ABSTRACT

THE “OTHER” WOMEN: WHAT ABOUT THE EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN FACULTY OF COLOR IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

By Truc HaMai

May 2014

Critical research on the intersections of gender, race and class on women faculty of color largely addresses the experience of those in 4-year universities. In addition, the available research on community college faculty namely addresses the perceptions of culture and climate by those of White women faculty. To date, the scholarship on the experiences of women faculty of color (WFofC) in community colleges is nearly non-existent. This study offers in-depth insight into the experiences of WFofC at 2-year institutions, contributing to the emerging body of critical research. Bringing the perspectives of WFofC at 2-year institutions to the forefront validates not only their presence in academe, but also acknowledges and celebrates their work as committed educators.

Semi-structured interviews were collected from 37 participants who represented 11 different community colleges in the urban/suburban regions of Los Angeles and Orange Counties in southern California.

Findings revealed that WFofC experience multiple forms of marginalization, as well as agency. The intersections of gender, race and class manifested themselves in the

findings and confirmed that the experiences of WFofC can be unified as a collective minority experience to contrast dominant groups. They are simultaneously diversified because of the unique differences in ethnic identity and lived experience amongst each other.

For many, the institutional culture and climate perceived by WFofC in community colleges validated that it was "chilly" and not as "warm" as those from research findings that sampled White women faculty. The type of the community college district, department culture and status in the faculty hierarchy were factors that influenced their experience of climate. Despite many expressing the culture of their institutions as being "hostile," these women of color were overwhelmingly satisfied in their faculty work. Their commitment to serving underrepresented students, and sense of responsibility to the community at large, mediated the chilliness.

Recommendations for future research include further analyses of the rich data collected from this study. Recommendations for policy and practice include institutionalizing the hiring of diverse administrators and faculty to reach critical mass. Furthermore, community college leaders should provide formal support for WFofC through ongoing structured mentoring opportunities and faculty learning communities.

.

THE "OTHER" WOMEN: WHAT ABOUT THE EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN FACULTY OF COLOR IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Educational Leadership

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

in Educational Leadership

Committee Members:

John P. Murray, Ph.D. (Chair)
Maythee Rojas, Ph.D.
Mary Grace Almandrez, Ed.D.

College Designee:

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Ph.D.

By Truc HaMai

M.A., 2008, California State University, Long Beach

May 2014

UMI Number: 3692151

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI 3692151

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Au

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower
Parkway
P.O. Box 1346

Copyright 2014

Truc HaMai

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"There's really no such thing as the *voiceless*. There are only the deliberately silenced, or the preferably unheard."

Arundhati Roy

This dissertation is dedicated to the amazing women who dared to share their deeply personal stories and courageously embark on this journey of discovery with me. For without your trust and confidence, this work would not have been possible. I am both honored and humbled by what I have learned. May your spirited voices sing loudly in these pages for they have been *preferably heard*. To sisterhood.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Problem Statement 4
Purpose of Study 5
Guiding Research Questions 6
Conceptual Framework 7
Social Capital Network Framework 6
Multiracial Feminism Theory 8
Significance 11
Operational Definitions 13
Assumptions and Delimitations 16
Conclusion 18

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 20

Introduction 20
Culture of Community Colleges 22
Culture of the National System of Higher Education 26
Culture of Community Colleges as an Institution 28
Culture of the Academic Profession 31
Culture of the Academic Discipline 33
Climate of Community Colleges 34
Institutional History Regarding Women 36
Women's Numerical Representation in Community Colleges 39
Students 40
Faculty 41
Administrators 43
Perceptions of Institutional Climate for Women 44
University climate 45
Community college climate 47
Behaviors of Women and Men on Campus 51

CHAPTER Page

Mentoring Relationships 53
Mentoring 56
Informal mentoring 58
Formal mentoring 59
Faculty Mentoring Relationships 61
Benefits 62
Challenges 62
Assumptions of equity 63
New faculty assumptions 66
Institutional Barriers 67
Conclusion 68

3. METHODOLOGY 71

Introduction 71
Positionality 73
Sample 74
Procedures 75
Data Collection 77
Methodology Design 78
Instruments 79
Data Analysis 81
Protection of Participants 82
Trustworthiness 83

4. FINDINGS 86

Introduction 86
Participants 86
Findings 90
Theme #1: Community College Structure/Culture 90
Subtheme #1: Type of Community College District 91
Single-college district 92
Multiple-college district 96
Subtheme #2: Culture of the Institution 99
Subtheme # 3: Climate of the Department/Discipline 105
Theme #2: Faculty Identity and Status 107
Subtheme #1: Tenure Status 107
Subtheme #2: Faculty Hierarchy 113
Theme #3: Help-Seeking Orientation 116
Subtheme #1: Mentoring Relationships 116
Formal mentoring 116
Informal mentoring 120
Subtheme #2: Organizational Affiliations 126

CHAPTER Page

Theme #4: Matrix of Domination 129
Subtheme #1: Educational Journey 129
Attended community college 130
Master's degrees 132
Doctorates 136
Subtheme #2: Family Status 138
Married/with a partner 139
Children/no children 142
Theme #5: Women's Agency 144
Subtheme #1: Work Outside of the Community Colleges 145
University work 145
Private sector jobs and professional careers 150
Subtheme #2: Ambassadors of Change 154
Advocates 155
Role models 157
Mobilizers 161
Theme #6: Diverse, Lived Experiences 164
Subtheme #1: Birth Origins 165
U.S.-born 165
Immigrated for better opportunities 169
Immigrated due to political persecution 171
Subtheme #2: Cultural Fluidity 176
Hybridization of a multiracial identity 176
Subtheme #3: Connection to Social Movements 180
American Civil Rights movement (1954-1968) 181
East Los Angeles walkouts (1968) 183
Asian American rights in San Gabriel Valley (1980s) 184
Environmental conservation 185

5. CONCLUSION 189

Introduction 189
Summary of the Study 189
Review of Methodology 190
Summary of the Results 194
Implications 195
Recommendations for Future Research 195
Future Research Recommendation #1: Disaggregate the Data by Ethnic Groups 196
Future Research Recommendation # 2: Create Case Studies by Institution 197

CHAPTER Page

Future Research Recommendation #3: Replicate Variations of the Study 197
Recommendations for Policy and Practice 198
Policy and Practice Recommendation #1: Strive to Achieve Critical Mass 198
Policy and Practice Recommendation #2: Establish Formal/ Structured Mentoring 199
Policy and Practive Recommendation #3: Encourage Faculty Learning Communities 201
Concluding Statement 202

APPENDICES 204

A. RECRUITMENT LETTER 205

B. PARTICIPANT LETTER 207

C. CONSENT FORM 210

D. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE 214

E. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 219

REFERENCES 227

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Multiracial Feminism Theory 9
2. African American/Black Participants 87
3. Asian American and Filipina/Pacific Islander Participants 88
4. Latina/Hispanic Participants 89
5. Participants of Other Ethnicities.......... 89
6. Single-District Community Colleges… 90
7. Multiple-District Community Colleges 91

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Though community colleges play a crucial role in serving nearly half of the undergraduate population in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2009), they rarely receive the research focus or funding attention that 4-year colleges and universities get in higher education literature. The open admissions policy of community colleges has enabled them to earn a strong and historically significant reputation as the "people's college" (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Dougherty, 2003; Valdez, 1996). This democratic ideal, however, has been challenged in multiple ways in current times. The tightened budgets resulting from the aftermath of the Great Recession (American Association of Colleges and Universities [AACU], 2012; California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office [CCCCO]; 2013); technological innovations pushing curricula to online platforms (S.D. Johnson et al., 2003); corporate partnerships to account for gainful employment in lieu of workforce development (Levin, Kater & Wagoner, 2006); increasing pressures to compete for performance-based funding (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2012); and, accrediting agencies demanding transparency of student learning outcomes and institutional scorecards (Carey, 2013; Dunsheath, 2010); community colleges struggle to maintain their mission of inclusivity (Geller, 2001; Levin, Haberler, Walker, & Jackson-Boothby, 2014; Tagg, 2003).

Even with all of these external forces stretching them in multiple directions, public 2-year institutions continue to embody diversity. They serve diverse populations that more accurately portray the mixed populations of America than those of most public 4-year institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Community colleges have a far higher representation of marginalized groups, which includes women, minorities, and those from lower socioeconomic levels. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC; 2013), the nation's 1,132 community colleges educate a majority of the Latina/o students (56%) and a significant percentage of undergraduate students of color, including African Americans (49%), Asian American and Pacific Islanders (44%), and Native Americans (42%). In addition, community colleges also have high student enrollments of veterans (3%), non-U.S. citizens (7%), single parents (16%), and those with disabilities (12%), with female students representing the prominent majority nationwide at 61% (NCES, 2009).

This pluralistic portrait, however, encompasses only the student population. Unfortunately, the community college faculty population is not representative of the student demographics they serve. Nationwide, the proportion of community college faculty who are underrepresented minorities is disproportionately inverted to the students of color they teach. In the fall of 2012, only 18 % of community college faculty consisted of people of color, a figure which includes Asian/Pacific Islanders, as well as both full-time and part-time faculty (AACC, 2013). Specifically to California, one of the most diverse states in the United States, its community colleges enroll over 50% students of color. Yet in the fall of 2012, White faculty held a strong majority in full-time (65%)

academic positions, with women representing the gender majority in full-time faculty for the state as well.

Why are our nation's community colleges lacking in an ethnically diverse faculty body? This reality should be more than a curious statistical question, but a grave concern to all higher education employment policies and hiring practices--it indicates that educational institutions at large have failed in their efforts to diversify faculty (Levin et al., 2014; Turner, 2002; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008). The institutional legacy of inequity and exclusion among faculty disadvantages those whose presence can actually improve the institution, but moreover, it is a detriment to the students (Umbach, 2006).

Multiple researchers have established that a diverse faculty body is crucial to students' success and preparation for an increasingly diverse, global society (Antonio, 2002; Stanley, 2006; Turner et al., 2008; Umbach, 2006). A diverse student body is better prepared by a diverse faculty (Hagedorn, Chi, Cepeda, & McLain, 2006). A diverse faculty assists in the recruitment of students of color to higher education (Alger & Carrasco, 1997; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; M. Garcia, 2000). Also, diverse faculty and their approaches to teaching positively impact student learning (Antonio, Chang, Hakuta, Levin, & Milem, 2004; Turner, 2000; Umbach, 2006; Vargas, 2002). Because a faculty of color "possesses different understandings of institutional life than their White colleagues and situating themselves in separate spheres from their White colleagues" (Levin et al., 2014, p. 8), they have the ability to see the experiences of students of color through a lens of empathy. It is arguable therefore, that a lack of an ethnically diverse faculty body directly impacts opportunities for the students to interact with someone of

their own race or ethnicity, someone whom they might seek as a role model or mentor to help them construct their own reality of persistence (Cole & Barber, 2003; Umbach, 2006).

Despite compelling research and efforts to increase underrepresented faculty, the failures of college and university faculty diversity initiatives is indisputable. Diversity is an effort that is more an illusion than fact. In a study by Turner et al. (2008), they chronicled the scholarship on faculty of color by looking at twenty years of research and confirmed that the promotion of diverse faculty is not only evidenced as largely unsuccessful, but crucial:

> To better prepare students for an increasingly diverse society, campuses across the country are engaged in efforts to diversify the racial and ethnic makeup of their faculties. These efforts are perhaps the least successful of campus diversity initiatives as faculty of color remain underrepresented and their achievements in the academy almost invisible. (p. 139)

Moreover, most invisible to the faculty body are the presence and research on women faculty of color. While there are studies that examine the segregated experiences of women faculty and those of underrepresented minority faculty, the lived experiences of women faculty of color, which integrates these identities along with other identities, remain largely hidden in the literature (Harris & Gonzales, 2012; Turner, 2002).

Problem Statement

There is a growing body of literature that specifically addresses the status of women faculty of color. Their experiences differ in a variety of ways from those of

White women faculty and also minority men (Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Lee; 2003; Turner, 2002). More recent research critically speaks to the intersections of race, class and gender, revealing the multiple marginalizations as experienced by faculty who identify both as persons of color and female (Turner, 2002). These studies, however, focus solely on the accounts of women faculty of color at 4-year universities, often disaggregating the research topic by specifying the experience by ethnic groups (i.e., African American women, Latina, etc.). In the quantitative studies, findings reveal that women faculty of color remain underrepresented, with persistently dismal numbers presented at 3.2% of tenured professors nationwide (Ryu, 2010). In the qualitative studies, experiential narratives mainly address the barriers that women faculty of color confront as they navigate through the tenure process, which is often within hostile environments (A. Cox, 2008; Turner, 2002; Winkle-Wagner, 2009; Winkler, 2000) and have been characterized as "chilly" or even "toxic" climates in the disciplines outside of the social sciences and humanities (Gardener, 2012).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this qualitative interview study is to explore the experiences of women faculty of color in southern California community colleges and give voice to an overlooked but important population. First, by using semi-structured interviews, the study will offer insight into the faculty experience of women of color at 2-year institutions, contributing to the emerging body of critical research, which exclusively focuses on the barriers and opportunities that exist within 4-year institutions. Secondly, this study will highlight how the institutional climate and culture is perceived by women

faculty of color in community colleges, noting that the intersections of their gender, race and class is manifested in their own agency and for the students whom they empower. Lastly, this study will provide a broad yet nuanced understanding that the diverse experiences of women of color faculty, who will come from a variety of different ethnic and class backgrounds, can be unified as a collective minority experience compared to dominant groups while simultaneously fractured by difference amongst each other.

Guiding Research Questions

This qualitative study is guided by these research questions for women faculty of color:

1. What are the influences that shape their decision to teach at a 2-year college rather than a 4-year university?
2. What are the various roles that they perform on and off campus?
3. What are the barriers that they face in their academic positions?
4. How do they seek support to navigate through those challenges?

Conceptual Framework

All human interactions that are enduring are defined by a relationship. As applied to professional relationships in the academic workplace, the connections that faculty members form with students, other faculty, administrators and the community is largely dependent on how they perceive the culture and climate of their institution. When the intersections of race, class, and gender are critically incorporated into the analyses of these social interactions as experienced by faculty members who are women of color, themes of opportunities, oppression and agency emerge.

For these reasons, the conceptual framework of this study is informed by the integration of two frameworks. First, this study considers the Social Capital Network Framework utilized in Felicia Jin-Sun Lee's 2003 dissertation research titled *Social Capital and Tenure: The Role of Race and Gender in Academic Promotion.* Second, this study also considers the framework of Multiracial Feminism Theory as outlined in *Women of Color in U.S. Society*, a movement formally developed into a theory by Maxine Baca Zinn and Bonnie Thorton Dill in 1996.

Social Capital Network Framework

In her 2003 doctoral study, Lee examined the experiences of women and minority faculty looking to attain tenure. Establishing that social relationship and the gaining of social capital were essential to a successful journey in the professoriate (Stanton-Salazar, 2002), Lee focused on three critical aspects (p.77):

1. University Structure/Culture
2. Faculty Identity and Status
3. Help-Seeking Orientation

Social capital has multiple definitions and is a broadly used term in a variety of applications in social science research. In general, social capital has been understood as those relationships that provide support to individuals in order to achieve a particular goal (Stanton-Salazar, 1997). Rooted in class and cultural reproduction, Lee (2003) conceptualized social capital to be "the utilization of key tools in social network analysis set in the context of a distinct organizational culture" (p. 65).

