (specifically women of color) in liberal arts and education disciplines. However, more empirically-driven research should examine the differences in how academic workers engage with discourses of professionalism across fields, particularly in the bench sciences, with specific emphasis on the effects of neo-liberal practices and measures. So far in this chapter, I have highlighted the major empirical findings of this dissertation, and I have discussed the significant theoretical contributions of this project. I will now end with a discussion of the particular policy implications of this research.

<div align="center">Policy Implications</div>

The topic of diversity in higher education and the labor force continues to be highly politicized and debated in local, state, and national contexts. I believe this dissertation project has great potential to contribute to these discussions in three important ways: first, this research demonstrates the need to shift analytical focus away from the issues of numerical inclusion, rates of retention, or even individual cases of discrimination to better understand how particular professional priorities or identities are valued or devalued within the institution. Second and correspondingly, the findings of this project empirically illustrate how the university rewards system narrowly reflects a hegemonic academic professionalism and consequently excludes and devalues the professional priorities of most minority faculty. Third and last, I call attention to the necessity for re-distributing diversity work among all academic workers to relieve some of the unjust burdens minority faculty members alone have been required to bear.

To begin, it is a common assumption in the modern day that the mere presence or

inclusion of historically discriminated minority populations within social institutions signifies the achievement of a democratic state free from race or gender based inequities. Particularly, in the U.S., popular rhetoric often invokes the images of President Barack Obama or Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor to illustrate that our country has attained racial and gender equality. However, scholars have for decades uncovered the slow progress of social and economic gains for women and people of color. A critical movement in empirical research has paid particular attention to what is deemed "the leaky pipeline" of minorities within the highest academic ranks. As a consequence, institutions have begun to implement various practices that attempt to address some of the barriers marginalized populations face with completing both undergraduate and graduate level degrees such as through academic remedial programs or scholarship opportunities. Other university policies (both written and unwritten) strive to rectify problems with recruitment and retention of minority faculty members, with particular emphasis on avoiding discriminatory experiences (via diversity sensitivity or anti-harassment training) or reducing the presence of a "chilly" climate (through the creation of multicultural centers).

While addressing these institutional problems can without a doubt, significantly improve the numerical representation and retention of women and faculty of color at the university, I argue that both researchers and university administrators need to pay more attention to how professional trajectories impact faculty achievement and success. In other words, how do professional choices regarding research agendas, curriculum development, or service influence outcomes such as tenure and promotion, publication or grant activity, or awards and merit attainment? In an era where racial and gender

discrimination manifests less commonly as the overt denials, exclusions, or behaviors of the past, I urge policy-makers to address the more subtle mechanisms of inequality that fall outside the legislative framework of discrimination, yet materialize into real and detrimental consequences for the professional lives of minority faculty.

Related to the first recommendation, I believe one practical method to begin this process of uncovering subtle forms of inequality at the university is to undergo a serious re-evaluation of the academic rewards system for tenure and promotion. I think overhauling this system and particularly reinstating equal weight (in practice, not just rhetoric) of research, teaching, and service would significantly improve the professional lives of many minority faculty members, especially at research universities. Attention to whether or not certain professional priorities are unjustly being valued or devalued through the established tenure and promotion processes would unquestionably alleviate considerable problems.

Last, I would like to echo some of the policy implications proposed by Moore et al. (2010) in their discussion of the devalued secondary labor market overrepresented by diversity instructors (overwhelmingly women and people of color). First and foremost, the additional emotional tax and burdens of doing diversity work, especially teaching diversity curriculum, must be formally recognized and valued. For example, the actual time and weight of teaching courses on sensitive, controversial, and politicized topics, especially as a minority faculty, is qualitatively different than most courses taught by majority faculty; therefore, this reality should be taken into account when examining student evaluations or when assigning course loads. Another recommendation for sharing the burden of diversification is to ensure that all faculty actively engage in mentoring

students of color and first generation students in order to relieve the loads that many minority faculty often take on alone. In general, my research suggests the need for all faculty members and administrators to share the responsibility and burden of diversifying universities. In order for social institutions to advance and achieve racial and gender equity, diversity work needs to be a priority and expectation for every member of a community, and should not be relegated to unpaid labor of minorities.

