

9-18-2009

Race Scholars on the Politics of Race, Research, and Risk: A Narrative Inquiry

Sibby Anderson-Thompkins
sibby@email.unc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/eps_diss

Recommended Citation

Anderson-Thompkins, Sibby, "Race Scholars on the Politics of Race, Research, and Risk: A Narrative Inquiry" (2009). *Educational Policy Studies Dissertations*. Paper 44.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Educational Policy Studies at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Policy Studies Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, RACE SCHOLARS ON THE POLITICS OF RACE, RESEARCH, AND RISK IN THE ACADEMY: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY, by SIBBY ANDERSON-THOMPSON, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

Richard Lakes, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Joyce King, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Marybeth Gasman, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Sheryl A. Gowen, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Date

Sheryl A. Gowen, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies

R. W. Kamphaus, Ph.D.
Dean and Distinguished Research Professor
College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of the dissertation, which involves potential financial gain, will not be allowed without my written permission.

Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Sibby Anderson-Thompkins
50406 Governors Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Richard Lakes
Department of Educational Policy Studies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303

VITA
Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

ADDRESS: 50406 Governors Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. 2009	Georgia State University Educational Policy Studies
M.S. 2001	Georgia State University Educational Research
M.A. 1990	University of North Carolina Speech Communication
B.A. 1987	University of North Carolina Speech Communication

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2007-Present	Director of Postdoctoral Affairs University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
2004-2006	Assistant Dean of the College Agnes Scott College, Decatur, GA
1996-1997	Acting Associate Dean for Community Development Hampshire College, Amherst, MA
1991-1996	Assistant Dean of Students and Assistant Dean, Office of Student Counseling University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, NC

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS:

2003-Present	American Educational Studies Association
1999-Present	America Educational Research Association

ABSTRACT

RACE SCHOLARS ON THE POLITICS OF RACE, RESEARCH, AND RISK IN THE ACADEMY: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY

by
Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

This qualitative study examined the experiences of race scholars whose agenda include investigating and writing about racial issues which run counter to the entrenched ideas, values and philosophies of the dominant academic culture. It questioned the possible risks associated with race work, and it examined the available support and validation for race scholars within the academy. Perceived prejudices and micro-aggressions are examined, as well as coping strategies for navigating the political academic landscape.

Designed as a narrative inquiry, the study utilized in-depth interviews and the analysis of written documents of four prominent race scholars, while critical race theory (CRT) served as the theoretical framework that guided the analysis. Critical race theory (CRT) serves as the theoretical framework for this study. CRT emphasizes the social constructs of race and the ensuing issues of racism,

racial subordination and discrimination. Within the literature, CRT scholars suggest that the scholarship of faculty of color is often resisted, rejected, devalued, or subjugated by the dominant political regime in power. Further, research suggests that scholars of color and the race issues they examine are often the targets of a biased scrutiny within the academy.

The results of this study reveal that race research carries potential personal and professional risks. Some of these are anticipated, others not. The results further support the importance of CRT concept of counterspace as both a coping strategy and a form of intellectual insurgence for race scholars within the academy. In addition, findings suggest that the impact and intersection of culture and language affect the experiences of scholars of color in significantly negative ways. Mentoring generally, and specifically amidst the politics of publishing, is very important to the scholar of color and is often the difference between success and failure. Also, micro-aggressions and racial subjugations, such as the assignation of Other seem to operate as a way to devalue the scholars and the research work they do. Finally, implications for better support for graduate students and emerging scholars are clearly evidenced.

RACE SCHOLARS ON THE POLITICS OF RACE, RESEARCH, AND RISK
IN THE ACADEMY: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY
by
Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Policy Studies
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA
2009

Copyright by
Sibby Anderson-Thompkins
2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is a Native American saying: Nobody trips over mountains. It is the small pebbles that cause you to stumble. Pass all the pebbles in your path and you will find you have crossed the mountain.

The doctoral process has certainly been a long, arduous journey with many pebbles. As I near my journey's end, I can honestly say that many people have touched my life during this passage. Some may not even be aware of the effect they have had on my thoughts, my work, or on my life. For the lessons and wisdom shared, I am forever grateful.

I want to offer special, heart-felt thanks to Dr. Richard Lakes, my dissertation advisor and cheerleader, who gave honest feedback, resources, and his time; Dr. Marybeth Gasman, my dear friend and mentor, who offered her understanding, support, encouragement throughout my doctoral studies; and Dr. Joyce King and Dr. Sheryl Greenwood Gowen, valued committee members who stuck with me. I thank you all.

Others who deserve gratitude are family, friends, and colleagues who supported me along the way.

Study participants - thank you for letting me intrude upon your lives, but most of all, thank you for your candor and your concern. Your willingness to share pieces of your innermost thoughts and feelings has not only helped me with my own work, it will also help other scholars of color who are facing the same issues you so eloquently expressed.

This dissertation is dedicated to the two most significant men in my life - my long-time partner and friend, Jim; and our beautiful son, Austin. Your love, patience, understanding, and support have sustained me through difficult personal losses and painful setbacks. I thank you both.

This dissertation is also dedicated to my mother, Dorothy Anderson - a loving and compassionate teacher and mother. You have been a constant source of unconditional love and encouragement throughout my life. I will never forget all the personal and financial sacrifices you and my

Dad made so that my siblings and I could attend college and graduate school. I love you and honor you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1 INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
Statement of Problem	11
Purpose of the Study	15
Theoretical Framework	16
Significance of Study	19
Limitations of Study	20
Definition of Key Terms	23
Summary	28
2 BACKGROUND LITERATURE	
Background Literature	29
Race Identity in the academy	29
Affirmative Action	35
Race, Research, and Risk	41
Summary	52
3 METHODOLOGY	
Methodology	54

Narrative Inquiry and Critical Storytelling	55
The Link between Theory and Method	58
Observational Stance	62
Data Collection Techniques	63
Participant Selection Criteria	65
Data Analysis & Coding	67
Systematic Approach to Coding	68
Internal and External Assessment	69
Summary	70
 4 THE CONTEXTUAL BIOGRAPHIES	
THE CONTEXTUAL BIOGRAPHIES	72
Lilly Lopez	73
Flora Franks	85
Charles Chavez	94
Willa Williams	103
Summary	111
 5 FINDINGS	
Findings	112
Discussion and Interpretation	115
Challenges for the Race Scholars	115
The Race Scholar as Intellectual	115
Race Work as Intellectual Insurgence	117
Devaluation of Scholarship and Inquiry	123

The Label of Other	126
The Race Agenda	128
The Academic Culture of Whiteness	130
The Politics of Location	133
Using Counterstory	137
Possibility and Performance of Mentoring ...	138
Anticipated and Unanticipated Risks	143
The Loss of Language	145
The Politics of Publishing	147
Support and Validation	156
Constructing Critical Counterspace	156
Advice for Emerging Scholars	160
Summary	164
6 CONCLUSIONS	
Conclusions	166
Implications and Recommendations	170
Future Research Questions	171
REFERENCES	
References	174
Appendix A	195
Appendix B	200

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In October 2007, Madonna Constantine, an African-American woman and Professor of Psychology and Education at Teachers College Columbia University, discovered a noose hanging on her office door. As a scholar of color, Constantine writes about issues of race in counseling education. And as a scholar of color, the symbol of the noose has significant historical meaning for her. It represents the practice of lynching and the history of violence enacted against African-Americans in the United States. Symbolically, the noose is representative of a racial hate so deeply embedded in our nation's psyche that it effectively serves as a tool to threaten and silence. It is a rooted icon for prejudice and a highly visual metaphor for silence and invisibility. Why the symbol for silence? Historically, the academy has given scholars of color rules and guidelines for doing respectable research on racial issues. (Alridge, 2001, p. 199). In Constantine's case, the noose represented to her a

modern-day academic reminder not to pursue her racial research agenda. No one was found to be or held responsible for hanging the noose on her office door. Cleveland (2004) argues, that although scholars of color have made tremendous strides in higher education, there still exists a great need to "break our silences" against the continuing devaluing of race work. Constantine was fired a year later, under suspicions of research misconduct and plagiarism.

Regardless of the many positions taken on the Constantine case, the situation illuminates what many scholars who write about race claim: studying race in the academy is risky business. Constantine agrees, stating in a 2008 email message to faculty and students: "As one of only two tenured Black women, full professors at Teacher's College, it pains me to conclude that I have been specifically and systematically targeted." (*New York Times*, February 22, 2008).

According to Jones (2001), many scholars of color attest to the various obstacles presented when they work on race issues. Many believe their work is looked upon with disdain or as simplistic, with little value to the academy or its research agenda. Among them, Alridge (2001) argues that the "silencing of Black voice" and neglecting or

minimizing Black agency in scholarship continues to remain a problem in the 21st century (p. 195).

Scheurich and Young (1997) define racism as:

An unfavorable attitude, and perhaps an unfavorable action, toward people who are members of particular racial or ethnic groups: it may or may not specify the type of relationship that exists between unfavorable attitudes and actions; and the idea of group ranking may be more or less salient (p. 153).

Within the academy, institutional racism may greet its scholars of color with a cold and indifferent attitude.

Scheurich and Young (1997) state: "Racism is a critically significant problem in educational research" (p. 141).

These researchers posit that racial bias occurs within contemporary and traditional epistemologies including positivism, interpretivism, postmodernism, and post-structuralism, and critical race theory. This bias manifests itself in 'epistemological racism'" (p. 141).

They argue that the current range of epistemologies "arise out of the social history and culture of the dominant race . . . logically reflect[ing] and reinforc[ing] that social history and that racial group while excluding the epistemologies of other races and culture" (p. 141). The authors state that racial and cultural groups that are not among the dominant, entrenched society are faced with many research dilemmas. For example, research and epistemologies

that stem from cultural histories and experiences outside the dominant culture face a difficult battle for legitimacy within the mainstream research community (p. 143).

Scheurich and Young (1997) argue that scholars of color must learn and become accomplished in epistemologies that arise out of a social history that has been profoundly hostile to their race. Delgado and Stefancic (2005) state that "race and races are products of social thought . . . not objective, inherent, or fixed, races correspond to no simple biological or genetic reality; rather, they are categories that society invents for particular purposes (p. 143).

Race has always been a major issue in the United States. Since its inception, the country has been dominated by a settler society of religious and ethnically diverse Whites. Prominent, racially-structured institutions built by these settlers included slavery, Indian reservations, segregation, residential schools (for Native Americans), and internment camps (for Asian Americans).

Racial stratification has occurred in employment, housing, education and government for more than two centuries. During and after the Civil Rights Movement, racial discrimination experienced a cultural, political, and legal redress. Racial prejudice and discrimination

became socially unacceptable and morally repugnant. After many years of tumultuous strife, the cultural mores of the dominant society began to change. Jurisprudence handed down by the Warren court responded affirmatively in *Brown v. Board of Education*. Government programs were put into place to facilitate the change to create a more equal society. Affirmative action programs were developed to help turn the tide of discrimination in housing, employment, and education. Minority voices were given platforms previously denied. Opportunities for educational and vocational advancement were made available across cultures. By the late 60s, however, the liberal tide had begun to change. American politics moved right, abandoning the liberal activism central to the Civil Rights Movement. Many activists believed their work was finished when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, yet others felt the work for racial equality had barely begun. Although numerous minority conditions changed for the better during the 1970s and 1980s, several civil rights precedents won through earlier court decisions were watered down with a Whitewash brush, yielded by a Republican, more prescribed judiciary. Countless hoped-for changes have remained entrenched in the mire of the dominant political and cultural systems, most especially a Republican Supreme Court that has promulgated

a formalist position on civil rights. Major inequalities still persist and racial politics remain a major concern, especially for scholars of color.

Historically, the greatest burdens of racism in the country have fallen upon Native Americans and African-Americans and their descendants. Members of every American ethnic group, regardless of color, have perceived racism in their dealings within the dominant culture (Moody, 2004). For minority scholars of color in pursuit of higher education, the road had been bumpy, muddy, winding, and often times, road blocked. Early scholars of color seeking an education within a predominantly White setting complained of malfeasance, maliciousness, and mistreatment at the hands of institutional officials and fellow students (Bonner & Evans, 2004, p. 4).

Racist attitudes, prejudice, and discrimination continue to exist in every stratification of the American culture, even among the intellectuals and academicians. Although the number of African-American scholars has steadily risen in the past several decades, students continue to face obstacles to their success. Smith (1997) has coined the term "chilly climate" in response to student criticisms of isolation, marginalization, and racism frequently endured within a predominantly White

institution. Yet, these students are expected to conquer an array of racial prejudices and succeed on their own. Walter Allen (1986) states:

Past research suggests that the fit between Black students and White colleges is not very good. Kirkland concurs and relates his experience, "The effects on one's psyche, cultural practices, and academic performance can be great." Constantly, as an African-American student, you find yourself defending your very existence as a qualified and critical-thinking scholar who is worthy of attending such an institution (p. 112).

In the early decades of the 20th century, the common minority person (most especially African-Americans and Native Americans) faced harsh, everyday issues in terms of racial prejudice and discrimination. Housing was an especially problematic issue, gladdened with blatant discrimination. This problem and most others received little attention by the mainstream White culture, and so existed mostly unnoticed. Minorities were mainly invisible with little voice in their affairs.

Intellectuals and academic scholars, on the other hand, experienced a different reality, especially in the 50s and 60s, when their voices actually made an impact on the mainstream culture. They were uniquely positioned, educationally and culturally, and granted wider latitude in which to express their opinions. They were able to address racial issues through their writings and public speaking

and because of their elite position, they were able to inform and persuade. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a perfect example of this. His intellect was so highly regarded that he was able to successfully dispel any lingering ethos that Blacks were uneducable. Bonner and Evans (2004) stated that at the time, a lingering, prevailing belief that Blacks were intellectually unable to master a collegiate regimen existed among many average White Americans (p. 5). King drew upon old-time biblical proclamations and prose to address racial discrimination as a moral issue. His voice, unique in power and cadence, made an indelible impression on the American psyche and the world at large. His distinctive oratory talents voiced a dominant opinion that it was time for equality for all, regardless of race. Racial prejudice, discrimination, and desegregation were issues to be addressed, reasoned-out morally and legally, and acted upon with swift affirmative change.

Today, public intellectuals and academic scholars in many disciplines, especially law and education, who use their intellect and educated voice to fight for racial and cultural equality, face a backlash from various levels of the political, business and academic hierarchy and cultural structure. This backlash is particularly felt in the

academy (Scheurich & Young, p. 141). As a result, these intellectuals have found themselves under attack. For example, in the spring of 2002, highly respected race scholar Cornel West was publicly criticized by Harvard President Lawrence Summers for his spoken word compact disc, *Sketches of My Culture*, on which West offers an attempt to counter the negativity of contemporary hip hop and rap music. *The Boston Globe* (June 6, 2006) reported that West left his coveted Harvard post as a distinguished member of the university faculty after Summers accused him of being an intellectual lightweight, suggesting that he needed "to engage in more scholarly work" and last, for alleging that West used race to promote and market himself as a public intellectual. It was clearly an insult.

David Horowitz (2006) assembled profiles on scholars whom he describes as radical intellectuals or political extremists who promote their personal and political perspectives on issues such as race, gender, class, and sexual orientation on college campuses. Some of the scholars profiled are: Michael Eric Dyson, Amiri Baraka, bell hooks, and Angela Davis. Horowitz argues that many of these scholars are merely activists whose personal opinions are masked as research. He contends that these scholars are dangerous because they corrupt the minds of young people by

abusing their personal and political power in university classrooms and by debasing academic standards.

Race scholarship has always been controversial. As early as the late 1960s, several law and civil rights scholars, including critical race founder Derrick Bell (1990), had doubts about the path taken by many "public intellectuals." Bell, concerned about civil rights scholars' lack of accountability, warned that:

Self-aggrandizement threatened to seduce them from their purpose . . . African-American scholars could be compromised: Through their writings, lectures and television appearances, some of them have more influence on public opinion and policy-making than do all but the top, Black elected officials. And yet, while Black academics are viewed as spokespersons for the race, they are neither elected by Blacks nor held accountable to them." (cited in Jones, 2001, p. 57).

Alridge (2001) counters the remarks and reactions of Summers and Horowitz by admonishing scholars of color to extend the work and voices of the elders (W.E.B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, Anna Julia Cooper, Horace Mann Bond, to name a few) by producing excellent research on the Black experience. "We have an obligation to address research that promotes racial stereotypes of Black people as well as be proactive in creating our own body of solid research on Black people grounded in the Black experience" (Jones, 2001, p. 194). Twyman (2005, para. 1) agrees: "When Black

law professors shy away from the hard, traditional work of scholarship, they are not seen as serious contenders in the academy." Perhaps this was the perception that Harvard President Summers had of Cornel West's work; however, to be called a lightweight among intellectuals, because of the type of scholarly work being done, remains a degrading criticism.

Statement of the Problem

What challenges exist in the academy for race scholars who choose to research race or social issues? Moody (2004) cautions new professors to expect "social isolation, overt prejudice, a lack of mentors, and ambiguous expectations about what they should do to succeed. Furthermore, the academy is not immune to the politics of meanness" (p. 175).

Ambiguous expectations come also from inside the minority research agenda. The continuum ranges from hard scientific research steeped in traditional research methodology to newer, more qualitative methodologies, such as critical storytelling, counter storytelling, or narrations grounded in experience. The storytelling approach, the invention of critical race theory originator Derrick Bell, has generated a lot of criticism in that

traditional scholars argue that it is not good scholarship, grounded in scientific methodology. Today, within the academy and in the world of civil rights issues, the liberal coalition of the 1960s has splintered into two camps: 1) the formalist and neo-conservative scholars of color who are intent on following tradition in classical research, and 2) the radical/liberal critical race theory scholars of color who pursue race work grounded in personal experience (Jones, 2001, p. 27). For new professors of color, the question might be: "Who is the real spokesperson and who do I model myself after?"

Does a specific location within an ideological landscape carry risks or threats? Many scholars of color think they must be better than their non-Black colleagues and be able to navigate their way through the political structures within the academy better than their non-White colleagues. Researchers report that for the scholar of color to successfully navigate the graduate experience, it is often inherently mandatory to assimilate into the dominant culture of the academy (Delgado, 1998; Sedlacek, 1999. Kersey-Matusiak (2004) suggests that for the novice scholar of color, it is critical to acknowledge a self-identity that goes beyond the designated role of teacher, researcher, or scholar (Kersey-Matusiak, 2004, p. 122). If

a student does not settle the question of who they are, Akbar (2002) warns "academicians risk living a life of adolescent indecision, drifting back and forth between dependency on the despotic rulings of others or forging a comfortable self-definition" (cited in Cleveland, 2004, p. 33). He suggests that for scholars of color an identity that is reality-based and incorporates race as an important dimension is the most advantageous.

Scholars of color must also make distinctions about their teaching and their path of research. A large body of research supports the prevailing consensus among scholars of race that teaching or researching racial issues is tricky business on the way to tenure. Wayne Stein, Associate Professor and Chair of Native American Studies at Montana State University, contends that minority faculty can get into trouble when they focus on racial issues. Students get upset; they complain. The complaint makes its way to the department chair, whom in turns puts pressure on the teacher to rethink what they are teaching. Tenure is a most important objective for the minority faculty as this ensures the continuance of their work, "to teach the facts as they really are and really happened, not what is most comfortable for their students and fellow majority faculty to hear and read" (Moody, 2004, p. 178).

Colin (2004) advises that often the choices scholars of color make for study are sometimes not recognized as valuable and rarely rewarded by promotion and tenure. (cited in Jones, 2001, p. 186) Instead, according to Colin (2004), research that incorporates the ideology of a Eurocentric "worldview, value system, and ways of behaving," is steadfastly rewarded: "The tenure and promotion of African-American [sic] faculty tend to be based on the level of their commitment to the perpetuation of this ideology in the classroom and their own research" (p. 55).

This study explored these issues and considered how academic counterspace may help scholars of color survive and thrive within the academy. Academic counterspace refers to a safe place or space (e.g. cultural centers, fraternities or sororities) students of color construct to find fellowship, a sense of community, or to resist systemic racism. However, for the purpose of this study, the term counterspace was enlarged to encompass virtual intellectual communities, networks, and academic blogging groups.

Understanding the challenges that race scholars experience within the academy and the unique strategies

they develop for success contributes to the study of critical race theory and higher education.

Purpose of Study

This study examines the politics of race, research and risk in the academy. The research questions that guide this study are:

- 1) What unique challenges do academic politics bring to these scholars?
- 2) How does the political climate of the academy affect scholars of color who choose to research race-related social issues?
- 3) What does it mean to engage in a discourse of race issues within the academy? Does race-related scholarship carry risks or threats? Do race scholars perceive their work as having risks?
- 4) How do scholars of color "locate" or "position" themselves within a broad political, theoretical, and ideological landscape?
- 5) Where do scholars of color find support and validation within the academy?
- 6) What advice or recommendations can be made for the support of emerging scholars of color involved in race-related scholarship?

Theoretical Framework

Critical race theory (CRT) serves as the theoretical framework that guides this study. CRT was crafted by legal scholars of color who were concerned about racial subjugation in society (Bell, 1987; Delgado, 1989; Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Williams 1995). In 1995, Ladson-Billings and Tate first introduced CRT to the field of education, introducing the CRT concept of White property rights and citizenship.

Since then, a growing body of scholarship in education uses critical race theory as a framework to examine a variety of educational issues at both the K-12 and post-secondary levels. Themes that resonate throughout the CRT literature in education include challenging racialized discourses and epistemologies in educational research (Parker & Lopez, 2003; Delgado-Bernal, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Dowdy, Givens, Murillo, Shenoy, & Villenas); colonizing research practices (Smith, 1999; Sandoval, 2000), issues of researcher identity (Delgado-Bernal, 1998; Pizarro, 1999; Brayboy, 2001; Fine, Weis, Pruitt, & Burns, 2004) structural and symbolic racism in the academy (Dowdy et al., 2000); race-neutral educational policies and practices (Parker, 2003; Rumberger, 1991); and

pedagogical implications of teacher diversity (Vargas, 2002).

As a theoretical lens, CRT emphasizes the importance of viewing policies, practices, and laws in proper historical and cultural context in order to deconstruct their racialized context or subtext (Villalpando & Bernal, 2002). Furthermore, CRT seeks to critique and point the way toward reforming ongoing trends, assumptions, and understandings that have existed long-term, and continue to currently exist within elementary, secondary, and higher educational settings in the United States.

According to Villalpando and Bernal (2002, p. 245), there are six key tenets that ground critical race theory:

- 1) Racism is endemic to American life.
- 2) CRT expresses skepticism toward dominant claims of neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness, and meritocracy.
- 3) CRT challenges ahistoricism and insists on a contextual and historical analysis of institutional policies.
- 4) CRT recognizes the experiential knowledge of people of color and the communities of origin in analyzing society.
- 5) CRT acknowledges interdisciplinary approaches and

mitigates epistemological and methodological boundaries.

- 6) CRT works towards the elimination of racial oppression as part of a broader goal to end all oppression.

While clearly more analytical than activist, critical race theory (CRT) does contain an activist element, seeking to discover, critique, and act on ways society currently organizes itself along racial lines (Delgado & Stefanic; Bell, 1987). Thus, the ultimate goal of critical race theory is to raise the consciousness, to inform action, and eradicate racism in our society.

One concept frequently discussed by critical race scholars is counterstory. Delgado & Stefanic (2001), Bell (1990), Williams (1987), and Bell (1987) observe that critical race scholars (as well as fiction writers and various other kinds of storytellers) use the power of stories and persuasion to illustrate and critique ways by which American culture typically sees race. Delgado (2001) argues that people of color speak from an experience framed by racism and the stories of people of color are born from a different frame of reference and therefore impart to them a voice that is different from the dominant culture of hegemonic Whiteness and deserves to be heard. Critical race

theorists argue that for the majority to understand the minority, the story of the individual must be understood in terms of the individual's own experience. Thus, "legal storytelling," observed Bell (1990) is a method that can sometimes prove useful in bringing to light minority experience, especially within the law.