This proposed study will focus on the three aspects as they pertain to the context of community colleges. For the first aspect, *University Structure/Culture*, this study will adapt the deconstruction of university structure to that of community colleges, specifically looking at the culture and climate that are experienced by women faculty of color. The adaptation of this aspect is *Community College Structure/Culture.* For the second aspect, *Faculty Identity and Status*, this study will explore the role of faculty identity and the status of those who teach or advise students in community colleges, drawing some comparisons to the differences between faculty work of 4-year institutions and 2-year institutions. For the third aspect, *Help-Seeking Orientation,* this study will examine how women faculty of color seek mentorship opportunities as well as provide mentoring to the students they serve.

Multiracial Feminism Theory

Even though some feminist scholars debate the actual start of multiracial feminism as a political strategy and as a legacy that is linear (Thompson, 2002), many agree that it was a movement that directly challenged the social elitism, heterosexism and racism that was associated with second wave feminism of the 1960s. They argued that second wave was (and still is) essentialist and lacked mass appeal for all women who were not White, middle-class, and educated (Rojas, 2009). In 1994, Maxine Baca Zinn and Bonnie Thornton Dill formally developed the term *multiracial feminism,* which is widely considered a multifaceted movement that sought to fracture the myth that there was one unified cause or goal that all feminists shared, bringing attention to the ethnic,

racial and socioeconomic differences between those of White women, lesbians and women and men of color.

Today, multiracial feminism continues to exist as an evolving body of theory and practice that seeks to address the plurality of perspectives and experiences of those within the context of U.S. societies:

> This framework does not offer a singular or unified feminism but a body of knowledge situating women and men in multiple systems of dominations. U.S. multiracial feminism encompasses several emergent perspectives developed primarily by women of color: African Americans, Latinas, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, women whose analyses are shaped by their unique perspectives as "outsiders within"--marginal intellectuals whose social locations provide them with a particular perspective on self and society. Although U.S. women of color represent many races and ethnic backgrounds--with different histories and cultures--our feminism cohere in their treatment of race as a basic social division of, a structure of power, a focus of political struggle, and hence a fundamental force in shaping women's and men's lives (Zinn & Dill, 1996, p. 324).

TABLE 1. Multiracial Feminism Theory

FEATURE	ASSERTION	INTERSECTIONALITY
"Matrix of Domination"	There is range of inequalities that are also interconnected (Patricia Hill Collins)	Race, class, gender and sexuality are experienced differently depending on where their location is on the matrix
Hierarchies	Hierarchies are intersectional and exist at all levels of social life	Race, class, gender, and sexuality are components of social structure and social interaction

Dominance-Subordination Relational	Women's differences are connected in systematic ways	Race is a vital element in the pattern of relations among women of color and White women
Women's Agency	Nature and organization of women's opposition mediates and differentiates impact of domination (Chandra Talpade Mohanty)	Within the constraints of race, class, and gender oppression, women create viable lives for themselves, their families, and communities
Reliance on Theoretical Tools	Use of research to destabilize universal categories of gender	Racially informed epistemologies provide for new understandings of women and men
Diverse, lived experiences	Asian American, Native Americans, Latinas and Blacks are comprised of many different national, cultural and ethnic groups	Each group is engaged in the process of testing, refining and reshaping its own image

Note: According to Zinn and Dill (1996), Multiracial Feminism is a theoretical framework that consists of six distinguishing features.

This proposed study will focus on the three features of Multiracial Feminism Theory: (1) *Matrix of Domination* (Patricia Hill Collins, 2000), (2) *Women's Agency* (Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 2002), and (3) *Diverse, lived experiences* (Anzaldua, 1990; Chow, 1987; Rojas, 2009; Roth, 2004). The intersections of race, class and gender and how they are experienced by women faculty of color within the academic setting of community colleges.

Significance

This study acknowledges and aims to bridge the gaps in the literature in several important ways. What is widely researched and known of the faculty experience is dominated by the scholarship on faculty who work in 4-year colleges and universities. Researchers tend to conduct studies that mirror their experiences; thus, the scholarship on faculty work is predominantly focused on issues that exist at universities (Grubb, 1999; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Namely, these issues concern structural inequities unique to university and departmental cultures as well as other climate concerns regarding the academic productivity in the tenure process. Because the main task of community college faculty is teaching, the research on the unique experiences of faculty work and experiences are rarely conducted by community college faculty themselves (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Instead, scholarship on community college faculty is mainly biographical and conducted by select university scholars looking from "outside" instead from "within."

To date, research on the status and experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges is nearly non-existent. Using 2-year colleges as the institutional contexts, the available literature that specifically focuses on women either provides salary differentials in relation to academic positions (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002) or explores work-life balance issues (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006) and perspectives as a working mother (Wolf-Wendel, Ward & Twombly, 2007). These findings, however, do not critically differentiate the experiences of women of color from that of White women. In

addition, the tenure and promotion practices at universities are different than at community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008); thus, making the current women faculty of color struggles at universities exclusive to a reward system that does not apply to women faculty of color at 2-year institutions.

Considering critical research on the intersectionality of race, class and gender among university faculty is emergent, it is no surprise then that it is skeletal among community college faculty. The lack of research on the intersections of race, gender and class among community college faculty echoes the same logic as to why research on faculty work exists mainly on the experiences of university faculty--university scholars conduct research mainly on their own experiences.

For these reasons, women faculty of color in community colleges experience triple marginalization. They are marginalized as women, as persons of color, and lastly, for the "second class" institutions in which they teach (i.e., community colleges). The exploration of how women faculty of color experience the culture and climate of community colleges must include the intersectionality of race, gender and class. Research of this nature is important because it starts the awareness and brings to light attention on an important, but grossly overlooked faculty population. Understanding the challenges that women faculty of color confront at community colleges will not only contribute to the field of critical research, but also pragmatically inform policy so that administrators and senior faculty can find ways to effectively practice their support and implement policies for meaningful diversity initiatives.

Operational Definitions

In this study, specific terms and phrases will be utilized throughout the research in reference to the conceptual framework, faculty participants, and the academic settings in which they work.

1. Adjunct faculty: An instructor or professor who does not hold a permanent academic position at the institution they teach. These individuals are hired on a part-time basis and do not have the contractual privileges of a salary and benefits of a full-time faculty member. Also known as “Freeway Flyer,” this is a commonly used vernacular that specifically refers to adjunct faculty who teach at community colleges.

2. Agency: The capacity of a person to act, or make the choice to act, whether it be involuntary behavior, or purposeful, or an intentional action.

3. Ethnicity: A socio-political constructed term that refers to a category by which a person considers membership to a specific group of shared ancestry, including attachment to customs, language and culture.

4. Feminism: This term refers to a collection of movements and ideologies aimed at defining, establishing, and defending equal political, economic, and social rights for women. Some of the earlier forms of feminism have been criticized for taking into account only White, middle-class and educated perspectives (Rojas, 2009). This let to the creation of ethnically specific or multiculturalist forms of feminism, such as Multiracial Feminism (Zinn & Dill, 1996) or Third World Feminism.

5. Intersectionality: First introduced by feminist sociology scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), this is the study of intersections of socio-political identities between different disenfranchised groups or underrepresented racial or ethnic minorities; specifically, the study of the interactions of multiple systems of oppression or discrimination. This term has evolved to include the intersection of other factors such as class, sexual orientation and disabilities.

6. Microaggressions: Brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people (Sue et al., 2007).

7. Minority: This term is often referred to a group that is disenfranchised and has limited access to social power. Considered controversial by some sociology scholars, this term has been criticized as creating a preconceived hierarchy of inferiority because those who have membership to a minority groups, such as women, are viewed as less than to dominant groups due to their lack of privilege. Also, in some instances, referring to a disenfranchised group as a minority is considered inaccurate because they may actually be the majority (i.e., Latina/o student populations in community colleges and women).

   a. For participants: This term is used interchangeably with person of color. Faculty of color continue to be the minority percentage in nearly all of higher education, excluding institutions that are Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU).

8. Non-tenure track faculty: An instructor or professor who holds a full-time academic position at the institution where they teach. These individuals are hired with

the contractual privileges of a salary and reduced benefits. However, they may have the permanence of a tenured faculty.

b. At community colleges: Adjunct faculty are often associated as non-tenure track faculty. Though they are not unionized, community college adjunct faculty may participate in shared governance and attend committees.

c. At 4-year colleges/universities: Non-tenure track faculty are more commonly referred to as full-time lecturers. Full-time lecturers are not usually unionized and do not have privileges like tenure-track/tenured faculty.

9. Race: A socio-political constructed term that refers to a category by which a person considers his/her identity as it is perceived by others. This term is often used synonymously with "ethnicity."

10. Social location: This phrase refers to an individual's identity. In particular, how and where the person's identity resides in the social order of a group, community, culture, nation and world at large.

11. Tenure-track/Tenured faculty: An instructor or professor who holds a full-time academic position that is permanent and continuous at the institution where they teach. These individuals are unionized and have the privilege of benefits as well as guaranteed employment and salary at the institution where they teach until they retire. In community colleges, tenure-track/tenured faculty positions consist of discipline instructors as well as librarians and counselors.

12. Woman of color: Primarily used in the United States, this political phrase refers to a woman who is non-White, challenging traditional notions of the Black-White binary as well as the derogatory connotations that are often associated with the term "minority." This term refers to a woman who identifies as having African, Asian, Filipina, Latina/Hispanic, Pacific Islander or Native American heritage. It may also be used to refer to women who are mixed-race or mixed-ethnicity.

Assumptions and Delimitations

The assumption of this study relies on the notion that critical thought is not only essential to the progress of research on faculty diversity and development, but also necessary to practitioners and administrators who seek to implement meaningful organizational change. Most research examines the segregated experience of women or ethnic minorities, or conversely that they are one group sharing universal forms of discrimination in higher education. This research challenges this philosophical approach and assumes neither. For example, women of color have unique and varied experiences from those of White women. Lastly, the experiences of faculty of color are engendered and that women and men of color may confront varying forms of racism and classism, but women of color face sexist attitudes and behaviors that men of color do not in the academic workplace.

In addition to the stated assumptions, this research is limited by its methodological approach. This qualitative study is based on data from women faculty of color through convenient and snowball sampling. Hence, the findings of these women's experiences are not generalizable to the population at large. First, there is no guarantee

that the sample produced participants who are varied or representative of the variety of ethnic representation in the southern California region. Second, participants were selected from a faculty population in urban and suburban southern California community colleges, which have some of the most ethnically diverse faculty bodies in the nation. Their experiences may not be seen as relevant to faculty who work in districts in parts of the state or country that are rural or more homogenized. Third, this study sampled participants from a variety of disciplines. Thus, the experiences of women faculty of color from the social sciences might be very different than those from the Science, Technology, Engineer, and Mathematic (STEM) fields. Finally, this study sampled women faculty of color who are full-time to better understand how they have to navigate through the tenure/tenure-track process. While there is high representation of women of color holding adjunct faculty positions in the community colleges (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen & Han, 2009), most of them teach at multiple institutions (Kezar & Sam, 2010) and capturing how they face challenges through the tenure and promotion process does not apply.

The delimitations of this study were bounded by several factors. While the study looks to capture the diverse experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges, the narratives in their comprehensive storytelling are largely symbolic of success. The participants were selected from a purposeful pool of faculty members who have attained full-time status; thus, exemplifying persistence to endure and overcome oppressions experienced. In other words, these participants are not faculty members who have chosen to leave the academic profession. Another factor that this study relies on is

that the participants self-identify as women of color; that is, one who is able to speak about the intersections of race, class and gender in their personal experiences as a faculty member. A woman faculty may identify strongly with her sexual orientation and include that as factor in the intersectionality of her experience.

Conclusion

Community colleges play a crucial role in serving nearly half of the undergraduate population in the United States, yet the importance of these institutions is overshadowed by the scholarship focus on 4-year colleges and universities. Despite external influences that are forcing community colleges to question their ability to maintain open access enrollment, they continue to serve a broad and diverse range of students, which more accurately exemplify the populations of society at large than those found in public and private universities. Unfortunately, even though the student populations are extremely diverse in community colleges, that reality does not hold true of the faculty representation. Why has research not focused on this lack of ethnic diversity among faculty in community colleges?

Research on and by faculty at 4-year colleges and university upstages the faculty work of community college instructors. Committed to teaching rather than research, community college faculty rarely drive the research agenda to focus on the students they serve and on the complex, academic work that they perform. Especially, little is known about the experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges. While there is emergent literature that critically examines women faculty of color, it mainly encompasses the structural inequities unique to university and departmental culture as

well as other climate concerns like the taxing tenure and academic promotion processes. The critical research on the intersectionality of race, class and gender on their 2-year counterparts is nearly non-existent. Research of this nature is important because it initiates the awareness of their struggles and challenges and brings to light attention to an important, but grossly-overlooked faculty population. This study proposes to explore this population and to better understand the multiple marginalizations that women faculty of color experience in community colleges. Understanding the challenges that women faculty of color confront at community colleges will not only contribute to the field of critical research, but also pragmatically inform policy so that administrators and senior faculty can find effective ways to practice their support.

As this study proposes, institutional efforts to diversify faculty must not only be intentional, but comprehensive. At the macro level, hiring committees should work in conjunction with faculty development offices to ensure that the review of faculty candidates is thorough and utilizes empirical data. Looking at the micro level, department chairs and other senior faculty should behave in highly visible ways that communicate their support to women faculty of color. When women faculty of color in community colleges see explicit avenues and scenarios of support, the increased chance of finding assistance is less of a blind search and more of one that is informed and strategic. This can only enable them to better serve the students with whom they have committed their professional careers.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review examines the topic of women faculty of color in community colleges. Because there is a paucity of research on the status and experiences specific to women faculty of color in community colleges, this review draws from the breadth of scholarship on a variety of topics and synthesizes in-depth where the topics overlap. The breadth of the topics include: the experience and status of women faculty of color in 4-year institutions; women faculty with children; the mission, faculty work as well as tenure and promotion practices of community colleges; the manifestation of social and cultural capital in the context of institutional inequities; and lastly, the mentoring paradigms that are both informal and formal for faculty support. The in-depth analysis employs an interdisciplinary approach while also being guided by the conceptual framework.

The conceptual framework used in this literature review is informed by the integration of two frameworks. First, Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003) establishes the importance of social relationships and the strategic attainment of social capital as essential to academic success for women and minority faculty. The three aspects of her framework that were selected for this literature review includes: (1) *Community college structure/culture*, (2) *Faculty identity and status*, and (3) *Help-*

seeking orientation. These aspects were adapted as they pertain to the context of community colleges rather than a research institution, which was the institutional context originally used in her study. Second, Multiracial Feminism Theory, an evolving body of theory and practice established by Maxine Baca Zinn and Bonnie Thorton Dill (1996), critically address the intersections of gender, race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation and the marginalizations of those identities as experienced by underrepresented groups in the United States. Though there are six critical features to this theory, the three relevant ones as they pertain to women faculty in community colleges were selected for this literature review: (1) *Matrix of Domination* (Patricia Hill Collins, 2000), (2) *Women's Agency* (Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 2002), and 3) *Diverse, lived experiences* (Anzaldua, 1990; Chow, 1987; Rojas, 2009; Roth, 2004).

The marriage of the in-depth analysis of overlapping topics as well as the conceptual framework formed the three main sections in the body of this literature review: Culture of Community Colleges, Climate of Community Colleges and Mentoring Relationships.

In the first section, the *Culture of Community Colleges* paints an overview of the landscape of community colleges. This includes the historical and socio-political examination of four interdependent subculture cultures (Kuh & Whitt, 1988) that have an impact on women faculty of color. The four interdependent cultures reviewed in the literature were: (1) The culture of the national system of higher education, (2) The institutional culture of community colleges, (3) The culture of the academic profession, and (4) The culture of academic disciplines.