Concluding Remarks

This dissertation project centered on the lived and embodied experiences of women of color faculty ultimately reveals the discursive power of professionalism in the academy. Drawing on data from a nationally representative faculty survey and forty in-depth interviews, I was able to empirically uncover the racial and gendered dimensions of academic professionalism and to show some of the ways women of color engage with discourses of professionalism to navigate and survive the work place. Although the primary objective of this research is not to generalize my findings to a larger population, I argue that this project does shed significant light on some of the processes and mechanisms that shape the experiences of many marginalized workers in mainstream, predominately white institutions. More importantly, the implications of this dissertation suggest that although minority populations are increasingly being incorporated into higher status professional spaces, they continue to experience powerful yet subtle mechanisms of exclusion and denials, particularly in regards to their legitimacy and authenticity as professionals.

Future research should examine the experiences of women of color in different professional spaces outside of academia or the corporate spheres, perhaps in non-profit or

governmental settings, in order to make important comparisons of how discourses of professionalism function across work contexts. In addition, future research should attempt to tease out the class, sexuality, or citizenship dimensions of professionalism since they all appeared to be important factors in shaping professional experiences, yet were beyond the scope of this particular dissertation project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society* 4(2):139–158.

Acker, Sandra. 1995. "Carry on Caring: The Work of Women Teachers." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 16(1):21–36.

Acker, Sandra, and Grace Feuerverger. 1996. "Doing Good and Feeling Bad: The Work of Women University Teachers." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 26(3):401–22.

Aguirre, Adalberto. 2000. *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.

Alexander, M. J, and C. T Mohanty. 1997. *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*. Burns & Oates.

Anzaldúa, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Bariso, E. U. 2001. "Code of professional practice at stake? Race, representation and professionalism in British education." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 4(2):167–184.

Battle, Conchita Y., and Chontrese M. Doswell. 2004. *Building bridges for women of color in higher education: a practical guide for success*. University Press of America.

De Beauvoir, S. 1953. *The second sex*. Vintage Books.

Berry, Theodorea Regina, and Nathalie D. Mizelle. 2006. *From oppression to grace*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Blackburn, Robert T., and Janet H. Lawrence. 2002. *Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. *Racism without racists*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bordo, Susan. 2003. *Unbearable weight*. University of California Press.

Boyle, Peg, and Bob Boice. 1998. "Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants." *Innovative Higher Education* 22(3):157–179.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Harvard University Press.

Brown, Michael K. 2003. *Whitewashing race: the myth of a color-blind society*. University of California Press.

Brown-Glaude, Winnifred R. 2008. *Doing diversity in higher education: faculty leaders share challenges and strategies*. Rutgers University Press.

Butler, Johnnella E. 2001. *Color-line to borderlands: the matrix of American ethnic studies*. University of Washington Press.

Butler, Johnnella, and Betty Schmitz. 1992. "Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, and Multiculturalism." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 24(1):37–41.

Castro, Corinne. 2010. "In the Margins of the Academy: Women of Color and Job Satisfaction." in *Dilemmas of Black Faculty at Predominately White Institutions in the United States: Issues in the Post-Multicultural Era*. Edwin Mellen Press.

Cheney, George, and Karen Lee Ashcraft. 2007. "Considering' the professional' in communication studies: implications for theory and research within and beyond the boundaries of organizational communication." *Communication Theory* 17(2):146.

Choo, H.Y., and M.M. Ferree. 2010. "Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities." *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129–149.

Clark, Vicki L. Plano, and John W. Creswell. 2010. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. SAGE.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black feminist thought*. Routledge.

Cooley, Charles Horton. 1902. *Human nature and the social order*. C. Scribner's Sons.

Costello, C. Y. 2004. "Changing Clothes: Gender Inequality and Professional Socialization." *NWSA Journal* 16:138–155.

Crenshaw, K. 1991. "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6):1241–1299.

Davies, B., and P. Bansel. 2005. "The time of their lives? Academic workers in neoliberal time (s)." *Health Sociology Review* 14(1):47–58.

Davies, B., J. Browne, S. Gannon, E. Honan, and M. Somerville. 2005. "Embodied women at work in neoliberal times and places." *Gender Work and Organization* 12(4):343.

Davies, B., and E. B Petersen. 2005. "Neo-liberal discourse in the Academy: The forestalling of (collective) resistance." *LATISS: Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences* 2(2):77–98.