Other CRT scholars have examined narrative theory, in order to better understand why certain stories worked to help erase ethnic or other prejudices, and others do not. Bell (1990); Olivas (1990); Russell (1991); Delgado (1989), and Williams (1987) have explored a long historical and literary tradition that includes slave narratives (written by African-Americans) and Native American narratives. In this study, narrative storytelling and counterstorying are used as both a methodological tool and a way to represent the stories of the participants.

Significance of the Study

This study offers both theoretical and practical contributions by examining the politics of race research within the academy. From a theoretical perspective, this study adds to the growing body of research on critical race theory in the field of education. Counterstory, a critical narrative that challenges entrenched assumptions by the

dominant cultural and political force, is used in examining the experiences of scholars of color as they pursue their research on relevant race issues. The totality of these experiences will offer insights into how the academy can better prepare and support doctoral students and scholars of color. Equally important, this study adds significantly to the scholarship on critical race theory by examining the use of counterspace as a methodological and/or pedagogical tool. The term is enlarged to encompass more than physical structures for constructing community. In this study, the term will refer to virtual intellectual communities, networks, and blogging groups.

While many studies have examined issues related to affirmative action, tenure, and promotion as they relate to faculty of color experiences in the academy, fewer studies have explored the implications of race scholarship in the political climate of the academy.

Limitations of Study

Since, the study utilized in-depth interviews and the analysis of copious written documents (e.g. books, articles, personal essays) of the participants, the volume of transcripts and documents dictated that the sample should be limited to a relatively small size: between three and four. Furthermore, due to the focus of the project, the

sample was limited to faculty of color who self-identified as scholars of color and race scholars. The participants were selected from the different regions across the United States in order to allow for the inclusion of predominantly White universities (private and public) in the analyses.

Another limitation is that of "inherent biases." As a researcher, I entered this study with preconceived notions of what I might find in the field. Pohland (1971) states that "the researcher does not enter the field tabula rosa—his or her training, experiences, theoretical perspectives, and research interests are part of the baggage carried [in]" (p. 12). This would certainly be true with me.

I admit I became interested in this research topic because of my own personal experiences as graduate student and emerging scholar engaged in race work. At times, during my training, I felt I encountered particular challenges because of my research agenda. One particular encounter stands out: I had scheduled a meeting to discuss my research interests with a faculty member, a respected White feminist/gay studies scholar, who I had planned to ask to be my adviser. As I outlined my plans to examine issues of race and higher education, she abruptly stopped me and said, "You can do more than race."

Years later, I am still puzzled and outraged by the dismissal and devaluation of doing race work as a scholar of color. Still, as I reflect upon my research process and personal journey, I emerge with a renewed sense of purpose and intention. The opportunity to have conversations with prominent race scholars about their own educational and personal experiences, theoretical perspectives, and research interests had a profound affect on me both personally and intellectually. At times, the conversations were enlivening, challenging my thinking on issues of race and identity. At other times, the conversations were intense and uncomfortable – leaving a lasting imprint of pain and loss.

However, in spite of the assumptions, biases, beliefs, and expectations I may hold, vigilant scrutiny in questioning and re-questioning, analyzing and re-analyzing the narratives of the participants, brings me to the conclusion that the research results expressed here are both valid and trustworthy.

Delgado (2001) argues that people of color speak of their experiences through a different frame of reference and inherently give to them a voice that is different, and often counter, to the dominant culture of Whiteness. These voices deserve to be heard and I feel that the personal

narratives of the scholars of color in this study will add a great deal to the understanding of what it means to be a scholar of color engaged in racial discourse in the academy.

Definition of Key Terms

Critical race theory (CRT): examines the socially constructed nature of race, particularly within the United States in a broader context than the traditional civil rights approach. CRT considers judicial conclusions to be the result of the workings of power and opposes all forms of subordination. This line of inquiry is the branch of legal studies concerned with racism, racial subordination, and discrimination. CRT began in the 1970s by legal scholars concerned with the slow rate at which laws were changing to ensure racial equality and by the slow erosion of early victories earned by the civil rights movement (Delgado and Stefanic, 2005).

Counterstory: refers to the use of "personal testimonies, dialogues, fictional accounts, parables, and chronicles whose aim is to acknowledge the experiences of the marginalized and analyze and counter the bundles of presuppositions, received wisdoms, and shared understandings that the dominant race brings to

the discussions of race issues" (Delgado and Stefancic, 2005, p. 10) It serves as a tool to expose systemic racism and micro-aggressions.

Counterspace: serves as a tool to resist systemic racism and micro-aggressions. Within critical race theory, it refers to a safe place. Students of color construct academic or social counterspaces on college campuses in the form of cultural centers, fraternities, or sororities (Howard-Hamilton, 2004). For the purpose of this study, counterspace transcends physical structures to include virtual intellectual communities, social networks, and academic blogging groups.

Epistemological racism: refers to the racial bias that occurs within educational research, according to Scheurich and Young (1997).

Ethnicity: a term commonly used to refer to a group of people who share common, cultural, linguistic, religious, or biological traits.

Identity politics/Politics of race: refers to politics associated with identity (e.g. sexual orientation, gender, race, disability); for purpose of this study, the focus is on race and ethnicity as identity. A term made popular by feminist scholars to refer to

politics that stress a collective identity as the basis of political or social analysis and action. The focus is personal, on the self and aspects of identity that inform social, cultural, ideological position.

Ideological landscape: refers to a continuum of theoretical perspectives that reflect beliefs and ideas that justify certain interests; for example, conservative, liberal, radical, critical race theory, feminism, Afro-centrism. An ideological position reflects and rationalizes particular political, economic, institutional, and/or social interests.

Liberalism: emphasizes democracy, the practice of social equality, and personal freedom. Liberals advocate gradual reform and believe that the government has a responsibility to redress social, political, and economic inequities. Influenced by the progressive writings of philosopher and educator John Dewey, the assumptions and beliefs associated with liberalism are colorblindness, equal opportunity, and opportunity for all.

Neoconservative: refers to an intellectual, political movement that originated and evolved in the late 1970s as a reaction to liberal and leftist thought. Also, supportive of traditional moral standards and anti-

Communist foreign policy. Tenets include: 1) individual freedom in economic enterprise should not be restricted by society or government regulation; 2) the state exists for the individual and not the individual for the state.

Radical/Progressivism: promotes progress (e.g. progressive schools) and favors fundamental social or economic reform, often by government action. Influenced by the writings of Karl Marx, radicals adhere to the values of democratic socialism. Radicals believe that many of the problems that impact education are the result of a capitalist economy – poverty and other social ills are perpetuated by a political structure that relies on capitalism.

Race: any of the different varieties or populations of human beings distinguished by physical traits such as hair, eyes, skin color, body shape, etc.

Traditionally, the three primary divisions: Caucasoid, Negroid, and Mongoloid; these with several subdivisions. Sociologists view race as a socially constructed concept that reflects the perception of differences in ability and achievement, categorized on the basis of race, social, and cultural factors.

Racialized: to differentiate or categorize according to race; to impose a racial character or context, or to perceive or experience in racial terms.

Race scholar: a term that reflects the double bind experienced by scholars of color who chose to engage in race work in the academy. In addition, the term refers to the politics of racial or ethnic identity and the way in which the scholar's body and intellectual work is racialized.

Race work: a term that refers to a research agenda or scholarly, intellectual work or discourse that centers on race, promotes social justice, and utilizes a critical theoretical perspective such as critical race theory, Latina/o critical race theory (Lat crit), or tribal critical theory (tribal crit).

Racial subjugations and micro-aggressions: refers to overt and subtle forms of insults directed towards people of color. Within CRT, these forms of insults can include verbal and nonverbal behaviors or actions.

Scholar of color: refers to the minority status of the intellectual or academic scholar based on skin color or racial identity, (e.g. African-American, Native American, Asian, Latina/o).

Summary

The purpose of this study is to examine the position of the race scholar as he or she pursues an agenda focused on race issues in America today. This study seeks to inquire of the perils and prejudices the race scholar faces as he or she pursues research that examines racial issues which run counter to the entrenched ideas, values and philosophies of mainstream culture.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) serves as the theoretical framework that guides this study. CRT emphasizes the social constructs of race, and the ensuing issues of racism, racial subordination and discrimination. This study, designed as a narrative inquiry, examines the politics of race as it relates to the political, theoretical and ideological locations of race scholars within a broad academic landscape. It questions the possible risks associated with race work by scholars of color and it examines the available support and validation for these scholars within the academy. Strategies for scholars of color include counterstories (challenge entrenched assumptions through voices speaking from a different frame of reference than that of the dominant culture) and counterspace constructs (locations that are physical,

psychological, or virtual) examined as "conceptual frames"
that offer shelter from real or perceived threats)

CHAPTER 2

Background Literature

An initial literature search yielded a number of empirical studies, both quantitative and qualitative, and philosophical articles on the professoriate. Some of the search descriptors included: "roles and expectations," "scholarly activities," "classroom behavior," and "faculty experiences." For purposes of this review, I have chosen to focus on the most relevant articles that serve to frame the current study. For clarity, I have organized the review around sub-topics: identity roles, scholarly research, and demographics of the professoriate; the politics encountered by faculty of color; the absence of perspectives from junior faculty of color on the politics of race, and critics of race scholars in the academy and allegations of abuse of the personal and political power of faculty.

Race Identity in the Academy

Scholars of color have traveled a rough, winding, and oft times a mountainous road in their pursuit of advanced degrees. Accounts of the experiences of this pursuit within

a predominantly White institution, detail a "litany of malfeasance, maliciousness, and mistreatment at the hands of institutional officials and fellow students," (Bonner & Evans, 2004, p. 104). Bonner and Evans cite Willie and McCord's (1972) *Black Students at White Colleges*, in describing the continuing conditions students of color face in today's academy:

We have discovered that most Blacks came to White colleges expecting to find less prejudice, less discrimination, and more social integration than they actually encounter[ed]. Their confidence and trust in Whites has been shaken by cruel, or, at the very least, thoughtless, insults and insensitivity (p. 104).

This is not the story, just for African-Americans, but also for other minorities of color and gender and sexual orientation. Asian American scholar Ruth Hsu (2000) states:

The place of minorities in academe is fraught with undesirable compromises and battles, in which we are routinely devalued, erased, and attacked, in which almost every aspect of our daily experiences with students, scholars, and administrators is embroiled in a hierarchical power structure constructed along axes of race, gender, sexuality, class, and age (Hsu, 2000, p. 185).

Many students of color complain that to make it successfully to graduation, it is necessary for them to assimilate to the White culture, curricula, and teaching styles of higher learning even when these standards are

inconsistent with their learning styles. Delgado, 1998; Sedlacek, 1999, argue that part of the standards include the ability to fit in (cited in Cleveland, 2004, p. xv).

Fitting in involves more than grades and test scores. The color of skin, even when an off-shade of White, can affect the perceptions of the dominant culture, as many Asians and Latina/os have come to experience. Skin and voice are often piggybacked in diminished cultural assessment. Xue Lang Rong (2002) speaks of a pervading immigrant belief that many Americans have - if a person has an accent different from normal American English, "that person must be stupid" (p. 136). Rong believes that student response to foreign accents is directly tied to the ethos of the institution and that student behavior is modeled after peers and faculty. This lack of respect is pervasive across minority cultures. Research posits that many Hispanic faculty feel discrimination due to their appearance and language accents (Astin & Burciaga, 1981; Garza, 1998; Rochin & de la Torre, 1986). Anatol (2002), a brown-skinned, Caribbean American, lesbian faculty member of a major university, states that her audience places her into certain roles. She relates her position in the classroom: "Students bring certain assumptions to the space the moment they see me because they read a racial identity

and a gender identity onto my appearance (cited in Vargas, 2002, p. 60).

Moody (2004) quotes philosopher Laurence Thomas who "speaks of the profound sense of vulnerability that comes with being a member of a diminished social category."

Moody states that:

Persons in this category are victims of the assumption "that they lack the wherewithal to measure up in an important social dimension" part of the vulnerability arises from "being weary of always feeling the need to prove that this [negative] social claim is a lie" (p. 14).

Puerto Rican professor, Sonia Nieto (2004) states that she realized early on, she would have to work hard to overcome the stereotypical reactions on a regular basis. "[I] strived to make it clear that I was intelligent" in spite of the cultural markers that distinguished me as a scholar of color separate from mainstream scholars (cited in Moody, 2004, p. xxiv). Nell Painter, Princeton historian agrees, stating: "Intellectually, any woman and any Black person must prove that she or he is not dumb" and it is "tiresome in the extreme to be made to feel as if you are always being evaluated and that your qualifications and achievements are always suspect" (cited in Reiss, 1997, pp. 6-7).

Many researchers have found that White elitism is rampant in academia (Boice, 1992, p. 265; also see Smith, 2000). Boice has found through decades of faculty development, that faculty of color have to constantly deal with insinuations that they are unworthy. "They must brace themselves for almost daily snubs and put downs, both large and small" (cited in Moody, 2004, p. 15). Moody states that a 1999 internal survey of Michigan faculty revealed that women and minority professors felt they were frequently discriminated against, scrutinized more, and undervalued as intellectuals. In opposition, the dominant culture faculty reported satisfaction with their department and with collaborative peers (Moody, 2004, p. 13-14). Verdugo (2002) states that a "significant number of Hispanic faculty believe they are the targets of racists beliefs by their non-Hispanic colleagues" (Reyes & Halcon, 1998; Uribe & Verdugo, 1989). Verdugo also reports that most Hispanic faculty feel their scholarship is devalued by their non-Hispanic colleagues (Uribe & Verdugo, 1989). Haro & Lara (2003) argue that many faculty have negative attitudes towards Latino students:

Such an attitude is most prevalent at highly selective institutions where faculty want to concern themselves with their research and interact only occasionally with the best and brightest students. Most of the older faculty

still consider Latino students somehow less well prepared or less intellectually capable than their Asian and White counterparts (Castellanos & Jones, 2003, p. 157).

It is not surprising that female faculty and faculty of color enter higher education bruised and vulnerable. The path for most has been of little support and even less inspiration. Raymond "Ramon" Herrera (2003) tells a poignant story about his path to his doctorate:

My journey toward the [doctorate] began in the guidance counselor's office when I was in high school. I remember I was in fourth period (Science), and the teacher received a phone call from the counselor's office. I walked into his office and he told me to have a seat. "So, Ramon, what are your plans?" he asked. After taking along breath, I remarked, "I'm not sure. Maybe I'll go to City College." Sensing my lack of conviction and assuredness about attending community college, the counselor looked at me for a long, uncomfortable moment and said: "What if I give you four choices?: Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marines?" (Herrera, 2003, pp. 111-112)

Herrera did join the Marines and "like many young people of color and working-poor Whites, the military provided the promise of opportunities that I would not have had otherwise. It was not until later that I realized that I had been tracked into a vocational path primarily because I was Latino. The limiting of options by this particular gate-keeper proved to be the first of many motivating factors for me to pursue a higher education" (2003, pp. 112-113).

Herrera alludes to the strong possibility that many students of color may have experienced the same kind of guidance, or lack thereof. And possibly, the lack of guidance propelled many others into higher education for the purpose of effecting change - "systemic changes to institutions that have shortchanged, cut off, and even destroyed the potential of Latina/os" (Herrera, 2003, p. 113).

Ibara (2003) argues that the minority mandate for change within higher education is intertwined and tied-up by the intersecting conflict of cultural diversity of population and traditional academic values of the White dominant culture. He states:

Voters, state legislatures, and court rulings are dismantling thirty years of affirmative action and anti-discrimination legislation, while women and ethnic populations on campus argue that the barriers they have always faced in academia remain unchanged" (Ibara, 2003, p. 214).

Although women and students of color continue to enter the academy in increasingly larger numbers, for many, real equity and diversity lag behind at a considerable distance.

Affirmative Action

Much of the literature predicts significant numbers of senior faculty retiring - most of whom are White and male. However, according to the *National Study of Postsecondary*

Faculty (U.S Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004), the professoriate continues to be predominantly White and male. This suggests that new professors of color are low in number. In fact, faculty members of color make up only 19 percent of the total distribution of full-time instructional staff at public and private doctoral institutions (U.S Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). Further investigation reveals that among faculty of color, African-Americans make up approximately 5.5 percent, Hispanics make up 3.5 percent, Asian/Pacific Islanders make up 8.1 percent and Native American/Alaska Natives make up 2.1 percent. Within the field of education, African-Americans make up approximately 4.3 percent, Hispanics make up 3.1 percent, Asian/Pacific Islanders make up 11.3 percent and Native American/Alaska Natives make up 2.0 percent.

Equally small are the numbers of women faculty throughout the academy. Women, as a whole, made up 38 percent. However, in the field of education, according to the same NCES report, women represent 58.3 percent of the full time instructional staff at public and private doctoral institutions. And equally out of balance, women of color represent only a fraction of the full-time instructional staff across the academy or in the field of

education. Research suggests that the implications for the shortage in the numbers of faculty of color are far-reaching.

Affirmative action has proven to be a double-edged sword; it has cleaved on the one side and cut on the other. Propelled into existence by massive minority unrest and the dominant culture's guilt, and legislated and institutionalized by the US Congress and the Supreme Court, affirmative action has been a lightning rod for change. For the African-American, affirmative action threw open the doors to higher education, from small community colleges to the most elite universities. Within a few short years, more and more Black scholars were teaching at these institutions. Others, attending well-known colleges and universities, enabled sweeping changes within administration and on the academic campus. Black students who attended White universities were numerous and demanded professors who could teach the African-American experience and provide mentoring. "Black students regarded personal counseling, advocacy, political advice and cultural invigoration as essential to the Black academic's role"(Banks, 1996, p. 32). In perspectives on race and their research on race issues, Black faculty added diversity through their students and faculty brought to

mainstream awareness racial problems at play and possible solutions.

For the Latino community (as well as Asian American, and down on the list, Native American), it was not until the 1970s, that the American government acknowledged "minority" was not just African-American. This recognition had a significant impact of subsequent state and federal court rulings and policies and brought about significant change for the Latino community, and as Richard Rodriguez writes in *Brown, The Last Discovery in America* (2002, p. 34), the result of federal intervention was that "several million Americans were baptized Hispanic." Although, the designation of the term Hispanic for peoples of diverse social and historical ties to the United States was controversial, in the long run, the documentation of Hispanics gave them a piece of the American minority pie, alongside Blacks, Asians, and Native Americans. During the 1980s, Hispanics became the fastest minority group in the United States. However, the number of Hispanics attending postsecondary institutions remained extremely low. The reality for the Latino community is that affirmative action did not operate as successfully for them as it did for African-Americans. However, Acuna (1998, p. 37) states, "Affirmative action gave us the justification for our being

at the university, and the right that administrators listen to our demands."

Unfortunately, the end road of affirmative action gave minorities reasons to question the justification for being hired by the university. Rong (2002) an assistant professor at the University of North Carolina, believes she was hired for the same reasons most women and minorities are hired: external pressure to comply with affirmative action goals. Rong states,

The lack of diversity stirred anxiety among some faculty and continued to raise many concerns for the next accreditation visit . . . To the best of my knowledge, when I was hired, I was the first minority woman faculty, the first Asian American person, and the first immigrant in the more than 80-year history of the School of Education. Like so many Research I institutions around the country, the hierarchy in the School of Education consisted of mostly White men at the full professor level and mostly minorities and women at the lower stratum . . . Several incidents during my first year led me to question: Was I hired for affirmative action alone, for my own merit alone, or for some combination of the two?" (2002, p. 128-129).

A quota system for hiring women and minorities seems to be an unwritten, unspoken system that yet, operates openly. Derrick Bell (1992, p.141) argued early on that "once a token number of minority faculty are hired, a "real ceiling" is reached that prevents the hiring of any more "regardless of their qualifications." Reyes and Halcon

(1991, p.75) have coined the term "one-minority-per-pot" to describe the syndrome that blankets numerous department chairs across the United States that decry "we hired a minority last year"—diversity has been satisfied.

The quota system is a skewed system that operates to serve the majority. It gives the majority privilege and manipulates the hiring process so that majority candidates are usually assured of being hired, and once hired, more likely to thrive professionally. Moody (2004) argues that for many universities, it is enough to have minorities in the hiring pool: "Apparently, an applicant pool that includes minorities is considered by White faculty as evidence of a 'good faith effort' in hiring and integrating minorities - even if minorities are not ultimately hired" (p. 37). Moody also states that it is a common practice for hiring committees to ask minority applicants for extra assurances that they are qualified. Reyes and Halcon (1991) found that as a rule, additional writing samples and letters of recommendation are requested from minority candidates. Moody argues that fear underlies this practice; a stereotypical belief that minorities are not as intelligent, nor as capable and may lower the department's reputation and standards. As such, minority candidates are placed at the starting gate labeled incompetent and not

sufficiently qualified. Robert Haro (2001) professor at San Francisco State University found that Latinos/as are most often stereotypically treated. Their academic credentials and experience are viewed as suspect and their personal styles of interaction are considered inappropriate.

"Latino/a candidates were sometimes regarded as inappropriately dressed and wearing 'cheap and distracting' jewelry . . ." (cited in Moody, 2003, p. 38).

Yosso (2005) asked the question: "Whose culture has capital?" I would answer: the dominant culture, especially within the academy. The institutional structure gives privilege to the majority and disadvantages and disfavor to the minority. White and Cones (1999, p.38) report that [Institutional discrimination] "involves patterns of resource allocation, selection, advancement, and expectations" that perpetuate higher status and likely success for the favored group, but have just the opposite effect for all others.

Race, Research, and Risk

The history of race scholarship dates to antiquity. Past the antebellum, elders of race scholarship (such as W.E.B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, Anna Julia Cooper, Alain Locke, St. Claire Drake, E. Franklin Frazier and Horace Mann Bond) struggled to gain their voices and to offer

personal perspectives within their research. They also realized the importance of locating or situating his or herself in a way that produced sound scientific, scholarly research and yet, remained grounded in the Black experience (King, 2005). V.P. Franklin and Bettye Collier-Thomas (2002) examine the biographies of early Black intellectuals; they contend that many of these biographical studies reveal a fervent commitment to "race vindication." According to Franklin and Collier-Thomas,

Race vindication was a major activity for Black intellectuals...African American preachers, professors, publishers, and other highly educated professionals put their intellect and training in service to "the race" to deconstruct the discursive structures erected in science, medicine, the law, and historical discourse to uphold the mental and cultural inferiorities of African-American people (p. 160).

Scholarship - the formal production, identification, and organization of what will be called knowledge - is inevitably political. However, Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, and Thomas (1995) argue that scholarship about race in America "can never be written from a distance of detachment or with an attitude of objectivity" (p.xiii). Alridge (2001, p.199) concurs by posing the following question:

What purpose does it serve to emotionally disconnect ourselves from the African-American experience, to write in a voice that is

inaccessible to the very Black folk that we are researching, and to accept methodologies that downplay our connection to the Black experience?" (cited in Jones, 2001, p. 199).

Rowley (2000) calls this issue a "dialectical challenge" in which Black scholars struggle to contribute to the Black movement and at the same time, successfully navigate an academic system that is often hostile to Black voice.

