

## **“Two Jobs:” On Experiences and Duties of Faculty of Color at a Predominately White Institution**

**Lyudmila Bryzzheva**

**Adelphi University**

### **Abstract**

Lived experiences of 21 faculty of Color are set against the backdrop of the Model Unit Peer Review Plan, utilized to evaluate faculty professional performance at a small private predominantly White institution (“PWI”). Participants demonstrate how faculty of Color at PWIs “have to do more” as revealed in additional professional duties and self-care tasks. Gender and immigrant status receive attention. Aggregated themes from this study and from literature reveal multiple additional duties that are not factored into job descriptions for faculty of Color at PWIs. Thus, faculty members of Color at PWIs expend time and energy in various forms of unremunerated and unrecognized labor whose results, with minor exceptions, tend to be invisibly transferred to another more privileged group. Concrete institutional changes are recommended.

*Keywords: Faculty of Color, Peer Review, PWI, Interpersonal and Institutional Racism, Institutional Change, Teaching*

Dr. Lyudmila Bryzzheva is an Associate Professor in Bilingual and Multicultural Education for the Ruth S. Ammon School of Education at Adelphi University. Her research and teaching interests include immigrant studies, peace education (restorative justice), and anti-racism activism.

*I think what makes it harder is that you have two jobs: the job of being Black, and the job of being a faculty.*  
(Participant in the study)

## Introduction

According to faculty of Color at a predominantly White institution ("PWI"), "We have to do more than White faculty" and cannot raise this issue in public lest such an act be construed as self-serving and thus easily dismissed (Bell, 1993 ("rules of racial standing"); De la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988, 1991; Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009; Flores Niemann, 1999; Jacobson, 2012). Sensing there was an alternate reality to what I had known, I had to acknowledge my racial privilege (I am Russian and White), and investigate the previously unseen lived experiences of colleagues of Color at the PWI where I work, and generally in academe. To do so I utilized my social location in ways that advance racial justice and improve access to decision making, resources, and power for people of Color (Calderon & Wise, 2014), in the process learning about objective (colorblind) policies, structures, and everyday relationships that help maintain the racialized differences in (professional) lived experience.

The higher education institution where the study was conducted is located in a majority-White (89%) community, which was described by one participant as "not very inviting" to people of Color, most of whom in this area are domestic workers. By contrast, the small size (under 10,000 students) and private management of the institution necessitate that faculty make a personal investment in the university community. This entails attendant duties of

heavy advising and mentoring, opportunities for interdisciplinary collaborations and networking, and expectations that faculty members will "do it all" (i.e., various hidden administrative duties).

## Literature review

Experiences of faculty of Color facing additional responsibilities and tasks at PWIs are well documented. For example, Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood (2008) provide a comprehensive synthesis of 252 publications, yet not all themes are directly tied to additional duties. Historically, the story of persons of Color in predominately White spaces was a story of "less than": perceived as less competent (Gutiérrez y Muhs, Flores Niemann, González, & Harris, 2012), having to prove themselves to students (Beeman, 2015; Closson, Bowman, & Merriweather, 2014; Gutiérrez y Muhs et al; 2012; Lee & Johnson-Bailey, 2004, among others), having to justify their theoretical lens or perspective (especially if it is race conscious) (De la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988, 1991; Diggs et al., 2009; Flores Niemann, 1999; Jacobson, 2012), and dealing with inappropriate student and peer challenges about their curricular decisions and individual teaching styles (Moore, 1996; Orelus, 2013, among others).

The additional expectation that faculty of Color have a "duty" to teach diversity-focused courses, may cause their own interests to fall by the wayside; resistance to this duty may be judged as bad citizenship, recalcitrance, and racial inauthenticity (Baez, 2003; Brayboy, 2003; De la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). Diversity-focused courses pose an additional burden as the sensitive content requires complicated preparatory work to teach as the

racial signifier that one is in a majority White space (Beeman, 2015; Closson et al., 2014; DeSoto, 2008; Mitchell & Rosiek, 2006). Teaching evaluations may be affected by sensitive content (especially if it touches upon White privilege) and various unflattering stereotypes (Beeman, 2015; Jacobson, 2012; Moule, 2005; Salazar, 2009; Stanley, 2006). And while White peers who take on diversity-focused courses are expected to change their perspective on the issues, which can be done in an armchair, faculty of Color are often expected to take action to address racial injustice, giving them one more responsibility on which to spend their exhaustible energy resources (Moule, 2005).

In the area of scholarship, many faculty of Color have to prove the legitimacy of their research topic and design (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Fournillier, 2011; Martinez, 2014; Medina & Luna, 2000; Turner, 2003); some are asked to reconsider their research agenda to accommodate the expectations of mostly White peers. "Black on Black" or "Brown on Brown" research is viewed with great skepticism (Flores Niemann, 1999; Gregory, 2001). There are fewer research journals that publish novel work, and White peers tend to rank them lower (Morris, 2015). Jacobson (2012) calls for recognition that there may be "paradigmatic differences" in the scholarship of colleagues of Color, often prompted by social necessity and distinct lenses. Scheurich and Young (1997) remind us of the role epistemological racism may play in evaluations of the scholarship of peers of Color, which requires more explanation of their research by faculty of Color and, at times, simply more publications and grants to prove their legitimacy as a scholar.

A recurring theme in the literature on the service contributions of faculty of Color is the expectation that they will perform diversity-related service (Baez, 2000, 2003; Brayboy, 2003; Duncan, 2014, among others). As Brayboy (2003) astutely points out: The bodies of peers of Color are "marked" for diversity work. Since our peers of Color are already underrepresented at PWIs, the need for more diversity work falls onto the shoulders of the few (Stanley, 2006). Diversity-related work includes educating students and peers about diversity, mentoring and advising, serving as public speakers, networking to recruit other faculty of Color, and dealing with the stress of conflicting demands from peers at PWIs and communities of Color (Baez, 2000, 2003; Canton, 2002; Gregory, 2001; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2012; Medina & Luna, 2000; Moule, 2005; Reyes & Rios, 2005; Saldaña, Castro-Villarreal, & Sosa, 2013; Stanley, 2006).