Davis, A. Y. 1998. *Blues Legacies and Black Feminism: Gertrude" Ma" Rainey, Bessie Smith, and Billie Holiday*. Pantheon Books.

Davis, Beverly A. 2004. "The Slippery Slope of Student Evaluations for Black Women Faculty." in *Building bridges for women of color in higher education: a practical guide for success*. University Press of America.

Ellis, Carolyn, and Arthur P. Bochner. 1996. *Composing ethnography*. Rowman Altamira.

Etzkowitz, Henry, and L. A. Leydesdorff. 1997. *Universities and the global knowledge economy: a triple helix of university-industry-government relations*. Pinter.

Feagin, Joe R, Kevin E Early, and Karyn D McKinney. 2000. "Many Costs of Discrimination: The Case of Middle-Class African Americans, The." *Indiana Law Review* 34:1313.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and punish*. Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel, Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Ph. D.). 1991. *The Foucault effect*. University of Chicago Press.

Fournier, V. 1999. "The Appeal to 'Professionalism' as a Disciplinary Mechanism." *The Sociological Review* 47(2):280–307.

Friedan, B. 1963. *The feminine mystique*. WW Norton & Company.

Gallagher, C.A. 2003. "Color-blind privilege: The social and political functions of erasing the color line in post race America." *RACE GENDER AND CLASS* 10(4):22–37.

Gibson, Sharon K. 2004. "Being Mentored: The Experience of Women Faculty." *Journal of Career Development (Springer Science & Business Media B.V.)* 30(3):173–188.

Gibson, Sharon K. 2006. "Mentoring of Women Faculty: The Role of Organizational Politics and Culture." *Innovative Higher Education* 31(1):63–79.

Giroux, Henry A. 2002. "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review* 72(4):425.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.

Goldberg, David Theo. 1994. *Multiculturalism*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Gordon, Avery, and Christopher Newfield. 1996. *Mapping multiculturalism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Gubrium, Jaber F., and James A. Holstein. 2003. *Postmodern interviewing*. SAGE.

Hancock, A.M. 2007. "When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(01):63–79.

Harley, Debra A. 2007. "Maids of Academe: African American Women Faculty at Predominately White Institutions." *Journal of African American Studies* 12(1):19–36. Retrieved June 14, 2011.

Harris-Perry, Melissa V. 2011. *Sister Citizen: Shame, Stereotypes, and Black Women in America*. Yale University Press.

Hart, Jeni, Margaret Grogan, Jackie Litt, and Roger Worthington. 2008. "Institutional Diversity Work as Intellectual Work at the University of Missouri-Columbia." in *Doing diversity in higher education: faculty leaders share challenges and strategies*. Rutgers University Press.

Hassouneh, Dena. 2006. "Anti-Racist Pedagogy: Challenges Faced by Faculty of Color in Predominantly White Schools of Nursing." *Journal of Nursing Education* 45(7):255–262.

Heilman, Madeline E., Caryn J. Block, and Jonathan A. Lucas. 1992. "Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77:536–544. Retrieved November 7, 2011.

Heilman, Madeline E., and Brian Welle. 2006. "Disadvantaged by Diversity? The Effects of Diversity Goals on Competence Perceptions1." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 36:1291–1319. Retrieved November 7, 2011.

Holmes, Sharon L., Lynette D. Land, and Veronica D. Hinton-Hudson. 2007. "Race Still Matters: Considerations for Mentoring Black Women in Academe." *The Negro Educational Review* 105–129.

hooks, bell. 2009. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Turnaround Publisher Services Limited.

Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbara Smith. 1982. *All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Feminist Press at CUNY.

Johnson-Bailey, Juanita, and Ronald M. Cervero. 2008. "Different worlds and divergent paths: Academic careers defined by race and gender." *Harvard Educational Review* 78(2):311–332. Retrieved June 14, 2011.

Johnson-Bailey, Juanita, and Ronald M. Cervero. 2004. "Mentoring in black and white: The intricacies of cross-cultural mentoring." *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 12(1):7–21.

Joseph, Tiffany D., and Laura E. Hirshfield. 2011. "'Why don't you get somebody new to do it?' Race and cultural taxation in the academy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(1):121.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1993. *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books.

Kolsaker, A. 2008. "Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: a study of English universities." *Studies in Higher Education* 33(5):513–525.