This is not a new issue. Still, Bell (1992) warned colleagues about the dual worlds they operated in when working within the academy, writing about race issues. Bernie D. Jones, in his dissertation, *Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium? 2001*, writes that those early race scholars who were not public intellectuals, made the passages through academia toward tenure by way of selection, judged by their colleagues, most of whom were White, on their ability as scholars and teachers. These colleagues had the power to grant permanent positions on college and university faculties, or not. Bell cautioned: "This fact translates into a not so subtle pressure to take positions in our writing that will not upset the mostly White faculty and college administration who hire and promote us. It goes without saying that those doing the selecting tend to be

attracted to minority candidates who appear as much like them as possible, and are most happy if the minority person's research and writing are comforting rather than confrontative," (Bell, 1998, p. 137). Bell urged: "not censorship, but restraint." (p. 138).

Contemporary race scholars complain that not much has changed. Racial work in the academy is risky, fraught with trial and the accompanying tribulations. Latino scholar, Roberto A. Ibarra (2000), argues: " it is difficult to achieve tenure it is even more difficult for faculty who are committed to research that is thought to be less mainstream, even marginal, within a demanding and intellectually rigorous discipline" (p. 212). Ibarra states that "research interests are geared to ethnicity, diversity, or gender issues what is accomplished is seen as somehow less worthy" (p. 212). He warns that for women and minorities, it is difficult to get strong letters of support for tenure from peers in their discipline because the work is still considered less rigorous, even though ethnic and gender research is much more difficult because it is marginalized in academia (p. 213). Because tenure is so tightly tied to publication, working in race or gender research presents huge obstacles in promotion and publishing. One Southwest college professor of color

states: "I don't think we are playing on a level playing field," (Ibarra, 2000, p. 213).

Seymore (2002, p. 214) calls the tenure process one of "sort" and "shoot." He argues threshold tenure reviews are "simply inspection systems designed to unearth deficiencies" and "eliminate people who are culturally different if they don't fit into the academy's definition of quality."

Fields (1996, p. 23) asserts that scholars of color habitually have their scholarship doubted whenever they raise non-conventional issues in the classroom that involve the under-represented, oppressed or minority groups. Fields (1996) also states that "African-American faculty whose scholarly interests' conflict with those of their White colleagues often face problems, particularly when it comes to tenure" (p.23).

Turner and Myers (2000) found that the African-American female faculty frequently fail to collect a permanent status, be promoted or sponsored by the academy. The researchers attribute this disappointment of the African-American female faculty to a number of reasons, the most apparent being: institutional circumstances that disregard and neglect minority faculty development, the lack of demystification of term and promotion procedures

and insufficient department mentoring curriculums. Patitu and Hinton (2004, p. 87) state that the African-American female faculty often encounter tenure difficulties because of "conflicting information, unwritten rules, lack of direction and mentoring, and nitpicking or triviality." This discriminatory scene plays out the same for Latina/os, Asian Americans, Native Americans, lesbians and gays.

Verdugo (2002) writes, that for the Hispanic faculty, the competing roles of professor and member of the Hispanic community often butt-heads at the intersection of "who they are and what they are about" (p. 69). Community activism is strong for the Hispanic professor. Many professors report that they feel pressure to "make good" for the whole community. They also feel that often, they singularly, represent their culture. In the game of higher education, many minorities feel they step up to the plate for their culture, make a home run for their race, and if they are lucky, when rounding third base, they just might achieve some degree of personal success. Garza (1998, 1999) warns [them], however, that community activism should be woven into the fabric of their scholarly work and to realize, that in doing so, they are jeopardizing their academic careers.

Most minorities complain about the difficulty of being in academia and a member of a minority community. Anatol (2002) an openly professed Caribbean-born lesbian, argues that all forms of identity are topics of intellectual and social relevance. She quotes Williams who posits:

Inherent in the idea of neutral, impersonal academic styles is the false assumption of no risk. "The personal has fallen into disrepute as sloppy because we have lost the courage and the vocabulary to describe it in the face of the enormous social pressure to keep it to ourselves - but this is where our most idealistic and our deadliest politics are lodged, and are revealed." (Anatol, 2002, p. 69).

Many minorities consider themselves as the Other. The Other is not part of the dominant White educational institution, where research is often done without a "lived, personal perspective" as a guide. The Other is the outsider whose scholarly work cannot exist without the lived experience inherent within the content. Karamcheti (1995), in *Reading the Body Indian: A Chicana Mestiza's Experience Teaching Literature*, states:

We are sometimes seen, it seems to me, as traveling icons of culture . . . We are flesh and blood information retrieval systems, native informants who demonstrate and act out difference, often with an imperfectly concealed political agenda . . . We are walking exemplars of ethnicity and of race. What we are not, however, is objective, impartial purveyors of truth (p.138).

Alridge (2001) writes that he often struggles with the issue of situating his self in his research and allowing his "Black voice" to be heard. He had been taught, however, that objectivity was most important in research. Placing his voice and his experience in his research was not a very smart move on the way to tenure because such personalized research was considered less academic, sloppy, or not research at all. Setting all this aside, Alridge (2001) presented a paper on the history of Black education at a conference. He was quickly taken to task for "taking advantage of my position as a Black man by using my Black voice to claim authority in studying my people" (Alridge, 2001, p. 197). bell hooks (1994) pleads the case for many scholars of color:

We are discouraged by the fabric of the academy and the institutions with which the academy intersects from naming the ways we are constructed as teachers by the racist, sexist, and ethnocentric society in which the classroom is steeped. We are disciplined in a multitude of ways to deny the existence of, internalize, and even legitimize the oppressive structures that surround us. We are supposed to pretend that the classroom is a neutral, safe space, and that we enter it as disembodied, neutral educators. (hooks, 1994, p 49).

A tenured Native American professor at a large public southwestern university voices his frustration at being an outsider at the predominantly White institution where he

teaches. He argues that his work on Native American issues is devalued because it is on tribal issues, and because he is Native American, it is not possible that he can produce "objective scientific research on his own people" (Moody, 2004, p. 35). He contends this backlash bleeds into publishing, arguing that mainstream journals resist publication of his work because they believe that scholarship on tribal issues should be done by "objective non-Indian" academics" (cited in Moody, 2004, p. 35).

Of course, this is not the situation for the White faculty. They are free to study and publish on any topic and their objectivity is never in question. Moody (2004, p.35) writes that dominant scholars are granted great latitude to study anything of interest and that they are presumed to be objective and competent. However, minorities are advised to resist doing "brown-on-brown" scholarship (studying and reporting on one's own culture) if they want their work taken seriously and published.

According to King (2005), how race research is carried out, what is being studied, and by who is a serious area of contention for faculty of color. Further, Turner and Taylor (2002, p. 5) argue that the significance of inherent prejudice cannot be under-estimated. "It is conceivable that research questions raised by White scholars might

differ markedly from those raised by scholars of color from the same discipline." Therefore, diversity amongst the faculty is essential in bringing variegated viewpoints to the research canons of the academy.

Farmer (1993) states that the absence of scholars of color has serious implications for the educational canon and power structures that subsist inside the academy. She argues:

Educational canon and power structure reflect a belief in the supremacy of Whites and males and, for this reason, the majority of those (Whites and males) who direct educational institutions find absolutely nothing amiss with things as they are. Students and scholars, constantly reminded of that to which they aspire, are forced to pay homage to the canon's gatekeepers, representatives and surrogates, and to duplicate as closely as possible the postures and thought processes of the mainstream(p. 200).

Baez (cited in Turner and Taylor, 2002) makes the case for further study into research protocol by stating that "many faculty of color engage in what can be called 'race work'; that is, research, service, and teaching that furthers social justice" (p. 5). According to Baez, the importance of race work is that it "not only alters what is said in the academy but also who is entitled to say it" (p. 5). As a result, race work tends to be a politically oriented and a personal act as well. Nevertheless, though many academic institutions frequently encourage race work

activities to enhance faculty diversity, Baez argues that most academies do not value it - and some of them may even harass or reprimand the scholars working on race research.

Baez also makes the case that "given the academy's place in society as the primary arbiter of what constitutes knowledge, race work alters what we can know about race and what we can do with that knowledge" (cited in Turner & Taylor, 2002, p.5). Baez believes that race work by scholars of color will help diversify the academy's curriculum by confronting the ideas of what subjects are valuable for study, and what comprises knowledge and understanding. A variety in the diversity of the academic faculty makes possible Racial Studies and Women Studies programs, thereby creating a raised consciousness of the concerns minority and faculty of color have concerning higher education.

Tierney (1997) suggests that it is past time to restructure our universities to become more responsive to the changing social, demographic, and political forces in contemporary America. He suggests a new model that includes collaboration, inclusive-ness, and community involvement and perhaps, most important, redefines the epistemology of faculty work in the context of academic culture change.

Summary

Much of the current literature concerning race scholarship and faculty of color in the academy focuses on issues related to affirmative action and hiring, tenure and promotion, or feelings of isolation, alienation, exclusion and devaluation. Presently, the literature clearly suggests that the scholarship of faculty of color is often devalued or subjugated by the dominating political force in play.

The studies discussed in this literature review reveal a number of factors that have influenced the experiences of faculty of color. Still, little research has been conducted and less is known about the perspectives and experiences of race scholars as it relates to the politics they encounter in terms of race and research in the academy. Most of the literature frames the challenges facing faculty in the academy or the politics of higher education as it relates to the issues of affirmative action, hiring, tenure, and promotion (James & Farmer, 1993; Allen, 1987). In contrast, this study fills a gap in the literature on faculty of color by focusing specifically on the politics of race, research, and risk encountered in the academy.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This study seeks to examine the politics of race, research and risk in the academy. The following questions are explored: What unique challenges do academic politics bring to these scholars? How does the political climate of the academy affect scholars of color who choose to research race-related social issues? Does race-related scholarship carry risks or threats? Do race scholars perceive their work as having risks? How do scholars of color "locate or position" themselves within a broad theoretical or ideological landscape? Where do scholars of color find support and validation within the academy? What advice or recommendations can be made for the support of emerging scholars of color involved in race-related scholarship? And ultimately, what does it mean to engage in a discourse of race issues within the academy?

This chapter is a description of how I conducted this study. Included are sections on narrative inquiry as methodology, sample selection, data collection, and data analysis.

Narrative Inquiry, Critical Storytelling, and Counterstorying

Narrative inquiry is a methodology that is widely used in interdisciplinary studies, such as psychology, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, history, sociology, ethnography, and anthropology. Narrative inquiry methodology is grounded in the assumption that the object of the study is the narrative itself. It is critical storytelling that conveys knowledge, shapes the meaning, and constructs identity. Denzin (2004) argues, "through our writing and speaking, we perform the worlds we study" (p. 215). Narrative inquiry methodology is an interpretive approach that is based on critical story-telling. According to Eisner (1991), storytelling can run on a continuum that ranges from the fictional truth (a novel) to the quantitatively described scientific experiment. All along the continuum lies the capacity to inform.

Critical race scholars (as well as fiction writers and various other kinds of storytellers) use the power of stories and persuasion to illustrate and critique the ways Americans typically see race. "Legal storytelling," observed Derek Bell (1990), is a method that can sometimes prove useful in bringing to light minority experience especially within the law.

One such example is Bell's (1990) fictional account, *The Chronicle of the Space Traders*; it is the story of extraterrestrials that came to the earth and offered to leave the United States with: enough gold to "bail out the almost bankrupt federal, state, and local governments," special chemicals to sanitize the now nearly uninhabitable planet," and a "totally safe nuclear engine with fuel to relieve the nation's swiftly diminishing fossil fuel resources." This was in exchange for the extraterrestrial visitors being allowed to "take back to their home star all African-Americans" (Bell, 1990, pp. 3-4). That is their one and only request; however, they did not say why they wanted all the African-Americans.

At first, the proposition was met with outrage and shock. Ever so gradually, however, enough official attitudes against the tradeoff softened so that, on the very last Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday ever to be celebrated in the United States. "At the traders' direction, the inductees [Black people] were stripped of all but a single undergarment. Heads bowed, arms linked by chains, Black people left the new world as their forbears had arrived" (Bell, 1990, p. 5). Using a fictional story, Bell illustrated a true, but very uncomfortable fact: even the most seemingly progressive attitudes about humanity and

race can be changed when a change in such attitudes offers sufficient reward to the majority. This story informs us of the human condition— good, bad, or indifferent. As discussed earlier, Bell believed that storytelling was an appropriate pedagogical method for presenting facts, questions, and dilemmas faced by people of color. "Subject matter in story form can gain and hold students' attention, and the very telling of a story evokes ideas and images about the subject matter that broaden and deepen the issues for discussion" (Jones, 2001, p. 51).

Dewey (1934) states that the most necessary ability of critical storytelling is the ability to produce an artistically crafted form that can convey meaning. In *Art as Experience* (1934, p 84), he writes:

The poetic as distinct from the prosaic,
aesthetic art as distinct from scientific,
expression as distinct from statement, does
something different from leading to an
experience. It constitutes one.

Stoddart (1991) suggests that the ability to construct conventional ethnographic essays is an essential ingredient for success in writing research. The ability to write is necessary for an accurate portrayal of the narration.

The Link Between Theory and Method

Charlotte Thralls argues that methodologies "circumscribe the kind of knowledge declared worthy of inquiry, the methodological procedures for conducting that inquiry, and the rhetorical strategies employed in published work" (Cross, Baker Graham, & Thralls, 1996, p. 105). As a methodology, it is represented by a narrative that constructs the meaning in a series of interpretive steps (Cross, Baker Graham, and Thralls, 1996, p. 105). Thus, narrative inquiry arises from narrative theory, ethnography, psychoanalysis, and modernist thinking (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003, p. 1).

Gulich and Quasthooff (1985, p.173) emphasize:

...how a storytelling situation is established, what sequential positions narratives have within the conversational framework, how narratives are elicited and possibly told one after the other, and how the narrator and listener negotiate for their roles.

Hence, narrative inquiry is based on storytelling as a complex verbal activity. Denzin (2004) states, this type of methodology has become an interpretive discipline that through the narrative, generalizes a social setting, a social group as its participants, and a social problem that can be interpreted from this group's narratives. (p. 215).

Narrative inquiry is multidisciplinary in its nature. For example, socio-linguistic studies use storytelling as the source of social constructions (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003, pp. 2-4). Denzin (1989) argues that the sociologist's task is to study "how each subject deals with the problem of coherence, illusion, presence, deep inner selves, others, gender, class, starting and ending points, epiphanies, fictions, truths, and final causes" (p. 83). All this is impossible without providing interpretive narrative techniques that find the implicit in explicit storytelling. The way an individual narrates and what structure he or she uses in their narrative becomes a source of multiple interpretations.

Narrative inquiry explores different aspects of human behavior: linearity of storytelling in surface structures, and hierarchical generalizations in macrostructures that help classify narrative techniques into groups and sets of human activity. Narratives represent diverse discourses that are specific to separate scientific disciplines, to a group of scientific disciplines, and to overall scientific research as an intellectual discourse based on shared philosophical assumptions adequate to the time of a told narrative.

The act of storytelling has a rich legacy and a continuing tradition in African-American, Chicana/o, Asian American, and American Indian communities, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) contends it is a powerful methodological and pedagogical tool. Within critical race theory, storytelling or counterstorying serves as both a pedagogical and methodological tool used to analyze and challenge the stories of those in power (Delgado, 1989). According to Delgado, the stories or counterstories of people of color often "counter" the majority story that is a natural part of the dominant discourse. Building on the work of Delgado (1989), some education scholars argue that these counterstories serve multiple methodological and pedagogical functions such as building community among those at the margins of society, putting a human and familiar face on educational theory and practice, and challenging perceived wisdom about the schooling of students of color (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001).

For instance, Delgado and Stephancic (2001) assert "critical race theorists have built upon everyday experiences with perspective, viewpoint, and the power of stories and persuasion to come to a better understanding of how African-American see race" (p. 38). How are

counterstories different from narratives? Counter-storytelling is an important tool in critical race scholarship for several reasons. Delgado and Stephancic (2001) argue that counterstories: 1) serve as a powerful function for minority communities by giving them a voice and revealing that others have had similar experiences; 2) can name injustice, and once named, can be contested; 3) once inscribed, can begin "a process of adjustment" (i.e. reforms or paradigm shifts) whereby the counterstories call attention to "neglected evidence;" and 4) are a "cure for silencing" (p. 43-44).

Many critical race theorists have studied narrative theory in order to understand how stories are constructed and why some stories are told while others are not. In fact, Soloranzo and Yosso (2001) argue, "while a narrative can support the majority story, a counter-narrative or counter-story, by its very nature, challenges the majority story" (p. 475). Delgado and Stephancic (2001) also point out that critical race theorists use counter-stories in legal discourse to "challenge, displace, or mock" the narratives about Black criminality often based upon "preconceptions and myths" (p. 42).

Observational Stance

Narrative inquiry as a qualitative research strategy has great potential. Various observational and evaluative positions are assumed in this study. Participant observation and a blending of several types of data collection, gathered by a process of observing, analyzing, and interpretation are used. According to Sevigny (1977, p.38) the role of participant observer stretches from "active" to "passive." Somewhere in the middle exists the participant-observer and this position allows the researcher to take an active part in the inquiry, allowing for a sense of the subjective nature of the experience. This type of observation is a multi-method, multi-person, multi-variable (Pohland, 1976, and multi-dimensional (Stokrocki, 1993) means of gathering information. On the one hand, a researcher studies participant narratives for the purposes of generalizations as schemes, frames or scripts that explain certain patterns of behavior and collective thinking. On the other hand, a researcher finds out that it is impossible to be isolated from these narratives in the process of interpreting them. Despite any honest attempt at objectivity, a researcher will interpret these narratives in a performative, pedagogical, and political way (Denzin, 2004, p. 215). In other words,

narrative inquiry is always pluralistic, for it explores the variety of narratives that may be interpreted from different narrative perspectives.

Data Collection Techniques

Unlike an objectivist narrative that collects and analyzes data oriented to giving an objective picture of the world, an interpretist narrative classifies the narrated phenomena as flexible data that can undergo further reconstructions and interpretations. In narrative inquiry, classifications are human constructs that reveal the researcher's worldviews, preferences, and attitudes (Cross, Baker Graham, & Thralls, 1996). In data collection techniques, narrative inquiry is "an instrument to construct and communicate meaning and impart knowledge" (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003, p. 1).

According to Creswell (1998), there are a number of procedures and techniques (e.g. observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials) that can be used in the narrative inquiry design. For this study, I used interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials.

First, I conducted three sets of interviews. I started with a set of open-ended interview questions to shape the semi-structured interview protocol. After the initial round

of interviews, I made adjustments to the interview protocol. Still, the semi-structured interview protocol remained flexible, allowing opportunities for the participant to lead the interview in unanticipated directions. To create a relaxed setting and to build rapport with each participant, I asked each to tell me about them.

The final interview questions covered a range of categories. These included: birth origin and family background, education, career and research, personal relationships, major life events, and closure questions.

All interviews were audio taped for transcription purposes. This method allowed me to be flexible and to modify questions or the sequence of questions when necessary. Prior to the interviews, participants were made aware of the purpose of the study, and that sessions would be taped. There were many follow-up emails and phone conversations. At the time of the interviews, I asked the participants to read and sign the required consent forms. (See Appendix B for the Consent Form.)

After completing the interviews, I conducted a follow-up with each participant via phone calls and/or emails in order to clarify some points. Regularly, I updated my field

notes to capture my initial thoughts and feelings about each of the interviews.

Documents and audiovisual materials served as secondary sources of data. I anticipated that documents such as participant electronic journals, scholarly papers, or personal notes might contribute information to the study. In addition, audiovisual materials, which included audiotape and videotape recordings, were collected. All audiotapes were destroyed after transcription.

I assured participants that all interviews would be strictly confidential. I used pseudonyms rather than the participants' names throughout this study. The findings were summarized and reported in-group form to ensure that individual participants were not identified.

Participant Selection Criteria

In qualitative research, according to Merriam (1998) sampling tends to be "small, non random, purposeful, and theoretical" (p. 9). Hence, for purposes of this study, I chose to focus on the cases of four race scholars. Participants were selected from personal acquaintances, professional associations, or through other sources. The criteria for selection included:

- 1) The participant was located in the field of

education.

- 2) The participant held a terminal degree.
- 3) The participant held a tenure-track faculty appointment.
- 4) The participant was a junior faculty member or newly tenured.
- 5) The participant held a faculty appointment at a research institution.
- 6) The participant self-identified race as their research agenda.
- 7) The participant self-identified as a scholar of color.

The following chapter presents the contextual biographies of the participants. Basic demographic information is detailed including age, ethnicity, education, profession, relationship status, and number of children (if any). The participants were interviewed between July 15, 2006 and July 15, 2007. Interviews ranged between fifty minutes and two hours. All participants were interviewed in person. In addition, there were a number of follow-up phone calls and emails for clarification and elaboration.

Data Analysis and Coding

Data analysis is the search for conceptual themes. Some are predetermined, some are dominant, and some emerge as the analysis takes place. According to Eisner (1991, p.33) "features that count do not wear labels on their sleeves; they do not announce themselves. Researchers must see what is to be seen, given some frame of reference and some set of intentions. It is not a matter of checking behaviors, but rather perceiving their presence and interpreting their significance. Narratives gathered by interviewing are analyzed as patterns and themes. Mitchell and Egudo (2003, p. 5) state, "narrative analysis can be used to record different viewpoints and interpret collected data to identify similarities and differences in experiences and actions."

Coding is the initial phase of data analysis, a process of categorizing and sorting data. Codes range from simple, concrete categories to more general, abstract conceptual categories in which emerging theories appear. After an initial "searching" phase, a more focused examination proves beneficial in building and clarifying categories. Charmaz (1983) believes that focused coding forces the researcher to develop categories, rather than just simply label topics.

Systematic Approach to Coding

1) Each participant interview was taped, transcribed, and analyzed. Participant responses to the interview protocol were closely examined. To ensure the accuracy of responses, transcripts were sent to each of the participants for his or her review.

2) Initially, responses were assigned within the broad categories of the study: race, research, and risks. Then, I looked for key words, phrases, and themes that helped me better recognize specific issues that were apparent or emerging. To assist me in my analysis, I developed a visual map of broad categories along with key words, phrases, and themes for more specific assignments. I solicited the help of a peer de-briefer to read the transcripts for confirmation of categories and themes.

3) At this stage, I began to critically analyze all the initial categories and collapsed these into fewer, more definitive categories. The final categories were matched against the questions I initially asked.

4) The conclusion of my data analysis culminated into dominant categories. The coding, analysis and interpretation of the data allowed for the construction of the narratives or counterstories of the participants. In the analysis phase, my intent was to describe the rich, yet

complicated lives of the scholars and to provide a meaningful discussion of the challenges they face in their academic work.

5) Final drafts were sent to each participant for member-checking (Merriam 2000). Additional steps, to ensure trustworthiness included continual review of findings and the interpretation of data.

Internal and External Assessment

Internal and external assessments consist of a system of checks and balances as initial assumptions change with new information and as viewpoints of the participants are clarified within an outside educational framework. Narratives contain multiple truths. Thus, issues of validity and reliability are important considerations. Merriam and Simpson (2000) delineate between two types of validity: internal and external. According to Merriam and Simpson (2000), the concern of the researcher is to follow strategies that ensure internal validity, then reliability, and then external validity. Merriam and Simpson (2000) contend that, "Internal validity asks the question . . . Are we observing or measuring what we think we are observing and measuring?" Reliability, according to Merriam and Simpson, asks if the "results are consistent with the

data collected" (pp. 101-102). Ensuring reliability offers trustworthiness and credibility to a study.

There are several strategies that researchers use to ensure trustworthiness, including member-checking and peer-debriefing. Triangulation is another important tool for establishing trustworthiness of this study. According to Creswell (1998), researchers should use multiple sources, methods, and theories in order to gain "corroborating evidence" (p. 202). Further, Creswell contends that by gaining evidence from different sources, this process can shed light on a particular theme or issue with integrity.