Female colleagues of all racial backgrounds, but predominately those who identify as African, Black, Caribbean, and Latina, may face double discrimination stemming from the intersection of racism and sexism by being expected to take on additional service and nurturing duties, dealing with the stress of being perceived as less competent than their male peers, and frequently facing family obligations that are an additional strain on their emotional and physical resources (Duncan, 2014; Flores Niemann, 1999; Gregory, 2001; Gutiérrez y Muhs et al., 2012; Oliva, Rodriguez, Alanis, & Quijada Cerecer, 2013; Saldaña et al., 2013; Stanley, 2006; Turner, 2002).

The daily professional work is done by complex and concrete individuals in concrete predominately White spaces characterized by a climate in which colleagues of Color are often stripped of

their individuality and are lumped into one abstract group; their concrete individual stories of becoming racialized and their individual aspirations are subsumed into the "majority" story of their racial and/or ethnic group (see the attending effects of "double consciousness" Du Bois (1903); "divided self" (Levin, Walker, Haberler, & Jackson-Boothby, (2013); or experience of "double bind" in Brayboy (2003)). The majority story creates the notion of "authentic racial identity," setting up an inner conflict and presenting one more thing to deal with (Baez, 2003; Duncan, 2014). Assimilation, self-determination, and any form of adaptation that incorporates elements of the two is an additional task faced by many colleagues of Color (Canton, 2002; De la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988; hooks, 1990). Assimilation, even if possible, requires making White peers feel comfortable with one's appearance, one's style of verbal and nonverbal expression, and one's political beliefs. To do so entails more work, and even for those who choose not to attempt assimilation, there is often a price to pay for this choice, and thus one more source of stress to deal with (De la Luz Reyes & Halcon, 1988). For faculty of Color, there is the additional work of dealing with overt acts of racism and/or daily microaggressions (Ong, Burrow, Fuller-Rowell, Ja, & Sue, 2013; Orelus, 2013; Pittman, 2012; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, & Esquilin, 2007); having to fight various unflattering stereotypes and to preempt or address linguisticism (Kim, 1998; McLean, 2007); having to correct the racist behavior of White colleagues; experiencing the general indifference to the issues of people of Color; being invisible (the pressure to represent the entire race rather than be an individual) and/or hyper visible (being the only person of Color in public spaces) (Duncan, 2014; Orelus, 2013, among others); dealing with the pressure resulting

from the myth of individual merit while being repeatedly stripped of individuality; dealing with a persistent is-this-about-race doubt (Wise, 2007); and because of all of this extra work, there is the need to pay extra attention to one's emotional and physical well-being (Orelus, 2013; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001; Turner, 2003).

Joseph & Hirshfield (2012) have argued that the additional duties performed by faculty of Color serve as a form of "cultural taxation" paid only by faculty of Color. I suggest instead that the weight of these duties is such that they constitute an additional job(s), and thus the term "two jobs" (proposed by one participant) more accurately describes the lived realities of faculty members of Color, who consistently expend time and energy engaging in various forms of unremunerated and unrecognized labor, and where the results of such labor, with minor exceptions, tend to be invisibly transferred to another group—the group that tends to set the rules (Mills, 2004).

## Method

This article is based on a larger case study guided by the following research question: What do faculty of Color mean when they say, "We have to do more than White faculty"? This case study, while not commissioned by any university entity, stems from my extensive involvement in diversity and racial justice work as an active member of a university community. The study was done with the purpose of inspiring institutional change and is grounded in an historical institutional context of race-conscious practices and policies. This information was collected in informal fact-gathering interviews with colleagues of Color who hold institutional memory. The bulk of working data for this study came from 21 semi structured, qualitative

interviews of colleagues of Color, most of whom work at this PWI. Three of them are former colleagues who left the university for various reasons, and two colleagues were recruited from outside of the university. The two outside colleagues were invited to corroborate the themes that emerged from the interviews and to protect the anonymity of colleagues who work at the institution. (For this purpose, the voices were not segregated.) The larger case study is concluded by a review of current race-conscious practices and policy changes. The data was collected in two informal interviews with an associate provost for institutional diversity and a key staff member in the office of multicultural affairs.

My inquiry was focused on the additional professional duties expected of faculty of Color at this PWI and the necessary self-care tasks required to maintain professional effectiveness, and might seem to "naturally" invite a quantitative comparison with the tasks performed by White peers. However, the numbers of committees, advisees, courses, and publications will not reveal the quality of lived experience, nor will they clarify what changes are necessary to ensure an equitable (professional) lived experience. A comparison with White peers would further validate White as the standard of normality and comparison (Stanley, 2006). While not intentional, comparison with White colleagues is also unavoidable and will come up in the findings. Colleagues of Color live their reality and perceive it clearly. It is from their perspectives that PWIs stand to learn. Rather than conducting a comparison with the experience of White faculty, the excerpts from lived experiences of faculty of Color are set against the backdrop of the Model Unit Peer Review Plan, the document suggested for objective (colorblind) evaluation of faculty professional

performance. I aggregate the themes from this study's data as well as from the extensive literature on responsibilities of faculty of Color at PWIs to reveal an alternative (unwritten) job description for faculty of Color at PWIs, and add to the recommendations for institutional change.

Participants for this study were recruited via email and personal phone calls, but the bulk of participants were recruited via snowballing technique, through which those already recruited convince other colleagues to participate. Participants included 14 tenured and 7 untenured colleagues; 8 Asian (immigrant and U.S.-born); 2 Latino/a (immigrant and U.S.-born); 10 African, Black, and Caribbean (immigrant and U.S.-born); and one participant who reported mixed racial background. Thirteen participants were female and eight were male.