For the second section, the *Climate of Community Colleges* provides an exploration of diversity and equity issues in community colleges as perceived and experienced by women faculty of color. The analysis of climate is based on the four dimensions as they were operationalized by Townsend and Twombly (2007) in their study on the status of women in community colleges. The four dimensions, which they adapted from the original study on racial climates by Hurtado, Clayton-Pedersen, Allen, & Milem (1998), provide sociological and psychological insights into the following: (1) The institutional history regarding women, (2) Women's numerical representation in community colleges, (3) Perceptions of institutional climate for women, and (3) behaviors of women and men on community college campuses.

The concluding section of this literature review is *Mentoring Relationships*. Mentoring is generally valued but the process is considered ambiguous, especially in higher education (Boice, 2000). Therefore, this section draws research from business literature and provides definitions of informal and formal mentoring. Finally, this section provides an evaluation of faculty mentoring relationships, exposing both the benefits and barriers that result from these nuanced relationships and their implication that may or may not support women faculty of color.

Culture of Community Colleges

Community college culture is reviewed with a particular focus on the open-access mission, the institutional values and beliefs, and changing functions in regard to the evolution of community colleges. An investigation of culture encompasses the structural and institutional history of community colleges. This allows for a distinctive

understanding of faculty work, and therefore also the unique experiences of a community college faculty member's socialization within and without their classrooms, the department, discipline and community at large.

According to Kuh and Whitt (1988), the concept of culture as viewed by scholars is varied and multi-faceted, reflecting a blend of disciplinary perspectives that provides the intellectual foundations for our understanding of the phenomena. One of the perspectives that is salient to higher education is institutional culture. Institutional culture is defined as "persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. iv).

Unique to institutional culture is that it consists of two properties - it is both a process and a product (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). As a process, institutional culture has the ability to mold as well as be shaped by the interactions of people on and off the campus. As a product, institutional culture reveals a window into the history, traditions, organizational structures and the present behavior of the current staff, faculty and students. Not only do cultural properties of process and product coexist within institutional cultures, but they can also overlap. Where they overlap, the interdependence of cultures can derive from external and internal (subcultures within the institution) sources (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Thus, the interdependence of the cultures can shape faculty behavior for women faculty of color in community colleges.

Kuh & Whitt (1988) identified that there are four main interdependent cultures. Specifically, the four main interdependent cultures that have an impact on faculty are: (1) *The culture of the national system of higher education*, (2) *The culture of the institution,* (3) *The culture of the academic profession*, and (4) *The culture of the discipline* (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Utilizing these four interdependent cultures, this section aims to paint a broad overview of the landscape of community colleges in which women faculty of color work as academic professionals. Understanding the history of our educational institutions, with a specific focus on community colleges, provides the foundation for the way that institutional structures became the blueprint for current inequalities as experienced by marginalized faculty (Drake, 2008; Levin et al., 2014; Opp & Gosetti, 2002).

Literature on women faculty of color has mainly focused on rank and not institutional type (Aguirre, 2000; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Glazer-Raymor, 1999). Because there is a paucity of literature on women of color in 2-year colleges, knowledge of the changes in their status as faculty relies on the examination of institutional structures and general information on faculty ranks (Bower, 2002; Opp & Gosetti, 2002; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Furthermore, in their predictive analysis of trends for women full-time faculty of color in community colleges, Opp and Gosetti (2002) state that "the importance of empirically assessing the status of women faculty of color in 2-year colleges has become critical, in light of successful legal challenges and ballot initiatives over the past decade to discourage equity initiatives" (p. 610).

In this section of the literature review, both frameworks under the overarching conceptual framework provide the lens for understanding the culture of community colleges. From Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003), the selected aspects of *Community College Structure/Culture* and *Faculty Identity and Status* seamlessly coincide with two of the interdependent cultures as identified by Kuh and Whitt (1988). In particular, outlining the beliefs, values and traditions in *Culture of Community Colleges as an Institution* (Kuh & Whitt, 1988) parallels those of *Community College Structure/Culture* (Lee, 2003). Also, *Faculty Identity and Status* (Lee, 2003) resonates with *The Culture of Faculty Work* (Kuh & Whitt, 1988), where the social location of a faculty member (which includes race, class and gender as well as rank, status and institution type) can hinder or aid in their academic advancement.

Alongside Social Capital Network Framework, Multiracial Feminism Theory (Zinn & Dill, 1996) is utilized to critically frame the way in which current hierarchies within these interdependent cultures impact women faculty of color. Primarily, the feature that is Patricia Hill Collins's (2000) concept called the *Matrix of Domination* provides insight as to why some inequalities are reinforced by dominant groups as a way to maintain power in existing hierarchies. In the genesis of this paradigm, Collins originally asserts that the range of inequalities found in cultures and other socially constructed entities, such as the economy or schools, are all interconnected for African American women. The application of this feature enables a critical analysis of the historical domination and subordination that stratified race, ethnicity, gender and class within the culture of community colleges (Collins, 2000).

Culture of the National System of Higher Education

The founding of America's colleges and universities began more than three centuries before community colleges appeared on the landscape of higher education in the United States (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Geller, 2001; O'Banion; 1997). Modeling after England's Oxford and Cambridge Universities, the earliest American colleges were established in the 1600s to train ministers and to extend the denominational teachings of Christian churches (Lucas, 2006). As these private colleges grew to become prestigious universities over the next two centuries, only selected populations considered elite enough--White men--were allowed to enter through their doors as students and educators (Lucas, 2006). Finally, elite universities allowed these groups to enroll as students and apply for faculty positions: in the 19th century for minority men (Lucas, 2006) and the 20th century for women (Perkins, 2011). However, the legacy of race and gender inequality as well as socioeconomic privilege remains active to the culture of these institutions to the present day (Krueger, Rothstein & Turner, 2006). To challenge the racial exclusion of African Americans in the private universities and to provide equal educational opportunities to that of the private elite universities, all but three historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were established after 1865, the ending of the Civil War (Lucas 2006; Williamson-Lott, 2003). There are 106 private and public HBCUs today, with the privates currently maintaining elite reputations for shaping the intellectual leadership among African Americans (Williamson-Lott, 2003).

Another significant corner in American's higher education history is the establishment of public colleges and universities. Unlike the religious beginnings of the

private institutions, the public institutions had a secular start. They were created with the assistance of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862. The Act parceled out federal lands to eligible states to sell and build public institutions, where they could provide liberal arts education and professional training to the larger public who could not afford to attend the private colleges and universities (Lucas, 2006).

Despite intentions for public good, state colleges and universities still had institutional cultures, which practiced exclusionary policies that discriminated against minorities and women (Lucas, 2006). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed in order to address these prejudices so that no public institution could discriminate against an individual based on religion, race, color, or national origin (Lucas, 2006). While the Civil Rights Act benefitted many students' admission to college, it did not address issues of gender bias against women nor did it ease issues of affordability of an undergraduate degree (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Title IX, which is a portion of the Education Amendments of 1972, was a watershed bill which stated that no individual should be discriminated against on the basis of sex, opening up opportunities for women.

Community colleges, by default, would become institutions that directly confronted these biases simply because they were not founded with any influence of religious denominations, goals of maintaining prestige, or meeting state demands like other private and public colleges and universities (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The genesis as well as the evolution of community colleges was to provide a post secondary educational service that was not being fulfilled at the other institutions of higher education (Levin et al., 2006; O'Banion, 1997). For this major reason, community

colleges carved their place in the higher education landscape in the U.S (Cohen & Brawer 1996; O'Banion, 1997).

Culture of Community Colleges as an Institution

Historically, open access policy has been the backbone of community college admissions (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Dougherty, 2003; Valdez, 1996). With universal acceptance to all who come to community colleges, the results have produced a broad range of students with a higher representation of low-income, minority and female students than found at four-year institutions (Shaw, Valadez, & Rhoads, 1999). In fact, in some districts the underrepresented ethnic minority students are not the minority population, but the majority (CCCO, 2013; Levin et al., 2014). In addition, community colleges also have high student enrollments of veterans (3%), non-U.S. citizens (7%), single parents (16%), and those with disabilities (12%), with female students representing the prominent majority at 61% (NCES, 2009).

With such diverse student representation that more accurately portrays the mixed populations in America than at most 4-year institutions, the term "people's college" or "democracy's college" became synonymously associated with community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Community colleges were known as a place which offered opportunities. Ultimately, many of the students who percolate through these institutions are driven by hopes of social mobility. This is most exemplified by the 40% of students (NCES, 2009) who are the first generation to attend college in their families (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Shaw et al., 1999). But as functions and institutional focus stretched

throughout the evolution of community colleges, the culture of universal chance and change would be challenged.

Particular to this current generation of community colleges is the rhetoric of community colleges as “people’s college” or “democracy’s college”, which has been argued as problematic (Shaw et al., 1999) and even outdated (Levin et al., 2006). In *Community College Faculty,* Levin et al. (2006) asserted that no longer is the community college an entity of democracy, but one that is subject to a volatile political economy, which harnesses the tenets of capitalism essential to its survival in today’s environment. That is, productivity and efficiency are imperative to the two classes of consumers – the students and employers: “The alliances are with economic entities such as business and industry and political affiliations with neo-liberal proponents such as those elements of government and business that foster economic development and competition” (p. 19). As economic conditions change, the balance of democracy and capitalism precariously shifts accordingly.

This precarious shift is embodied within the identity and culture of today’s community colleges. State funding, which community colleges rely on heavily to operate and provide educational opportunities, is channeled to other public services prioritized as more important by local governments (Lovell & Trouth, 2002). For example, states are pressured to fund health, welfare and prison systems due to their life and death contexts. Consequently, the issues within the education sector are overshadowed because they are seen as less dire. Not only is education at the bottom of the recipient list for state funding, but community colleges are at the bottom of the education list. This leaves two-

year institutions vulnerable and necessitates that they find other avenues of resources (Levin et al., 2011).

Embracing a variety of business practices has meant a major retooling of community college operations to survive during the lean economic times. One way in which they do this is to focus on course offerings that cater to the funding trends of the moment. If the needs of transfer students are what generate the most funds, some colleges may often dramatically reduce or even eliminate their adult education programs (Laden, 1999). Alternatively, if the focus is on state budgets for transferring adult education from the K-12 districts to community colleges, some colleges may reduce other courses to accommodate. Another business practice that community colleges conduct is partnering with large corporations through contract training, where classes are offered to teach a job-specific skill or improve performance to employees of a business, labor union, public agency or industry (Kane & Rouse, 1999). Finally, the practice to increase Career Technical Education (CTE) distance-learning courses to reach to a wider pool of students also has business implications (Johnson et al.,, 2003). With distance learning and other forms of web instructions, students have the option to chose a community college based on the course offerings and fees; therefore making recruitment from the local geographic community less important than it used to be in the past (Lovell & Trouth, 2002).

As the geographical boundaries of community colleges erode, economic orientation weighs even more heavily on many of the organizational decisions at community colleges. The adoption of business practices to react to the economic

environment can have profoundly complex, and even dangerous, implications. By serving the interests of government, business and industry and international corporations, the primary mission of open access is undermined. "By aligning themselves with these interests, community colleges direct their behaviors not to the needs and desires of their students and local communities, but to external forces…" (Levin et al., 2006, p. 22). For these reasons, referring to community colleges as the "new world colleges" or "noveau colleges" best describes these two-year institutions as they are no longer for the people (Levin et al., 2006).

Culture of the Academic Profession

The culture of the academic profession in the United States, specifically faculty work at community colleges, can best be understood by recognizing the hierarchy of the academic labor market. Academic labor, also known as faculty work, is broadly segmented with the primary task of either research or teaching (Clark, 1987). Therefore, the norms that guide faculty selection should be different from that of research and comprehensive universities (research-focused) than from the community colleges (teaching-focused). The simplicity of this norm, however, is grossly overlooked when it comes to faculty selection (Twombly, 2005).

Because of the different employment criteria for faculty, Clark (1987) suggested that faculty work at community colleges should be categorized into a separate academic occupation versus the work of professors at 4-year colleges and universities. Specifically, community college faculty work is more similar to that of a public school teacher, where the main task of teaching involves instruction and curriculum design.

This is vastly different from the work of a college and university professor, where they are hired mainly for their academic expertise and publications, which underscores that teaching is overshadowed by research (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Time for scholarship, then, becomes a constant juggle with teaching undergraduate and graduate classes for university faculty (Bridges et al., 2002; Clark, 1987; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; J.P. Murray, 2009; O'Meara, Terosky & Neumann, 2009). This is also true at comprehensive universities, even though the claim is that these institutions emphasize teaching (Boice, 2000; Clark, 1987; Kezar & Sam, 2010; J.P. Murray, 2009). While the heavy teaching workload is a primary concern, the "publish or perish" culture is one that does not exist, and is therefore, not an issue for community college faculty (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002).

Despite this widely accepted delineation between the primary tasks of research versus teaching, the dominant view in higher education to group faculty work at colleges and universities along with community colleges persists currently (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Twombly, 2005). Furthermore, the outcome of this produces a singular hierarchy within this post secondary faculty group. At the top are the prestigious research universities; in the middle are comprehensive universities; at the bottom are community colleges (California Study of Higher Education [CSHE], 2013; Youn, 1988). Therefore, teaching as a task is viewed as inferior to scholarship, marking the work of faculty at community colleges as less prestigious (Twombly, 2005). Community college faculty are acutely aware that their work may be considered on the bottom rung of the academic hierarchy--especially by their university colleagues (Townsend & LaPaglia,

2000)--but they continue to teach in 2-year institutions for different motivations and reasons (Levin et al., 2006; Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

<u>Culture of the Academic Discipline</u>

Similar to the hierarchy of faculty work, there is also a hierarchy that exists among the academic disciplines within universities and community colleges nationwide. The pecking order or internal divisions, however, depends on the institution type (Grubb, 1999). Specifically, for community colleges, the disciplines in which a faculty member teaches can impact their status within the institution. Based on the course that a faculty teaches, Twombly and Townsend (2008) concluded that "…some community college faculty members are disrespected or held in lower esteem by some of their own colleagues" (p.17). For example, faculty who teach English as a Second Language (ESL) or remedial courses are sometimes considered lesser in status by their faculty peers at the community colleges (Grubb, Badway, & Bell, 2003; Perin, 2002).

Another inequity observed in the culture of discipline at the community colleges is the hierarchy between academic versus non-academic faculty. Academic faculty or instructors, who teach in the general education or transfer programs, are often held in higher regard than those who teach in the adult education programs, which includes career and technical transfer programs (Grubb, 1999; Grubb et al., 2003; McGrath & Spear, 1991). These internal divisions give insights to the negativity or inferiority that some community college faculty may feel if they are teaching in developmental education or adult education (Grubb & Cox, 2005).

Moreover, among the academic disciplines, there continues to exist an engendered hierarchy at community colleges similar to those in universities where the natural sciences are dominated by men and considered more prestigious (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002). With funding incentives focused on STEM fields, faculty in STEM are given the highest priority, even in some cases higher pay (Perna, 2003), though some are content experts and may lack the teaching experience which is valued at community colleges (AACC, 2004). The targeted recruitment, retention and treatment of STEM faculty elevates their status to one that conveys more prestige and importance than faculty in any of the other fields in community colleges; thus putting them at the very top of the hierarchy of disciplines. Conversely, women faculty remain concentrated in the disciplinary areas of the humanities, social sciences, and education (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002), where they also receive lower salary as compared to their male colleagues teaching in STEM, and in some cases, in the same disciplines (Perna, 2003).

Climate of Community Colleges

Beyond the generalized and holistic views of institutional culture, a tighter scope in which to examine the experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges can be explored by focusing on the institutional climate (Hurtado et al., 1998). The climate of a university or college can be defined as the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members (Hurtado et al., 1998). Moreover, the analysis of climate enables a better understanding of the nature of the social interactions within the academic community as these have a profound effect on the experiences of faculty.