Similarly, the process of peer debriefing provides an opportunity for "an external check of the research process" (Creswell, 1998, p. 202). According to Lincoln and Guba (as cited in Creswell, 1998), peer debriefing "keeps the researcher honest" (p. 202). That is, the process facilitates the researcher asking "hard questions" about the research process, methods, interpretations, etc.

Summary

The preceding section provided an overview and rationale for the chosen methodology, methods and data collection techniques and, the systematic approach to coding and analysis. It also provided a rich discussion of

the link between narrative inquiry, critical storytelling, Critical Race Theory (CRT), and the concept of counterstory.

CHAPTER 4

Contextual Biographies

The following section provides a context for the life and work of each participant. Details of their ethnic backgrounds, family life, educational and professional experiences, and personal/work relationships provide a sense of knowing these participants. According to Larson (2006), biographies vary in focus, sometimes with a focus on actions or career trajectories, geographical movements from place to place, or personal relationships as an intellectual history of social networks. Each biography provides a contextual understanding of the academic decisions, experiences and challenges these participants faced as they developed their voice as scholars.

Each scholar in this study has pursued and articulated his or her work through the lens of CRT. Each has recognized and experienced the pervasive nature of racism; indeed, this has informed their crafting of a race research agenda. Each has worked with a mindset towards a White one-sided history that has produced a social construction of race and discrimination. Each is involved in race research

that challenges the dominate concepts of neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness and institutionalized meritocracy. Each challenges entrenched institutional policies that curb or silence the voices of the minority experience. Each recognizes the importance of the experiential knowledge of people of color and the contribution their communities make to the fabric of American society.

The names have been changed to provide anonymity, as have the educational institutions.

Lilly Lopez

Associate Professor at South University

Background

Lilly is a Mexican immigrant who grew up in the rural countryside of Mexico. Previous generations of family had acquired much land; however, over the years her mother and father lost most of it to the banks. As a result, the family migrated to the nearest city to find employment. While her father struggled in finding work, Lilly's mother served as the primary provider for the family. Ultimately, the struggle proved too much for her father and he abandoned the family, leaving the mother with five young children to rear. Lilly was still a young child at this time. Her mother

worked the late-night shift for a local hotel doing accounting bookkeeping. When she returned home in the early morning, she woke the children and readied them for school. Both Lilly and her older sister, Essa, attended a school for girls run by nuns. The nuns started the school to assist single working mothers. At school, girls were expected to learn the basics (reading, writing, and math) and were taught practical domestic skills, such as cooking and cleaning.

Lilly's mother and aunt encouraged both Lilly and Essa to pursue a formal education, although neither of them had received any formal instruction as they were growing up. Lilly recalls how important education was to them, particularly to her aunt. Lilly considered her aunt as her first teacher, remembering especially that she taught both girls at an early age that girls could do anything. Lilly was still in junior high school when Essa went to the university. Fortunately, Lilly was able to visit her older sister frequently at the campus. Lilly often reflected on how these visits were instrumental in her later development as a scholar and activist.

Lilly remembers the political climate of Mexico during the 1960s as greatly influenced by a social movement spurred on by poets and intellectuals who were questioning

the social order in Mexico. Lilly and Essa were involved in the social movement of the time through their affiliation with a student activist group called "the Anarchists." Using theatre and poetry as radical tools for social critique and dialogue, the Anarchists performed short skits, designed to draw attention to social issues and prompt conversations on campus about race and class. Like many student movements and political activist groups of the time, the Anarchists' rhetorical stance challenged normative notions of class and offered legitimacy to a burgeoning social and political movement. This was not unusual. Social movements seeking redress on many of society's entrenched customs were proliferating across the globe, each with their own particular style of operation. For instance, the Harlem Renaissance and Black Arts Movement utilized art and theatre as tools of resistance. Other movements used rebellious and illegal acts to draw attention to their agenda.

Lilly was especially influenced, at this time, by the work of Jose Vasconcelos, a nineteenth century Mexican philosopher. He authored *La Raza Cosmica*, a critically important treatise in which he wrote about Social Darwinism and the French colonization of Mexico. Vasconcelos and the

ideology of revolution he espoused resonated deeply with Lilly:

Vasconcelos and the ideology of the 1910 Mexican Revolution were both patriotic and radical. It was patriotic in that it was nationalistic, concerned with what was best for the country; yet radical, in that it was clearly committed to class struggle and challenging the elite.

Graduate Education

After graduating from university, Lilly continued her education with graduate studies in the United States. She chose to study philosophy, a discipline where there were few women. Upon receiving her doctorate, Lilly was offered a teaching position in the Southwestern region of the United States. She accepted the position. At this point in her life, decided to divorce her husband and leave her son with his father in Mexico. Lilly expressed regret about her decision. Although she felt it was the best decision for her son at the time, she admits that being absent from his daily life at that critical point in time left a strain on their relationship.

Junior Faculty Experience

After teaching several years in the Southwest, Lilly obtained a tenure track faculty position at a prestigious university in the Southeast. While a junior faculty member,

Lilly felt lonely and isolated the first few months. She had been assigned a faculty mentor, but had little interaction with him. Her difficulties were compounded by the fact that she was without an office space for several months. She asked her department chair about acquiring an office. His response was that office space was limited and that she would have to share space with a colleague. He advised that she should ask the faculty colleague herself. Uncomfortable with the suggested solution, Lilly used the department's mail-room as a makeshift office. Often, it was necessary for her to leave her personal items unprotected while she taught classes or met with students. Lilly described her experience in trying to find an office space:

When I arrived, I wasn't assigned an office. Instead my chair suggested contacting a senior faculty who was on sabbatical about using her office. I felt uncomfortable, but contacted the professor anyway. Not knowing my situation or me, she said no. So, when I would come to the department - I would end up storing my personal items in the mailroom and I would use a small table in the lobby of the main office to meet with the students following my classes. However, the office staff complained and I was told I had to stop holding meetings in the main office.

Lilly's experience of working without an office space is a challenge faced by many junior faculty. The lack of an academic home left Lilly feeling unsettled and undervalued. Not only did it impede her work as a professor, it affected

how she thought others perceived her value and authority. She felt that to be a professor without an office communicated to peers, students, and office staff that she was less valuable. She also felt that her "without an office" experience was a message of migrant transiency: she did not really belong and was out of place. Without an office, she had to carry her belongings with her at all times. She felt that her department chair chose not to provide an office for her to prepare lessons, meet with students or advisees, or carry out her research and writing. She felt that the absence of an office, a space that most faculty take for granted, was an example of racial subjugation. It communicated a lack of permanence and importance. Although the department staff complained on her behalf, the department chair did not acquire office space for her.

Her junior faculty experience left her feeling unwanted, unsupported, and on her own. Although she was the only woman of color, she was not the only scholar of color. However, she had little interaction with other scholars of color within the department. Later she would learn that a male scholar of color had had similar experiences.

Lilly is brown-skinned, her voice is soft, her Mexican accent is strong, and her stature is petite. All of her

person belies the expectant professor at a prestigious institution. However, her literary voice is strong and definitive. She writes with determination, about the challenges faced by scholars of color at predominantly White campuses in the United States. Much of her writing reflects her own experiences as a scholar of color:

I remember having a profound feeling of alienation. As a new junior faculty member, I was not prepared for what I encountered. Despite my years of experience teaching, I found my teaching abilities being questioned. After several student complaints, I was called to a meeting with my dean to discuss my teaching style. I felt humiliated.

Lilly's feelings of insecurity and alienation were continually present in her academic life as a new faculty member. Issues such as perceived value, questionable authority and lack of power were discriminatory and, she felt, existed purely because she was a Mexican immigrant and a woman. Both of these, she stated, carried the "stigma of a lack of intelligence and incapability." She felt that gender played a significant role in how she, as a Mexican immigrant woman, was received in the academy.

Gender expectation originated in her early childhood when cultural beliefs about the appropriate role and place for women were quietly embedded. Expectations were rooted in sexist views that women did domestic work, had children,

and cared for the family; the Mexican machismo culture did not see any value in educating women. Although her mother and aunt encouraged her and her sister to attend university, her brother held the traditional view of a woman's place. That was at home as a wife and mother. Lilly recalled conversations with her brother on the topic of college; his expectations were that she would pursue coursework in nursing, a more gender appropriate discipline. Philosophy, her choice of degreed study was considered masculine and therefore inappropriate.

The complexity of race was also a definitive issue for Lilly. She related that as a child, she was acutely aware that her skin was darker than her siblings. She recalled that she was often called "Darkie." She felt that her sister, Essa was fortunate because she was "the White one." Race awareness embedded itself early on and imprinted its stigmatic implications in her psyche. She explained that race in Latin America was a constant then and continues to be so now. Issues of gender followed close behind and together these inform her research agenda, which she admitted has been shaped by difficult educational experiences, social interactions, and the politics of gender and class. Although she resisted labeling her agenda as one solely of race, she did acknowledge that race is one

of the primary interconnected structures that support the ideologies of racism.

Lilly was clear in defining her research agenda as one of social justice, which encompasses race, ethnicity, class, gender, and other social issues. When asked to "locate or position" herself within a political, theoretical or ideological landscape (for example, conservative, neo-conservative, liberal, progressive, radical), she described herself as an anarchist radical educator concerned with social justice. She stated, "The tendency for power to rest with the elite requires brave scholars to challenge un-interrogated practices." Lilly also asserted that she was a poststructuralist as much of her work examines language and power. This philosophical stance determines that the study of any underlying structure is itself culturally conditioned and a myriad of biases and misinterpretations are nearly inherent. To understand the true (as is possible) meanings of language in text, it is necessary to study both the language/content of the text, and the systems of knowledge used to produce the text. In short, a poststructuralist studies how knowledge is produced. Lilly's research focuses specifically on the continuing regeneration of social

distinctions that include race, ethnicity, class and gender.

Reflecting upon her research, Lilly states that the focus of her work centers on the relationship between social justice and difference, especially race, ethnicity, class and gender.

I have sought to conduct interdisciplinary research that addresses pressing social and political questions, such as migration, inequality, discrimination, and the diversification of the faculty of higher education. I have also tried to be an engaged scholar by both learning from and sharing my expertise with grassroots organizations.

Her research on women of color in the academy is particularly noteworthy because it offers a different perspective on the issues of racial discrimination and biases and stereotypes in higher education. Lilly uses the power of language and narrative, filtered through a poststructuralist lens, to demark and describe the impact of race and gender on these scholars. Her present work centers on the pedagogical experiences of faculty women of color and literacy for Latina girls.

Although her research has made a significant contribution to understanding how both higher education and popular culture are simultaneously racialized, genderized, and classed in particular ways, her methods are often

criticized. Her critics note that her scholarship crisscrosses the traditional disciplinary boundaries between the humanities and the social sciences. However, this has been advantageous for the disciplines of education, media studies, and women studies.

And she is not without recognition. To date, she has earned a national and international reputation as a respected scholar. Reviews of her work have appeared in *Academe* and the *Journal of the American Association of University Professors*, as well as the *Peabody Journal of Education* (one of the leading journals in education) and *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (a British journal with wide international circulation). Several institutions have recognized her scholarship, and most importantly, have deemed her work worthy of funding. Her present academic institution has awarded her a semester of research leave and four summer research grants. She has also earned extramural funding from the Kaiser Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Lilly sees her work triangulated - teaching, research, and service as one. Connecting them has been a conscious choice, hard-earned. She would argue that her greatest contribution is how she approaches her subject matter:

Above all, I strived to achieve methodological innovation. My continual fascination with epistemological questions has influenced various methodological approaches that are uncommon in my line of research. My first book is among the very small number of ethnographic investigations of media-based development projects, while my anthology is a collection of auto ethnographies, and for my project with Latina girls, I relied on action-research.

Of late, Lilly's focus has shifted somewhat to take on an activist edge. She is troubled by the current contempt for Mexicans and especially aggrieved by the 2004 presidential campaign where the media focused on the problems of policing the United States and Mexico border and worse, negatively portrayed illegal aliens as hugely burdening the financial systems of the border states. Little mention was made of the many labor contributions Mexicans make to the prosperous economy of the United States. Since September 11th, 2001 (often referred to as 9/11), there have been major consequences for the Mexican immigrant communities. The use of ethnic and racial profiling is prolific along the border states and restrictions on citizenship and immigrants rights signal significant shifts of institutional change. All of this has Lilly deeply worried.

Currently, Lilly is a tenured associate professor at a prestigious Research I institution in the Southeast United

States. She has a new book forthcoming and she continues to work on race-related issues, with the goal of strengthening her relations with colleagues in Latin America and publishing more in her native Spanish. She has somewhat come full-circle.

Flora Franks

Full Professor at East Central University

Background

Flora Franks is a native of the West Indies and an immigrant. Her family was well respected and established. Her father held an important job with the government and her mother was an educator. Flora is articulate, colorful, and the owner of a rather fascinating childhood, best told in her own words:

I came here already a product of the Black National Movement in West Indies in which my brother and sister were very, very involved as high school students and were thrown out of high school because of their militant activities. I mean they were organizers; they were protestors against the government and the colonial education that we were being served. They were in the forefront of demanding that we read authors of West Indies heritage, Caribbean heritage, and Black heritage as a counter to the Eurocentric education. These were my siblings. So my brother and sister, my brother was six years older than me, my sister was three years older than me. And that experience had a tremendous impact on me. So when I came to the United States, I was already conscious of being part of the African Diaspora.

Through her teenage years, Flora enjoyed a flourishing career in the performing arts. She began as a professional dancer, but ultimately became enamored with drama and the fascinating aspects of storytelling. She has performed on stage and television as both a dancer and actress since the age of ten. When she was twenty-three, Flora traveled to the United States to pursue acting and fortuitously began her formal training at the Conservatory of the Arts theatrical program. After earning her B.F.A., she continued her education at Regal University, completing a doctorate in literacy education. She explained:

I needed to find out what Black American meant. I was Black, but not Black American. So, what did Black American mean? And so I began my journey finding out what it meant to be a Black American. . . I entered the American Diaspora, the Black Diaspora. By choice.

Graduate Education

Flora acknowledged that deciding to pursue a doctorate was not without its challenges. Her advantage was that she was clear on what she wanted to do. She knew she wanted her work to be a community-based approach to literacy education. She recalled entering her program and articulating this vision. She was quickly informed that the program had no connections in the local community. So while still a doctoral student, Flora decided to make her own

connections and find her own mentors. She was successful in this endeavor, finding a woman who served as the director of a community-based initiative at a local college. However, even with an entry into the community, Flora still faced considerable difficulty trying to do community race work while she was associated with the academy. She explained her difficulties as stemming from "guilt by association." The race scholar's affiliation with a White institution can work against the researcher." I feel that it worked against me. It was not useful in gaining entry into the community." In fact, she felt that it was a hindrance because it set-up a Black/White separation of a mutual cause.

Flora's experiences during her graduate work further informed her research agenda as a race scholar.

In graduate school, when I was learning to be a researcher, one of the projects I worked on was about the experiences of non-White students in a White academic environment. We sat around with a videotape running, just as we are now, and taped our conversations about our experiences coming into the academy, and coming to realize the academy is Eurocentric, that our voices were in the margins - if at all represented. Then we countered the mainstream ideology and investigated the philosophy underlying the kinds of research methods we were studying. We were rebellious. At worst, one of my colleagues was accused of practicing guerrilla warfare, like he was an anarchist because he spoke out and said, "All this theory is from a Eurocentric perspective. Where are writers from the other

cultures? Who talks about documenting issues in their communities and trying to speak from the voice of the community?" Not from the outsider, who is Eurocentric and coming in with their lens on community experience. So, that was an important project for me. It informed the work I continue to do, documenting the lives of Black women in their pursuit of higher education.

Junior Faculty Experience

After finishing her doctorate, Flora obtained a position at a large urban public institution, Metro University. There she served jointly as an assistant professor and administrator for the college adult literacy program. The university was located in the heart of a large metropolitan setting; yet, the College of Education had very few ties to the local community. This was surprising as she chose such an institution and location because she felt they would ensure community involvement. Even more surprising were the negative attitudes and blatant biases that floated in faculty meetings:

All discussions of Black children and the achievement gaps in local school performance reports centered on the "deficit model," that is, failure as a normative construct.

Flora found the dominant perspective troubling as her vision and research focused instead on describing success. She sadly concluded that within the academy, failure was more of a topic than success.

Flora was also surprised at the overall experience of her faculty position. As a newly hired junior faculty member, she was a "grunt" - just a rung above doctoral students. She was expected to cover classes, advise students, and serve on committees, all the while continuing her work both in and outside of the academy. The demanding schedule left little energy for her to pursue publishing. In a sentence, her opinion of her academic position was: "Pressure came with the territory."

Although her faculty position left something to be desired, Flora filled the void by studying influential writers, writers of color who spoke of experiences that she, Flora, had not yet articulated.

I remember very clearly how delighted I was when I came upon Lisa Delpit's work. Through studying her, I came upon the silence dialogue. Oh, it just lit up my mind. It just gave me words, words, words. Even though I was already employed as an assistant professor, I had not been exposed to that literature. I did research about Black education on my own, but to come to a Black writer whose world is peopled by Black writers and who comes from a tradition of Black education and Black writing. That was my postdoc.

Flora's program was discontinued after the director of her administrative office retired. She felt that she was then left with only one option: to go full-time into an academic department. Flora stated that she did not feel "at home" with this option and that, given her background, the

position would not be a good fit. Moreover, she would have been responsible for teaching classes outside of her expertise and training. It was a relatively easy decision for Flora to re-enter the academic job market. She soon left Metro University for a new position at a large, public institution in the central region of the United States.

Flora's research describes and details the ways in which Black women are situated at the intersections of race, economic class, and age, and also how their positions affect their ability to successfully pursue higher education. She has successfully created spaces or counterspaces where disenfranchised women are valued, where they can meet and be part of communities where learning is not an end in itself, but an entry point to establishing supportive and caring networks with other women. These spaces are created through the act of story-telling. Women tell their stories via interviews and group work. It is through this process, Flora asserts, that Black women begin to see themselves in a different light. Changing their perspective, empowering them to seize new opportunities and create new meanings with those opportunities is an important objective of Flora's work. The personal drama of empowerment that emerges when a Black woman hears about the Black experience through a Black voice is what Flora so

stridently works to create; the same kind of personal empowerment she experienced through the writings of Lisa Delpit's (1995) *Other People's Children*.

Flora's growing body of research provides an historical overview of the development of African-American female education, focusing most specifically on the problems of Black female education within the educational system of the United States. She has opted to bypass the traditional approach to the problem of racial discrimination within higher education and instead asks the deeper questions concerning the biases of gender and class toward poor Black women.

Flora positions herself both as an Afro-centric and critical race theory scholar. Her work focuses specifically on the intersections of race, gender, and class in examining the continuing biased attitudes that persist towards African-American female students. Flora believes that existing gender stereotypes considerably enforce biased attitudes and racial stereotypes. The power of storytelling, Flora argues, cannot be overestimated. As she documents and shares the narrative experiences of African-American female students plugging their way through a biased and discriminatory system, she creates a kaleidoscope of perspectives on a variegated educational

landscape. These narrative experiences provide psychological opportunities for Black women to construct new meanings for the circumstances of their educational lives.

Flora looks back through history to delineate the ways in which past struggles of literacy attainment still influence the current struggles. Her essays address issues such as neutrality, objectivity, and color-blindness as they reflect the experiences of the African-American female in route to higher education. She argues that many of the restraining issues faced in the past (academic and familial) still remain problematic for the African-American female student of today. For this reason, Flora's focus on privileging the current voices of Black female students is especially important in understanding what biases continue and why they continue. Often, these voices speak of overcoming, not only the limited views of educators, but also those of their relatives and friends who remain comfortable in the traditional status quo.

To complete a triangulated viewpoint, Flora also incorporates narratives written by White educators who describe their experiences of teaching and interacting with African-American women. These narratives speak candidly to the inherent problem of racism, racial discrimination, and

biased attitudes of educators towards Black women. Many times, White educators acknowledge their practice of color-blindness and biased attitudes. This is one-half the crux of Flora's work, getting educators to acknowledge and understand the risk of being influenced by the existing racial stereotypes concerning the potential and academic abilities of African-American women.

Today, Flora has achieved full professor, published five books, and continues to teach literacy education. Her research agenda continues to focus on Black women and their pursuit of higher education. She believes that these women live invisible lives academically, overlooked and ignored by the larger intellectual and academic community.

As a professional writer, Flora has found her voice and her home here in the United States.

This is interesting because I was raised as a performing artist and for the longest time, I thought I would be a professional dancer . . . a professional actor. But I never felt at home until I became a writer. A professional writer. If you started counting from sixteen, when I got my first acting gig...then you will have counted a journey of thirty years. Still, the last five years, is the first time I felt I've arrived. This is home. This is what I do. This is my voice.

Charles Chavez

Associate Professor at Banner University

Background

Charles was born in Puerto Rico to an abusive father and a responsible, hard-working mother. According to his autobiography, in the early 1970s, his mother left her abusive husband and moved herself and her four boys to New York City. At first, the family lived with her sister, her sister's husband and their seven children. Although she was a licensed nurse in Puerto Rico, she was unable to continue such work as she spoke very little English. Instead, she worked as a cleaning lady in downtown. It was the only job she was offered. Soon, she had saved enough money to move the family into their own apartment in the city. Charles respected his mother because she had the guts to leave her abusive husband and strike out on her own, with four young boys in tow, all the while speaking very little English. He reflected on his mother and how she shaped his critical thinking about race, cultural identity and language:

She spoke little English, my mother. Actually, she spoke little "proper" English, but in fact, she communicated effectively in English. She had a very thick accent and was always uncomfortable with English, but she spoke it well enough to come to North City, get a job, raise four boys, and negotiate the oppressive institutions that subjugate and humiliate the poor. This she did by herself. Yet, she never considered herself

bilingual. She always, until she died in 1995, claimed she was "Puerto Rican" when asked why she did not learn better English. This is important, this claim, because for her, speaking better English and being Puerto Rican somehow were polar choices. I think she might have been correct.

Charles grew into believing that the acquisition of English, which made all things possible in America, came at the expense of one's native language:

My experiences in this regard are not unique. Many Latinos and Latinas experience similar loss. Yet, my sense of loss is compounded by my inability to reconnect in any significant way with my past. I still know Spanish. I label myself Puerto Rican. My scholarship almost always centers on race and ethnicity. But I'm not the same; that is, I'm not the same Puerto Rican I think I once was. When I learned English, I forgot a large part of myself.

Charles also experienced the immigrant feeling of alien-ness and the assignation of "other." He believed this labeling was tied specifically to language and its accompanying accent. Charles recalled his early schooling experience when he first came to the United States, when he "was not yet American":

I remember that first day of school. I was not able to understand a word of what was being said. I sat in the front, crying profusely. My teacher came to me often and said she would help me. She spoke Spanish to me. She was from a Spanish-speaking country, or more precisely, she could claim ancestry there. The children laughed at me; they too helped me learn to forget, by making me feel alien. My teacher offered to help me after school. She helped me with the lessons, and she told me to practice English every day. She told

me that at every chance, I had to learn English. She encouraged me to watch English television, speak to my family in English, and read English books. I had to speak in English at every opportunity, including with her. This, of course, was good advice.

To learn a new language, one has to live it; one has to learn its sights and sounds, its practices and norms. To live here successfully, one has to learn English, "proper" English, that is. To learn English requires forgetting Spanish and all the sights and sounds associated with it. Anyway, for me that was the case.

This sense of trauma and loss was not apparent to Charles or his mother at that time. She pushed him and his brothers to learn English (the language of power) and pursue advanced education. In his autobiography, he reflects upon his mother:

She believed and constantly reinforced to them that in a country that finds multiple reasons to exclude them, such as their dark skin and accents or their inner city education . . . education and good English were critical to becoming American. She encouraged us to learn because it was crucial to our success.