It is important to stress that both literature and the current study show that faculty experiences are significantly and variously affected by racial/ethnic background, gender, and immigration status. It is, therefore, important both to recognize that the "extra responsibilities" were especially clearly highlighted in the experiences of African, Black, and Caribbean, as well as Latino/a faculty, consistent with their public perception as the "Other" and to note that degrees of Otherness are exacerbated or mitigated by various intersecting identities and specific racial/ethnic backgrounds. At least three participants who identified as Asian during their interviews referred to faculty of Color in the third person, as "they" (some have self-corrected, others were prompted to reflect on their perception of themselves as faculty of Color). This distinction is consistent with their unique experience of Otherness.

Interview questions were designed to address the three areas of experience that are evaluated for professional advancement at this institution via the suggested Model Peer Review Plan (teaching, scholarship, and service) and to explore the climate of the institution from the perspective of faculty of Color. Prior to this study, interview questions were reviewed and commented upon by a colleague of Color with significant experience as a qualitative researcher.

Participants were interviewed in person, on the phone, or via Skype. Interviews lasted one to two-and-a-half hours, as participants were invited to speak freely and many felt the need or were prompted to explain some of the issues to the researcher (more on this in the next section).

While transparency is expected of qualitative researchers, I found myself going to great lengths to ensure clarity and transparency. I regret that this study was not done in collaboration with a researcher of Color. As was true when the study was initiated, the network of colleagues with whom I had working relationships was almost entirely White. Due to this factor, I consistently communicated with all participants. They were invited to review full transcripts of their individual interviews, to weigh in on the chosen portions/working quotes and themes gleaned from their interviews, to read and offer feedback on the full manuscript, to read the article prepared for dissemination in professional circles, and to review and comment on the power point presentation that I have created to share with various units (schools and colleges) throughout the university.

### **Researcher lens and rapport:**

*If your name was "Mary Jones" I wouldn't have responded to your email. I wouldn't even have insulted you by telling you I'm busy. I would just not have thought of it as something that is genuine. . . . So personally I'm putting a lot of trust in you, trust that comes with your last name. You are actually riding on the capital of your last name.*  
(Participant in the study)

As a White Russian immigrant I found it both internally compelling to embark on this study and challenging in terms of justification of my motivation/purposes and lens. I did not face questions from participants, possibly because I chose to address the subject of my racial identity and motivation as a researcher in my initial interviews during the recruitment stage of this project. I did, however, anticipate criticism as the findings are being reported and shared publicly.

As stated in the opening quote to this section, due to my immigration status I am perceived as the Other at the same time as I am perceived as White. Coming from Russia, a society that is not racialized at its core, I have not subconsciously absorbed "Whiteness" as exemplified in various forms of internalized racial superiority. Instead I have encountered Whiteness in the United States and, while I undoubtedly collect "the wages of Whiteness," the part of me that never had to be White is alive and well. Thus, the immigrant was able to connect with colleagues of Color who, at the same time, had to offer lengthier explanations of the issues they face, as they correctly perceived me as White and, therefore, in need of clarification as to the meaning and nature of alternative realities we inhabit.

In addition, I am actively involved in groups and initiatives that advance racial justice and address various forms of diversity. I suggest that this commitment may have further helped establish and maintain rapport throughout the process.

## Findings

### Teaching

A review of the Model Unit Peer Review Plan shows that the following elements of teaching are routinely used for evaluating all faculty, regardless of racial/ethnic background, for tenure and promotion: (a) *philosophy of teaching*, (b) *teaching performance*, (c) *assessment of students*, (d) *curriculum development*, and (e) *advisement*.

Nowhere is it stated that every professor in a U.S. classroom is a racial signifier, which affects what they can teach and how they can teach it, as well as how they may be perceived and evaluated by students. One participant who identifies as Black summarizes the uneven student perception as the difference between the "Uh oh!" at the sight of a Black professor in the room and "Oh, hi!" to a White professor. This additional challenge ought to be recognized and included in the consideration of *teaching performance*.

While all faculty, as they prepare their tenure or promotion portfolios, are invited to discuss their teaching values and priorities in their *teaching philosophy*, faculty of Color are additionally marked and therefore invited to make diversity-related courses an important priority.

*They asked me to teach the diversity course. I said, I do not want to teach the diversity course. I do not want to*

*be pigeonholed as a diversity person. It is like saying, okay you are this so [diversity] is really your thing when I am [amply qualified] in so many different areas. (A colleague who identifies as Latino/a)*

If one resists, one might not be considered a good citizen. If one takes on the job, there is additional preparatory work to be done, as the student body at PWIs rarely reflects the racial/ethnic background of the professor of Color.

*I'm not going to explain to a bunch of [young people] that they are privileged over me because they do hear it that way. There are some things that they are going to hear through the vessel that they are getting it from. I have to think very carefully about how I talk to them [students] about race. I do work on it. I know that my [White] colleagues don't think of it in the same way. They don't have to. (A colleague who identifies as Black)*

The vessel matters. Two colleagues who identify as Black spoke about having to consider daily the choice of professional attire, choice of hairstyle, and how to present as a competent professional. One also has to consider the perceived legitimacy of one's theoretical perspective:

*If you come from a Marxist theory, or gender theory, or queer theory, and if a student doesn't like that or thinks you harp on it too much [that's one thing]; if it's about being Black then all of a sudden it's not a legitimate theory anymore; it's about being Black. It's [when people perceive] your consciousness as*

*intertwined with your theory; it can become problematic.*

Perspective matters. Having to prove the legitimacy of that perspective based solely upon one's membership in a racialized body presents one more challenge to deal with.

Three participants, one who identifies as Asian immigrant, one as Latino/a immigrant, and one as Black spoke explicitly about their linguistic expression, as one factor in student (and peer) perception of professors of Color's competence. Preemptive action to address potential linguicism (linguistically argued racism) (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), may involve speaking openly about one's accent and inviting students to ask for additional clarifications, and/or using humor. A way to reassert one's competence, preemptive or reactive action is one more task to face and one more factor that has the potential to affect the outcome of student evaluations.