Hall and Sandler (1982) originally coined the phrase "chilly climate" to describe the negative experiences of female college students because professors exhibited favorably towards male students. Subsequently, this phrase had groundbreaking implications for future studies. Namely, "chilly climate" has been applied to studies that focused on women's experience in higher education (Solorzano, 1998; Solorzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000; Yosso, Ceja, Smith, & Solorzano, 2009), including the discriminating practices that female faculty and administrators confronted in terms of professional advancement (Hall & Sandler, 1984). More recently, "chilly climate" has been used to describe the prejudice--both in the forms of overt practices as well as microgressions--as experienced by minority faculty (Stanley, 2006). Expanding on the concept of climate as a measure of racial and ethnic diversity, Hurtado et al. (1998) conceived of four dimensions in which to examine the level of discriminating policies and practice within universities. Though a seminal study, the climate of community colleges was not addressed in their discussion of the diversity of campus climates and was limited to 4-year institutions (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado, Milem, Clay-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999).

Bridging this gap in the literature on institutional diversity, Townsend and Twombly (2007) adapted the four dimensions from the study of Hurtado et al. (1998) to examine issues of equity within the context of community colleges. Specifically, the four dimensions were modified to address the unique characteristics of community colleges, where they have higher representation of women across student, faculty and administrator populations. The first dimension is *Institutional history regarding women*, where the inclusion and exclusion of women in community colleges was examined. The second

dimension is *Women's numerical representation in community colleges,* where the majority female representation was evaluated for trends and projections. The third dimension is *Perceptions of institutional climate for women,* where critical research on university faculty of color (which is more prevalent) was used to lay the groundwork for a comparison on to the critical research on community college faculty (which was nearly non-existent). Lastly, the fourth dimension is *Behaviors of women and men on campus,* where the leadership behaviors affecting women students were considered in reference to their treatment, mainly towards students, within community colleges.

This section utilizes the four dimensions as proposed by Townsend and Twombly (2007) to examine perceived climate as it pertains to the experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges. Though their findings helped expose gendered issues of equity in community colleges, Townsend and Twombly (2007) did not account for the intersections of race and class. In fact, therefore, this literature review also applies aspects of Multiracial Feminism Theory to enable for a more critical approach. Namely, by using the three selected features (*Matrix of Domination, Women's Agency* and, lastly, *Diverse, lived experiences*), the critical lens employed expands and even challenges some of their findings on climate as experience by women as a collective group, revealing that not all findings may be congruent to those of women of color.

Institutional History Regarding Women

The first dimension to be assessed in examining the community college's climate for women is its history of inclusion or exclusion of women. In looking at the community college as an institution, the historical development and its consequential

legacy reveal that it has been favorable to the admission of female students as well as female workers. As an extension to the high school system, community colleges (which were initially called junior college throughout at least the first half of the twentieth century) were considered a place for affordable education that was accessible to both men and women. Because it was deemed an inexpensive institution for postsecondary educational attainment, the community college became a desirable place for those students who sought to be near their families or community. Many students, particularly women, were attracted to this option because parents were typically more concerned about their daughters than their sons leaving home to receive a college education. Furthermore, women students found community colleges as a viable, alternative option to 4-year universities especially at a time when undergraduate enrollments were being saturated with both male and female students (Solomon, 1985).

Whether it was the close proximity to home or that it provided an alternative option to universities, community colleges became synonymous with the ideals of accessibility. According to the AACC (2004), the historical background of these 2-year institutions had a notable characteristic: "A distinctive feature of the institutions was their accessibility to women, attributable to the leading role the colleges played in preparing grammar school teachers" (p. 4). This was particularly important as an undergraduate degree, or baccalaureate, was not mandatory to teach in the K-8 levels in some states (AACC, 2004).

This notion of accessibility to women students manifested in the development of the curricula (Drake, 2008). The gendered curricula in community colleges, which

targeted women students, offered benefits that were two-fold. On the one hand, "feminine subjects" such as home economics and secretarial programs satisfied the educational needs for some women students. On the other hand, women students who wished to transfer to universities and attain a baccalaureate degree could also achieve that through the transfer program (Drake, 2008). As a result of the popularity of the transfer program, the gendered curricula morphed and expanded frequently to provide academic content that the women students sought for their university transfer goals (Fry, 1995).

The President's Commission report of 1947 marked the official renaming of Junior Colleges into Community Colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). This report further popularized community colleges, inadvertently marketing the college as a postsecondary institution to attend grades 13 and 14 after high school. This "open access" mission of community colleges continued to be favored by women students due to the its reputation as a low-cost and accessible place that was open to all. Not surprisingly, women students were not the only ones who were drawn to community colleges. As Townsend & Twombly (2007) noted:

> Not only women students joined the community college during this period. Women faculty had always been a part of 2-year colleges, reflecting the high school roots of many of these institutions. However, with the tremendous expansion in the number of community colleges, built at the rate of one a week in the mid-1960s, institutional leaders, desperate to fill faculty positions, were even more willing to hire women as faculty. Since community college faculty during this time period frequently came from high schools, there was a relative abundance of women available to be faculty. Also, since the 4-year sector was expanding during this time period, many men seeking faculty positions were wooed to 4-year colleges and universities rather than to community colleges, a situation that further contributed to the community college's receptivity to women. (p. 209)

Women's Numerical Representation in Community Colleges

In the examination of this second dimension of institutional climate (Townsend & Twombly, 2007), a detailed look at the representation of women as students, faculty and administrators in community college is provided to give numerical association reflecting their increased presence as a gender group. In applying a critical lens, the figures also include the breakdown of race and ethnicity. It is important to disaggregate beyond gender so as not to lump the representation of White women with that of women of color, given that the latter group's racialized experience of community college culture and campus climate are uniquely different to those of White women (Bower, 2002; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Levin et al., 2014; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Especially, in the ranks of full-time faculty and administrators, national figures uncover the disproportionately majority representation of White women (Opp & Gosetti, 2002).

The figures were from the California Community College system (CCC) since it is known as the largest system of higher education in the country. CCC currently serves approximately 2.4 million students statewide at its 112 campuses and is one of the most diverse community college systems in the nation (CCCCO, 2013). Based on the findings of Opp and Gosetti (2002), Californian 2-year colleges should be the focus of community college research on climate because they serve as a positive predictor in terms of the proportional representation of women full-time faculty of color. In other words, no other minority female faculty population could best indicate whether the climate is truly "less chilly" or that it actually is a dominant perspective exclusive to White women,

Students. In terms of the most current gender breakdown of the students who attended California community colleges for Spring 2013, the presence of female students is greater than the male students across overall enrollment as well as a majority of the disaggregated ethnicity groups (CCCCO, 2013). Over half of the students who are enrolled at a CCC are female (54%), with male representation trailing behind (45%), and lastly, there is a small percentage of unknown or undeclared gender (1%). Among the Latina/o student population, which represents the highest student enrollment compared to other ethnic groups in CCC, the student population consists of 37.20% Latinas and 35.53% Latinos. The Pacific Islander student population consists a higher percentage of males (0.55%) versus females (0.53%), however, their exceedingly low numbers resembles similar underrepresentation of American Indians on the CCC campuses, with males (0.49%) and females (0.53%).

Even among those disaggregated ethnicity groups where the number of enrolled female students are less than male students (African-American, Asian American, Filipino, and Whites), the difference between the gender count was insignificant and sometimes just a hairline apart. Among the African Americans students enrolled at CCC, females consist of 6.15% whereas males consist of 6.20% of the overall student population. Among the Asian American students at CCC, females consist of 12.25% and males consist of 12.28% of the overall student population. Among the Filipina/o students enrolled at CCC, Filipina comprised 2.95% whereas Filipino comprised of 3.38% of the overall student population. The gender difference between White students, who did not identify as Latino, was the biggest among all the groups where there were more males

(33.07%) than females (32.16%) among the student population.

In addition to the ethnic diversity of the student population, CCC also comprises a student population that ranges in age groups as well as enrollment status (CCCCO, 2013). Continuing students are the largest group enrolled at CCC, representing 70.78% of the entire population. In addition, over a third (39.61%) of the continuing students fall into the non-traditional age group of 20-24 years old, with 22.85% who fall into the traditional aged group of 19 years and under. The second largest group enrolled at CCC is the returning students, representing 10.90% of the overall student enrollment. Similar to the continuing students, the highest representation of those enrolled as returning students fall in the non-traditional age group of 20-24 year old (32.76%). Returning students also tend to have high representation in the other non-traditional age groups, with 19.53% who fall into the 25-29 year old age group and 11.64% who fall into the 30-34 years old age group.

Faculty. As of fall 2012, there is a total of 17, 248 tenured/track faculty teaching in CCC. Similar to gender representation among the student population, over half of the full-time faculty in California's community colleges are female. Female faculty represent 54%, whereas male faculty represent 46% of the CCC faculty.

The ethnic composition of the faculty, however, does not reflect the overall student body of CCC and holds the highest ethnic contrast of faculty to student ethnic match. White faculty hold a strong majority of the full-time faculty positions and comprise of nearly two thirds (64.69 %) of the entire faculty population at CCC. Latina/o faculty hold 13.44 % of the tenured/track positions and represent the second largest

ethnic representation among faculty at CCC. The Latina/o faculty population, however, does not come close to mirroring the Latina/o student population that they teach, which comprises of 36.31% of the overall students attending CCC. On the other hand, African American faculty consists of 5.81% of the tenured/track positions, which closely mirrors the overall African American student population on the CCC campuses (6.16%).

While the ethnic and gender representation of adjunct faculty somewhat parallels the figures of tenured/track faculty in the CCC, the alarming difference is that there are almost twice as many temporary faculty, or adjuncts, as there are full-time faculty. Within CCC, there are a total of 38,185 adjunct faculty teaching at the 112 campuses and 2.4 million students. Similar to their full-time counterparts, White faculty comprise the ethnic majority of the overall adjunct faculty population (65.81%). The second most represented ethnic group of adjunct faculty members are Latina/o faculty (11.61%). Reflecting figures close to the tenured/track faculty, the third most represented ethnic group among CCC faculty are the Asian American faculty, with 7.68% comprising overall tenured/track positions and 7.4% comprising overall adjunct positions.

Each community college institution is unique to the community that it serves. Therefore, the faculty ethnic representation in CCC, when disaggregated at the district or institutional level, may not align with these statewide figures. Rather, these statewide numbers prove their utility when a broad analysis of the faculty make-up is required to better understand the institutional climate of California's community colleges. A more acute analysis, using site-specific figures, may be necessary when looking at differences among regional districts throughout the state.

Administrators. The overall administration population is the smallest compared to faculty and staff, comprising only of 1,928 individuals. Similar to the gender make-up of the overall student and faculty populations, females (52.9%) comprise the majority over males (47.1%) among educational administrators.

Next to the faculty demographics, however, the population that has the second highest ethnic contrast to the student population at CCC is that of the administration. Whites comprise the largest ethnic group among the administrators, with males comprising 58.2% and females comprising 52.9% of the administration ranks. Latina/os are the second largest ethnic group at CCC among both females and males. Among the administration ranks, Latinas comprise of 16.5% while Latinos comprise 11.7%.

Though there are more males than females for White and Latina/o administrators, the opposite is true for the other ethnic groups in CCC. Among African American administrators, females comprise of 10.8% and males 8.9% of the administration population. Similarly, there are more female (9.7%) than male (7.7%) Asian American administrators.

For other ethnic minority groups that are drastically underrepresented, there are slightly more males than females. Among CCC administrators, American Indian males represent 0.99% and females 0.49%. Pacific Islander males represent 0.66% and females 0.39 % of the administration population. Like the student demographic, staff representation among these ethnic groups is as scarce as they are in the student population.

Perceptions of Institutional Climate for Women

While disaggregated numbers provide actual representations and can serve as indicators of trends, they alone do not provide a complete picture of an institution's treatment towards women of color. As Townsend & Twombly (2007) asserted, the strength of numbers "can mask negative perceptions of climate at individual institutions" (p. 212). For example, African American women faculty may be the ethnic majority at a historically black college, but they may still perceive the climate as chilly because of the gender discrimination they confront among their faculty peers and administration. Therefore, it is crucial to get a comprehensive understanding of community college climate based on the collective and individual-based views of faculty members (Hurtado et al., 1998). The third dimension to be assessed in examining a community college's climate is how the institutional climate is perceived by women of color (Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

While the critical research on the experiences of women of color faculty in 4-year institutions is still emergent, it is available. It was not until the 1980s that the scholarship first addressed the intersections of class and race for women faculty (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002). To date, there has been considerable acknowledgement that the university climate is considered chilly, if not hostile or toxic, by women faculty of color (Harris & Gonzales, 2012; Turner 2002). Unfortunately, the literature regarding the perception of women faculty of color in community colleges climate is scant. Scholarship on issues of equity in community colleges suggests that the climate is less chilly, or even warming up (Townsend & LaPaglia, 2013; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). These discussions, however,

are aggregated views of women faculty, often ignoring the critical intersections of race and class. Therefore, a discussion of how women of color perceive the community college climate is limited to these two available sources: critical perspectives on university climates and aggregated perspectives on community college climates.

University climate. Faculty members often struggle as they negotiate their journeys through the university. There is evidence that faculty members who are not part of the dominant culture, especially women and minority faculty, experience these struggles with more difficulty due to the fact that they are marginalized (Harris & Gonzales, 2012; Turner, 2002). Often, women and minority faculty experience hostile climates, which causes them both professional (Gardner, 2012; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002) and personal harm (Vakalahi & Starks, 2011). These damaging interactions compromise their contribution to the institution and can ultimately attribute to high attrition rates (Gardner, 2012; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Rosser, 2004). In addition, women faculty must sincerely question the viability of marriage/partnerships (Etzkowitz, Kemelgor, & Uzzi, 2000) or balancing a family during the pressures of the tenure process, with many opting to delay both or risking a pregnancy (Armenti, 2004; Finkel, Kolker & Olswang, 1996; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). Furthermore, these challenges are most pronounced in the hard sciences, where male faculty still overwhelmingly dominate these disciplines, creating offensive and isolating climates for their female colleagues (Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science, Engineering (U.S.), Committee on Science, & Public Policy (U.S.), 2007). These challenges faced by women faculty, however, do not address the additional barriers that women of color confront

within the academy. Specifically, critical scholars, who research the intersections of race, class and gender among university faculty perspectives, confirm resoundingly that women of color continue to confront a myriad of other discriminating practices. For example, women faculty of color face widespread presumption of their incompetence in the academic community, including doubt from administrators, faculty peers and students who openly treat them and their scholarship as inferior (Bonner & Thomas, 2001; A. Cox, 2011; Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Lee; 2003; Turner, 2002; Winkle-Wagner, 2009; Winkler, 2000). Also, women faculty of color are viewed as the token voice representing their race/ethnicity; thus, they are asked to serve on committees that are critical to the function of the institution while also being overloaded with students of color who seek their advice or support because they are the only person of color in the department (Aquirre, 2000; Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Turner, 2002). These experiences substantiate that the climate is extremely chilly, if not icy, for women faculty of color working in universities. Since women faculty of color experience their academic roles significantly differently than White women faculty and male faculty of color at 4-year institutions, it would be equally crucial to parallel this critical approach to women faculty of color at community colleges. Unfortunately, the intersectionality of race, class and gender in the literature regarding community college climates is skeletal. Hagedorn and Laden (2002) asserted:

> A discussion of conditions for women faculty must acknowledge that women of color may experience an even chillier climate than White women. Ignoring women's differences related to culture and race/ethnicity would be a glaring omission akin to that of Erikson (1968) and others' psychological development studies of White men that assume that they represent the entire population. (p. 72).

Therefore, if a female faculty identifies as both a woman and a minority, her perspective and experiences are overgeneralized--or even negated--by findings from the current studies. Ironically, research intending to inform about the experiences of marginalized faculty (women and minority) inadvertently serves to further marginalize women of color. For these reasons, future exploration of how women faculty of color experience the climate of community colleges must include the intersectionality of race, class and gender.