Kuhn, Manford H., and Thomas S. McPartland. 1954. "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes." *American Sociological Review* 19(1):68–76. Retrieved April 1, 2012.

Laughlin, Shannon, Jane Schroeder, and Donna Baird. 2010. "New Directions in the Epidemiology of Uterine Fibroids." *Seminars in Reproductive Medicine* 28(03):204–217. Retrieved February 8, 2012.

Leathwood, C. 2005. "Treat me as a human being-don't look at me as a woman': femininities and professional identities in further education." *Gender and Education* 17(4):387–409.

Lewis, A.E., M. Chesler, and T.A. Forman. 2000. "The impact of 'colorblind' ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university." *Journal of Negro Education* 74–91.

Lincoln, Y.S., and N.K. Denzin. 2003. *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Sage.

Maguire, M., and G. Weiner. 1994. "The place of women in teacher education: Discourses of power." *Educational Review* 46(2):121–139.

Margolis, Eric, and Mary Romero. 1998. "'The Department Is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative': The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments." *Harvard Educational Review* 68:1–32.

McLaren, Margaret A. 2002. *Feminism, Foucault, and embodied subjectivity*. SUNY Press.

McNay, Lois. 1993. *Foucault and feminism: power, gender, and the self*. Northeastern University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. University of Chicago Press.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "Ivory Ceiling of Service Work, The." Retrieved June 28, 2011 (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3860/is_201101/ai_n56829320/).

Mohanty, C. T, A. Russo, and L. Torres. 1991. *Third world women and the politics of feminism*. Indiana Univ Pr.

Moore, Helen A., Katherine Acosta, Gary Perry, and Crystal Edwards. 2010. "Splitting the Academy: The Emotions of Intersectionality at Work." *Sociological Quarterly* 51(2):179–204. Retrieved June 14, 2011.

Moore, Sharon E., Rudolph Alexander, and Anthony J. Lemelle. 2010. *Dilemmas of Black Faculty at Predominantly White Institutions in the United States: Issues of the Post-Multicultural Era*. Edwin Mellen Press.

Moraga, C., and G. Anzaldúa. 1981. *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Persephone Press Watertown, MA.

Mullings, Leith. 2005. "Resistance and Resilience: The Sojourner Syndrome and the Social Context of Reproduction in Cenral Harlem." *Transforming Anthropology* 13(2):79–91. Retrieved November 7, 2011.

Mullings, Leith, and Amy Schulz. 2006. *Gender, race, class, and health: intersectional approaches*. Jossey-Bass.

Murray, Jean. 2006. "Constructions of caring professionalism: a case study of teacher educators." *Gender & Education* 18(4):381–397.

Nash, Jennifer C. 2004. "From Lavender to Purple: Privacy, Black Women, and Feminist Legal Theory." *Cardozo Women's Law Journal* 11:303.

Olssen, Mark. 2002. *Neo-Liberal Appropriation of Tertiary Education Policy in New Zealand*. Kanuka Grove Press.

Olssen, Mark, and Michael Peters. 2005. "Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism." *Journal of Education Policy* 20(3):313–345.

Padilla, A. M. 1994. "Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues." *Educational Researcher* 23(4):24–27.

Park, Shelley M. 1996. "Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Shouldn't Women's Work Count?" *Journal of Higher Education* 67(1):46–84.

Perry, Gary, Helen A. Moore, Crystal Edwards, Katherine Acosta, and Connie Frey. 2009. "Maintaining Credibility and Authority as an Instructor of Color in Diversity-Education Classrooms: A Qualitative Inquiry." *Journal of Higher* 80(1):80–+. Retrieved June 14, 2011.

Porter, Stephen R. 2007. "A Closer Look at Faculty Service: What Affects Participation on Committees?" *The Journal of Higher Education* 78(5):523–541. Retrieved February 18, 2012.

Prichard, C., and R. Deem. 1999. "Wo-managing Further Education; gender and the construction of the manager in the corporate colleges of England." *Gender and Education* 11(3):323–342.

Priola, V. 2004. "Gender and feminine identities-women as managers in a UK academic institution." *Women in Management Review* 19(8):421–430.

Pyke, Karen. 2011. "Service and Gender Inequity among Faculty." *PS-Political Science & Politics* 44(1):85–87. Retrieved June 14, 2011.