Additional stress (and the attendant work of dealing with it) is also caused by an unwritten demand to assimilate to the majority culture. In order to survive, some feel the push to conform to the expectations of the host country and host institution:

*I think I have to try harder than all my colleagues, because I really want students to give me a good evaluation. I'm working harder to get the American classroom. I am international [professional], so take me as such, and support me as I enrich your students to look at the world differently, to hear me pronounce words differently . . . that's an asset that I have that your White faculty don't have and yet I have to work so hard to be White, to*

be with the White students. . . .  
*[emphasis added]*

The emphasized part of this quote points to a problem that runs deep in this country, and the participating institutions are no exceptions. While the United States is a multiethnic/multiracial society, the image of the assimilated immigrant still circulates as a powerful—though perhaps not realistic or desirable—ideal (Kumar, 1997).

According to at least six participants, across racial backgrounds, gender identities, and immigration status, course content influences how a professor is perceived and then evaluated while doing the risky work of challenging students to think critically about difference in human experience. Thus, a good citizen who took on a diversity-focused course to satisfy the demands of the administration may then face the additional stress of having to explain his or her course's content and instructional choices to the administration as well as to peers when it is time to be evaluated for tenure and promotion.

Participants across racial backgrounds cite multiple examples and express a general sense of being let down by their peers and administration when it comes to support for teaching. Three colleagues who identify as African, Black, and Caribbean cite instances in which students felt entitled to bypass a professor and take their complaints about this professor's teaching or *assessment* practices—an "unfair" (read "low") grade—directly to the administration or, even more disturbingly, often to other White colleagues or to post them on the Internet site [Ratemyprofessor.com](http://Ratemyprofessor.com). According to one participant, the administration hires faculty with unique teaching styles and perspectives, but then inappropriately



challenges them by trying to "fix" their teaching, promising the students "to have a word" with the professor instead of challenging the students' behavior.

The last element of the teaching criterion is *advisement*. A colleague who identifies as Black referred to "invisible advising," a common theme in the literature and in other interviews for this study:

*There is the teaching, there is the advising, but there is also this invisible advising that goes on. It is advising students who are not my official advisees. These are students of Color primarily who come with questions, come with issues. So there is this invisible advising, in addition to all the other committee work and then working on your own development in the profession.*

With a few exceptions, students of Color are more likely to bring questions and concerns about life at a predominately White institution to same-race colleagues of Color, where there is a greater likelihood of being understood. Invisible advising can also be done by faculty who identify as White. Often these faculty members are the ones who have made their commitment to racial justice clear. Commitment to racial justice on the part of a White faculty member is not expected and may even earn this faculty a pat on the back (see Gorski's (2015) notion of "institutional likability") or peer skepticism to deal with (Moore, Penick-Parks, & Michael, 2015). Then, not obviously propelled by concern for racial justice, there are faculty members who routinely go above and beyond and keep their doors open an extra minute for those who may not be their official advisees. Both take on this "one more" duty by choice and therein lies the difference between them and

the faculty members to whom the duty falls due to their marked presence.

Two participants, one who identifies as Asian and the other as Asian immigrant, one who is male and the other female, evoke a "model minority" stereotype, according to which the teaching competence of male faculty members is not in question, while the female faculty member interprets the stereotype as follows:

*I am very dutiful, obedient, subscribe to certain Confucian ideals, I have reverence towards learning, I am present for my students. . . . So I am here. It's reflected in the course evaluations that whether or not they liked the course, the content or even my pedagogical style that they acknowledge that I am present for them.*

Both participants point out that because of this stereotype, their mostly White colleagues expect it as given that an Asian faculty member will do more.

Another faculty member who identifies as Asian narrated an experience the participant attributed to the "passive Asian" stereotype. According to this colleague, "students can bully you much better," and may demonstrate various forms of disrespect in the classroom, including behaving as if the professor were invisible and/or inconsequential.

### **Scholarship**

A review of the Model Unit Peer Review Plan shows that the following definition of scholarship is used routinely for evaluating all faculty, regardless of racial/ethnic background, for tenure and promotion:

*[S]cholarship shall be judged in the context of its appropriateness to the degree program(s) in which the individual works and will be judged based on the following criteria: (a) originality; (b) rigor; (c) contributions to knowledge; (d) recognition by peers.*

The above criteria seem comprehensive and sufficiently general to be inclusive. Most colleagues who identify as Asian, with two exceptions (one is cited above), did not speak about the negative peer perceptions of their scholarship. Three of them evoked the "model minority" stereotype, according to which it is a given that they will do more (and better). The key concerns expressed by these colleagues were common to all faculty, such as the lack of institutional support to conduct and disseminate research (scanty financial resources and an understaffed research and grants office), and the difficulty of negotiating a heavy teaching load with research. In contrast, colleagues who identify as Black, African, and Caribbean and one Latino/a colleague, with one exception, cited multiple examples when both their scholarship and their legitimacy as scholars were questioned. Extensively documented in the literature and brought up in various interviews is the notion that "Blacks are never seen 'as bright as' Whites . . . [and] credentials and capabilities are not judged equally." In this light, one might hear lower peer expectations in the question related by one participant in the study: "Well, gee, who helped you with that article?"

Peer expectations tinged with sexism and racism surface in the experience of a Latina participant when, following a particularly successful presentation of her scholarship, her White colleague was

praised for her intelligence, while she was complimented on her outfit. Three female colleagues who identified as Black and Caribbean reflect on the paradox of being an (female) "overachiever" of Color. While their competence may ordinarily be in question,

*. . . if you are super smart that is untrustworthy. Suddenly people are very concerned about the integrity with which you operate. "Oh, you are just an opportunist and you are only in it for your career." This is as if somehow everybody else isn't. I think especially the women of Color can't be too ambitious.*

Another colleague explains that the content of one's research is under "heightened scrutiny" because a scholar of Color often chooses to explore those issues relevant to her or his people, what is commonly referred to in literature as "Black on Black" or "Brown on Brown" research, which is reportedly viewed with skepticism by many White peers, suggesting that one "should be doing more on these canonical well-known sort of figures in [the field]."