Community college climate. Despite the prevalence of recent literature which critically focuses on the perceptions of women faculty of color of their campus climates, scholars have mainly relied on the institutional data and experiential accounts of faculty at 4-year institutions (Aquirre, 2000; A. Cox, 2008; Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Turner et al., 1999; Turner et al., 2008; Winkle-Wagner, 2009; Winkler, 2000). For the scarce research that explores climates at community colleges, the analytical approach categorizes all women faculty into one group and minority faculty into another (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Levin et al., 2014; Perna, 2003; Townsend, 2009; Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). The high percentage of female representation at all levels--administrators, faculty, staff and students--creates an environment that normalizes rather than marginalizes women. In addition, community colleges "enable [faculty women to] comfortably achieve professional fulfillment, sometimes combined with raising a family" (Townsend, 1998, p. 655). Though current challenges exist, the overall scholarship on community college climates has concluded that the climate at 2-year institutions is 'less chilly' for women faculty (Townsend, 2009;

Townsend & Twombly, 2007; Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). These findings are informative yet unsatisfying. They beg the questions: Is it truly "less chilly" for all women faculty? Would women faculty of color concur that the climate is warmer in community colleges?

While those questions may spark interest for new research contributions, they cannot be answered conclusively given the scarcity of studies that examine the specific views of faculty of color in current community college literature. For this literature review, three studies were identified which revealed specific findings that included women faculty of color in community colleges, with only one which explicitly sampled women of color as a participant group.

In the study of Opp and Gosetti (2002), a national trend and predictive analyses was conducted to examine the changes in proportional representation of women faculty of color from 1991 to 1997 across various types of 2-year colleges. The data on female faculty were sampled from a national data set and disaggregrated by race/ethnicity with the purpose of measuring unique trends to women faculty of color, which are often grouped with White women. Their findings indicated that across all underrepresented ethnic groups, there was limited growth that occurred in the proportional representation of minority women faculty (i.e., American Indian, Asian American, African American, and Latina/Hispanic). In contrast, White women faculty experienced the largest increases in proportional representation across all public community colleges. They concluded that "women of color did not benefit to the same degree as did White women" (p. 611). In addition, the researchers found that the strongest predictor of representational growth of

minority women faculty was when there was a “critical mass” of women of color administrators because they were “an essential ingredient in enhancing the number of women full-time faculty of color in 2-year colleges” (Opp & Gosetti, 2002, p. 621). They suggested that for the institutions that have a critical mass of women of color, they reflect a commitment to diversity and inclusivity and would likely have a less chilly climate. Though the findings from their study are over 15 years old, the predictors identified have remained salient over time and continue to provide relevant policy implications for issues concerning race-equitable practices in community colleges.

The most recent of the studies, which include findings on women faculty of color in community colleges, is the dissertation research of Julianna Oakes (2008) titled *Tenure and Promotion Differentials for Women Faculty and Faculty of Color at Public Two Year Community Colleges in the United States*. In Oakes’s study, a national secondary data set was used to understand the extent to which gender and race/ethnicity are related to tenure status and academic rank in community colleges. Even though her sampling of the data did not intersect the race and gender characteristics for women faculty of color as a specific group, the findings suggest that the roles of race and gender were important in the analysis and implications. For example, Oakes (2008) concluded that White and male faculty maintained a representational advantage in terms of tenure status in community colleges, yet there was no significant gender difference in the attainment of rank of full professor. Lastly, Oakes (2008) also asserted that White faculty maintained an advantage over faculty of color regarding attainment of the rank of full professor.

Applying a critical lens to the findings of Oakes (2008) revealed that they

similarly reflect the findings of Opp & Gosetti (2002), but in reverse. That is, the critical mass of senior White male faculty in community colleges allows them to maintain a tenure advantage over faculty of color and women (Oakes, 2008). By "women", this is presuming the aggregated data for women is predominantly White, as reflected in national data sets once race and ethnicity is disaggregated for women faculty (NCES, 2009). Considering women faculty of color are still underrepresented in full-time faculty ranks in community colleges (NCES, 2009), this institutional practice is implicitly exclusionary which makes for a chilly climate for women faculty of color. In contrast, Opp and Gosetti (2002) assert that the community colleges that have a critical mass of women of color, particularly in senior administration levels, makes for a less chilly climate for women faculty of color because they benefit from being around others like them, changing their token status (p. 612).

While quantitative studies using national data sets help identify factors that control for the prediction of representational growth or tenure promotion for women faculty of color, the absence of qualitative narratives do not give the complete picture of how they perceive the climate at community colleges. The mixed-methods study of Beverly Bower (2002), which synthesized survey results along with focus group interviews, helps satisfy this void.

In the study of campus life for faculty of color, Bower (2002) conducted focus group interviews to compare the minority faculty experiences at two community colleges, which were both predominantly White institutions. Though it was not the specific aim of her study, Bower (2002) was able to capture the voices and experiences of women faculty

of color by default because African American and Latina women comprised the majority of the participants in her focus groups. Focus group conversations from both institutions addressed issues of race. The minority faculty discussed how race influenced their interactions on campus:

> As they recall with some detail encounters they have had over the years with students and faculty alike, it is clear that the experiences of the long-time faculty, many of whom were among the first minority faculty on their campuses, have made lasting impressions. Isolation, alienation, overt discrimination by peers and students, and a sense of separation are experiences shared by [minority] faculty on both campuses. (p. 83)

For the newer minority faculty, their experience with racism was experienced more in the forms of microaggressions by their students. They shared how the race of the students can determine how it can affect interactions. For example, White students displayed doubts or questioned the competence of the minority faculty; whereas, students of color assumed automatic liberties because of shared ethnic bonds. Finally, the minority faculty from the focus groups discussed how being consumed with issues of race was both a reality and exclusively something only *they* were aware of because their White faculty colleagues were not aware of the concerns surrounding race (and of their privilege).

Behaviors of Women and Men on Campus

In this final dimension of institutional climate (Townsend & Twombly, 2007), examining the behavioral interactions among relevant groups on community college campuses provide insight to the climate as experienced by women faculty of color. Expanding on Townsend & Twombly's adaptation (2007), this dimension looked at the leadership behaviors affecting women faculty of color in the community colleges, with a critical lens looking at the intersections of race, class and gender when applicable.

Similar to the previous dimension on institutional climate, the lack of literature addressing the perspectives of women faculty of color in community colleges also applies to the female leadership in community colleges (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Other than a few articles looking at female deans by Hilton (1935), "little attention was paid in the [Community College Journal] to women administrators or faculty in the 1970s and 1980s. The attention took the form of spotlighting an occasional college for its efforts to develop an inclusive work environment" (p. 214). White men held leadership positions in community colleges exclusively and were uncontested until twenty years ago. However, this should be no surprise. According to Amey and Twombly (1992), they suggested that the sexist language used in describing leadership positions were engendered as masculine and, as such, women were not likely to show interest in a position that recruited for a "strong, often militaristic" leader (p. 145).

Times and values have changed as reflected not only in the rise of community college presidents that are women, but also their financial compensation. Currently, women presidents in community colleges comprise 30% of the executive team nationwide (AACC, 2013). In a research brief by the AACC (2012), *Compensation and Benefits of Community College CEOs: 2012*, the executive summary stated that women presidents, on average, earned higher base salaries than their male counterparts. Female leaders earned an average base salary of $170,000, which is higher than the average base salary for male leaders ($167,000). Furthermore, the study reported that Hispanic and Black presidents earned more than their fellow White leaders. Hispanic presidents topped the salary list with a median base salary of $201,555, followed by Black

presidents who earned a median base salary of $190,000. Trailing in third place are White presidents, who had a median base salary of $167,200.

How is it that women and minority leaders are subverting dominant structures and traditional pay scales in executive community college positions? Across most institutions of higher education, White men have generally commanded the highest pay. A critical approach is required for further analysis. One explanation is that ethnicity is not necessarily a predictor for higher salary, but that minority presidents tend to work at large colleges in urban areas. Coincidentally, both of these factors are associated with higher salaries as reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Rogers, 2012).

Though the number of female presidents is not yet equal to that of male presidents in community colleges, does the legacy of their leadership have an impact on women faculty of color? It is difficult to determine when the available studies on salary differentials are not explicitly addressing the intersections of gender and race. In the study of Perna (2003), she asserted that the average salary for female adjunct faculty (aggregated) is higher than for male adjunct faculty. Considering White women comprise the majority of adjunct faculty in community colleges nationwide, collectively that would suggest that women adjuncts might find the community college climate not so chilly.

Mentoring Relationships

Women faculty of color in community colleges have several advantages compared to those faculty in 4-year colleges and universities. First, they teach in an engendered institutional culture where the female student representation is often the

majority and the overall student body is significantly diverse (Levin et al., 2014). Second, the racialized climate of community colleges is purported to be less chilly than what is experienced by women faculty of color at 4-year universities, though the paucity of research on this topic leaves room for further investigation (Bower, 2002; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Perna; 2003). Third, the tenure and academic promotion in community colleges is generally based on seniority and academic credentials (Grubb, 1999; Twombly & Townsend, 2008), rather than the highly pressured environment of research universities. So why then is the ability to adopt and express social capital appropriate for academic success at 2-year institutions considered stifling?

Social capital for community college faculty can be understood by taking a closer look at the demands of faculty work. Faculty work in community colleges requires a tremendous amount of institutionalized knowledge that faculty should have, and unwritten skill-sets that faculty should possess, but often they have neither, especially new faculty (Vega, Yglesias & Murray, 2010). The main task of faculty work is balancing a heavy teaching workload. Because teaching can be a series of classes, this often leaves faculty little time to connect and they often experience phenomenal isolation from the rest of their colleagues and their department (Grubb, 1999). Teaching to the diversity of students from all different backgrounds and learning levels requires an awareness of pedagogical methods. However, faculty rarely get to participate in that exchange. These defining aspects leave both new and experienced faculty desiring for ways to connect with a mentor, colleagues or a learning community (Grubb, 1999). Furthermore, this isolation may feel even more exacerbated if the faculty member is new

or is an underrepresented minority, where they may experience tokenism (Perna, 2003).

In the study of Vega et al. (2010), the authors suggested that a mentoring program is one way in which community colleges can create a smoother transition and provide support for new faculty of color. They recommend that mentoring is most sustainable when it is formal and structured. Most literature on faculty mentoring also suggests this, but they are almost exclusive to university programs where there is more funding and other resources to design an effective mentoring program.

For this section, the literature review draws from university faculty mentoring paradigms as well as from business. This is due to the fact that literature on mentoring relationships, namely faculty mentoring, is nearly non-existent. Mentoring, in all of its forms, is a way to empower faculty of color, and especially women faculty of color, to better their prospects of navigating through challenging situations as they confront institutional inequities in their faculty work at community colleges.

In this final section of the literature review, both frameworks under the overarching conceptual framework provide the lens to examine questions on what motivates women faculty of color in community colleges to seek support and how they may go about doing it. From Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003), the aspect *Help-Seeking Orientation* informs the framing of mentoring relationships as a process that seeks to establish or attain social capital. *Help-Seeking Orientation* borrows from the definition of Stanton-Salazar (1997, 2002), which represents perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs that "inform or motivate the choices an individual makes--whether consciously or

unconsciously--in recruiting, manipulation, and maintaining various social relationships" (p. 26).

Coupled with Social Capital Network Framework, Multiracial Feminism Theory (Zinn & Dill, 1996) is also utilized to critically frame mentoring relationships. Specifically, the feature called *Women's Agency* by Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2000) is applied with the intersectional implication that within the constraints of race, class, and gender oppression, women of color create viable lives for themselves, their families and communities. Despite institutional inequalities that women faculty of color confront daily, they can still display agency by tapping into resources or reaching out for support, such as mentoring relationships, as a means to oppose dominant structures.

Mentoring

In their book *Training in Organizations: Needs Assessment, Development, an Evaluation*, organizational psychologists Goldstein and Ford (2002) defined mentoring as a process where "individuals can also gain enhanced leadership competencies from learning partners (tutors) or mentors whose role is to work with and coach less experienced leaders" (p. 319). Specifically, the "less experienced leader" is the mentee, who is also at a lower position--from an organizational level--than the mentor. The mentor may hold a more senior or higher position, yet does not serve as the mentee's supervisor. Finally, the goal of a mentorship, or the mentoring process, is to enhance the mentee's skills in a manner that is focused and effective with the intention of reducing the time it takes for the mentee to become proficient while also preventing costly mistakes or unnecessary trial-and-error in the mentee's learning (p. 319).

Even though the business sector acknowledges the value of mentoring, the process is still often left to chance. Management consultants Kaye and Jacobson (1996) attributed the "random nature of mentoring" (p. 35) to many organizations incapable of clearly defining their assumptions about the process. Some define mentoring based only on the end product. For example, one of the assumptions businesses make of mentoring is in emphasizing targeted sales growth (product) but not the actual career development of the employee (process) (Drucker, 2008a; Kay, 2008). The effort required to clarify the mentoring process and to approach it systematically is time-consuming, if not considered costly upfront (Drucker, 2008b; Goldstein & Ford, 2002). As a result, mentoring is fostered, but remains largely informal in the business sector and, moreover, across many other industries (Goldstein & Ford, 2002, Kaye & Jacobson, 1996; Kay, 2008; Zellers et al., 2008).

Given that the fast-paced business industry is generally *lassiez faire* in formalizing the mentoring process for new employees, the approach to mentoring in higher education is even less developed and receptive (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Zellers et al., 2008). The academy's unresponsiveness to formal mentoring, however, does not necessarily signal a resistance. Rather, the lack of response reflects an outdated and unrealistic (Boyle & Boice, 1998), if not romanticized (Boice, 2000), view of mentoring. Based on interviews with campus deans and department chairs, Boice (2000) observed: "Most campus leaders in a position to help new faculty believe that the best mentoring occurs spontaneously, without unnatural arrangements" (p. 237). Boice's (2000) observation, which lends itself to informal mentoring, underscored what is the established

culture of independence and academic freedom across among faculty in higher education of all institutional types (Welsh & Metcalf, 2003; O'Meara et al., 2009, Zellers et al., 2008).

Informal mentoring. In the culture of higher education, both the intellectual capital and rank of faculty are valued as an institution's most important resources (Bowden & Marton, 2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Zellers et al., 2008). In general, the investment in faculty not only highlights the importance of scholarship, but also assumes leadership as well as academic freedom in faculty members (Welsh & Metcalf, 2003). By leadership, the implication in academic culture is that senior faculty members will take the initiative to nurture new faculty as well as guide junior faculty. "The academy has historically depended on the incumbent generation of the professoriate to cultivate the development of the next" (Zellers et al., 2008, p. 553). However, the independence associated with academic freedom also suggests that new faculty members are to take the initiative to seek guidance. Informal mentoring is higher education's response to cultivating the development of new faculty (Boice, 2000; Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009; Hudson, 2010; Schönwetter & Nazarko, 2009; Tenuto & Gardiner, 2012). But do senior faculty members and administrators actually resort to this default solution in assisting new faculty members to their institution?

Similar to the business world, informal mentoring in higher education is random, spontaneous, and hard to clarify. Informal mentoring, at its most practical, is a process where the mentor and mentees are identified. In their longitudinal study of alumni reflections on their career development, Chao, Walz, and Gardner (1992) stated:

> Informal mentorships grow out of informal relationships and interactions between senior and junior organizational members. The relationships may be based on work or nonwork issues. From these interactions, protégés may prove themselves to be worthy of the extra attention that a mentorship would demand. Mentors often select protégés with whom they can identify and whom they are willing to develop and devote attention. (p. 620)

In addition, Chao et al. (1992) added that informal mentorships occur because the motivation for the relationship to happen is mutually agreed between the mentor and the mentee or protégé. The mentors participate because they are compelled to help the mentees; the mentees participate because they are open to seeking assistance and advice from their mentors.