As a result of the encouragement and support of his mother, Charles completed his undergraduate degree and attended law school at Stellar University, in upstate New York.

Graduate Education

After earning his law degree, Charles worked for several years in higher education. He became interested in

law and policy and how those impacted race issues like affirmative action, hate speech, and tenure for professors of color. This political mind-set propelled him to a PhD in higher education at Stellar University, a liberal arts institution with a tradition of educating for social responsibility and civic engagement. It was here that progressive thought shaped his thinking and worldview. He became "much more radical":

Stellar has a strong tradition of social activism and student-led protest movements. I think it was instrumental in my development. It was a place where questioning was not prohibited; in fact, it was required.

Junior Faculty Experience

With doctorate in hand, Charles wanted to pursue a faculty appointment, but he was not sure what type of institution would best suit his career goals. He considered many different options and applied to a variety of institutions; however, positions were scarce. He received only one job offer; that was from Urban University, a large public institution in an urban setting. Although neither the institution nor the position was exactly what he had in mind, he soon realized it was a very beneficial match.

Urban was the one offer I got. Otherwise, I was going to do a post-doc at Columbia. But you know it turns out that Urban was a good move for me

because there were a lot of really smart people there at the time. I'd never been around such smart, critical people. So I went to Urban and I didn't know what I was doing. It was a tough time getting used to all these people. I really felt inadequate as a scholar. I felt like I didn't know what I was doing. Here I was, a Puerto Rican man, and the only Latino in the department. I felt like everyone, all White scholars, around me knew more. They were reading authors and material I had not been exposed to in my doctoral program. And when I picked up the same scholarly material that they were reading, I felt like I didn't know how to read it critically.

Determined to use the experience to his advantage, Charles studied to expand his literary knowledge and hone his critical and analytical skills.

I decided that my first year I was just going to read, so I didn't really do anything else. I didn't try to write much. When I went to Urban, I wanted to do two things. I wanted to write about this tenure issue, but I also wanted to do much more legal stuff in education work, legal education, and legal issues in education.

Charles became more interested in asking questions about processes rather than end-product. His focus became "asking a different kind of question." However, at this juncture, he felt didn't know how to think those kinds of questions. Several faculty members influenced both his thinking and writing because it seemed to him that they asked the deeper, more important questions about racial issues, and more specifically about the tenure process.

Two young faculty members, Darryl and Sarah, really influenced my thinking, and subsequently,

my writing. Darryl was a philosopher writing on commercialization in education and Sarah was a post-structural feminist writing on sexuality in the academy. I had never about race or racism with colleagues. Though challenging, my conversations with Darryl and Sarah exposed more interesting ways to interrogate race. For example, they would caution against the argument that the tenure process is racist. Instead, they would argue to pose a deeper question such as, how is the tenure process racialized? That is, can one identify aspects of the tenure process where only certain kinds of people or certain kinds of research are adversely affected? What do the people or research have in common?

Charles stated that this early phase of his career was pivotal in shaping his research agenda and his voice as a scholar. He attributed the space he was given as a newly hired junior faculty member as pivotal because he had "time to read, to think, and to question." As a result, he was able to clarify his intentions for doing race work:

So in terms of my research, I found that I was doing more traditional race work, the type of research expected of faculty color. I recognize, it's easier to publish doing that work than asking the deeper questions about racialized discourses and how we inscribe them. For instance, when we argue for relieving faculty of color engaged in service so they can focus more on their publications, we don't realize it but we are actually re-inscribing racism and racialized thinking and racist attitudes that wind up hurting the person of color. The irony is that the act of engaging in service can expose racial uplift issues that race research often tries to address. So, my first year, I went back to re-read my research asking different questions that I think were more interesting.

To me, the best race research is not the one that talks simply about the African-American experience. The best research takes the obvious and situates actual experiences within it. That's a more interesting position.

While Charles was at Urban University, the department faculty became embroiled in a hotly contested struggle over the search for a new department chair. The faculty became divided along ideological lines, and Charles, along with his mentors, found themselves estranged from the majority faculty who supported a particular candidate. The struggle became personally bitter and Charles felt that the environment which once offered freedom and space became infused with departmental politics and posturing. After a failed search, the faculty selected an interim chair from within the faculty. For Charles, however, the environment had forever changed and he decided to leave. He explained:

I lost the sense of possibility there. I had great connections and colleagues, but they were not enough to outweigh everything else. So, I found myself not moving anywhere there and I felt like I had to move. So I sacrificed and I knew why. I sacrificed intellectual engagement for personal engagement. I wanted to come to a place where people were just nicer to each other.

Charles joined the faculty at Banner University where he is now an associate professor in educational policy studies. He is a prolific writer and has written several books on hate speech, tenure and affirmative action policy,

and also essays on the struggle for social equality and racial justice. He steps beyond the role of writer and critic and steps up to adjudicate the issues of race in the academic system. He does not simply criticize the existing educational system; he analyzes numerous legal cases in which racial issues are examined and judges the extent to which the existing higher education system is unjust and biased. He argues that White students have substantially more opportunities compared to non-White students and concludes that the existing laws and policies for affirmative action do not contribute to the inclusion of ethnic minorities and African-American students into higher education. He argues that the low economic position of many African-American students and non-White minorities is one of the major reasons for the biased attitudes of many educators. Consequently, Charles argues, educators have lower expectations for African-American and non-White minority students.

Perhaps it is his tenacious examination and scholarly adjudication of affirmative action law that is his most significant contribution to CRT. It is significant because it rests on the foundation of "language as power." Charles argues that the federal and state courts use very specific language to represent racial discrimination in neutral

terms. Legal language is one that "ensures subordination" and the courts, in turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to the lack of education opportunities for students of color, effectively "enact their own form of violence against racial minorities."

In the last few years, Charles has experienced tumultuous personal challenges, including the trauma of his young son's illness, the dissolution of his marriage, and the difficult decision to "come out" as a gay man in the academy. Coming out has been one of the most difficult decisions of his life—in part, because of his two young children.

The process required him to think critically about the practice of masculinity, in society and within the academy. He also had to consider what it meant for his research agenda and for him, as a Latino man coming from a machismo culture. Coming out in the academy forced him to think about the complexities of identity in the intersections of race, gender and sexuality. He reflected on the social nuances he experienced:

I recall thinking of the people who would always bring up their wives in conversations, constantly. Colleagues, who would, without thinking twice, discuss their husbands and their children, or they would pass around pictures of their kids. (I do have pictures of my kids if somebody asks.) It is the taken-for-granted

practice of heterosexuality. The practice extends to professional conferences where colleagues bring their kids to these conferences.

Similarly, heterosexuality plays out in the practice of talking about marriage, bachelor parties or bridal showers. Yet, I'm not allowed as a gay man to do that. And, because I'm not permitted, I am hyper-aware of the intersections of multiple or competing identities.

Charles acknowledges but dislikes the social conventions of familial conversations within his work environment. After all his struggles to become educated and accepted into mainstream academia, he finds himself once again, cast as "the Other." In the new arena as an out gay man, he finds that his voice no longer holds the same place in familial conversation. It does not seem to matter that he has a loving partner or is still the father of two children. The power of language, it seems, continues to be the cornerstone of Charles' life journey.

Willa Williams

Associate Professor at Midwest University

Background

Willa Williams is an African-American woman and an assistant professor of educational leadership, administration, and foundations at Midwest University. She holds a Masters and Ph.D. in higher education from the

University of Centerville and a Bachelor of Arts degree from Gulf State University. Her research interests include studying the experiences of African-Americans and women in higher education, multicultural identity and sexual orientation, and institutional support of community-based programs.

Willa grew up in Centerville, Indiana, with her parents and sister, Camille. Her mother and father were very involved in church activity: her mother a deaconess and her father a deacon. Her father also sang locally and sometimes regionally at gospel concerts and revivals. Their family home was one committed to God. Willa and Camille were also "blessed with the gift of music and song;" both sisters sang in the church's gospel choir and were active in youth activities.

In interviews, Willa reflected on her parents, the strong Christian values they instilled in her, and how the family's involvement in the church shaped her thinking about race. Her long-time pastor also heavily influenced her idea of Black expression.

Christianity is so embedded in who I am. I try hard to not let it limit my thinking. Christianity is definitely my point of reference. I attribute that to how I was raised and growing up in the Black church. My parents always emphasized self-determination; we could do anything we put our minds to, so quitting was

never an option. They also taught us the importance of service to the Black masses, to uplift our people.

Black religious expression is powerful, provocative, and deeply emotional. My pastor, somewhat sexist and homophobic, but intellectual man, he valued education. I appreciated how he situated his sermons, just as I approach my classroom lectures or how I situate issues within my research.

And that is to cast race issues using a "racial uplift framework." Willa stated, "I see education as a tool for racial uplift for the Black community, for Black students, and in Black women's lives."

Willa attended a historically Black college in a major city in the Gulf of Mexico region of the United States. "There," Willa said of her undergraduate work, "I found an environment that nurtured and empowered me to succeed." Her carefully chosen undergraduate institution emphasized Christian values, leadership, and public service as ways to solve the problems that face the Black community.

Graduate Education

Unfortunately, Willa's graduate educational experience was neither nurturing nor empowering; it was much the opposite. After completing her master's program and ready to apply for the doctoral program, she turned to the

department chair for advisement and was unprepared for his lack of commitment to her or her educational goals.

I thought, you know, I've gotten pretty good grades in his class. So I went to him and said, "I'm thinking about applying for the Ph.D. program and I'd like your support." He replied, "I never would have thought you'd want to consider a Ph.D. I always thought you were just really ready to get back in the job market and do your thing." I said, "Yeah. But, you know, I've thought about it and I'm getting older." He replied: "Well, there's nothing I can say about you. You weren't a star in my class by any means."

To her surprise, Willa was accepted into the doctoral program. Once in the program, she found support lacking from her dissertation chair who was not extremely interested in her research on African-American women.

My dissertation committee chair was not very helpful to me. She was Latino and she was interested in quantitative stuff and Latino stuff. But she took me on because she knew I didn't have anybody else and she probably needed me for her dossier as much as I needed her. So, this woman, Melinda . . . I went and met with her, talked with her, told her about my research and she said, "You know what, I'd be willing to read whatever you have."

I entered my doctoral program immediately after earning a Master's Degree; however, it was without the blessing of the department faculty. The program chair made the decision to override the rest of the faculty's no votes and granted me admittance. From that point forward, I was left to navigate the process solo. As I proceeded to the dissertation stage, a Hispanic junior faculty member agreed to be my chair. She was in the process of tenure and promotion review as I was writing my dissertation. The outcome of her

review was not good. She was not granted tenure, which meant that I needed to quickly get my research completed and the dissertation done.

I did finish the dissertation and graduated with Ph.D. in hand, but with no job prospects in sight. The problem was that I had not been mentored to understand the process of career development, in order to be prepared for work in the academy. Most members of my cohort were busy presenting at national conferences and working as research assistants during our time of matriculation. Meanwhile, I worked at the Gap, drove a limousine and was a grader for a faculty member at another college. As a first-generation college-educated-bachelors, masters, and Ph.D. degreed woman— I had absolutely no clue about how to navigate the world of academia.

Willa's early research interests, including race research, started rather unexpectedly.

I came across a little monograph and it was on African-American women administrators. It was a quantitative piece and it sort of was the anchor of my early research. I always found a way to talk about Black people, so I started reading a lot of history and looking at people like Mary McCloud Bethune, Lucy Laney and Charlotte Hawkins Browne, and Anna Julia Anna Cooper and some of those early Black educators. It made me think about how long people have been fighting for education and it being really a mechanism for race and racial uplift.

Much of Willa's work is framed in religious scripture. Christianity is vividly apparent in her writing and embedded in who she is. Yet, there seems to be a slight thread of uneasy tension that weaves between her Christian beliefs and values and the race research she conducts.

Junior Faculty Experience

Willa positions herself as a radical Black feminist CRT scholar, influenced by the writings of Mary McCloud Bethune, Jean Noble, Patricia Hill Collins, Annette Rusher, Yolanda Moses, and Paula Giddings. She was also significantly influenced by the writings of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; his writings, framed and grounded in scripture and proverb, reflects Willa's own voice and writing style. The Christian perspective shaped her thinking so that race became further defined by a historical understanding of race, church, and racial uplift.

I've looked at [King's work] in terms of race and race consciousness and WEB Dubois, and Carter G. Woodson's *Mis-Education of the Negro*. That was a big influence for me. I always read about and wrote papers about Black people for whatever spectrum, whatever the class assignment. I always found a way to talk about Black people, so I started reading a lot of history and looking at people like Mary McCloud Bethune (race vindication and the historical significance of women's organizations aimed at anti-slavery and women's suffrage). Others who have influenced my work are Lucy Laney and Charlotte Hawkins Browne and Anna Julia Cooper and some of those early educators. It was just fascinating to me because I wasn't what I considered an educator or even interested in education as a profession and then I thought about how long people have been fighting for education and that it was really a mechanism for race and racial uplift.

Currently, according to Willa, her research serves as "a form of protest and public demonstration." In her latest work, she challenges the dominant claims of neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness, and notions of meritocracy by examining how the issues of White privilege, racism, and sexism impact the educational opportunities for the diverse populations of college students today. In addition, she examines how affirmative action, tenure policies, and institutional practices contribute to challenges faced by faculty of color.

Willa's research connects a historical and cultural context to current issues facing college students by examining anti-discrimination policies such as Title IX. She explores the contradictions inherent in predominantly White institutions which enact policies that empower marginalized populations. These include competing interests among diverse populations, incongruence in institutional practices and traditions, and/or the political climates and trends that impact policies and practices.

Willa embraces an interdisciplinary approach to her examination of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. She draws from gender literature in higher education and Black studies.

Most importantly, she attempts to cross epistemological and methodological boundaries. Her latest book, a collection of case studies that reflect a wide range of experiences and perspectives, draws from identity theories, critical race theory, and organizational theory. She effectively pushes boundaries by using different methodologies, including counterstories, case studies, and ethnography.

Willa acknowledges that top journals in the field of education are not actively seeking articles concerning the race research issues she writes about:

I don't think the journals are seeking research writing concerning my interest. I think they publish them sporadically to say that they do publish them. I wanted to just get one published, just to say it's one of the things I have done and check it off my list.

I think I need to publish in one of those journals, just so White folks will read it, because they are not going to pick up the Journal of Negro Education. They're not going to read it. White folks are not going to read what's in *Minority Education*. That's why I felt free to write what I wanted to write. Midwest University professors are never going to pick up that journal to read.

Willa states that for her, and many others, writing is especially radical and revolutionary:

Look at how Cornell West writes and how Angela Davis used to write and a lot of those people who we think are prolific and profane in the way they get attention. They get called in for lectures

because they think radically and in a revolutionary way. I don't know that I'd get to that level, but I do want to. I am radical. I've always been radical and I will revolt against the status quo. I've always been like that.

Summary

This chapter captures the personal and professional experiences that have helped to shape and inform the work of the scholars in this study. Each narrative examines, with rich, thick description, the educational, familial, and personal relationships that influence them. Further, each scholar in this study has pursued and articulated his or her work through the lens of CRT. Each has recognized and experienced the pervasive nature of racism; indeed, this has informed their crafting of a race research agenda. Each has worked with a mindset towards a White one-sided history that has produced a social construction of race and discrimination. Each biography provides a contextual understanding of the academic decisions, experiences and challenges these participants faced as they developed their voice as scholars.

CHAPTER 5

Findings

The purpose of this study was to interrogate the politics of race as it relates to the political, theoretical and ideological positions of the race scholar as he or she pursues research that examines racial issues which run counter to the entrenched ideas, values and philosophies of mainstream culture.

The process for generating these findings involved a comparative analysis of data collected from participants in the field and external literature of the discipline. The resulting comparison supported the following findings:

- 1) All the race scholars in this study were affected negatively by politics through which blatant and subtle forms of discrimination—racial subjugations and micro—aggressions—were part of a daily existence.
- 2) The participants experienced a variety of challenges as a consequence of their race research agendas or witness the costs for fellow scholars—for example, mentoring and publishing opportunities were non-

existent, cautiously-given, or blatantly withheld.

Tenure was also often threatened or gained at great personal costs.

- 3) The participants identified themselves as radical, anarchist or progressive. They located themselves within a critical paradigm (e.g. critical race, post-structural, feminist, and/or Afro-centric). Although their experiences were different, each participant perceived research on racial or social justice issues risky and their experience suggested that doing race work came with the potential risks of racial subjugation or micro-aggressions.
- 4) The participants' perspectives differed on the perception of risk, although each confirmed the potential risks of racial subjugation and micro-aggressions in doing race work. The participants also identified risks relating to their academic presence and their race-related scholarship. Some were anticipated (lack of opportunity or support); while others (loss of status, prestige, or personal relationships) were not.
- 5) Counterstorying and critical storytelling were evidenced as an important methodological tool used by participants. These scholars often used critical

stories and autobiographical experiences to infuse their research with reliability, trustworthiness, and a sense of communal "everyday-ness."

- 6) Most significant, innovative ways in which race scholars created counterspaces within the academy were revealed. Some of these included web-based capabilities like the development of electronic journals or participation in academic blogging, or the use of social networking websites such as *MySpace* or *Facebook* to construct communities of scholars.

Also of importance, each scholar had advice for the next generation of graduate students and emerging scholars on doing race or social justice work in the academy. In the following section, the major themes and interpretations suggested by the personal narratives and counterstories of each participant are discussed.

Discussion and In-depth Interpretation

Challenges for Race Scholars

What unique challenges did the participant scholars face because of academic politics? All participants stated that there were unique challenges for scholars of color, whether domestic or International, within the academy. The challenges identified ranged from those of a professional nature: choosing a research agenda, the devaluation of scholarship, the label of "other", lack of mentoring and support, lack of resources or funding for research, lack of publishing opportunities, loss of status or prestige, denial of tenure or fear of termination; to those of a more personal nature: isolation, hostile environment, loss of language and/or culture, fractured relationships, stress and/or health related strains.

The Race Scholar as Intellectual

William James wrote a letter in 1899 and in this letter, he introduced the term "intellectual" to America. He also set the moral obligation for such to stand outside their cultural constructions and maintain a critical conscience for reasoning.

We "intellectuals" in America must all work to keep our precious birthright of individualism . . . Every great institution is perforce a means of

corruption? Whatever good it may also do. Only in free personal relation is full identity to be found. (*Letters of William James*, 1899, pp. 102-103).

Keller (2002) argues that until recently, intellectuals were not the same as academics and vice versa. Academics are ensconced in some type of educational institution where their duties are largely uncoded, where they are expected to teach, do scholarly studies, research, publish, and serve their community and nation (paraphrased from "Academic Duty: The Role of the Intellectual", Keller, 2002, para.6) He states of the intellectual:

Their allegiance is to exposing hypocrisy, error, and shame, to uncovering deep currents and truths, and to raising the quality of life, thinking and justice in their time, not to specific institutions, groups, or causes.

A notable characteristic of intellectuals, deriving from their desire to help shape a culture, is that they write quite a lot. They write to be read.

Academics have different aims, different concerns and different modes. They may be fine thinkers, but they prefer to be deep specialists or experts in one area of knowledge. The chief concern of many academics is to be highly regarded in their discipline.

And so it is with the participants of this study. They are intellectuals, academicians, and writers. They research to write and they write to be read. They want to make a

difference for themselves, their communities, and their cultures.

Baez (cited in Turner and Taylor, 2002) states that many faculty of color choose to do race research because it impacts changes in social justice. According to Baez, engaging in a discourse of race or doing race work is important because it "not only alters what is said in the academy, but also who is entitled to say it" (p. 5). As a result, race work becomes a personal act as well as a political one. Unfortunately, Baez stresses, although many institutions encourage a diverse faculty, race work is not valued. In fact, some scholars may be harassed or reprimanded for doing race research.

Race Work as Intellectual Insurgence

Each scholar in this study described how his or her race work served as a radical, methodological tool. For instance, Flora talked about doing race work as "fighting a war" and race scholars as "part of an army."

We're all part of the army. This is a fight and we have to band together to win our space. It's not taken for granted. One has to understand what it means to be a minority in an overwhelming White environment and how you have to navigate in that setting. As a scholar, I am building an army. I need all hands on deck. I need everyone at the front. Whatever it takes from you—gird up your loins. You're on duty. Remember you're not here [in the academy] for yourself. You're

carrying a village with you. You can't crawl out of here. You have to walk out proudly, shoulders back, head up.

Flora states that she made a conscious decision to talk about what was real and important to her; that is being Black and female in a predominantly White environment. She describes her decision to do race work as a conscious one.

I was writing from specific location and that location was Black female, immigrant, educated and that was me making it plain that I knew who I was and where I was coming from and because qualitative research method required me to state those issues upfront, then I found a space in which to make it clear that I was not hiding behind theory and I was not hiding behind my elevated theoretical perspective. Anyone who reads me would have to understand where I enter the conversation, this is who I am and this is how I see the world based on my experience and this is why these subjects are important to me.

Similarly, Willa described writing about race issues as her "weapon of choice." She acknowledges that race identity plays a crucial role in shaping her research.

I've recently gone back to read *Black Feminist Thought* and the more I read it, the more I know it's okay to situate myself as part of the subject. That I can have my voice and say we Black women, and not they Black women, and because my experiences are so similar, I'm enjoying writing more and more because I can say I and we and us. We've experienced and we are this and so it's become cathartic for me. The theoretical model that I'm building is really cathartic for me. It's really helping me psychologically with this whole academic system because I felt like I didn't fit in because I like to write from my heart, from my emotional self, but I also want it to be rigorous in

scientific method just because that's the way they want it. So I want it to be that; but I also want it to have some heart. I want people to feel me and so that's what writing is to me right now.

Lilly, who described herself as an anarchist, explained how her research is connected to her activism and her desire to bring about social change. She is disturbed by the absence of Latina/o scholars in her department. She argues that her agenda is about more than just race:

It is having a social agenda, one aimed at using research as a tool for change. The tendency for power to rest with the elite requires brave scholars to challenge un-interrogated practices.

Charles takes a somewhat different approach to his research and the environments that may or may not welcome race-research. The bottom line of his research agenda: to ask the more interesting question, not the obvious, but a deeper question about racialized discourses and how we inscribe them. For Charles, the best research takes the obvious and situates experiences within it and that's a more interesting question.

Questions, or better yet, the right questions become a very important issue in racial insurgence. Charles stated:

So, I could speak from a different perspective [from Urban University] than the people who spoke about racial justice from the cushy confines of the University of Southern California, the University of UCLA. I could probably be much more successful if I was in a place like that because they have more resources. Of course, they do and

if you have a lot of money, you can do a lot more things. But I think if you go there, you are limited to the kinds of questions you can ask.

African-American Nell Irvin Painter (2008) states that the questioning procedure is value-laden; there exists what is appropriate and what is not. She stated of her experience at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA):

I realized three things . . . there exist acceptable and not-acceptable questions, with acceptability resting on opinion and personal identity as well as science; experience shapes what question one wants to ask (White, 2008, p. 32).

According to the participants in this study, the kind of research that questions norms and values, and challenges the status may not get funded. Moreover, what is at great risk is the possibility that good scholars who are interested in race work and ask the not-acceptable, yet very relevant questions, will not be hired.

The practice of privileging and marginalizing certain types of research is common, according to Charles:

What I see happening more and more is that there is an overlay of social influences that are forcing educational research to be much more like scientific studies. In which case, there'll be a very limited way of theorizing race. It's going to be more about focusing on how Black students fair on tests or whether Latina/o students test better. More about achievement and things like that. Which will never lead to a questioning of the things that lead to people to be poorly

achieved, and things like that, however best defined.