Ramazanoğlu, Caroline. 1993. *Up against Foucault*. Routledge.

Robinson, Cynthia Cole, and Pauline Clardy. 2010. *Tedious Journeys: Autoethnography by Women of Color in Academe*. PETER LANG PUB.

Roos, Patricia A., and Mary L. Gatta. 2009. "Gender (in)equity in the academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 27(3):177–200. Retrieved April 4, 2012.

Sandoval, C. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Univ Of Minnesota Press.

Smith, J.K., and D.K. Deemer. 2003. "The Problem of Ctitetia in the Age of Relativism." *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* 427.

Solorzano, Daniel. 1998. "Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11(1):121–136.

Solorzano, Daniel, Miguel Ceja, and Tara Yosso. 2000. "Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate: The Experiences of African American College Students." *The Journal of Negro Education* 69(1/2):60–73. Retrieved June 29, 2011.

Stanley, Christine A. 2006a. "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 43(4):701 –736. Retrieved September 2, 2010.

Stanley, Christine A. 2006b. "Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 43(4):701 –736. Retrieved September 2, 2010.

Stanley, Christine A. 2006c. *Faculty of color*. Anker Pub.

Stanley, Christine A. 2007. "When counter narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process." *Educational Researcher* 36(1):14.

Stryker, S. 1980. *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company.

Thomas, Gloria D., and Carol Hollenshead. 2001. "Resisting from the Margins: The Coping Strategies of Black Women and Other Women of Color Faculty Members at a Research University." *The Journal of Negro Education* 70(3):166–175.

Tierney, William G. 1997. "Organizational Socialization in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 68(1):1–16. Retrieved October 10, 2011.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender & racial inequality at work*. Cornell University Press.

Trethewey, A. 1999. "Disciplined bodies: women's embodied identities at work." *Organization Studies* 20(3):423.

Turner, Bryan S. 1996. *The body and society*. Sage Publications.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes. 2002. "Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality." *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(1):74–93.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, Juan Carlos González, and J. Luke Wood. 2008. "Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(3):139–168.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, and Samuel L. Myers. 2000. *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Allyn and Bacon.

Umbach, Paul D. 2006. "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education." *Research in Higher Education* 47(3):317–345. Retrieved February 18, 2012.

Urrieta, Luis, and Lina R Méndez Benavídez. 2007. "Community Commitment and Activist Scholarship." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 6(3):222–236. Retrieved February 18, 2012.

Vakalahi, Halaevalu F. Ofahengau, and Saundra Hardin Starks. 2011. "Health, Well-Being and Women of Color Academics." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 1(2):185–190.

Vargas, Lucila. 2002. *Women faculty of color in the white classroom*. P. Lang.

Walkerdine, Valerie. 2003. "Reclassifying Upward Mobility: femininity and the neo-liberal subject." *Gender & Education* 15(3):237–248.

West, C. M. 1995. "Mammy, Sapphire, and Jezebel: Historical images of Black women and their implications for psychotherapy." *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training* 32(3):458.

Williams, David R. 1999. "Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Health The Added Effects of Racism and Discrimination." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 896(1 SOCIOECONOMIC):173–188. Retrieved November 1, 2011.

Woods-Giscombé, Cheryl L. 2010. "Superwoman Schema: African American Women's Views on Stress, Strength, and Health." *Qualitative Health Research* 20(5):668 – 683. Retrieved November 7, 2011.

Woolley, C. M. 2009. "Meeting the mixed methods challenge of integration in a sociological study of structure and agency." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 3(1):7.

Yin, R.K. 2006. "Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrated or merely parallel." *Research in the Schools* 13(1):41–47.

Zinn, M. B, and B. T Dill. 1994. *Women of color in US society*. Temple Univ Pr.