Informal mentorships among faculty do occur in higher education, but they rarely happen with notable success or empirical evidence reflecting the exemplar (Hobson et al., 2009, Welsh & Metcalf, 2003; Zellers et al., 2008). In Boice's (2000) year-long observation of informal mentoring for diverse new faculty, he discovered that the practice only occurred for about one-third of new faculty, with a large majority of the natural pairings terminating early. Even though the mentor and mentee contributed their hectic schedules as a factor, the main reason for the failed informal mentoring was the lack of a strategic approach. Boice concluded: "Natural mentoring is uncommon and usually ineffective. Moreover, exceptional instances of mentoring that works remain generally unknown" (p. 238).

Formal mentoring. In contrast to informal mentoring, research on formal mentoring of faculty members suggests its effectiveness and value, but varies in terms of relationship, strategy, praxis and academic disciplines (Ambrosino, 2009; J. Davis, 2007; Malmgren, Ottino, & Amaral, 2010; Morse, 2011; Welsh & Metcalf, 2003; Zellers et al.,

2008). Because of the disparateness and multidimensionality of learning contexts, evaluations of formal mentoring programs are limited in scope in their empirical generalizability and are mainly reported as case studies (Boice, 2000; Diegel, 2010; Donnelly & McSweeney, 2011; Zellers et al., 2008). As a result, “understanding faculty mentoring programs within the context of their academic cultures is critical” (Zellers et al., 2008, p. 552).

The first step to understanding faculty mentoring programs requires a working definition of formal mentoring. Formal mentorships, as described by Chao et al. (1992), are programs that are based on the interaction between two organizational members, who typically have not had prior interaction in an informal relationship. In addition, “the match between mentor and protégé may range from random assignment to committee assignment to mentor selection based on protégé files” (p. 620). In the context of the academy, a formal mentoring program for new or junior faculty would consist of a faculty mentor and a mentee. The pairing may or may not be in the same department or share the same discipline. Noe (1998) specified that the mentoring should be formally outlined with clear program goals and mentor training for the faculty mentor.

In the study of new faculty transitioning into their roles, Tenuto and Gardiner (2012) posited the need for formal mentoring. Experienced university professors from a College of Education attended an orientation for new faculty and expressed concerns that new faculty hires overwhelmingly start their first academic year struggling: “New faculty enter the professoriate without any formal preparation for teaching or conducting research outside of their doctoral experience” (p. 2). Even though the experienced

professors wanted to provide assistance to the new faculty members, they did not feel comfortable initiating an informal mentoring. The experienced professor would have opted to guide or mentor through a structured channel such as a formal mentoring program. This study exemplifies the reason why informal mentoring is largely a failed default option when it comes to faculty leadership.

Faculty Mentoring Relationships

Faculty mentoring involves a two-way interaction (Shulman; 2004). Indeed, successful faculty mentoring is a joint venture that involves the sharing of responsibility for learning by both the mentor and mentee (Boice, 2000). The relationship between the two is contractual and outlined (Kaye & Jacobson, 1996; Zeller et al., 2008). Even with clear learning goals in a faculty mentoring relationship, the only learning role that is explicit is that of the faculty mentee (Clutterbuck & Lane, 2004; Sands, Parsons & Duane, 1991; Zeller et al., 2008). The faculty mentees seek professional and personal support through a learning relationship from faculty mentors who can share their experiences and expertise.

Literature on the role of the faculty mentor is less explicit and offers no consensus. In their study of faculty mentoring relationships, Sands et al. (1991) categorized the faculty mentor in four main roles: friend, career guide, information source, or intellectual guide. Clutterbuck and Lane (2004), however, argued that the mentoring relationship is situational and that the measurement of the faculty mentor role is subject to interpretation. Thus, defining such a phenomenon in the literature translates into inconsistencies or overgeneralizations. Further, other research suggested that the role

of faculty mentors depends greatly on their ability to be exemplars in writing, teaching, socializing (Boice, 2000) as well as political navigation (Welsh & Metcalf, 2003; Zellers et al., 2008). For these reasons, faculty mentoring relationships remain difficult to define and present equal challenges in labeling the roles.

Benefits. Despite the multiple functions of the faculty mentor, research on formal mentoring relationships in higher education indicates compelling reasons for the mentor and mentee relationship (Hobson et al., 2009; M. M. Murray, 2001; Zellers et al., 2008). For example, faculty mentors reported intrinsic gains from their mentoring experience, citing a sense of accomplishment and personal satisfaction for helping a new or junior faculty transition into their roles (Hobson et al., 2009; Zellers et al., 2008) or into the institution itself. Some faculty mentors have found that mentoring reenergized their own interest in their research (M. M. Murray, 2001) and improved their own teaching strategy and styles (Hobson et al., 2009), with the latter resonating as the most important for community college professors. As for faculty mentees, they affirmed a variety of helpful associations, which include a heightened sense of confidence, higher career satisfaction, relief from academic isolation (Carr, Bickel & Inui, 2003), and enhanced teaching effectiveness (Ambrosino, 2009; Berry, Daughtrey, & Wieder, 2009; Boice, 2000; Robinson & Schaible, 1995; Schönwetter & Nazarko, 2009).

Challenges. The reality, however, is that not all faculty mentoring relationships are positively stimulated and produce constructive outcomes for the mentoring pair (Boice, 2000; Hu & Smith, 2011; Jedele, 2010; J. Murray, 2005; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2010). Further analysis reveals two challenging issues. One is the assumption of equity

(Bernacchio, Ross, Washburn, Whitney, & Wood, 2007; Jedele, 2010; Zeller et al., 2008). When this assumption is examined, research exposes that mentoring relationships are created with bias, from which women and minority mentees have distinctly unique mentoring experiences (Gibson, 2004; Ross-Gordon, 2005; Thomas, 2001; Tillman, 2001). In addition, another issue that challenges the concept of faculty mentoring relationships stems from new faculty assumptions, which perceives the participation of mentoring in an unfavorable light (Boice, 2000).

Assumptions of equity**.** Power within formal organizations exists within a hierarchy that is engendered, racialized, and heteronormative (Bernacchio et al., 2007; Hu & Smith, 2011; Jedele, 2010; J. Murray, 2005; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2009; Tillman, 2001; Thomas, 2001). The academy is not immune to this concept and has had its own historical legacy of social promotion and biases (Boice, 2000; Gibson, 2004; W.B. Johnson, 2007; Thomas, 2007; Tillman, 2001). As mentoring provides an entranceway to power, it is crucial to examine how power is accessed and by whom. Regarding their study of faculty mentoring relationships, Boyle and Boice (1998) discovered that "the newcomers who are less likely to find spontaneous support like mentoring are women and minorities" (p. 159). In formal faculty mentoring, the pairings may be more constructed and deliberate, but the issues of equity remain pronounced (Bernacchio et al., 2007; Zeller et al., 2008). In particular, access to power focuses on two main assumptions, which consist of the mentor selection of a mentee and the mentee experience of underrepresented groups.

The first assumption of faculty mentoring relationships is that the selection of mentees is equitable. In a study of faculty mentors, W.B. Johnson (2007) suggested that mentors are naturally attracted and inclined to help faculty members who are like them, which includes but is not limited to research interest, alma matter, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, class, and physical appearance. Faculty mentees who show like-mindedness and mirror similar ethnic lineage to the mentors are more likely to be selected. W.B. Johnson (2007) described this biased selection as the "cloning phenomenon" (p. 28). The selection results from the dominant group that occupies the majority in higher education institutions--White heterosexual men--being inclined to socially align and professionally promote other White heterosexual men. Although women and other underrepresented faculty who hold positions of authority may also be practicing the "cloning phenomenon," they are still the minority in most higher education institutions. Thus, they are unable to match the amount of mirror-mentoring relationships to that of their White male colleagues.

Another assumption of faculty mentoring relationships is that there are no differences in the mentee experiences between underrepresented groups. Because faculty minority groups are underrepresented in higher education, the scholarship on this mentoring assumption is also limited (Tillman, 2001; Ross-Gordon, 2005; Zellers et al., 2008). Specifically, women and ethnic minorities are often lumped together as one category in research that aims to look at the "minority mentee experience" (Tillman, 2001). Current studies examining women and minority mentees can make generalizations to the mentoring experience that do not apply to all underrepresented

groups, when the groups are disaggregated by race, ethnicity, orientation, and other factors (Ross-Gordon, 2005; Zellers et al., 2008). As a result, research that aims to understand issues of access to mentoring relationships, comparing the differences of minorities to dominant White male groups, may actually erase the diversity of experiences found within the various underrepresented mentee groups (Boice, 2000; Gibson, 2004; Hudson, 2010; Tillman, 2001).

In Gibson's (2004) research, she focused on gender-related mentoring experiences and found five essential themes that differentiated how women experience mentoring versus men. Gibson (2004) found that female faculty mentees sought nurturing mentors with whom they could feel connected, affirm their worth, and help them navigate through workplace politics. Although the findings highlighted gender differences, the study assumed Whiteness in the female faculty mentees and mentors and may not have adjusted the impact of mentoring experiences to that of women faculty of color mentees.

What if part of the politics, which encompasses issues of access, lies within the mentoring relationship as a result of cross-race pairing? Thomas (2001) asserted that cross-race mentoring relationships are subject to avoidance behavior by both the mentor and mentee because neither faculty member wants to address difficulties that may have racial implications and misunderstandings. In addition, Tillman (2001) suggested that African American faculty mentees are less likely to seek emotional fulfillment if their mentors are of a different race. Furthermore, each of the studies of Thomas (2001) and Tillman (2001) underscored that Gibson's (2004) findings on gender differences were

specific to White women mentees' experiences, but not necessarily to other minority groups, such as faculty women of color.

New faculty assumptions. Another challenge to faculty mentoring relationships lies in the assumptions experienced by new faculty. Unlike the faculty mentee experience, new faculty assumptions are not actualized in a mentoring relationship, rather these are internalized attitudes, values, beliefs and dispositions held by new faculty which prevent them from becoming mentees (Ambrosino, 2008; Boice, 2000; Kerka, 1994; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2010). Furthermore, Orland-Barak and Hasin (2010) noted that understanding assumptions involves "the premise that actions and thinking cannot be separated and constitute part of the same incident" (p. 428). For example, when new faculty discussed an issue regarding their research or students, they were relating their thinking to a particular incident that exists within a specific context, but that is perceived as an action by the various listeners involved in the discussion. As a result, the new faculty actually shared their assumptions.

Unfortunately, new faculty are less likely to voice their concerns, allowing for their assumptions to go unchecked or dispelled. Boice (2000) discovered novice faculty were hesitant to seek support because they believed that they would appear incompetent. Further, Boice (2000) stated that new faculty assumed that their graduate school training of the "dissertation rules"--which entails working solo and only sharing when perfect--was being applied to their professoriate as well (p. 233). This new faculty assumption is not only counterproductive and unnecessary, but also perpetuates the isolationism synonymous with academic culture. Boice (2000) reasoned that: "Because they, already

on the defensive, found it hardest to trust others and to admit even obvious failings. Worse yet…they were caught up in a pride that made them regard offers of help as little more than condescension" (p. 234).

Institutional Barriers

Because current research on mentoring and faculty mentoring relationships is variable, higher education administrators hesitate to address these concerns in any formal way, if at all (Ambrosino, 2009; Hobson et al., 2009). This lack of administrative acknowledgement and support for formal mentoring programs acts as an institutional barrier (Ambrosino, 2009; Boice, 2000; J. Murray, 2005; Welsh & Metcalf, 2003; Zeller et al., 2008). In this third issue regarding faculty mentoring programs, the literature identifies the institutional barriers within faculty development and highlights how the context and culture of mentoring programs varies between universities in the United States and other countries (Hobson et al., 2009; Hudson, 2010; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2010; Tolutienė & Domarkienė, 2010).

Institutional barriers at universities are often intangible and equally difficult to resolve for faculty. One way to resolve or address these issues is through implementing policies and procedures within faculty development programs (Tillman, 2001; Welsh & Metcalf, 2003). When a program institutes a policy that prohibits the success of its faculty, the barriers are clearer because a causal association can be made directly with the policy itself (Welsh & Metcalf, 2003). However, in the absence of policy, the institutional barriers exist but are seemingly invisible because there is no policy to make a clear-cut connection. Further, the absence of this connection prevents the program (and

the academic institution at large) from addressing the barriers (Welsh & Metcalf, 2003).

Ambrosino (2009) identified institutional barriers as one of the hindrances to supporting mentoring programs for faculty:

> Institutional or structural barriers might include such roadblocks as inadequate funding, contrary social norms, a non-collaborative work environment, or a communication vacuum. With all institutional barriers, strong cross-departmental collaborations will help pave the way to success. (p. 32)

Ambrosino (2009) reported that her institution attempted to dismantle some of the "roadblocks" by employing program facilitators to educate and encourage faculty buy-in about the formal mentoring program. This procedure not only challenged the "communication vacuum," but it also fostered campus-wide collaboration (p. 33).

Conclusion

Though community colleges play a crucial role in serving nearly half of the undergraduate population in the United States, they rarely receive the research focus or funding attention that colleges and universities get in higher education literature. The open admissions policy of community colleges has enabled them to herald a strong and historically significant reputation as the "people's college". Though this has been challenged by current economic tides, community colleges nonetheless continue to serve diverse populations and have a far higher representation of marginalized groups among their student bodies. These include women, minorities, veterans and those from lower socioeconomic levels as compared to public and private 4-year colleges and universities. And for the very reason that they are inclusive rather than exclusive, community colleges are viewed as inferior and lacking prestige.

This general view of community colleges hits directly at the heart of degrading perspectives towards the faculty as well. What is widely researched and known of the faculty experience is dominated by the scholarship on faculty who work in 4-year colleges and universities. Researchers tend to conduct studies that mirror their experiences. For this reason, the scholarship on faculty work is predominantly focused on issues that exist at universities. Namely, these issues concern structural inequities unique to university and departmental culture as well as other climate concerns like the taxing tenure and academic promotion processes. Because the main task of community college faculty is teaching, the research on the unique experiences of their work and experiences is rarely conducted by community college faculty themselves. Instead, scholarship on community college faculty is mainly biographical and conducted by select university scholars looking from "outside" instead from "within."

Considering critical research on the intersectionality of race and gender among university faculty is emergent, it is no surprise then that it is nearly non-existent among community college faculty. Critical scholars assert that if a female faculty identifies as both a woman and a minority, her perspectives and experience cannot be segregated as existing only in one or the other. By examining the intersections of multiple identities, the research reveals findings that women faculty of color experience their roles as academics differently to those of White women as well as to men of color faculty. Lastly, the lack of research on the intersections of race and gender among community college faculty echoes the same logic as to why research on faculty work focuses mainly on the experiences of university faculty.

For these reasons, women faculty of color experience triple marginalization. The exploration of how women faculty of color experience the culture and climate of community colleges must include the intersectionality of race and gender. Research of this nature is important because it starts the awareness and brings to light attention on an important but grossly overlooked faculty population. Understanding the challenges that women faculty of color confront at community colleges will not only contribute to the field of critical research, but also pragmatically inform policy so that administrators and senior faculty can find ways to effectively practice their support.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

There is a growing body of literature that specifically addresses the status of women of color faculty. Their experiences differ in a variety of ways from those of White women faculty and also of minority men (Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Turner, 2002). More recent research critically speaks to the intersections of race and gender, revealing the multiple marginalizations as experienced by faculty who identify both as minority and female (Turner, 2002), although these studies focus solely on the accounts of women of color faculty at 4-year universities. Furthermore the tenure and promotion practices at universities are different than at community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008), thus making the current women of color struggles exclusive to a reward system that does not apply to their counterparts at 2-year institutions.