So, we have to be leery, that the student who wants to work on achievement issues and wants to figure out ways to help African-Americans improve their test scores is going to be in a very good spot at this moment in time. That's the kind of thing that gets funded, that's the kind of thing that gets privilege, and all that. The one who wants to theorize race, who wants to be much more of a critical race theorist, is going to have a slightly harder time, but still a good time. Race continues to be a very significant aspect of our lives. But they're going to be marginalized in certain kinds of places, and things like that.

They are not going to get accolades, and that's I'm not saying it's a bad research, I'm just saying, there's research that also allows us to question some very basic assumptions in society. People who are doing Afro-centrism, for example, will probably find it pretty impossible to get into universities now. The scholar who will be privileged, who is really bad, is the one going to be doing the kind of research that allows the social system to stay in place... I shouldn't put it that cynically, but the ones whose entire well-intentioned research is to help Black students achieve, is the kind of race research that people are going to want. That's going to get funded, going to get you hired at a lot of places. No question.

Gloria Ladson-Billings (2000) discusses the importance of "racialized discourse and ethnic epistemologies" within the academy; the value of which is not to simply "color scholarship," but to challenge hegemonic structures and symbols that keep injustice and inequity in place. The work is also not about dismissing the work of European and White-American scholars. Rather, it is defining the limits

of such scholarship (p. 271). According to James Banks (1999), the absence of scholars of color in the academy also results in the lack of voice in academic scholarship.

He argues:

The biographical journeys of researchers greatly influence their values, their research questions, and the knowledge content they construct. The knowledge that they [the researchers] construct, mirrors their life experiences and their values (p. 4).

Critical race studies in education research calls for an in-depth examination of the processes, structures, practices, and policies that create and promote persistent racist, classist, and gendered inequalities in education. Ladson-Billings (2000) argues that one of the primary goals of critical race theory is to challenge Eurocentric epistemologies and dominant ideologies such as meritocracy, objectivity, and neutrality. The researchers suggest that what makes critical theory different from other critical lenses is that, although scholars have examined race as a tool for understanding social inequities, "the intellectual salience of this theorizing has not been systematically employed in the analysis of educational inequality" (p.50). The use of "race as an analytical tool, rather than a biological or socially constructed category used to compare and contrast social conditions, can deepen the analysis of

educational barriers for people of color, as well as illuminate how they resist and overcome these barriers" (p.52).

Ladson-Billings (2000) contends that the notion of epistemology is more than just a "way of knowing" and can be defined as a "system of knowing" that is linked to differing worldviews. Roithmayr (1999) contends that "raced" and "gendered" epistemologies allow critical race scholars to deconstruct master narratives and illustrate the way in which discursive and cultural sites "may be a form of colonialism, a way of imparting White, Westernized conceptions of enlightened thinking"(p. 5).

Devaluation of Scholarship and Inquiry

Present research argues that race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual identity can bring about undesirable effects on faculty and their experiences (Allen et al., 2002; Astin et al., 1997; Gregory, 1995; Nettles and Perna, 1995). Studies by Nettles and Perna confirm variations in remuneration and professorate rank amongst the faculty according to gender and race; male professorate possess the highest salary and ranking, over female counterparts. Moreover, the White professorate have higher salaries with more promotions than their African-American counterparts.

Fields (1996) argues that intellectual scholars of color habitually have their scholarship doubted whenever they raise any non-conventional social issue such as the under-represented, oppressed or minorities. Indeed, Fields states that "African-American faculty whose scholarly interests conflict with those of their White colleagues often face problems, particularly when it comes to tenure" (p. 23).

The devaluation of ability and scholarship were issues that hit Lilly head-on in her early academic life. As a new faculty member, she experienced the humiliation of having her abilities as a teacher criticized and the authorship of her published work questioned. Both of these, she stated, carried the "stigma of a lack of intelligence and incapability." Lilly perceived the devaluation of her work to be about issues such as value of scholarship, a questionable racial subjugation, or a lack of power; all were discriminatory and existed solely because she was a Mexican immigrant and a woman.

As a new junior faculty member, I was not prepared for what I encountered. Despite my years of experience teaching, I found my teaching abilities being questioned. After several student complaints, I was called to a meeting with my dean to discuss my teaching style. I felt humiliated.

Several CRT scholars speak of a pervasive lack of respect for Latina/o scholars, blatant discrimination, and a pronounced interrogation of their credibility. Vargas (2002) writes about her own experience in the classroom; she argues that students quickly pick up on this disrespect and they behave in like manner; for example refusing to address the professor properly (i.e., as Doctor) and continually challenging teaching and advising abilities (p. 264). Vargas (2002), a member of Mexico's mainstream culture (as she describes herself) speaks of her experiences within the "enlightened racism" of the University of North Carolina campus:

Since I come from stigmatized groups and my appearance and expressive behavior definitely fail to fit the persona of the "normal" professor, I have encountered repeated difficulties getting accepted and treated as a legitimate member of academe (p.45).

Lilly recognizes that she also fails to fit the persona of a professor, even to her colleagues. It is as though being brown and petite, and speaking with an accent screams "incapable." This became very clear to Lilly when a senior colleague reviewing her dossier made a comment about her first published book:

One White male colleague asked me one day and with the best of intentions, you know . . . he said, after reading my first book which is based on my dissertation . . . did you really write

that book? And I said, "Do you understand what you are asking me? Who wrote it for me?" And it's because I don't sound as articulate when I talk as I sound when I write. Well, English is my second language. For him to dare to ask me that question . . .

This incident reflects the history of pervasive, usually unspoken micro-aggressions. From Lilly's perspective, her colleague believed that she did not have the ability to produce a book so well written.

Many scholars of color believe there is a pervasive belief that people of color do not have the same intellectual capacities as White scholars. This belief, standing alone, devalues the work of many scholars of color. Vargas argues that the deprecating belief is widespread across many campuses, creating undue and unnecessary hardships for minority faculty.

Lilly believes such challenges originated for her because of her "thick, heavy accent." She argues that her accent signals alien, foreign, different - Other. It reads as less intelligence, less rigorous, and intellectually inferior. The interpretation, she believes, has to do with American perceptions of "good grammar."

The Label Other

Many minorities consider themselves as the Other. The Other is not part of the dominant White educational

institution, where research is often done without a "lived, personal perspective" as a guide. The Other is the outsider whose scholarly work cannot exist without the lived experience inherent within the content. The term Other is often used by post colonial or feminist scholars to denote the opposition status of the marginalized. Lilly felt that she was perceived in the White academy as an unexpected face and body in the role of professor and scholar. Twine (2000) argues, "researchers must often navigate racialized fields in particular local and national contexts. They frequently have to navigate the way their bodies are racialized and the meanings attached to these racializations" (p. 17). Lilly stated that she was judge severely on her acquisition of the English language; more specifically, the academic language or the language of the elite.

Rong (2002) argues that a foreign accent (or a certain foreign accent) accompanied by a foreign appearance can immediately signal to students and faculty that a professor's credibility may be questioned. "Many Americans believe if a person doesn't speak Standard English that person must be stupid" (p. 140). Rong also directs a finger to the ethos of the institution, arguing that new students

and faculty of color tend to model their behavior on the norms or standards already in place.

Flora also experienced the label of Other; sometimes by her own description:

I'm an immigrant, and if students are not familiar with immigrants, if they have not grown up in a metropolitan area, if they haven't traveled as part of their experience, then I am Other. I am as much any Other as the White professors in their environment and they [the students] have to uncover who I am in the same way that they have to uncover the White professor.

Being the Other is a tension significantly lived by Flora. She considers the Other as being the Outsider:

We know what it is to be outside and it is the outside-ness that binds us together. It is no accident who I let into my space. It has to be people that I identify with; people with whom I feel warm and comfortable and can let my guard down.

The Challenge of a Race Agenda

Farmer states: "Educational canon and power structure reflects a belief in the supremacy of Whites and males, and for this reason, the majority of those who direct educational institutions (Whites and males) find nothing amiss with things as they are. Students and scholars, constantly reminded of that to which they aspire, are forced to pay homage to the canon's gatekeepers, representatives and surrogates, and to duplicate as closely

as possible, the postures and thought processes of the mainstream" (p. 200).

The greatest challenge for scholars of color is their race agenda. The challenge arises out of an inherent racial polarity that politically divides racial research into the "insider" researcher and the "outsider" researcher. The insider researcher is a scholar of color who believes that there are dimensions to the colored minority experience that are invisible to the White researcher who "possess neither the language nor the cultural equipment either to elicit or understand the experience" (Twine, 2000, p. 9). However, the outsider researcher, whom is also White, has a long history of racial authority and scientific objectivity set in place by White, traditional methodologies.

Flora discussed the contradictions in her training and the different expectations for those doing research on their own racial or ethnic group.

I thought it interesting from the perspective that everyone who had taught me and trained me wrote about people who looked like them; which means that they were White and they were female or male and there was no question about that fact and their relationship to their participants.

Michael Hanchard, a Black researcher, in describing the responses of some of his White colleagues and mentors

at Princeton University to his chosen ethnographic research project, observed the fact that:

...when White researchers study White-controlled institutions and movements, their research is not perceived as 'biased.' However, when he chose to study a Black movement in another national context, concerns were raised about his topic being too 'narrow' and possibly biased" (Twine, 2000, p.23).

This is the kind of impact that White academy politics had on the participants of this study. Most of their less-than positive experiences came down to race and their race agenda being incongruent with the academic climate they worked in.

The Academic Culture of Whiteness

In a study on academic culture, Cook (1997) found that White cultural morals and ethics were imposed and fabricated into the command configuration of the academy's academic departments. Flora's experience as a junior scholar mirrors this agenda to change scholars of color into acceptable, palatable soldiers of the academy.

As the only immigrant female member in her department (one of two Blacks), Flora describes the academy's efforts to "refashion scholars of color by retooling and redirecting who they are." She uses the analogy of boxing to reflect the need for scholars to vigorously resist the academy's efforts to refashion them. Flora's experience was

one of consciously "working against the grain." She cautions emerging scholars of color to "be vigilant all the time because they don't plan to let you have this [place in the academy] without fighting for it."

Delpit (1995) argues that "the culture of power" produced and perpetuated in education is held firmly in place by autocratic teaching practices and prevailing assumptions about intelligence or the abilities of certain students, often based on race, class, or gender. This perpetuation is what James Scott (1990) calls the "hidden transcripts," that is, an unspoken understanding of power.

Flora describes the unspoken philosophy as that of "better and less good":

Because of the way that power is negotiated in cultural forms of schooling, there is a better and a less good. Mine was less good. Theirs was better. So, if you choose better, that means you are degrading your own. No one is going to go around and say, "it's better" but, that is implicit. Otherwise, you wouldn't need me to speak like you. You would accept the way I talk, and we would go from there.

Ruth Frankenberg writes in *White Women, Race Matters* that color-blindness "continues to be the polite language of race" (1993, p. 142). Warren (2002, p. 146)) argue that "in not discussing race, in working to not recognize it, many Whites tend to direct their attention away from racism." Many educated Whites "actively attempt to ignore,

forget, or deny racism through 'selective hearing,' 'creative interpreting,' and 'complicitous forgetting'" according to Jennifer Simpson (as cited in Warren, 2000, p. 146). Simpson calls this "White talk" and argues that it is based on learning not to acknowledge or perceive the links between phenotype and power; on pretending one has transcended the multiple ways one's ideas, values, expectations, emotions, and practices are shaped by race (Warren, 1996, p. 377).

The literature on critical race theory (CRT), according to Gordon (2005) and Delgado and Stefancic (2001) states the original purpose of critical race theory (CRT) is to address an unmet need for both a more useful and a more truthful way of looking at, and ultimately, changing deep-rooted racially and/or otherwise prejudiced relationships that influence group inequities.

Flora argues that what complicates these issues is White liberalism. She believes that many CRT scholars hold a rather ambivalent critique toward White liberalism: White liberals often have "good intentions" as it relates to race. One story shared by Flora illustrates the best intentions of her White supervisors. "I remember shaking. I was sitting in the meeting with both of my bosses, who had generated a list of issues to discuss with me." The meeting

was meant to articulate what their expectations or the academy's expectations were; what she would need to do to sufficiently meet administrative demands while approaching her third-year tenure review. Flora described both women as White liberals with good intentions yet, "struggling" in an effort to be supportive, doing "the best they knew how."

Politics of Location

Critical Race Theory (CRT) drives the research agenda of the participants. CRT is used as a methodological approach and a real-world practical approach to solving lingering social, economic, and psychological problems.

In response to the question: How do scholars of color "locate or position" themselves within a broad political, theoretical, and ideological landscape?; the participants described themselves as radical, anarchist, progressive, feminists or Afro-centric, and as critical race scholars. The ties between race, identity, ideology, and scholarship are most clearly articulated by Flora, who described herself as Afro-centric with an activist agenda. As an immigrant from a predominantly Black West Indian culture, she stated that her experience here in the US has shaped the intent behind her research, which is to tell the stories of successful Black women:

My experience of being mistaken for someone with low or no education... I think that was the first verbalization of a series of experiences I'd had since coming to the United States in 1982. And after some twenty years of trying to understand how I was perceived and under-standing what my speech patterns meant with different groups of people, race became salient the minute I entered the school system and I understood I was identified as Black. I had to figure out what that meant. What did it mean to be Black? Then, what did it mean to be Black and female? What did it mean to be Black, female, and immigrant? What did it mean to be Black, female, immigrant, and educated beyond high school level?

Lilly also remarked that she was acutely aware of skin color and her awareness of race in Latin America was a constant. She stated that the presence of race is evidenced in the autobiographical nature of much of her work and the way she chooses to frame her research agenda. She acknowledged that her agenda has been shaped by difficult educational experiences, social interactions, and the politics of race, gender and class in Mexico. Although she resisted stating that her agenda is solely of race, she did agree that race is one of the many intersection identities that collide in oppression. She stated that her agenda is one of social justice, which encompasses race, ethnicity, class, gender, and other issues. When asked to "locate or position" herself within the academy, Lilly identified herself as a poststructuralist feminist philosopher.

Willa stated that race identity played a critical role in shaping her research. She describes herself as a radical Black feminist influenced by the writings of Mary McCloud Bethune, Jean Nobel, Patricia Hill Collins, Annette Rusher, Yolanda Moses, and Paula Giddings. Willa explained that her experiences of growing up in the Black church and being greatly influenced by the writings of Dr. Martin Luther King and her own minister left an indelible mark on her consciousness.

Charles describes himself as a radical critical-race theorist. On the intersections of race and gender, Charles explained how his experiences with the dominant masculine culture within the academy have shaped his research. He also acknowledged the intersections of race, gender, and sexual identities and discussed how he is constantly confronted with messages about heterosexism and masculinity. Of course, these messages have been out there all along. However, coming out in the academy has changed his perspective, compelling him to think about the complexities of identity.

There is a belief that the only truth is derived from personal experiences. This belief leads to two kinds of consequences. The first one is that you can say that since I didn't experience it, I can't understand your opinions. The other one is to deny the experience of someone else. Such as,

"Since I didn't experience racism, it didn't happen."

According to Talburt (2000), gay scholars adapt to the academic politics of identity and almost seamlessly weave the assigned identity into their scholarship, pedagogy, and departmental relations. Charles has done this to the point where it is not the issue that drives his interests. He believes that there are intellectually right ways to be a race scholar, regardless of identity.

They have an agenda and I'm okay with their agenda. What I don't like is that they don't see themselves as critical. I want them to say, "This is the kind of work we want to do. This is the only kind of work we want to do." Some scholars are much more interested in getting research out about minorities, instead of worrying about the arguments. I worry about the arguments.

He is a deep thinker and his intellect is apparent in his work. He states that he is a critical-race theorist (emphasizing "the critical") whose work is filtered through the lens of CRT.

When I approach qualitative research, and I'm going to do more of it, because I want to do a study on undocumented students, and I want to do that quantitatively or ethnographically, I will still approach it from the perspective of CRT. My method is to look for underlying assumptions; no question ever comes separate from that. A general question might be: what is going on here? That's not a research question. My research question is ultimately determined by the method. The critical theorist always approaches the questions in the same way. But methodologically they have a

philosophy connected to the underlying assumption.

Using Counterstory as Methodological Tool

Though Lilly, Flora, and Willa more regularly use critical storytelling or counterstorying as a methodological tool in their research, all participants write stories, personal essays, or infuse their own autobiographical experiences into their research. This is significant because storytelling serves as a way to analyze and challenge the stories of those in power (Delgado, 1989). Critical race scholars argue that these counterstories help build a sense of community among those at the margins of society, putting a human and familiar face on educational theory and practice, while challenging the perceived wisdom about the schooling of students of color (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001).

Radley (2002) argues that it is not sufficient for narratives to make researchers "feel" better or help them to manage with the day-to-day business of their lives. He contends that, "counter-story, within definition, must resist the master narrative in such a way as to bring about a moral shift, and hence to be a narrative act of insubordination." Thus, the act of storying, recounting,

and reclaiming allow the voices of those previously invisible and voiceless to be heard and made visible.

The Possibility and Performance of Mentoring

A mentor is an important element of success for most emerging scholars; it is a crucial element for many scholars of color. Numerous minority cultures are communally structured, and the familial nesting, nurturing, and modeling from a more experienced member of the same culture are paramount to the success of a fledgling trying to find its wings.

The minority cultures' social structure is very different from that of a White American culture, whose emphasis is on individuality and a "stand on your own" mentality. A difference lies between the cultures; one may need mentoring to help mark the successful path, while another does not understand why mentoring is so necessary.

Bramen (2000) suggests that universities usually provide some type of socialization process through informal networks of "academic, administration, and political information; collegiality and positive social contact; [and] intellectual exchanges" (p. 138). Luna and Chullen, (1995) and Welsh, (1992) state that networks, such as these, are crucial. For newcomers, mentoring is a collegial

way to get junior faculty oriented effectively. This study confirms this is especially true for minorities of color whose culture thrives within a communal infrastructure. Flora expressed that she was extremely fortunate in securing a senior African-American female faculty who held an endowed chair and was well-respected in her field and at the university. Flora's mentor offered encouragement, advice, advocacy, and protection and was instrumental in guiding Flora through her junior faculty years and in her development as a race scholar.

Willa's success at securing a mentor got off to a shaky start. She reflects in an autobiographical piece on the early years of her career, her mentor Carol was advised by a tenured professor to be careful in showing an interest in mentoring Willa:

"Carol, if I were you, I wouldn't invest time in helping Willa secure this position. She was not one of our strongest students, and we typically only assist those students who we believe to be stellar."

Fortunately, Willa persevered and prevailed, securing the mentoring of three different female faculty, as reflected in the same article:

Three women took me on at different intervals of my journey. The Hispanic professor, in addition to chairing my committee, would periodically call or email me to make sure things were going well. Another committee member, a Black professor

mentored me during the data collection and writing phase of the dissertation. But, she was not a member of my academic field, so her mentoring was limited to the dissertation. And then, entered a senior faculty member, Carol. She immediately began mentoring me, offering feedback on my vitae, inviting me to write and publish research and present at national conferences with her. Each of these elements is absolutely crucial for anyone interested in becoming a college professor.

The multiple-mentor experience has its positive benefits. According to Tierney and Bensimon (1996), most new faculty have several areas in which they need help; for example, in teaching, research, publishing and maneuvering academic and departmental politics. One mentor may be perfect for one or two areas, but multiple mentors can provide a broader scope of advisement (p. 138). Still, Charles cautioned that in the early career years, it is important to balance your career objectives with those of your mentor's. It is important to not lose one's self interest as a scholar.

I actually have good opinions of mentoring. But, mentoring is socialization. It requires that you have your own interests, and that you put your own interest at par with theirs. The problem is people wind up getting on their grants and doing their work. Then they say that when they get their job, they want to do something different. And then they're expected in their jobs to have these connections and do that kind of work. And then, here's the worst thing—they forget that they had their own interests.

Rong (2002) suggests that mentoring can occur on many levels and through a variety of experiences. She encourages junior faculty to seek out mentors "across race, ethnicity, and gender" (p. 140). Rong believes that seeking mentoring is a two-way street. Junior faculty seeking a monitor just may find out that there are colleagues who share the desire to connect.

Overwhelmingly, the participants in this study seemed to think that mentorship, in some form, should be part of the package of a junior faculty position. They seemed to feel as though it would be automatically provided and would not require them to seek a mentor. They did not seem to think it was a two-way street. This may be because the study participants, at one time or another, found their department void of other scholars of color.

Further, based on the evidence, I think the women of this study would have preferred a same-race/culture mentor that could have walked them through their initiation into the ranks of professorship; believing that a sister who had made it through successfully would better understand their issues. Although whatever the conditions or restrictions of the mentor circumstances, all of the participants realized how important mentoring was to their success.

Many researchers posit that same-race mentors are not really necessary to have effective mentoring. Essed (1994) suggests that people have "multiple identifications." It is not a given that people of the same race, nor the same culture share the same perspectives. Twine (2000) argues that race is "not the only signifier. The meanings and impact of racial difference are complicated by age, class, accent, education, national origins, region, as well as sexuality" (p. 9). Aguilar (1981) argues that "all socio-cultural systems are complex. Many societies are fragmented by class, regional, urban-rural, and ideology related affiliative differences and all cultures are characterized by internal variation" (p. 9).

Many scholars of color posit the notion that multicultural mentoring provides different kinds of knowledge; a positive for a novice faculty member navigating the academic landscape. However, the female participants of this study showed a strong preference for same-race mentoring. Charles, on the other hand, showed no particular interest in securing a mentor for guidance, support, or protection. He exhibited a confidence in his own intellect to take him where he wanted to go. And he saw support in different terms.

You know, support comes in very odd ways. It doesn't always come in the way we are taught to have it come to us, in the terms of people who are going to help us publish. Support can come from being around other scholars who are still energized by their intellectual talents, even if you may not personally like them.

Support came in leaving me alone. We didn't have a big program. Letting me travel where I wanted to go, so that I could meet people who would help me along. That's how it came. Other forms of support may be the formal ways of support, but they may be absolutely detrimental to your own psyche.

This is not an unusual perspective for a scholar who lives and navigates life through his intellect, as Charles does. His questions, responses, perspectives, and advice are couched in the language of the intellect: thoughts, ideas, beliefs, souls, psyches, and of course, questions, the deeper questions, the critical ones.

Personal Risks: Anticipated and Unanticipated

Much has been written about the anticipated professional risks associated with race work in the academy. Issues such as no job opportunities, devaluation of scholarship, denial of tenure, the lack of mentoring or support for faculty of color, or pernicious terminations, have been extensively studied. However, the unanticipated personal costs associated with race scholarship have been examined less.

Perhaps the most anticipated cost to a race scholar is the bottom-line of a career; not being offered a position, or being fired from a position. Charles spoke candidly about the dismal career prospects for a race scholar: lack of job opportunities and successfully securing a position. Charles states, "Given the economic constraints, social foundations departments are being watered down, reduced, and closed."

The participants in this study agreed that a greater risk is the possibility that good scholars will not be hired because they are interested in pursuing a race-agenda. However, once a position has been offered and secured, a scholar's race-agenda might still come laden with risks, personal and financial. According to the participants in this study, the kind of race research that questions and challenges the status quo may not get funded to begin with.

This study revealed that the practice of privileging and marginalizing certain types of research is alive, well, and continues to play out. Charles stated that certain types of research, such as philosophical, critical studies, or textual-based research are being marginalized every day.

The Loss of Language, a Serious Unanticipated Cost

Charles has written about his difficult personal experiences as a young school-aged boy trying to learn English in an environment that mocked him daily as the Other. In the essay, Charles talks about how "learning English required forgetting Spanish." Charles states that relinquishing one's own language is the cost for belonging to a new culture. Charles believes that the penalty for clinging to one's own culture and identity is exclusion in the new culture.