Besides the reported skepticism from White peers regarding the content of their research, colleagues may have to face additional skepticism about their research design. Reportedly, quantitative research is seen as more rigorous but, as one colleague who identifies as Caribbean points out,

*As people of Color we were ignored and rendered invisible for so long that the issues that affect us never came into play. So we have to go out there and ask the questions! And numbers are not going to help us get to where we want to get. We need to*

*go where people are, where people live to get at their lived experiences.*

Seven interviewees, all of whom identify as Black, Caribbean, or Latino/a, spoke of the special value they place on innovative and interdisciplinary research (see the *originality* indicator in the Model Peer Review Plan). Reportedly, not all fields are equally welcoming to scholarly innovations.

In addition, while several mainstream forums are opening up to welcome nontraditional (qualitative) research, finding them could be a matter of extra digging. Some forums are specifically devoted to issues faced by, and research conducted by, professionals of Color and/or race/ethnicity-related issues; yet those may not be rated as highly by mostly White peers. Reportedly, some international journals, those that are read by colleagues abroad, may also not carry much weight in an "objective" professional evaluation, if the reputation of the journal in the international arena has not been firmly established.

While it is not inconceivable that faculty who identify as White may also be questioned on their novel research design and the content of their scholarship, and while they, too, may have to put more effort into finding a suitable publication venue and then have to prove that publication's status, one can sum up the difference between the challenges faced by colleagues who identify as White and colleagues of Color as follows: "There are White faculty who study populations of Color and their work may be seen as a little less than but they, as scholars, are not" (colleague who identifies as Black).

International faculty members may face an additional challenge while doing and disseminating research that serves their

communities. Immigration status affects travel and the ability to do research outside of the United States. The supplementary tasks required to maintain one's immigration status, which, besides the additional financial costs (which are often addressed by taking on extra courses to teach), also includes paperwork, waiting time, additional inquiries/prodding of staff on whose paperwork this status depends, and extra-good behavior (and, reportedly, self-silencing when one might otherwise speak up on controversial issues).

### Service

A review of the Model Unit Peer Review Plan shows that the following definition of *service* is to be used routinely for evaluating all faculty, regardless of racial/ethnic background, for tenure and promotion: "*University Service . . . active involvement in the enhancement of the University.*"

Every participant expressed a sense of responsibility to community; what divided participants along racial/ethnic lines was where they felt they (have to) apply themselves. Most participants who identified as Asian (immigrants) felt a strong sense of connection to the university and discussed explicitly their sense of responsibility to serve the internal community. Here, the "model minority" stereotype was cited, as well, and again as a foundation of the belief that faculty who identify as Asian will "naturally do more." Most colleagues of African, Black, and Caribbean background and one Latino/a colleague found themselves serving the university community and, in addition, external communities of Color. These colleagues articulated their expanded conception of service.

*My main view of service is I help [community groups] write a proposal and they send it out for funding. That's what I do, that's my service but I don't write about that in my portfolio. I write about: I sat on this committee and we wrote this, and we met all this number of times. And that will get me recognition.*

This particular colleague spoke extensively of the debt owed to the colleague's home community. But what about White colleagues who serve in communities of Color? The difference is that for most White colleagues such service is a choice, while for most colleagues of Color these obligations, in the words of one participant, are "a social necessity," and therefore are hardly negotiable. Yet community service ranks the lowest among criteria for professional evaluation, with some exceptions within particular units.

A strong sense of responsibility to advocate for students and colleagues of Color was a common theme in the interviews of colleagues who identify as Black, Caribbean, and Latino/a. Such advocacy involves:

***(a) Education of mostly White peers about issues faced by colleagues of Color***

One colleague who identifies as Black recalls an instance of having to take on a task to educate White colleagues who are in positions to make decisions that affect careers: "So I got a bunch of articles and I said, this is what you're seeing in the evaluations, it has little to do with the capacities and abilities of this person but more to do with the person who is making the evaluation."

***(b) "Invisible mentoring" —similar to invisible advising, it involves providing support to faculty members of Color outside of one's officially assigned mentorship duties***

*The two minority faculty members who have left since I've been here, I feel a certain kind of responsibility for, because I feel that I wasn't involved enough . . . I wasn't in their departments but it's only after the fact that I've heard. . . . If I'd been their mentor, [perhaps] I would have been able to lobby more or been more . . . I'm not sure.*

***(c) Advocacy for applicants of Color as a member of a search committee***

Amply documented in the literature, and explicitly discussed in most of the interviews with study participants across racial backgrounds, is diversity-related service. It has been demonstrated (Baez, 2000) that diversity-related service can be a healing outlet. Yet, we are also reminded that colleagues of Color are "marked" for such service. Being "marked" for such service, colleagues of Color take on additional duties, even though stellar service does not bear much fruit at the point of tenure or promotion, and the pressure to offer such service continues after one earns tenure. Some of these additional duties include:

- a. Engaging in committee work that focuses on diversity, or service on committees that are explicitly devoted to implementing diversity initiatives.
- b. Doing the job of "representing" in public spaces. As one participant who identifies as Black puts it: "It is important to show up at those new

student days and at the Open Houses to just say, 'Here we are.'"

- c. Networking, i.e., reaching out to one's professional networks in order to "diversify" the pool of potential job candidates, which involves "a lot of phone calls, a lot of emails, a lot of follow-up." (colleague who identifies as Black)

### One More: Coping and Adaptation

In a predominately White university, there is one more professional/personal task to accomplish on a daily basis. This is the task of coping with interactions in a sometimes hostile environment.

Participants in this study experienced the institutional climate differently: Nine colleagues across racial/ethnic backgrounds, gender, and immigration status reflected on the supportive nature of their departments, their fields of study, and the larger institution.