Zinn, Maxine Baca, and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1994. *Women of color in U.S. society*. Temple University Press.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

I. *Can we start by telling me how you came to be an academic?*

    1. How did you enter your field?

II. *I'm interested in hearing about your time at your institution.*

    1. How long have you been in your current department?

    2. Tell me about your hiring experiences: Interview process? Negotiations?

    3. Have there been important changes in your department during your time?

III. *Tell me about your research.*

    1. Why did you choose these topics?

    2. How familiar are your colleagues with your work?

    3. Would you consider your work as adequately recognized by your discipline?

IV. *What do you find most rewarding as a faculty member?*

    1. Is this similarly valued by your department? Larger institution?

V. *Can you tell me about your teaching experiences?*

    1. What are the typical subject areas you teach?

    2. What do you like about teaching? What don't you like?

    3. Describe what happens on an ordinary day in your classroom.

    4. How do you view teaching compared to research?

VI. *I'm interested in learning about your interactions with students.*

    1. How do you prefer your students address you? Dr? Professor? First name? Why?

    2. What do you do when students don't address you as_____?

    3. Have you ever been challenged by a student? Disrespected?

    4. What role does being a woman of color play in your interactions with students?

VII. *I'm interested in learning about your interactions with your colleagues.*

1. Describe the climate of the department. Does it feel collegial? Do you feel included? Accepted?

2. Have you ever been challenged by a colleague or other faculty? Disrespected?

3. What role does being a woman of color play in your interactions with colleagues?

VIII. *What do you consider some of your major sources of professionalization into the Academy? Graduate School? Dissertation advisors? Faculty mentors? Colleagues?*

1. Have you encountered any challenges with professionalization?

2. Do you think women of color academics have different experiences with professionalization?

3. Do you consider yourself a 'professional'? What does that mean to you?

4. Do you often think about or reflect on being a professional?

5. Can you give personal examples of 'acting' professional? 'Looking' professional?

6. Does being a 'professional' affect your personal life in any way? How?

7. Do you think women of color academics have different experiences with being seen as 'professionals'?

IX. *What are some of the most significant challenges you have experienced during your academic career so far?*

1. Do you think your job is stressful?

2. How do you handle the high levels of stress involved as a faculty?

3. How would you describe your overall health or well-being?

4. Do you have any unique family pressures or challenges?

5. Do you think women of color experience similar challenges in the academy?

X. *Can you talk about your experiences with tenure and/or promotion?*

1. (If respondent is tenured) How has tenure changed your experiences as a faculty member? Did becoming tenured meet your expectations? Do you

find yourself more, less or similarly satisfied as a tenured faculty? Were you surprised by this difference?

    2. (If respondent is not tenured) What are your expectations about tenure? How do you anticipate tenure changing your experiences as a faculty member? Do you expect to find yourself more, less or similarly satisfied as a tenured faculty? Tell me more.

XI.   *[On a scale of 1 to 10] Can you describe your overall satisfaction with your current position?*

    1. If you had to do it all over again, would you still choose an academic career? In hindsight, would you change anything?

    2. Is there anything currently that would make a significant difference in your daily experiences?

    3. Do you think that women of color are more, less or similarly satisfied in the academy compared to other groups?

XII.   Is there something I didn't ask you about that you feel is an important aspect of your experience in the academy?

APPENDIX B

HIERARCHICAL CODE LIST

1. Recognition/Lack of
2. Legitimacy/Perceptions
3. Professional challenges
4. Mentorship/Lack of
5. Community/Collaborations
6. Discrimination/Disrespect
7. Tokenism/Stereotypes
8. Isolation/Insulation
9. Burdens/responsibilities
10. Family Responsibilities/Challenges
11. Personal challenges
12. Acting Professional
13. Promotion/Tenure/Merit
14. Otherness/Exclusions
15. Teaching pedagogy
16. Professional values/Identity
17. Struggles with authority
18. Emotional/Physical Health
19. Diversity Issues/Concerns
20. Looking professional
21. Colleague challenges
22. Rewards/Values
23. Language/Citizenship
24. Greatest challenges
25. Cutting-edge/marginal research
26. Intellectual Challenges
27. Discipline/Control
28. Innovations
29. Hostile climate
30. Being a professional
31. Student challenges
32. Personalizing research
33. Chilly climate
34. Preferring the formal
35. Entitled students
36. Respect
37. Black/non-black divide
38. Cultural Guilt
39. Faculty demands
40. Corporate turn

PREDICTED PROBABILITIES

Table C.1: Predicted Probabilities for Faculty Beliefs about Legitimacy			
	Assistant	**Associate**	**Professor**
Women of Color	75.05	73.68	65.3
White Women	60.74	59.14	51.44
White Men	48.06	46.54	41.94
Men of Color	65.3	63.56	56.94