Research on the marginalization of minority faculty at community colleges is scarce. To date, research on the status and experiences of women of color faculty in community colleges is non-existent. This study initiated this focus on an overlooked but important faculty population. Not only does it expand our knowledge about women of color faculty, but also contributes to the limited research on the faculty work of tenure-track and tenured faculty at 2-year colleges (Kezar & Sam, 2010). This qualitative study on women of color faculty was guided by these research questions: (1) What are the

influences that shape their decisions to teach at a 2-year college rather than a 4-year university, (2) What are the various roles that they perform within and outside the classroom, (3) What are the barriers they face in their academic positions, and (4) How do they seek support to navigate through those challenges.

The conceptual framework of this study was informed by the integration of two theories. First, this study considered the Social Network Analytical Framework (Lee, 2003), which utilizes social capital as it relates to academic promotion and achieving tenure within the context of community colleges (A. Cox, 2008; Perna, 2003; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Turner, 2000; Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). Second, Multiracial Feminism (Zinn & Dill, 1994), a multifaceted political movement that was formally developed into a theory, was also utilized to directly challenge the myth that all women faculty share universal oppressions in their academic life (Harris & Gonzalez, 2012; Niemann, 2012; Rojas, 2009; Turner, 2002). Multiracial Feminism fractures this assumption and critically underscores that the ethnic, racial and socioeconomic differences between those of White female faculty and women of color faculty result in different lived experiences (Lerum, 2001). When the intersections of race and gender are critically incorporated into the analyses of academic work for women of color faculty at community colleges, themes of opportunities, oppression and agency will emerge.

In this qualitative study, full-time women of color faculty working in the California Community College system were purposefully selected as participants. The

data collected sought to capture their experiences in their classrooms, departments, institutions and community at large.

Positionality

I am a Vietnamese boat refugee who was born in Saigon, Vietnam. We were fortunate enough to escape political persecution and arrived in the United States to settle when I was 2 years old. After months spent at the refugee camps at Camp Pendleton, we eventually were relocated to Tempe, Arizona and made that our home. While we practiced traditional customs at home, which included speaking Vietnamese, I was socialized in the public sphere as an American minority female. Because of this bicultural upbringing, I have an intimate and empathetic understanding of what it means to identify as “other”--a person who does not identify as the part of the dominant majority by gender, race and ethnicity.

This sense of “otherness” became more acute based on my undergraduate experience at a private all-women’s college in the East Coast. Though the student body was considered ethnically diverse at this liberal arts campus, international students were included as part of the students of color demographics. Most of these international students were from wealthy backgrounds, which made their experience neither reflective nor relatable to American students of color who came from working class beginnings like mine. In addition to conflicting notions of race and ethnicity, the institution also grappled with class issues. It boasted a history of pioneering educational opportunities for women and championing feminist issues. I learned, however, that its institutional legacy was founded by and created for White women of middle to upper middle class backgrounds.

This exclusionary form of feminism persisted as the dominant culture, which ironically, muted or even negated the experiences of other women who were neither White nor privileged, like myself.

My participation in this qualitative study was actively integrated within the fabric of the research design. Not only am I considered an instrument where my thoughts and actions act as a tool of analysis, but also my positionality played a visible and socially constructed role in the qualitative interview methodology. I am a woman of color who was asking highly sensitive questions to participants who are also women of color. The intention of this design adheres to the tenets of the conceptual framework of this study--Social Capital Network Framework and Multiracial Feminism Theory--where the foundation for interviews lends itself as a social space that allowed for the emergence of counter story-telling (Delgado, 1989; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). This concept is further expanded in detail in the Methodology Design portion of this chapter.

Sample

Levin et al. (2013) discovered in their research that the highest concentration of faculty of color were found in southern California districts in the CCC. In addition, they recruited participants from southern California because the highest-ranking institutions for faculty diversity came from this region. For these reasons, the recruitment of women of color faculty were limited to the Los Angeles and Orange county districts within the southern California region. The recruitment, however, was not limited to one institution or district within these two southern Californian counties.

There were two criteria that the participant had to meet for the study. One criteria

was that the participant identified as a woman of color and belonged to one of the following ethnic groups: African American/Black, Asian American, Filipina/Pacific Islander, Latina/Hispanic, or Native American/American Indian. This criteria also included participants who identified as mixed-race or having mixed-ethinicities. The second criteria was that the participant was a current full-time faculty member who was employed in one of the community college districts in Los Angeles or Orange counties.

Procedures

Prior to conducting the study, I obtained the approval of the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB was provided documents of the interview protocol and demographic questionnaire. In addition, they were provided detailed explanations of the following: how the participants would be recruited, the purpose of the research, and how the confidentiality of the participants would be protected. Pseudonyms were used for the participants as well as the institutions in which they were employed as faculty. Not only were participants offered the opportunity to opt out of being recorded for the interview, they were also given the chance to review their transcripts and revise or omit any statements made during the interview. Lastly, participants were also notified that they could opt out of the interview, or the research, at any given time.

Utilizing my own personal and professional contacts, I used both purposeful and snowball sampling to recruit participants. These contacts were informed of the participant criteria. Those who were eligible to participate in the study were women faculty of color who met the following criteria: (1) identified as a woman of color and

(2) worked as a full-time faculty member in a southern California community college district in Los Angeles county or Orange county.

Purposeful sampling allowed me to recruit and select participants who met the criteria (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Through snowball sampling (Patton, 2002), a total of 52 eligible participants were referred to the researcher. I contacted all potential participants via email, providing a summary of the purpose of the study. Those who were interested responded via email or phone call. A consent form along with the demographic questionnaire was sent to these willing participants to complete prior to the interview.

After the faculty members were chosen as participants, I emailed each individually to confirm their participation. In that email, I thanked them for their willingness to help with my study and emailed a request to schedule a meeting, offering to meet at a time and location that was convenient for each person. For the location, I asked that they suggest a place that was convenient, but safe so that they would have the privacy to speak frankly about their work and any of the issues that they may associate with their institution. I asked that we meet at a quiet place that offered privacy so that the interview could be conducted without loud disruptions. Examples of places where interviews were conducted included their homes, quiet places on their campuses that was away from their offices as well as restaurants during off-peak times.

On the day prior to the interview, I called the participant to remind them of the time and to bring the completed materials. I also brought printed copies of the consent

form and a copy of the demographic questionnaire as back ups in case the participant forgot to bring the needed materials.

After the interviews were conducted, I sent each participant a personal thank you card via mail and thanked them for their contribution to my study.

Data Collection

Utilizing the interview protocol and demographic questionnaire, one-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with all participants. For interviews that were not completed from the one-on-one, a follow-up interview was scheduled via phone call. All recorded interviews were either transcribed by professional transcriptionists or myself.

According to Seidman (2006), interviewing is an effective method to extract data when there are stories to be told: "At the heart of interviewing research is an interest in other individuals' stories because they are worth it" (p. 9). Because the scholarship on the experiences of women of color faculty at community colleges is unavailable, exploring and capturing their stories became even more crucial because it has not previously been done before. Furthermore, the best way to capture these stories is when the interviews are conversational rather than a simple question and answer approach (Burgess, 2011; Seidman, 2006). In semi-structured interviews, the openness of the design is not only conducive to conversation, but also puts the interviewee more at ease and may encourage them to share richer details of their stories (Seidman, 2006). Lastly, qualitative interviews allowed for the interviewer/researcher (myself) to share in the experiences and add subjective reasoning.

Methodology Design

Subjective reasoning, for this particular study, was one that strengthened the depth of the data, especially when taking into account my own positionality. In Multiracial Feminism Theory as well as in the scholarship of Critical Race Theory, the perspectives of those who come from underrepresented groups are posited from a non-deficit framework (Delgado, 1989; Solarzano et al., 2000; Zinn & Dill, 1996). In other words, the outcomes of the subjective reasoning that result from the interviews are not seen as lacking objectivity, but rather as a positive factor that is based on a connection and understanding of one another. Because I identify as a woman of color, my positionality enabled me to process concepts and co-construct understanding along with the participants in a way that may not be possible if the interviewer had been a member from a dominant group, such as a White male (Delgado, 1989). For example, the participants might not feel comfortable talking about their cultural upbringing in a multicultural household, or speak frankly about experiencing racist, sexist, classist microaggressions or assaults with a White male interviewer.

Because of my positionality, I believe I created a constructed social space where the participants could share their counter stories without feeling that their personal narratives would be viewed as inflammatory, inferior or unworthy (Delgado,1989; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). Because dominant narratives can carry multiple layers of assumptions which are often disguised as race-neutral discourse, the aims of counter storytelling is to expose those assumptions as filters and reveal the racism, sexism, classism and homophobia that actually exist and is experienced in numbing ways by the

non-dominant groups. Solorzano & Yosso (2002) defined counter storytelling as "a method of telling the stories of those people whose experiences are not often told" including people of color, women, gay, and the poor (p. 26). Lastly, while counter stories reinforce that the current reality of society is vastly unequal, they can also facilitate the agency, survival and resistance among marginalized groups (Delgado, 1989; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002).

By utilizing a semi structured qualitative interview methodology, coupled with my positionality as an interviewer who is a woman of color, this intended design created a platform for counter stories to become the data. The data collection included each faculty's personal history, educational preparation, professional background, prior community college experience, their experiences with sexism, racism, and classism as well as factors that influenced personal decisions to become and to remain community college faculty.

Instruments

For this study, there were a total of three instruments used to conduct the research. Acknowledging that qualitative research is inherently interpretive, the researcher had the ability to shape the work as an interviewer and that should be acknowledged as a tool of analysis--an instrument to the study (Creswell, 2009). Considering myself as an instrument necessitated that I maintained an extensive research log to track thought processes.

The second instrument was the demographic questionnaire, which I developed to capture descriptive data that helped contextualize the participant (Appendix C). The

questionnaire consisted of 18 items total. Two questions asked about basic demographic information such as age and ethnicity. In addition, there were three questions that asked about the participant's educational history; for example "What is your highest degree(s) attained"? Six questions asked about the faculty work history and/or employment of the participant. For each question, there were multiple choices as answer options. Lastly, the remaining two questions asked about the participant to rate the climate and culture of their faculty experiences. Some answer choices were written open-ended, where space was provided for the participant to write in their own answers (if one was not provided in the multiple choice option) or to expand on an answer in their own words.

The third instrument was the interview protocol (Appendix D). The interview protocol comprised a total of 25 questions, where those questions were categorized into three parts. For Part I and Part II, I developed the questions based on their alignment with my conceptual framework and research questions. Part II consisted of questions that asked the participants to identify opportunities and challenges that they have experienced in their faculty work at the community colleges.

Part III consisted of questions that asked the participants to consider their support network and the providers, mentors and allies who have assisted them throughout their academic careers. For Part III, I adapted this section from a portion of the dissertation research titled: *Social capital and tenure: The role of race and gender in academic promotion* (Lee, 2003). In this section, the scripted introduction, questions and probes were adapted for the participant population of this study, acknowledging that they had unique experiences as community college faculty. In community colleges, the tenure

reward system is temporal and based on teaching experience/effectiveness rather than on a faculty's publishing productivity (Cohen & Brawer, 2008); therefore, the questions were adapted to accommodate this difference.

Data Analysis

The data analysis began with the processing of the interviews. The data were reviewed for accuracy by listening to the interviews as I read along the transcriptions, making the necessary changes to any typing errors made by the either the transcriptionist or myself. For interviews where the participant requested not to be recorded, extensive interview notes were reviewed. All transcriptions and interview notes were double and triple checked for accuracy.

Following the suggestion of Miles and Huberman (1994), I used several techniques to make meaning of the interview data. For this study, the conceptual framework informed the thematic analysis of the data. Utilizing the conceptual framework, Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003) and Multiracial Feminism Theory (Zinn & Dill, 1996) were employed in the coding process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The coding process included exploring themes that related to the three aspects from the Social Capital Network (Lee, 2003) and the three features of the Multiracial Feminism Theory.

One technique was to create a visual diagram based on the preliminary themes determined by the thematic analysis. Large colored posters as well as colored pens were used to categorize emergent themes as they pertained to the six aspects and features of the conceptual framework. I compared, contrasted, and clustered exemplar notes, which

were printed on color-coded strips of paper, by physically arranging and rearranging these strips on the posters to make meaning and find coherence.

Another technique was using the Nvivo software to assist with text management. Nvivo is qualitative data analysis software that has been approved by the IRB. All transcripts and interview notes were uploaded to Nvivo to help facilitate the thematic analysis. Nvivo provided a central location where I was able to see all of the raw data and organize exemplars. Having a centralized location provided an efficient way of identifying meaningful areas of connection and overlaps between the data, enhancing the strength of the visual diagram technique the coding process.

A third technique was using SurveyMonkey to assist with the organization of the data collected from the demographic questionnaire. SurveyMonkey is an online tool that enables the digital storage and analysis of survey results that is both confidential and secure. I was the only one who had access to the SurveyMonkey account. All questionnaire paper results were manually uploaded to SurveyMonkey. Utilizing SurveyMonkey assisted with the data analysis resulting from the demographic questionnaire.

Protection of Participants

I took multiple steps to protect the confidentiality of the participants. All data, which includes demographic questionnaire and consent forms, was stored off -campus, in a private residence. All digital data pertaining to the interviews was stored on a designated external hard drive where access to its content is password-protected. All digital data pertaining to the demographic questionnaire was stored on a secure server

where access to its content is password-protected. This included email messages from participants. The content of these email messages, which may have included participants' personal information, was moved from the email message itself to a Word document to facilitate analysis and further protect anonymity. All paper copies, which included consent forms, transcripts, and completed demographic questionnaires were stored in a filing cabinet that is locked when not in use.

All participants and the institutions in which they work as faculty members were given pseudonyms immediately after the interviews were conducted. A single document linking actual name to pseudonym exists only on the computer at the private residence. Data was transcribed by both a third party and myself. The third party was only given the participant's pseudonym to ensure confidentiality. All research documents over which I have direct control also reflected the participants' pseudonyms.

Trustworthiness

According to field research scholars Lincoln and Guba (1985), qualitative research that is trustworthy is exemplified by four characteristics. Using these characteristics as a guide, the trustworthiness of this study was established in a variety of ways. First, credibility was established by piloting the instruments as well as maintaining an extensive research log chronicling member-checking from the interviewees of the research. Second, transferability was established by providing thick, rich descriptions detailing data and context of study. Third, dependability of this study was established through peer debriefing, chair critiquing and member checking. The fourth characteristic,

confirmability, was also established by keeping an extensive research log documenting the decisions throughout this research process.

For the first dimension of trustworthiness, credibility of this study was exercised by piloting instruments for their reliability and validity. The two instruments tested for credibility were the demographic questionnaire and an interview protocol. They were piloted with three women of color who were employed as full-time faculty at separate and different institutions in southern California. From each interview, I gauged to see if the demographic questionnaire questions were relevant to the study. In addition, I evaluated protocol questions to see if they were appropriately structured to elicit the information desired. Also, I reviewed the overall length and flow of the responses as well as the frequency of the participant's pauses to determine if a certain question was stated in a confusing style, or disrupted the level of intimacy that I was hoping to achieve. Lastly, the protocol was refined based on member checking, or direct feedback that I received from each pilot interviewee, along with those of my chair. All feedback regarding the pilot of the instruments is documented in my research log. The demographic questionnaire and interview protocol were submitted to my three-member dissertation committee for review during the proposal defense.

Transferability, the second dimension of trustworthiness, was established by providing thick descriptions of the data. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) specified about qualitative studies, "It is, in summary, not the (researcher's) task to provide an index of transferability; it *is* his or her responsibility to provide the *data base* that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of the potential appliers" (p. 316). For this

multi site research, I consistently provided thick description over a wide range of information regarding the data as well as how the protocol was carefully applied.