Overall, the majority of colleagues who identify as Asian (immigrants) and one who identifies as Latino/a spoke of a friendly institutional climate, while two other colleagues who identify as Asian, one colleague who identifies as Latino/a, and all the colleagues who identify as African, Black, and Caribbean, had either experienced ambiguous feelings about the racial climate on campus or had found it unfavorable. On the positive side, some mentioned that they felt welcomed by their departments, or by individual colleagues; some spoke about the freedom to create, mostly during the transitional phase in institutional history.

While instances of overt racism were rarely cited, colleagues who identify as African, Black, Caribbean, one Latino/a, and

two as Asian and Asian immigrants spoke extensively about their experiences with "genteel" and "dysconscious" (King, 1991) racism, which manifests as frequent incidences of microaggression, low expectations, stereotypes, silence and indifference toward issues faced by faculty of Color, the maintenance of the myth of individual merit while denying individuality to colleagues of Color, exceptionalism, and so-called colorblindness. The effects of these experiences have had physical and psychological manifestations: feeling physically ill, being emotionally drained from the struggle to prove oneself, having nagging doubts about whether or not an experience had racial undertones, and feeling marginalized. Yet, in the face of all of this, two colleagues, one identified as Asian and one as Caribbean, spoke about working to protect White sensibilities. As they speak up on controversial issues "It's almost as if we always want to apologize, 'We are all human, at the end of the day, we're all human.' [and] 'Look, I want to talk to you about these differences but I also want you to be comfortable. . . .'"

Two female colleagues who identify as Black and Caribbean described their experiences of having to function in "stereotype-management" mode. One of them chose to "be quiet" at faculty meetings early in her appointment, so that "I would not come across as chatty, assertive, or intense." She recognized that, coupled with "my whole persona, my color, my hair, my straight-shooting style (looking folks in the eye, speaking from my trained intellectual level), my perfect King's English, where I had gone to school," she might be constructed as "potentially threatening" to the mostly White males at the meeting. The other participant speaks of always being aware that "any kind of pushback from me has the potential of coming off as anger, and

once it gets pushed into that category then they can invalidate it; they don't need to listen." Yet if her behavior doesn't support the stereotype, her mostly White colleagues "are not sure what to do with me."

One colleague, who identifies as Black, reported a common-to-some experience of having to always be on guard, with "armor on," "which makes us distrustful of each other." In contrast, 11 colleagues, 6 of whom identify as Asian and Asian immigrants, 3 as Black and 2 as Latino/a, highlighted the supportive role of their mentors of a different race, and 4 colleagues, 2 of whom identify as Caribbean, 1 Latino/a and 1 Asian, reported the most meaningful support coming from same-race mentors in a relationship referred to earlier as "invisible mentoring."

Five colleagues, three of whom identify as Black and Caribbean, one who identifies as Latino/a, and one who identifies as an Asian immigrant, spoke about how important their work for social justice is to their daily survival, as it provides a sense of agency. The general theme of agency came up in nine interviews of faculty across racial/ethnic backgrounds, gender, and immigration status. In those cases colleagues referred to their proactive approach to networking within the institution and beyond; but in fact all the networking meant "going beyond."

In contrast to reaching out, some choose self-marginalization, often in response to daily experiences of marginalization. Two colleagues—one who identifies as Black, the other as Caribbean—openly discussed a survival strategy of self-marginalization. While necessary for coping, the experience could be disempowering, yet one of them saw this self-positioning "in the bell hooks way" as a source of strength, the

positioning that can provide unique insights from the margins, to an understanding of the way the center operates.

Both assimilation and self-determination were reported as ways to adapt to the predominately White environment. The only colleagues who spoke about the value and/or possibility of assimilation (joining those at the center), whether temporary or permanent, were the colleagues who may on occasion be "invited" to join the majority White group, namely colleagues of Asian background (four participants reflected on this theme) and one Latino/a colleague. In contrast, seven colleagues, all of whom identify as African, Black, or Caribbean, perceive self-determination as critical to preserving and fostering a healthy personal identity. One of these colleagues spoke about the importance of "creating one's own narrative" instead of "having a narrative created for me or stepping into someone else's narrative."

Five colleagues from across racial backgrounds questioned the value of long-term coping and survival as they spoke about the match/fit between an institutional identity and a faculty member's identity, and having personal goals that are not within one's power to change (either there is a match or there isn't). Ironically, the same logic has been used by search committees to bypass candidates of Color altogether on the assumption that "they may not like it here."

Finally, one colleague who identifies as Caribbean points at the ultimate goal of this work of adaptation/coping:

Participant: . . . *many of the daily experiences feed into this sense of not belonging. . . . You never quite feel like you have arrived, even with tenure. You are always in transition.*

Interviewer: *Where do you want to arrive? What's the destination?*

Participant: *I just want to be accepted for who I am! We all have the same degree; we all went through the same process to get it although we have different expertise. I'm not trying to take anything away from anyone. I am very good at what I do, I work hard to get where I am and I just want to be accepted on those terms in the same way my White colleagues are. I don't want to be anybody else or to deny aspects of myself so that you can feel comfortable with me. [emphasis added]*

## Discussion

I found that our colleagues' stories about doing more fell into roughly three categories: (1) doing more as an *unwritten mandate* (mostly, but not exclusively, participants who identified as African, Black, Caribbean, and Latino/a); (2) doing more as a *personal choice* (various racial backgrounds, but all male participants); and (3) doing more as a perceived given, based on a stereotype (most participants who identified as Asian). Overall, the extent to which faculty members felt pressure to do more varied by racial/ethnic background, gender, and immigration status.

In addition to all the tasks described in the Findings section, participating in this study was one more task for colleagues of Color. Each participant devoted time to the interview, to reviewing the transcript, to reviewing working excerpts, to reading the long manuscript (the original report is 140 pages long), and to offering corrections and suggestions—all in order to be “good

citizens,” and as a form of advocacy for themselves and other peers of Color.