Today, Charles reflects in more current terms the unanticipated costs associated with losing his native language. Although he identifies as a Puerto Rican, he does not speak Spanish, nor does he feel a sense of connection to his past. However, he deeply believes that "culture, language, and identity are inextricable linked." There is a void in his identity that he cannot fix. Losing his native language was the price he paid for entry into the academy.

Language, however, creates more than the contours of identity; it may also set up the conditions for other kinds of inclusion and exclusion, belonging and not belonging, success and failure, and so forth.

In one of my first interviews with Flora, she reflected upon her experiences of acquiring a formal

education and the costs involved. She also talked about the unanticipated loss of language and culture:

When I went to the conservatory, I was the only Black woman in the group. The whole four years was prescribed. I think of the Art School, like any formal schooling, as going on a cruise. You suspend your whole idea of normalcy and whoever organizes the cruise gets to choose what you eat, what you think and how you manage your time. So, it's the surrender of you to powers that be.

I spent the whole four years studying the Classics; Shakespeare, Chekhov and Shaw, and learning to speak proper American English . . . which was a huge emotional, spiritual, and physical transformation for me. I had to make up my mind to learn to do that because if I didn't, I would not have stayed in the program. They would not have kept me. Without being able to articulate what I felt and what I knew; it was going to cost me something huge. And I believe it did cost me something huge. I feel to be able to speak the way I do now cost me. I trace that back to my training at the conservatory. Whether I was trained or whether I was just in a new country learning to speak a new language, I think the cost is same. You have to make this transition from your home to someone else's home, and learn the ways of that new home. Learning the new ways transform you.

CRT scholar Mary Howard-Hamilton (2004) has posed an important question: "When the ideology of racism is examined, exposed, and racial injuries named, and the victims of oppression are allowed to find their own voices to speak for themselves, is this type of research risky?" (CITE). The participants, Lilly, Willa, and Charles expressed an emphatic "yes." Willa and Charles stated that

most of their risks are tied to publication and productivity; these being inextricably intertwined. Lilly finds that her risks lay in having a social justice agenda; one aimed at using research as a tool for change. Her methodological choices were often questioned, as were her epistemologies and what constituted research. "Risk," she stated, "is related to the possibility of disrupting the status quo." Flora resisted labeling race work as risky—although she acknowledged and identified some of the obstacles for scholars of color.

The Politics of Publishing

Not surprising, all participants agreed there were risks that came with publishing. What one published, where one published, and with whom one published were the defining accomplishments that insured or negated scholar success at the academy. Charles stated that publishing opportunities for race research differed from institution to institution, dependent upon the level of academic freedom available to scholars. Regardless, "faculty are very much punished if they don't publish in the right places. You will be punished in the end, if you don't have the traditional journal publications." When asked kind of punishment, Charles replied, "Simple. No tenure."

The denial of tenure can be a powerful reminder to junior faculty to color within the lines. Charles states that "junior faculty will see the denial of tenure and behave accordingly."

This is what happens at mature institutions. Junior faculty responds with "I'm going to up my publications." The expectations vary depending upon the type and maturity of the institution. Whether someone is at a traditional prestigious Research I institution versus a fledging third-tier teaching college which hold different views on publishing and productivity . . . well, this makes all the difference. However, as the competition for students and dollars grow, lesser known and younger institutions are starting to adopt the values practiced by Research I institutions.

Willa cautions that it is important to understand how the politics of publishing affect scholars of color who chose to do research about race or social justice issues. She states that academic publishing comes down to economics. For instance, the first author's name is a well-established name that the academic book publishing company will make more money with, and it's a name that is more prestigious. An emerging scholar is not going to make the money nor have the name recognition or the notoriety. Academic publishing is a well-entrenched system that seems to "reinforce status or hierarchical practices of the past," according to Willa. Emerging scholars of color are listed as the associates on their own projects, while

senior White scholars are listed as first author. Willa states, "Sometimes senior White scholars are often given honorary authorship for what they have done in the past."

Willa continues:

Here's an example. A particular senior scholar gets to be first author on a book. It is kind of a follow-up to his other book. He uses the associates to go out and do the work. They collect the data, do the work, pull the themes together and write the long reports that become the book, and they are considered the associates. They don't get their names listed. They get a little money for going out and doing the research, but who gets credit for the work? It's risky. It has a financial risk. It has the risk of not being.

On a project involving myself, the book of a senior scholar landed in my lap. I met with all of her authors. I helped to pull the book together and she promised me that I was going to be co-editor on the book. Well, she was going up for full-professor and she needed a solo piece. I don't even know if I'm in the acknowledgements.

Willa acknowledges that the kind of research she does is not "viewed as good research or sound research or rigorous. That's the word. It does not have the rigor so much." There is an additional risk, Willa argued, if the scholar is doing race work. She stated that the financial rewards often enjoyed by other scholars may be out of reach for the race scholar and that it depends upon their eligibility to establish a name for themselves through their research publications.

I think there's a financial risk to it because I think that as we publish, the people who read what we write are really folks without the influence. I don't think the people with the power and influence really read it or read it critically or read it with the hope that it can help build the academy and make it better. I think they might read it just to make sure we're writing. But the folks that really read it and value it are other Black people who say "Yeah, this is true."

Wow. It's interesting how it came to this. They're not the policy-makers. They're not going to be the ones to really help move me forward...because they are not in the power structure.

The participants in this study all commented on the publishing plight of marginalized race scholars. Each perceived there to be risks related to hypervisibility due to their epistemological or theoretical locations or their raced, gendered, classed, or sexual identity. In a study of Black women scholars, Dowdy (2008) found that the majority of the women encountered obstacles and roadblocks in trying to publish in top tier journals. One of the underlying themes that Dowdy identifies is the "importance of choosing the right academic journals and finding editors who understand the work being written" (p. 60).

Findings of this study revealed the practice of privileging and marginalizing certain types of research. According to the participants in this study, the kind of research that questions norms and values, and challenges

the status quo may not get funded to begin with. Moreover, what is at great risk is the possibility of good scholars not getting hired because they are interested in race.

Flora's publishing experience has been different from that of the other participants. Her opinion: Power comes with the act of publishing.

The act of publishing is to make a place in the academy. That's the space I'm beginning to carve out a niche in. What can I do with the space that leverage and power have now granted me? Well, it is a work in progress. I did a presentation for my faculty and students based on a new book I am working on.

At the end of that presentation, the chair of my department said in words that amounted to this, "It occurs to me that Dr. Franks is mining a new line of research. If you look at the titles of her publications, you come to understand that she is taking a completely different turn on the questions that she raises concerning race, sex, and class." And that turned the light on in my head. "Oh, that's what I'm doing. They're seeing me as the one carving a space, not settling in, but carving a space."

Being the pointer so that others may follow or not. But others will recognize that I carved a space. So that is just coming home to me.

I ask Flora the question: What is it about writing and publishing that makes you feel that you have arrived at some sense of accomplishment, of credibility? She answered:

Because people do not brush off the fact that you have published. They have great respect for that. Our society has somehow managed to elevate, hold up the writer, the published writer. And there is a status associated with it. And to be in a

group, in a society, in a career where the pinnacle of success is published writing, just makes it so much sweeter.

This is my voice. Writing has allowed me to be everything, and the owner, and the producer. So, I have moved into the place where I call the shots. I choose the subject, I choose the method, I deliver the product and negotiate the terms on which it will be sold, and then I am the face that represents that product from there on in. You can't separate me from any of the books that I publish.

Based on interviews with all the participants in this study, my interpretation is that publishing offers power and leverage to the race scholar. Flora, as the scholar, has that power and leverage to leave her footprints for others to follow. But as a performing artist, that is not the case. Performance art is visceral and impacting, yet short-lived. Flora commented that she thinks of all those invisible Black women as powerful artists on stage and yet, "they do not enjoy the same power afford by the act of inscribing, writing, or publishing."

A most important element within the politics of publishing is the practice of peer review. There seems to be three central points of view concerning this practice.

According to Lawrence Gorman (2008), peer-review is a process that serves as a form of certification and has been a fixture of academia for many years, yet remains controversial. The most contested issues are: (1) Many

social scientists argue that peer review makes the ability to publish susceptible to control by elites and personal bias; (2) The peer review may suppress ideas that counter or go against mainstream thoughts or theories; (3) Reviewers tend to be especially critical of conclusions that contradict their own thinking, and lenient towards those that are in accord with them; and (4) Elite scholars are more likely than less established ones to be sought out as referees, particularly by high-prestige journals or publishers. (Gorman, 2008, pp. 3-5). As a result, Gorman (2008) argues that ideas that harmonize with those of the elite scholars are more likely to see print and to appear in premier journals than research that is less-than traditional.

Others such as Weller (2001) have pointed out that there are a very large number of academic journals in which one can publish; making it more difficult for one class of academic culture to ignore, censor, or restrict knowledge. The decision-making process of peer review, in which each referee gives his or her opinion separately and without consultation with the other referees, is intended to mitigate some of these problems. Weller (2001) in her book *Editorial peer review: It's strengths and weaknesses*, has suggested that the peer review does not thwart new ideas.

Journal editors and the 'scientific establishment' are not hostile to new discoveries. Science thrives on discovery and scientific journals compete to publish new breakthroughs (Weller, 2001).

While it is generally possible to publish results somewhere, researchers in many fields need to attract and maintain funding. Therefore, it is necessary to publish in elite, prestigious top-tier journals. Such journals are generally identified by their impact factor. The small number of top tier journals is susceptible to control by an elite group of anonymous reviewers (Weller, 2001). Most researchers in any field usually ignore results published in low-impact journals. This has led to calls for the removal of reviewer anonymity (especially top tier journals) and for the introduction of author anonymity (so that reviewers cannot tell whether the author is a member of any elite).

Similar to journal submissions is the process of conference submissions. According to Charles, conferencing can be a valuable alternative to publishing in terms of presenting race work or making the work public:

The conferences that I go to are not changing the work; however, if you are looking at race work in terms of scholarship, then conferences are very good for that, because as scholarship, they're very much privileged. But any person who wants to

say, "How can we question the institutional values? What can we do to get institutions to stop doing that?" That kind of work is not a professional position. That happens at the local level. It happens at the media level. It can change like that. And it requires that you sacrifice a lot for your scholarship success.

On the subject of "publish or perish," Charles stated:

Faculty are very much punished if they don't publish in the right places. "Let's say I wanted to start a new journal, an e-journal, at an institution like Stellar. That would be seriously frowned upon. Stellar would ask: 'Why would you do that?' However, at Banner University, as a matter of academic freedom, it is more acceptable.

Maintaining funding is critical to success in research and publishing. It makes seeking grants a serious business on many levels for an academic institution. Research requires funding and that puts scholars in the position of chasing and jockeying for grant dollars. This is, of course, delegated to faculty on the lower rungs of the tenure ladder. According to Charles, earning tenure is a position where scholars can make some personal choices; however, they must realize all choices come with a consequence. Grant pursuit is one of those choices. Charles had a real issue with the "grant scheme," as he described it. He stood his ground as a tenured faculty, to say:

I don't play the grant game. I just don't. I'm not saying that I won't. I'm not saying I'm not going to try and get this little grant. I would like to get it, but I'm not going to play the

grant scheme. I'm just not going to do it. I think I will lose way too much of who I am if I were to do that. I become a manager of grants rather than a scholar. Okay? And I think I'm a scholar. So I've decided I'm not going to do that. It will likely, anywhere I go, hurt my chances for promotion to full professor, especially in the field that I am. You know? But, I am not going to publish or seek out grants just for the sake of publishing.

Support and Validation

Charles argues that support came in very odd ways.

Sometimes it is protection. Sometimes it is risk. And sometimes they are so intertwined as to be one.

Tenure is protection. Getting tenure is risky, but once you are tenured, you are protected. Of course, now you put other people at risk because you're in charge of getting them tenure or not. So, it's risk and protection, going hand in hand. But there are other kinds of protection like being supported by a major scholar or a major senior person, usually at the institution, but not necessarily so.

Constructing Critical Counterspaces

Perhaps the most informative finding of this study has to do with the concept of counterspace. Traditional support in academia usually comes via formal identity-affirming counterspaces. These might be faculty services organizations or discipline-centered organizations or networks, possibly co-constructed by the academy and the academy's scholars. These have been found to be of little support for scholars of color simply because university

faculties have few scholars of color on campus, and those are scattered across departments and disciplines.

The evidence is clear that scholars of color struggle within the academy's dominating White structure when there are few places (spaces) where these scholars can get support and validation for their ideas, voice, and research work. Many scholars find themselves in a hostile environment where micro-aggressions of discrimination occur on a daily basis and blatant discrimination is not even veiled. In reaction, scholars of color have created formal and informal, social and academic counterspaces where they create their own identity-affirming support and validation as a resistant, protective strategy against racism and other forms of discrimination.

All the participants in this study were excited about the possibilities of "virtual counterspaces," created to build communities of scholars and nurture an environment that serves as a platform to express ideas and voices, as well as validate the same.

Willa, in reaction and resistance to an academic publishing system that reinforces status and hierarchy practices of the past, created a counterspace, a MySpace page, where she can go out on her own. "If somebody googles me and they find *MySpace* and they say 'oh, this is

interesting, she does this'— but I don't know it that will work for me,' and that's okay."

For many scholars today, *MySpace* or *Facebook* are extensions of this whole notion of counterspace. According to Boyd and Ellison (2007), more academics are blogging and websites are growing exponentially, specifically dedicated to academics and scholars of color. Willa sees the virtual counterspaces as very political and is excited by the possible opportunities available through these types of Virtual sites as a way to construct a forum type of space that allowed the exchange of ideas and the sharing of one's work.

I mean you really are constructing more of a virtual space, but it's a way that people can have access to your way. This is in lieu of playing the academic publishing game.

I plan to blog about issues that I write about. I want to blog about the state of the Black community, about issues of poverty, kids going to school hungry, without clean clothes, parents addicted to drugs. So that's the kind of stuff I want to blog about on *MySpace* page.

If it gets out there anywhere and it helps somebody, then I've accomplished what I want to accomplish. If I get cheated (and I have been cheated), I try to move onto the next thing. That's one of the reasons I created the *MySpace* page. If somebody Googles me and they find me on *MySpace*, they can find my work or links to my publications.

Willa is clearly a proponent of virtual counterspace.

She describes it as "real and educational and enlightening, and it's divine, and as long as you stay plugged into your spirituality, it keeps you centered and open and generous, so that those who are ready and want to be in the space find that they have a place."

As for Flora, when asked if she feels that what she has made is a space where others can come in and develop, she admitted that she did not consciously go in with the intent to create such a space; however, she realizes that she has successfully craved out a space for herself and other race scholars.

The concept of space raises a number of questions regarding counterspace and its potential to transcend or transgress the boundaries of regulated space. Charles believes that "Language can neither permit or prohibit spaces, or make spaces public or private." As to the question, "does race work help to construct spaces within the academic culture?" he responded with this story about emerging scholars working to create a counterspace journal or essay forum:

I was approached about submitting. "Oh, you know, we're trying to get this journal off the ground and it's a journal about Chicanos in education, and we want different manuscripts." And I was asked, "Would you be willing to submit something?" I wanted to help them out. I want this journal to succeed. I said, "Well, maybe.

Would you take an essay kind of thing? Are you looking for research articles?" And they said, "We'll take anything." And they set up the journal in a very interesting way, which sort of reflects them, but it's also a good journal because it has this sort of research article, and then they have these essays, and they have these reviews. You know, by creating these distinctions, it's sort of privileging traditional ways of publishing scholarship; but at least it says, "We're going to have a space for the personal essay, or whatever."

The results of this study support the importance of counterspace as a strategy for intellectual insurgence used by race scholars. Counterspace is used to construct new avenues for promoting research, such as academic blogging, electronic journals, and social utility networks such as *MySpace* and *Facebook*.

Advice for Emerging Scholars

Ellis (2004) argues that for many graduate students of color, especially African-American, they must take greater responsibility for their own preparation than their White peers. Ellis also states that as a faculty member engaged in teaching race, they will continually need to be responsible for their own self-preservation. This assessment also extends to writing and publishing, especially if it involves race or other social justice issues.

Each participant in this study had advice for graduate students on these issues. Flora expressed concerns regarding the expectations and standards set for graduate students. Low expectations and coddling students, according to Flora, left students ill-prepared for the battle associated with doing race work. Flora expressed disappointment in graduate students in terms of "lack of stamina, commitment, willingness to work hard, or to fight." The lack of socialization into the profession, the lack of understanding in terms of the politics they may encounter, and the lack of consciousness leaves White liberals and Blacks as potential saboteurs. Flora explained:

I don't care how sorry you think the White professors are. When you act like you don't have any respect for yourself or me, you're more sorry than them. Because the stories that you bring to me and your reaction to those situations, show me you're trying to get over. And once I realize that is your objective, then I become militant. Because you're not only doing yourself in, you're doing in a whole group of people that you represent. And it makes it more difficult for me to operate in the setting and any other student who looks like you to operate in the setting because everyone's on guard. They're looking to see how this next person is going to play to get over.

Flora recalled one graduate student she mentored, and the advice she offered the student concerning the fight she would face as a race scholar.

It's a draining fight and if you don't see it as a calling, then it's better you are not in the trenches.

Graduate students need to prepare intellectually and psychologically for the battle. Part of the preparation is refining research skills, writing, and mentoring. When asked about mentoring, Charles laughed and carefully maneuvered around the subject. "I actually have good opinions of mentoring. But, mentoring is still a form of socialization."

Charles argues that certain practices entrenched in the academy actually hinder graduate students, resulting in "trained incapacity." In Charles' opinion, graduate students are not required to read or interrogate. He contends "graduate students just don't question. There is an amazing rigidity towards it."

Flora expressed similar disappointment in graduate students in terms of lack of commitment, willingness to work hard, or to fight. "Graduate students need to build competence and prepare for the rigors of research."

Much of the literature on preparing future faculty suggest that mentoring graduate students, particularly graduate students of color, is critical for their success within the academy (Jones, 2001; Cleveland, 2004, Gasman, et al, 2004; Ellis, 2004). In the case of Willa, she

confirmed the important role that mentoring plays in socializing one to the profession. In an autobiographical piece, she characterizes "mentoring as counterspace":

The opportunity I had to be mentored by a Hispanic and two Black women provided me with what critical-race theorists would call counterspaces to tell my counterstories. Counterspaces are those havens where ethnic minorities can go to find not just physical, but emotional and intellectual safety. The teaching, guiding, coaching, protecting, counseling and even friendship that these women shared with me provided the space where my voice was heard and made me more self efficacious. They believed that investing the time in this scholar, me, would provide a firm foundation for a more promising professorial career.

Charles's advice for emerging scholars is to seek effective ways to negotiate the mentoring relationship and collaborative work. He cautions to minimize the risk of losing one's self interest as a scholar. Most importantly, he explains why conferencing is important in publishing:

It's very important. It's related to you getting to meet editors. You get to meet the people who ask you to submit things. You get to meet the people who then review your stuff. As a scholar, you cannot be successful without the conference circuit. Conferences are very good, and they were wonderful to me, in getting ideas put on paper, ideas presented, people asking me questions, making connections, networking. Those are crucial things for making a successful academic career. No student who wants to be an academic can avoid that. And the poorer you are at that conferencing, the less likely you're going to be able to get a job.

Lastly, the participants of this study suggested the importance of scholars reviewing departmental and institutional tenure policies and procedures before they accept an appointment. They should ask, "Are the policies flexible? Do they allow credit for interdisciplinary approaches, methodological diversity, radical perspectives, and/or action or activist research?"

Summary

In this chapter, the findings reveal that race research carries potential personal and professional risks. Some of these are anticipated, others not. The results further support the importance of the CRT concept of counterspace as both a coping strategy and a form of intellectual insurgence for race scholars within the academy. In addition, findings suggest that the impact and intersection of culture and language affect the experiences of scholars of color in significantly negative ways. Mentoring generally, and specifically amidst the politics of publishing, is very important to the scholar of color and is often the difference between success and failure. Also, micro-aggressions and racial subjugations, such as the assignation of Other seem to operate as a way to devalue the scholars and the research work they do.

Finally, implications for better support for graduate students and emerging scholars are clearly evidenced.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

What does it mean to engage in a discourse of race in the academy? What does it mean to be a scholar of color doing race work? Critical race studies in education have effectively helped to articulate a conception of race as a social construction and examine the policies, practices, and structures that perpetuate racial and social inequities (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Parker & Lopez, 2003; Delgado-Bernal, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Dowdy, et al., 2000; Delgado-Bernal, 1998; Pizarro, 1999; Fine et al., 1997; Brayboy, 2001; Jones, 2001; Vargas, 2002; Dixson and Rousseau, 2006; and Lyn and Parker, 2006). Still, as Theodore R. Berry contends in a forthcoming journal article:

It has become increasingly important [for CRT] to address the inequalities and disparities for those whose identities place them in double or tertiary bind with intersecting identities of race or ethnicity, nationality, class, gender, and sexuality.

The impact of the intersection of multiple identities on the work of scholars of color is, to a significant extent, still under-analyzed. Thus, using CRT as a critical

lens, this study contributes to the understanding of race as both a social construction and an epistemological stance and, offers an in-depth analysis of race scholars and the intersection of race (or identity), research, and the risks they encounter within the academy.

Moreover, the narratives in this study reveal the challenges for the scholar of color who has a race or social justice agenda. The problem is a complex one. It is not only about the racial or ethnic origin of scholar, but rather the un-interrogated academic culture of Whiteness and the uneasy tensions and biases that dominate their academic lives. As mentioned earlier, the overwhelming majority of the academy is comprised of White, middle-class, privileged men, while people of color, and more specifically, women of color, including African-Americans and Latin-Americans, represent a fraction of the academy. Naturally, stereotypes and biases concerning scholars of color affect their experiences and relations with White peers. Further, these perceptions are compounded by intersections of race or ethnic identity, gender, sexuality, and nationality.

According to Lynn and Parker (2006), critical race theory is still evolving as a theoretical framework and new directions are being charted by a second generation of

critical race scholars in education. Though the authors assert that CRT has been effective in advancing the way we think about race, they also suggest that CRT has been negligent in looking at "the interpersonal ways in which race is produced" (p. 263). As the second generation of CRT scholars emerges, Lyn and Parker call for more nuanced analyses of race-producing practices and the "choices" people of color make in terms of negotiating and performing identity. In fact, Valdes, Culp, and Harris (2002) make the case for using "a new form of CRT" as a way to think about multiple identities (e.g. race, social class, sexual orientation)" as a set of shifting bottoms and rotating centers, where no one category dominates...but where there are multiple ways in which they operate" (p. 262, cited in Lyn and Parker, 2002).

Valdes, et al.(2002) further suggest that the second generation of CRT scholars must draw from a variety of critical perspectives, "teasing out the multi-varied meanings of race and its interaction with other forms of domination" (cited in Lyn and Parker, p. 262). This "new hybridity" of critical perspectives and theories is clearly evidenced in the work of the race scholars examined, who draw from Afro-centrism, post-structuralism, feminism, and racial uplift--and in the present study.

Furthermore, Adrienne Dixson (2006) cites legal scholar John O. Calmore who suggested that jazz music, "an aesthetic form of resistance," was an ideal metaphor for CRT, an oppositional discourse used to critique racism. Dixson extends this metaphor by arguing for the use of jazz as a research methodology— one situated within the idea of "racial discourse and an ethnic epistemology" (p. 227). Similarly, this study itself adopts both an artistic, somewhat eclectic methodology—drawing from narrative theory, critical storytelling, and CRT counterstorying—to make sense of, to critique, and poignantly represent the powerful personal stories of the participants.