On the surface the rules, as demonstrated in the Model Unit Peer Review Plan, are fairly inclusive. However, their fair application, as demonstrated in the lived experiences of faculty of Color cited here and in the extensive literature on the subject, is uneven. In a predominately White institution, we White people tell a story to ourselves and to others: In this story we are featured as people who are colorblind, who should value neutrality and objectivity, and who are committed to social justice. However, in a predominately White institution, there is a greater chance that the decision makers will be White people who do not experience themselves as racialized individuals. Thus, we are likely to experience “a clash between a social group perspective, learned by people of Color through the social experience of racism, and an individualized perspective, learned by Whites through their racial socialization” (Scheurich, 1993, p. 6). In other words, the individualism of academe is antithetical to the routine perception of colleagues of Color as being inseparable from their group identities, stripped of their individuality; hence the inequitable allocation of responsibilities to colleagues of Color beyond the expectations delineated in the Model Unit Peer Review Plan, and the easily explicable ignorance of mostly White academe about this reality (see Mills (1999) on “racial contract”). As Brayboy (2003) points out, the extra requirements placed on faculty of Color “are never explicitly stated by the institutions or on RPT guidelines. To do so would border on illustrating an agenda . . . that is different for one group of faculty than for others and would begin to destroy ideas and conceptions of neutrality, objectivity, and meritocracy” (p. 78).

How might we address this discrepancy in responsibilities? One can call for brutal honesty about an alternative reality for many faculty of Color. Truth is important and is shared, without a doubt, between colleagues of Color who are properly attuned to reality (participants called this relationship "mentoring" and/or "invisible mentoring"). Yet, truth alone works to validate, to caution about, maybe even to soothe one's perception of inequitable lived experience but changes little about the nature of this experience; and it serves to get the institution off the hook as far as radical change is concerned, the change that would respond to the specific needs of those who are to be affected by the changes, discussed with all the relevant voices at the table and carried out reflectively and in true solidarity. These changes are in the service of the ultimate goal, which, in the words of one participant who identifies as Black, is to change in a more radical way "who is considered the custodian of knowledge." Perhaps then predominately White institutions could truly claim to have become diverse.

### **In Lieu of Conclusion: Recommendations**

At the end of their reflections on lived experience, colleagues of Color were asked to contribute their recommendations to (a) make the university more (racially/ethnically) inclusive; (b) address teaching and tenure for faculty of Color; and (c) revisit criteria and procedures for tenure and reappointment, with an eye toward change. The original list consists of 54 recommendations divided into sections; here I chose some recommendations (in the participants' own words) that I have not seen in the literature, or ones that reflect especially well the themes from the findings section of this paper.

### **General:**

1. Accept what people of Color do: different ways of being, teaching, creating, and serving.
2. Be transparent with junior faculty of Color about the differences in reality (for faculty of Color and White faculty) and what needs to be done for survival.
3. Diversify decision making bodies. This recommendation also hinges on hiring faculty of Color and on bringing in voices from outside of the university to educate and advocate for faculty of Color when major decisions are made.
4. Support faculty of Color (and all faculty) holistically: Implement a holistic approach to tenure, understanding the demands of daily life, of responsibilities to multiple communities, and of the challenges of being a faculty of Color at a PWI.
5. Build interracial alliances. Determine what White colleagues can do to share the burden of diversity work.
6. Commit to international faculty and support them; help process documents in time; understand and help bear the burden of international research and travel.
7. Offer special hiring packages: Increase research money; attend to marketplace demands (higher demand—greater salary; course release).
8. Offer/allow sabbatical before tenure (unfortunately, faculty of Color may also need this time to process and deal with the effects of racism).



9. Add contributions to diversity to hiring and tenure criteria.

(content may take time to take hold in students' minds, perceptions of its value may change with time).

**Teaching:**

1. Engage in community discussions, panels on teaching practices in general and on experiences of faculty of Color at PWIs.
2. Understand, value, and reward invisible advising.
3. Ensure that peer observers of teaching be diverse; represent diverse interests and backgrounds.
4. Accept, understand, and value a variety of teaching styles.
5. Especially with controversial content, accept the transient nature of student evaluations

**Scholarship:**

1. Expand the notion of legitimate scholarship. Expand the notion of canon. Value applied research; advocacy scholarship; exploratory work. Revisit Boyer model (Boyer, 1997).

**Service:**

1. Understand, value, and reward external community service.
2. Count mentorship as university service (and not as service to department or unit).

## References

- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education* 39(3), 363–391. doi: 10.1023/A:1003972214943
- Baez, B. (2003). Outsiders within? *Academe*, 89(4), 41–45.
- Beeman, A. (2015). Teaching to convince, teaching to empower: Reflections on student resistance and self-defeat at predominately white vs. racially diverse campuses. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege*, V(1), 13–33.
- Bell, D. (1993). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the legitimate knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 169–180. doi: 1080/713845282
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2013). *Racism without racists: Colorblind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (4th ed.). New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Boyer, E. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2003). The implementation of diversity in predominately white colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(1), 72–86.
- Calderon, J., & Wise, T. (2014). Code of ethics for antiracist white allies [J. Calderon's website]. Retrieved from <http://jlovecalderon.com/code-of-ethics-for-antiracist-White-allies/>
- Canton, C. E. (2002). From slaveship to scholarship: A narrative of the political and social transformation of an African American educator. In L. Jacobs, J. Cintron, & C. E. Canton (Eds.), *The politics of survival in academia: Narratives of inequity, resilience, and success* (pp. 15-33) [Immigration and the Transnational Experience Series]. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Closson, R. B., Bowman, L., & Merriweather, L. (2014). Toward a race pedagogy for black faculty. *Adult Learning*, 25(3), 82–88.
- De la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcon, J. J. (1988). Racism in academia: The old wolf re-visited. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 299–314.
- De la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcon, J. J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano academics. In P. G. Altback & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- DeSoto, A. (2008). The strange career of ethnic studies. In L. Guerrero (Ed.), *Teaching race in the twenty-first century: College teachers talk about their fears, risks and rewards* (pp. 15–31). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Diggs, G., Garrison-Wade, D., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *Urban Review*, 41, 312–333. doi: 10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1903/1995). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Penguin.
- Duncan, P. (2014). Hot commodities, cheap labor: Women of color in the academy. *Frontiers*, 35(3), 39–63.
- Flores Niemann, Y. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, 20(1), 111–134.

- Fournillier, J. (2011). Working within and in-between frames: An academic tourist/midnight robber and the academy. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(6), 558–567. doi: 10.1177/1077800411409889
- Gorski, P. (2015). Foreword. In E. Moore, Jr., M. W. Penick-Parks, & A. Michael (Eds.), *Everyday white people confront racial and social injustice* (pp. ix-xiv). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Gregory, S. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124–138.
- Gutiérrez y Muhs, G., Flores Niemann, Y., González, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister citizen: Shame, stereotypes, and black women in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End.
- Jacobs, L., Cintron, J., & Canton, C. E. (Eds.). (2002). *The politics of survival in academia: Narratives of inequity, resilience, and success*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jacobson, M. (2012). Breaking silence, building solutions: The role of social justice group work in the retention of faculty of color. Special issue on the pursuit of social justice in group work. *Social Work with Groups*, 35(3), 267–286. doi: 10.1080/01609513.2011.642265
- Jacobson, M., & Rugeley, C. (2007). Community-based participatory research: Group work for social justice and community change. *Social Work with Groups*, 30(4), 21–39.
- Joseph, T. D., & Hirshfield, L. E. (2012) "Why don't you get somebody new to do it?": Race, gender, and identity taxation in the academy. In M. Chesler & A. A. Young, Jr. (Eds.), *Faculty social identity and the challenges of diverse classrooms in a historically white university* (pp. 153–169). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.
- Kim, E. (1998). At least you're not black: Asian Americans in U.S. race relations. *Social Justice*, 25(3), 1–6.
- King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 133–146.
- Kumar, A. (1997). Conditions of immigration. In M. Hill (Ed.), *Whiteness: A critical reader* (pp. 265–277). New York: New York University Press.
- Lee, M., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2004). Challenges to the classroom authority of women of color. In M. Alfred (Ed.), *New directions for adult and continuing education*, No. 102 (pp. 27–36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levin, J. S., Walker, L., Haberler, Z., & Jackson-Boothby, A. (2013). The divided self: The double consciousness of faculty of color in community colleges. *Community College Review*, 41(4), 19.
- Martinez, A. Y. (2014). A plea for critical race theory counterstory: Stock story vs. counterstory dialogues concerning Alejandra's "fit" in the academy. *Composition Studies*, 42(2), 33–55.
- McLean, C. A. (2007). Establishing credibility in the multicultural classroom: When the instructor speaks with an accent. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 110, 15–24.
- Medina, C., & Luna, G. (2000). Narratives from Latina professors in higher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 47–66.
- Mills, C. (1999). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Mills, C. (2004). Racial exploitation and the wages of whiteness. In G. Yancy (Ed.), *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question* (pp. 25-55). New York: Routledge.
- Mitchell, R., & Rosiek, J. (2006). Professor as embodied racial signifier: A case study of the significance of race in a university classroom. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 28(3/4), 395–409.
- Moore, E., Jr., Penick-Parks, M. W., & Michael, A. (2015). Introduction. In E. Moore, Jr., M. W. Penick-Parks, & A. Michael (Eds.), *Everyday white people confront racial and social injustice* (pp. 1–12). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Moore, V. A. (1996). Inappropriate challenges to professorial authority. *Teaching Sociology*, (24)2, 202–206.
- Morris, C. (2015). Exploring gender and diversity. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, 31(24), 16.
- Moule, J. (2005). Implementing a social justice perspective in teacher education: Invisible burden for faculty of color. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(4) 23–42.
- Oliva, M., Rodriguez, M. A., Alanis, I., & Quijada Cerecer, P. D. (2013). At home in the academy: Latina faculty counterstories and resistances. *Educational Foundations*, 27(1/2), 91–109.
- Ong, A. D., Burrow, A. L., Fuller-Rowell, T. E., Ja, N. M., & Sue, D. W. (2013). Racial microaggressions and daily well-being among Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(2), 188–199.
- Orelus, P. W. (2013). The institutional cost of being a professor of color: Unveiling micro-aggression, racial [in]visibility and racial profiling through the lens of critical race theory. *Current Issues in Education*, 16(2), 1–10.
- Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominately white university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81(1), 82–92.
- Reyes, X. A., & Rios, D. I. (2005). Dialoguing the Latina experience in higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(A), 377–391.
- Salazar, C. F. (2009). Strategies to survive and thrive in academia: The collective voices of counseling faculty of color. *International Journal of Advanced Counseling*, 31(3), 181–198.
- Saldaña, L. P., Castro-Villarreal, F., & Sosa, E. (2013). Testimonios of Latina junior faculty: Bridging academia, family and community lives in the academy. *Educational Foundations*, 27(1/2), 31–48.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1993). Toward a white discourse on white racism. *Educational Researcher*, 22(8), 5–10.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4–16.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominately white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736.
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271–286.

- Thomas, G. D., & Hollenshead, C. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 166–175.
- Turner, C. (2002). Women of color in academe. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74–93.
- Turner, C. (2003). Incorporation and marginalization in the academy: From border toward center for faculty of color? *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(1), 112–125.
- Turner, C., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(3), 139–168.
- Wilson, S. (2012). They forgot Mammy had a brain. In G. Gutiérrez y Muhs, Y. Flores Niemann, C. G. González, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 65–78). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Press.
- Wise, T. (2007). *White like me: Reflections on race from a privileged son*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press.
- Yancy, G. (2004). *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question*. New York: Routledge.