Most significant, this study serves to extend the CRT concept of counterspace. As mention previously in this study, the notion of counterspace most often is used as a reference to a physical location or a structured organization students of color construct to find fellowship, community, and to resist systemic racism. However, this study offers important insights on the concept of academic counterspace as the construction of virtual communities of scholars with like interests and goals. Drawing from the literature in communication and information technology, I look to Danah Boyd and Nicole

Ellison who write about social networks as cultural phenomena. According to Boyd and Ellison (2007),

what makes these constructions unique is not that they allow individuals to meet strangers, but rather that they enable users to articulate and make visible their social networks. This can result in connections between individuals that would not otherwise be made, but that is often the goal... one can type oneself into being. (para. 6-7).

Thus, these websites have the potential to create communities of scholars to publish, to support one another, and to work together to resist racism.

Implications and Recommendations

The results of this study suggest that research is political and choosing to do race work in the academy comes with potential personal and professional risks. The participants of this study shared their personal experiences of racial subjugations and micro-aggressions as well as those experienced by close colleagues and students.

The narratives of this study confirm the intellectual prowess of the race scholars and the mental grasp they each have on the historical underpinnings that sustain racism. The narratives also reveal the pain and anguish that these scholars have endured in both their careers and personal lives.

Findings suggest that the race scholars in this study identify themselves as radical/anarchist or progressive and locate themselves within a critical paradigm (e.g. critical race theorists, post-structural, feminist, Afro-centric). Perspectives differed on the notion of risk; however, each of their stories confirmed that doing race work came with potential risks of racial subjugation. Micro-aggressions occurred for some, but not all. Salient points revealed are: risks are both anticipated and unanticipated and require participants to prepare psychologically and intellectually in order to successfully do race work.

The findings uncovered innovative ways in which these race scholars created counterspaces within the academy. Lastly, each scholar had advice for the next generation of graduate students and emerging scholars on doing race work while balancing the politics of the academy and the risks associated with race research.

Future Research Questions

Still, this study only scratches the surface in terms of what it means to do race work in the academy. Thus, further research needs to be conducted to examine the following relevant issues:

- 1) How the impact of research is currently measured (impact index, bibliographic index, etc.).
- 2) The impact of methodological choices in tenure decisions.
- 3) The significance of alternative methods in research (e.g. visual art, performance, poetics, etc.) on tenure.
- 4) The significance of alternative methods for academic publishing (e.g. academic blogging, electronic journal, *My Space*, etc.) on tenure.

Summary

This study offers both theoretical and practical insights. Further the study offers contributions in examining the politics of race research within the academy. From a theoretical perspective, this study adds to the growing body of research on critical race theory and cultural studies in the field of education. Counterstory, a critical narrative that counters entrenched assumptions by the dominant cultural and political force, is used in examining the experiences of scholars of color as they pursue their research on relevant race issues. This study offers insights into how the academy can better prepare and support doctoral students and scholars of color. Equally

important, this study adds significantly to the scholarship on critical race theory by examining the use of counterspace as a coping strategy. Last, this study addresses the critical role that location or positionality plays in the politics of race.

References

- Acuña R.F. (1998). Sometimes there is no other side: Chicanos and the myth of equality. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Aguilar, J.L. (1981). "Insider research: An ethnography of a debate." In *Anthropologists at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society*. D. Messerschmidt (Ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aguirre, A., Martinez, R. & Hernandez, A. (1993). "Majority and minority faculty exceptions in academe." *Research in Higher Education*, 34(3), 371-384.
- Allen, W., Epps, E., Guillory, E., Suh, S., Hammarth, M.B. & Stassen, M.A. (2002). *Outsiders Within: Race, Gender and Faculty Status in U.S. Higher Education*. In Smith, Atbach, & Lomotey (Eds.). *Racial Crisis in American Higher Education*. New York, NY: SUNY.
- Alridge, D.P. (2001). Redefining and refining scholarship for the academy. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Retaining African-Americans in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Anatol, G.L. (2002). "Passing /out" in the classroom: Eradicating Binaries of Identity. In L. Vargas (Ed). *Women faculty of color in the white classroom*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Anderson-Thompkins, S., Gasman, M., Gerstl-Pepin, C., Hathaway, K, & Rasheed., L. (2004). "Casualties of war:" Supporting graduate students of color. In D.Cleveland (Ed). *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African-American faculty and graduate students in higher education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Arenson, K. (February 22, 2008). Professor to keep her job. *New York Times*. Retrieved November 28,2008 fromhttp://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/22/nyregion/22prof.html?_r=2&scp=2&sq=university&st=nyt&oref=slogin&oref=login
- Arnove, R. (1971). *Student alienation: A Venezuelan study*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Astin, H., Antonio, A., Cress, C. & Astin, A. (1997). *Race and ethnicity in the American professorate, 1995-1996*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Austin, A. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to academic

- career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Baez, B. (2002). Race work and faculty of color: Changing the academy from within. Paper presented at the Keeping Our Faculties Conference, University of Minnesota (April 21-23), 47-52.
- Baez, B. (2002). Learning to forget: Reflections on identity and language. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1(2), 123-132.
- Banks, J. (1998) The Lives and Values of Researchers: Implications for Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society. *Educational Researcher*, 27(7), 4-17.
- Banks, T.L. (1995). Two life stories: Reflections of one African-American woman law professor. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. (pp. 329-336). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Bell, D. (1987) *And we are not saved*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (1990). Racial realism - After we're gone: Prudent speculations on America in a post-racial epoch. In R. Delgado (Ed.). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 2-8). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (1998) Afrolantica legacies, *The Black Seditious Papers*, p. 137.
- Bernal, D.D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 105-126.
- Bombardieri, M. (2006). Some seek a scholar's return: His Harvard peers hope to woo West. *Boston Globe*, June 6. Retrieved August 23, 2008 from http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2006/06/06/some_seek_a_scholars_return/
- Bonner II, F.A., & Evans, M. (2004). Can you hear me? Voices and experiences of African-American students in higher education. In Cleveland, D. (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African-American faculty and graduate students*. NY: Peter Land Publishing, Inc.
- Boyd, D.M. & Ellison, N.B. (2007). Social network sites: definitions, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1). Retrieved February 23, 2008 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey Bass.
- Brayboy, B. McK. (2001, November). Toward a tribal critical race theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, Virginia.
- Castellanos, J., & Jones, L., (Eds.).(2003). *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Cleveland, D. (Ed.) (2004). *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African-American faculty and graduate students*. New York, NY: Peter Land Publishing, Inc.
- Cook, D. (1997). *The art of survival in white academia: Scholars of color finding where they belong in off white: Readings on race, power and society*. New York, NY: Routledge Publishing.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Delgado, R. (1989). Legal storytelling: Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. In R. Delgado (Ed.). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*

- (pp. 64-74). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2005). The role of critical race theory in understanding race, crime, and justice issues. Paper presented at Critical Race Legal Conference, CUNY, New York.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: New York Press.
- deMarrais, K.B. & LeCompte, M.D. (1998). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as Experience*. New York: Penguin-Putnam.
- Dixson, A. & Rousseau, C. K. (Eds.). 2006. *Critical race theory in education: All god's children got a song*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dowdy, J.K. (2008). *Ph.D. stories: Conversations with my sisters*. Creswell, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

- Dowdy, J.K, Givens, G., Murillo Jr., E.G., Shenoy, D, & Villenas, S. (2000) Noises in the Attic: the Legacy of Academic Expectations. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, (13) 5, 429-446.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Columbus, OH: Macmillan.
- Epps, E. (1998). Affirmative action and minority access to faculty positions. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 59(3), 755-774.
- Essed, P. (1991). Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory. *Race and ethnic relations*: Vol. 2. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fields, C. (1996). A morale dilemma. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13(17), 22-29.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Pruitt, L. P. & Burns, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Off white: Reading on race, power, and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Finkel, S. (1994). Childbirth, tenure and promotion for women faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 17(3), 259-270.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Franklin, V.P. & Collier-Thomas, B. (2002). Biography, race vindication and African American intellectuals. *Journal of African American History*, 87, 160-174.
- Garza & Lipton (1982). Theoretical perspectives on Chicano personality development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 4(4), 407-32.
- Gasman, M., Gertsl-Pepin, C., Anderson-Thompkins, S., Hathaway, K, & Rasheed, L. (2004). Negotiating power, developing trust: Transgressing race and status in the academy. *Teachers College Record*, 106(4), 689-715.
- Gregory, S. (1995). *Black women in the academy: The secrets to success and achievement*. NY: University Press of America, Inc.
- Haro, R. (1995a). Held to a higher standard: Latino executive selection in higher education. In R.V. Padilla & R.C. Chavez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American Universities* (pp. B32-33). Albany, NY.: State University of New York Press.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. (2004). Theoretical frameworks for African-American women. *New Directions for Student Services*, 104, 79-94.
- Horowitz, D. (2006). *The professors: The 101 most dangerous academics in America*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.

- Horowitz, D. (March 29, 2001). *The racial McCarthyism of Jonathon Alter*. Retrieved February 4, 2006 from *FrontPage Magazine.com*.
- Hsu, R.Y., 2000. Where's Oz Toto?: Idealism and the Politics of Gender and Race in academe." In S. Lim & M. Herrera-Sobek (Eds.), *Power, race, and gender in academe*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Ibarra, R.A., (2003). Latina/o faculty and the tenure process in cultural context. In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.). (2003), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- James, J. & Farmer, R. (Eds.). (1993). *Spirit, space & survival: African-American women in white academe*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jones, B.D. (1992). *Critical race theory: New strategies for civil rights in the new millennium?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, J.D., New York University School of Law, 1992). Retrieved August 22, 2008, from <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/blj/vol18/jones.pdf>

- Jones, L. (Ed.). (2001). *Retaining African Americans in higher education: Challenging paradigms for retaining students, faculty, and administrators*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Karamcheti, I. (1995). Caliban in the classroom. In *pedagogy: The question of impersonation*. Gallop, J. (Ed). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- King, J. E. (2005). *Black education: A transformative research and action agenda for the new century*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kowalski, C. & Cangemi, J. (1983). *Perspectives in higher education*. New York, NY: Philosophical Library.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. (1995). *Toward a critical race theory of education*. Teachers College Record, 97, 47-63.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative inquiry*. (pp. 257-278) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Larson, R.R. (2006). *Bringing lives to light: Biography in context*. Retrieved September 9, 2008 from <http://www.ecai.org/imls2006/biognarr.pdf>

- Left-wing politics*. Retrieved April 7, 2006 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Left-wing politics](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Left-wing_politics).
- Lewis, M. (1993). *Without a word: Teaching beyond women's silence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lopez, G.R. & Parker, L. (Ed.). (2003). *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Luna, G, & Chullen, D.L. (1995). *Empowering the faculty*. Washington DC: George Washington University.
- Lyn, M. & Parker, L. (2006). Critical race studies in education: Examining a decade of research in U.S. schools. *The Urban Review*, 38, 257-334.
- Maitland, C. (1990). The inequitable treatment of women faculty in higher education. In L. Welch's (Ed.), *Women in higher education: Changes and challenges*. (pp. 246-254). New York, NY: Praeger.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and narrative inquiry applications in education*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. & Simpson, E.L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults*. (2nd Ed.) Malabar, Fl: Krieger Publishing. Neo-conservative.

Retrieved April 7, 2006 from

<http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Neo-conservative>.

Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. NY: Routledge.

Nieto, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Puerto Rican students in U.S. schools*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nettles, M. & Perna, L. (1995). *Sex and race differences in faculty salaries, tenure, rank, and productivity: Why, on average, do women, African-Americans, and Hispanics have lower salaries, tenure, and rank?* Association for the Study of Higher Education, ASHE Annual Meeting Paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 402).

Padilla, R.V., Chavez, C.R. (Eds.). (1995). *The leaning ivory tower : Latino professors in American universities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Parker, L. (1998). "Race is . . . race ain't": An exploration of the utility of critical race theory in qualitative research in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.

- Parker, L., Deyhle, D., & Villenas, S. (Eds.) (1999). *Race is...race isn't: critical race theory and qualitative studies in education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Patitu, C.L. & Hinton, K.G. (2003). The experiences of African-American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed? *New Directions for Student Services*, 104, 79-94.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Payne, K. (1998). Power and the esteemed professorate. *Education*, 118, 394-406.
- Pizarro, M. (1998). "Chicana/o power!" Epistemology and methodology for social justice and empowerment in Chicano/o communities. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, (1), 57-80.
- Pohland, P. (1976). Participant observation as a research methodology. *Studies in Art Education*, 13(3), 4-24.
- Pohn, C. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity. *Equity Excellence in Education*, 29, 62-67.
- Political ideologies*. Retrieved April 7, 2006 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Left-wing_politics.
- Reiss, S. (1997). Nell Painter: Making it as a woman of color in the academy. In *Diversity Digest*, Fall, 6-7.

- Reissman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Reyes, M. & Halcon, J., (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano academics. In *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Altback, P. & Lomotey, K. (Eds.). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Right-wing politics. Retrieved April 7, 2006 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right-wing_politics.
- Rochin, R. & de la Torre, A. (1986). *Chicano studies and affirmative action in higher education: Complementaries and prevailing issues*. Chicano Studies Program, University of California at Davis. Mimeo.
- Rong, X.L., (2002). Teaching with differences and for differences: Reflections of a Chinese American teacher educator. In Lucila Vargas (Ed.). *Women faculty of color in the white classroom*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Rumberger, R. (1991). Chicano dropouts: A review of research and policy issues. In R. Valencia, (Ed.). *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agenda for the 1990's* (pp. 64-89). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*.

Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Scheurich & Young. (1997). *Racism in Research*. Retrieved

August 22, 2008 from

[http://www.edb.utexas.edu/faculty/scheurich/proj7/crtr
esearchracism.htm](http://www.edb.utexas.edu/faculty/scheurich/proj7/crtr
esearchracism.htm).

Sevigny, M. (1977). *A descriptive study of instructional interaction and performance appraisal in a university studio art setting: A multiple perspective*.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Seymour, D. (1995). *Once upon a campus: Lessons for improving quality and productivity in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Schapiro, R., Gendar, A. & Connor, T. (2007) *Noose found on professor's door at Columbia University*. *The Daily News*. October 10, 2007 Retrieved August 22, 2008 from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/ny_crime/2007/10/09/2007-10-09_noose_found_on_professors_door_at_columb.html

Sedlacek, W.E. (1998). Special focus: Admissions in higher education: Measuring cognitive and noncognitive variables. In D. J. Wilds & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Minorities in higher education 1997-1998: Sixteenth*

annual status report (pp.47-66). Washington D.C.:
American Council on Education.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Smith, Atbach, and Lomotey (Eds.). *Racial crisis in American higher education*. NY: SUNY.

Solorzano, D.G. (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, D.G. & Delgado Bernal D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308-342.

Solorzano, D.G. & Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality, and the experiences of students of color in higher education. In Torres, C.A. & Mitchell, T.R. (Eds.). *Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives* (pp. 211-224). New York: SUNY Press.

Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2000). Toward a critical race theory of Chicana and Chicano education. In C. Tejeda, C. Martinez, & Z. Leonardo, (Eds.), *Charting new*

- terrains of Chicana(o)/Latina(o) education* (pp. 35-65). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Solorzano, D., Ceja, M. & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial micro-aggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African-American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 60-73.
- Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2000). Toward a critical race theory of Chicana and Chicano education. In C. Tejeda, C. Martinez, & Z. Leonardo, (Eds.), *Charting new terrains of Chicana(o)/Latina(o) education* (pp. 35-65). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling, Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 471-495.
- Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 23-44.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of narrative inquiry research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Stokrocki, M. (1997). Qualitative forms of research methods. In LaPierre, S. & Zimmerman, E. (Eds.) *Research Methods in Art Education*. Reston, VA: NAEA.
- Tack, M. & Patitu, C. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Talburt, S. (2000). *Subject to identity: Knowledge, sexuality, and academic practices in higher education*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- The Commission on the Status of Women in Sociology. (1984). *Unique barriers women of color faculty encounter, in Equity issues for women faculty in sociology departments*. Washington, D.C.: The American Sociological Association Commission on the Status of Women in Sociology.
- Terzakis, E. The new McCarthyism: The assault on civil liberties and academic freedom, *International Socialist Review*, 41 May-June 2005. Retrieved May 8, 2006 from http://www.isreview.org/issues/41/_mcacrthyism.shtml.
- Tierney, W.G. (Ed.). (1997). *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Tierney, W.G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 1-16.
- Turner, C & Taylor, D. (2002). *Keeping our faculties: Addressing the recruitment and retention of faculty of color*. Unpublished position paper, University of Minnesota.
- Turner, C. & Myers, S. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.
- Twyman, W.F., Jr. (2005). *The lightness of critical race theory*. Retrieved on September 22, 2008, from <http://www.intellectualconservative.com/article4783.html>
- United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). (2004). *Degrees and other formal awards conferred surveys*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Uribe, O. & Verdugo, R.R. (1989). *A research note on the status and working conditions of Hispanic faculty*. Paper presented at the annual American Education Research Association meetings. Boston, MA.

- Valdes, F., Culp, J., & Harris, A.P. (2002). *Crossroads, directions, and a new critical race theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Vargas, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Women faculty of color in the white classroom*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Verdugo, R.R. (1995). Racial stratification and the use of Hispanic faculty as role models. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(6), 669-686.
- Villalpando, O. & Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. Smith, P.G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey's (Eds.). *The racial crisis in American higher education*. SUNY press, pp. 243-269.
- Villenas, S. & Deyhle, D. (1999). Critical race theory and ethnographies challenging the stereotypes: Latino families, schooling, resilience and resistance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(4), 413-445.
- Warren, J. (2000). Masters in the field, white talk, white privilege, white bias. In F. W. Twine & J. W. Warren (Eds.). *Racing research, researching race*. NY: New York University Press.
- Weller, A.C. (2001). *Editorial peer review: Its strengths and weaknesses*. Medford, New Jersey: Information Today.

White, D.G. (Ed.). (2008). *Telling histories: Black women historians in the ivory tower*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Williams, P. (1987). Alchemical notes: Reconstructing ideals from deconstructed rights. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 84-94). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Williams, P. (1997). *Seeing a color blind future: The paradox of race*. New York: Noonday Press.

Yosso, T.J., (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*. Vol. 8, No. 1, March 2005, pp. 69-91. Retrieved on September 10, 2008. DOI: 10.1080/1361332052000341006

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Participant Background and Interview Guide

Preliminary Interview Questions and Background Information Sheet

Please answer each question completely

1. Race or ethnicity:
2. Gender:
3. What is your current academic rank? (Full, Associate, or Assistant Professor).
4. What type of institution do you currently hold your primary faculty position? (A major research university, liberal arts college, public or private college that grants graduate degrees, a historically Black college and university)
5. Are you tenured or on a tenure track?

6. What is the departmental field of your current faculty appointment?
7. What is your highest degree earned? (Ph.D., J.D., Ed.D., or other equivalent degree).
8. How long have you been in your current position?
9. Can you describe your research interests?
10. Do you think race/ethnicity informs your work? If so, how?
11. What have been some of your challenges as a researcher who studies race?

Participant Code_____

Interview Guide

Participant Code _____

Date	Place	Start	Time
End	Time		

As you know, this is a study about your experiences in the academy related to race, research and risk.

Background

1. Tell me about yourself (your background, education, career, etc.).
2. What led you to pursue a career in the academy?

Research Agenda and Location

3. Tell me about your research interests.
4. How did you become interested in race research? What has motivated or led you to do this work?
5. What scholars have influenced your research? Who do you read? Who do you frequently cite in your own work?
6. Do you have a research agenda? If so, how would you describe your agenda?
7. How would you "locate or position" yourself within a political, theoretical, and ideological landscape

(e.g. conservative, neo-con, liberal, progressive, radical or e.g. positivist, critical, etc.)? Explain why.

Graduate Education

8. What were your experiences like in graduate school?

(e.g. classroom, department, professional associations)?

9. Describe the politics you encountered (if any) as it relates to doing race research.

Experiences as Scholar

10. What has been your experience as a "junior" faculty member?

11. Describe some of the politics you have encountered as it relates to doing race research.

12. Do you perceive there are risks (personal or professional costs: emotional, financial, academic, etc.) associated with doing race research? If so, what are some of the risks? How has risk been communicated?

13. Do you perceive colleagues hold certain perceptions of you as a "race scholar" because of the

type of research you do? What do you think are some perceptions?

14. What role, if any, does your race (e.g. Latino/a, African-American) play? How do you negotiate race?
15. Do you perceive your research as valued by the academy? If so, how has its value been demonstrated? If not, how has the lack of value been communicated?
16. Do you feel you have profited or earned status from "doing race work"?

Finding safe spaces

17. How do you find "safe spaces" within the academy?
18. How, specifically, have you found safe places or communities of scholars within the academy?
19. What kinds of informal or formal support have you received?

Preparing doctoral students for careers

20. What advice would you give to graduate students or emerging scholars as it relates to negotiating race, research, and risks?
21. Other comments? Thank you for your assistance!

APPENDIX B

Consent

Interviewer: Sibby Anderson-Thompkins
Educational Policy Studies
Georgia State University

Principal Investigator: Richard D. Lakes

Interviewer: Sibby Anderson-Thompkins

Title of the study: Race scholars on the politics of race,
research, and risk in the academy: A
narrative inquiry

Date: _____

Dear _____

I am a doctoral student at Georgia State University in Atlanta. As part of my dissertation, I am conducting a research study about the politics of doing "race work" in the academy. I am interested in how you as a race scholar locate or position yourself within a broad political, theoretical, and ideological landscape (e.g. conservative, neo-con, liberal, progressive, radical or e.g. positivist, critical, etc.)? Some of the questions posed will ask about your perception about the political climate of the academy

and where you find support and validation within the academy.

I appreciate your agreement to participate in this study and would like to inform you of what that participation implies.

I will be asking you to participate in three sets of interviews. All interviews will be audiotaped for transcription purposes and will last 45 minutes to an hour. The initial interview with me might last 1-2 hours and will also be audiotaped. All audiotapes will be destroyed after transcription.

I would like for you to know that participation is voluntary and that you may chose not to answer any questions or withdraw entirely from the interview at anytime. You may skip questions or discontinue participation at anytime. There is no particular risk involved in answering these questions. The benefit is that you will contribute to the acquisition of new knowledge about the experiences of race scholars and faculty of color within the academy. Further, your participation will help to get a deeper understanding of the type of support and guidance needed to prepare graduate students of color for the professorate.

I can assure you that all your answers in the individual interviews will be kept strictly confidential. Nobody (except myself and my supervisor, Dr. Richard Lakes) will know your individual responses. We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. We will use pseudonyms rather than your name on study records where we can. Your name and other facts that might point to you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally.

Contact Dr. Richard Lakes or myself if you have questions about this study:

Dr. Richard Lakes
Associate Professor
Educational Policy Studies
Department of Educational
Policy Studies
Colleges of Education
P.O. Box 3977
Atlanta, GA 30302-3977
Tel: (404) 651-3124
Fax: (404) 651-1009
Email: rlakes@gsu.edu

Sibby Anderson-Thompkins
Graduate Student
Educational Policy Studies
Department of Educational
Policy Studies
Colleges of Education
P.O. Box 3977
Atlanta, GA 30302-3977
Tel: (678) 799-1215
Fax: (404) 651-1009
Email: sanderson-thompkins@student.gsu.edu

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) which oversees the protection of human subject participants. Susan Vogtner, in the Office of Research Integrity, can be reached at (404) 463-0674 or svogtner1@gsu.edu.

I will give you a copy of this consent form to keep. If you are willing to volunteer for this study, please sign below.

Participant

Date

Interviewer

Date

Principal Investigator

Date