The third dimension of trustworthiness, dependability, was established through peer debriefing and member checking for this study. My peers, all of whom have experience working in the community college context, provided invaluable feedback based on their institutional knowledge. Member checking also increased the trustworthiness since participation feedback improves the accuracy of the data. Both forms of feedback were incorporated with the critiques of my dissertation committee, ensuring dependability.

The fourth characteristic, confirmability, was established by keeping an extensive research log documenting the trail of decisions throughout the research process of this study. Acknowledging that I am an instrument in this study, I documented my own personal reflections and thoughts as to how I processed the data as a researcher. In addition, I kept a detailed analytic memo and a research log to chronicle changes and decisions that were made throughout the evolution of the study. As Lincoln and Guga (1985) suggested, having multiple sources is crucial for the triangulation of data because it enables the comparison of themes to increase trustworthiness.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The conceptual framework of this study informed the six major theme findings. The first three themes were informed by the Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003). Overall, these themes emerged in the findings as addressing the organizational and institutional umbrella under which these participants experience their work as women faculty of color. The last three themes were informed by Multiracial Feminism theory (Zinn & Dill, 1996). Because Multiracial Feminism theory exists as an evolving body of theory and practice, the selected three aspects of this theme is further informed by the contributions of multiple feminist scholars (Anzaldua, 1990; Chow, 1987; Collins, 2000; Mohanty; 2000; Rojas, 2009; Roth, 2004). The last three themes that emerged in the findings explicitly addressed the complexity--both unifying and contracting--of identities that the faculty participants embody and experience as women of color.

Participants

In this study, the participants all met the two following criteria: (1) identified as a woman of color and (2) worked as a full-time faculty member in a southern California community college. There were a total of 37 participants who self-identified as: African American/Black, Asian American, Filipina/Pacific Islander, Latina/Hispanic, Middle Eastern and Mixed Race. They ranged in age from 30-60 or more years. All 37

participants currently worked as full-time faculty members as: instructional faculty, counselors and librarians. All but two of the 37 participants were tenured faculty. In this section, all 37 participants were included in findings that indicated results from the demographic questionnaire. Twenty-six participant interviews were used as exemplars in these findings.

The educational backgrounds of the participants were spread across institutions attended, degrees attained, and instructional experiences. Of the 37 participants, over half were first generation college students with a majority of a parent or both parents having no college education. A large majority attended community college before transferring to a university to complete their Bachelor's degrees. Most went on to pursue one or more master's degrees in a variety of disciplines, while others advanced directly from their undergraduate degree to a doctoral degree. Several participants started a PhD program, but left with a terminal master's. (Please refer to Tables 2-5.)

TABLE 2. African American/Black Participants

Name	Ethnicity	Age	Birthplace	Education	Discipline	Faculty Position	Family status
A	African Am/Black	50-59	Queens, NY	MS	Physical Education	Instructor, Faculty Development	Widowed, no children
B	African/Black	50-59	Enugu, Nigeria	MA; MLIS	Public Relations; Library Science	Librarian	Divorced, with children
C	African Am/Black	60+	Washington, D.C.	MFA	Creative Writing	Academic Instructor	Divorced, with children
D	African Am/Black	30-39	Los Angeles, CA	MA	English	Academic Instructor	Married, no children

Name	Ethnicity	Age	Birthplace	Education	Discipline	Faculty Position	Family status
E	African Am/Black	60+	Los Angeles, CA	MA*	History	Academic Instructor	Married, with children
F	African Am/Black	50-59	Fairfield, AL	MS *	Counseling	Counselor	Married, with children

* Attended community college

TABLE 3. Asian American and Filipina/Pacific Islander Participants

Name	Ethnicity	Age	Birthplace	Education	Discipline	Faculty Position	Family status
G	Filipina	30-39	Guam (U.S. Territory)	MS *	Nursing	Academic Instructor	Single, no children
H	Chinese	40-49	Los Angeles, CA	MLIS	Library Science	Librarian	Married, no children
I	Chinese	60+	Taiwan	MA; MA	Asian American Studies;	Academic Instructor	Married, w children
J	Vietnamese	30-39	Vietnam	MS	Counseling	Counselor	Married, w children
K	Chinese	60+	Hong Kong, China	PhD	Geology	Academic Instructor	Married, with children
L	Japanese	50-59	Artesia, CA	MS	Counseling	Counselor	Widowed, with children
M	Thai	40-49	Pasadena, CA	PhD*	Asian American Literature	Academic Instructor	Married, no children
N	Mixed (Japanese and White)	40-49	Westchester, NY	MLIS	Library Science	Librarian	Partnered, with children
O	Japanese	40-49	Monterey Park, CA	MA	ESL	Academic Instructor	Married, with children

* Attended community college

TABLE 4. Latina/Hispanic Participants

Name	Ethnicity	Age	Birthplace	Education	Discipline	Faculty Position	Family status
P	Mexicana	50-59	Tijuana, Mexico	MA* (terminal from PhD work)	Spanish Language	Academic Instructor	Married, w children
Q	Costa Rican	50-59	Costa Rica	MA*	Applied Math	Academic Instructor	Married, w children
R	Chicana	40-49	CA	MLIS*	Library Science	Librarian	Married, no children
S	Uruguayan	50-59	Uruguay	PhD*	Psychology	Academic Instructor	Married, no children
T	Mixed Race (Mexican and White)	50-59	Los Angeles, CA	MS	Counseling	Counselor	Married, with children
U	Chicana Indigena	30-39	Los Angeles, CA	MA*; (working on PhD)	English	Academic Instructor	Married, with children
V	Chicana	40-49	Monterey Park, CA	MS; EdD *	Counseling	Counselor	Partner, w children

* Attended community college

TABLE 5. Participants of Other Ethnicities

Name	Ethnicity	Age	Birthplace	Education	Discipline	Faculty Position	Family status
W	Lebanese	50-59	Beirut, Lebanon	MS (terminal from PhD work); MFA *	Dance	Academic Instructor	Divorced, w children
X	Pakistani**	30-39	Los Angeles, CA	M.Ed.	Developmental Reading	Academic Instructor	Single, no children
Y	Persian	50-59	Iran	MS (terminal from PhD work) *	Math	Academic Instructor	Divorce, w children
Z	Persian	30-39	Los Angeles, CA	MS; EdD*	Academic Counseling	Counselor	Single, no children

* Attended community college. **Participant self-identified as in the "Other" category.

Findings

Theme #1: Community College Structure/Culture

From Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003), the aspect of *Community College Structure/Culture* informed the foundation for this first theme in the findings. In particular, the organizational structure of community colleges, location and academic divisions determined how these women of color experience their faculty work. In this first thematic analysis, three subthemes emerged in the findings: (1) Type of Community College District, (2) Culture of the Institution, and (3) Climate of department/discipline.

Based on the findings, a total of 11 community colleges were represented by the participants. The 11 community colleges represented were found in Los Angeles (LA) and Orange Counties (OC) of southern California. Of the 11 colleges, 5 were institutions that were in single-district community colleges and 6 were institutions that were in multiple-district community colleges. Of the 11 colleges, 8 were situated in LA County and 3 were in OC. The surrounding communities of the institutions varied from urban to suburban as well as working class to middle class. One institution had a surrounding community that consisted of middle to upper middle class residents. (See Tables 6-7).

TABLE 6. Single-District Community Colleges

Institution Name	County Location	Surrounding Community
North College	Los Angeles	Suburban, Middle Class
Northwest College	Los Angeles	Suburban, Middle Class
Northeast College	Los Angeles	Suburban, Working/Middle Class

Institution Name	County Location	Surrounding Community
Ocean College	Los Angeles	Urban, Working/Middle Class
Central College	Los Angeles	Urban, Working Class

TABLE 7. Multiple-District Community Colleges

Institution Name	County Location	Surrounding Community
South College	Orange	Suburban, Middle/Upper Middle Class
Southeast College	Orange	Suburban, Middle Class
Southwest Ocean	Los Angeles	Urban, Working Class
Central East College	Los Angeles	Urban, Working Class
Central West College	Los Angeles	Urban/Suburban, Middle Class
North Ocean College	Orange	Suburban, Middle Class

Subtheme #1: Type of Community College District

For the first subtheme, the *Type of Community College District* emerged in the findings under Community College Structure/Culture. In this study, there were 5 colleges that were in single-college districts; 6 colleges that were in multiple-college district. Depending on whether their institutions were within a single or multiple college district, as well as the community that the institutions were located in, was an important factor in how they experienced institutional barriers and opportunities.

Five were single-district community colleges; six were multiple-district

community college districts. Neither type of district proved to be superior to the other. In other words, the participants found there to be both advantages and disadvantages to working as a faculty member in either community college districts.

Single-college district. For some participants in the single-college districts, they felt that leadership decisions were streamlined and efficient, but noted that was only in the rare case when there were qualified administrators who were transparent in their communication with the strategy and direction of the college. Other participants who were in single college districts compared their experience as feeling trapped under a single-rule dictatorship. Specifically, they felt that when administration made poor or uninformed decisions, there were no consequences for the college leaders, which they felt would have happened if their institution existed in a multiple-college district.

For Participant L, working as a counselor at Central College has largely been an enjoyable experience. Because Central College is in a single-college district, leadership decisions do not have to go through multiple campuses and a long approval process in order to be implemented. Participant L asserted that the Counseling department at her institution has benefitted from being part of a smaller system. For example, a former dean of student services had created a legacy of hiring diverse faculty for the counseling department in efforts to provide ethnic representation that mirrored the student population. As a Japanese American woman, Participant L attested that this was because her institution was in a single college district:

> I think because of the demographics of our own department I feel very comfortable"…it <makes> a difference that Central College is a single college district. So we don't have to worry about what the other colleges are doing and it's all just us. So I think that makes life simpler for everybody.

Unlike Participant L's positive experience of working in a single-college district, Participant H's experience as a librarian faculty has been one of enduring unchecked dysfunction. The library department at Northwest College consists of five main faculty, all tenured White women with one identifying as culturally Armenian. Participant H is the only person of color. She began her faculty work at Northwest College as an adjunct hire and was initially well regarded by these tenured colleagues, or the "inner circle", because she "was doing so much, and I was doing more hours than any other adjunct there". During those years working as an adjunct, Participant H stated that her experience with the department was collegial; however, she admitted that there were political issues she may have missed: "Like any work place, there are problems with personnel and with stuff like that…I saw *some* of the stuff, but at the same time…I didn't, you know?" Once she became a tenure-track faculty, Participant H experienced a difference in treatment from "the group." As a full-time faculty member, Participant H was suddenly viewed as a threat, "There were internal conflicts that existed prior to my arriving at Northeast College…But they escalated *after* I became <tenure-track>." The five tenured faculty operated as an exclusive group that deliberated over decisions to intentionally segregate or harm people. They used their seniority to establish a culture of fear in the department:

> So basically, there were personality conflicts. There were internal dysfunctionalities at the college - in the department - that due to a lack of leadership *made* the problem that much worse. I don't think it necessarily started off as a problem of difference…
>
> This is basically the environment: You've got these five librarians who are at the top of the totem pole of the library department. Everybody else is adjunct or staff.

> We've got almost a dozen staff, almost a dozen adjuncts, and then we've got the five full-time librarians and the dean...
>
> There were a lot of problems. It reflected an endemic dysfunctionality that had been percolating. It was a *weird* convergence of lack of leadership, insulation and…personality disorders. They created an environment where it was an 'us' versus 'them' mentality…'Us' being full-timers. Full-timers versus part-timers. Full-timers versus staff. Full-timers versus the leader. Full-time librarians versus non-librarians…
>
> My colleagues became more and more alienating in terms of themselves…separating from the rest. That's ok, but you've got to be able to fight *nicely*. *They were not nice fighters*.

In addition, Participant H noted disturbing patterns with more scrutiny-events that she had dismissed as benign when she started as an adjunct in 2004. Over the course of 10 years, she had witnessed the high turnover of faculty, but never made the connection that all of those who left had been denied tenure once they were up for their final review.

> For the entire time that I've been there…from 2004 up until now…we've never had the complement of full-time librarians and/or a dean. We've always had someone who was on-leave, sabbatical, or retiring and people filling in. So, I filled in to a certain degree. So since I was hired from 2004 up until now, we've had…five <tenure-track faculty> leave…
>
> There were internal conflicts within the librarian group. And then when a couple of these people left, we had one person who was basically controlling the show…She had some *major, major*, personality character issues…There was a lack of professionalism, malfeasance… She created a hostile work environment *across the board*.

When it became her turn to undergo the tenure review, Participant H experienced firsthand the hostile bullying by "the group," which she believes the five other faculty members before her had endured before leaving the department on their own accord:

> My tenure review, up until my third year, was excellent…But then, things turned. It got to the point where they were trying to deny me tenure in the most egregious way possible by putting information in my tenure review that were absolutely inappropriate, unprofessional…just really egregious. They tried three times to rewrite my third year tenure review and they still couldn't get it right.

Upon reviewing her tenure file, Participant H discovered that one of the members of "the group" who was on her review committee denied her tenure based on the petty grounds that she "overused disfluencies" in her verbal speech. The member had documented in detail how the participant had excessively used "ah's, um's, like's, and you guys" in meetings, exaggerating her usage. This among many documented reasons provided from the committee were irrelevant to tenure.

Because Participant H works in a single-college district, she was isolated and cornered into a stance of self-defense since there were no other campuses where she could retreat to from the bullying.

> It's mobbing. It's mobbing is what it is. It was bullying by a group of people who did not have oversight, who operated in a way that was committee-rule. And I knew, I had been there long enough… because I have been to these meetings…The decisions that get made about anything or a*nybody* is made among 'the group'. And within this group, there was one person who was a malcontent and made decisions and everybody followed in suit…They supported each other…They were all White women, three were middle-aged and one was younger than me.
>
> I didn't like the way they spoke to me. They spoke down to me. They would roll their eyes. Their tone was annoyed or exasperated. It was four people mobbing one -- it *happened* that I was the only person of color. It *happened* that the things they would say to me <were wrong>.
>
> When I addressed them individually about how I was being treated in meetings, their responses were: 'This is just how it is… It's *you*. It's you, <name>. You just don't get it. This is how we operate.'

With no choice, Participant H went public with her abuse and enlisted the help of the union. At first, the college leadership dismissed her grievances as a singular event (though it was speculated that they delayed acknowledgement of the abuse because one of the members in “the group” is the wife of the college’s senior administrator). Participant H fought a long and stressful battle with the committee, which nearly went to litigation.

As the only person of color, she felt compelled to expose the discriminating practices of her colleagues. While she felt members of “the group” were racist in their behavior towards her, the assault of microaggressions were difficult to prove. However, she was able to successfully prove that their blatant mobbing unjustly prolonged her tenure approval. Participant H contended that college leadership chose to ignore the mobbing and allow the senior faculty in the library department to operate in a culture of fear because their governance was isolated in a single-college district environment.

Multiple-college district. For those participants in multiple college districts, they felt the bureaucracy of being connected to several colleges can paralyze college leadership. This was particularly true for simple policy decisions that were institution-specific, but would require centralized approval from the chancellor’s office in order for them to be implemented. As a result, these decisions would often get stuck in a bottleneck of bureaucracy and time lag. On the other hand, multiple college districts allowed for mobility and administrative transfers, which was considered lifesaving for some faculty who were subject to abusive environments.

For Participant Y, teaching at an institution, which was part of a multiple college

district in Los Angeles, gave her an advantage to escape an abusive environment without negative impact on her faculty status. During her tenure at Central East College, Participant Y saw the Math department go through changes in leadership. The department chairs transitioned from women to men, all of whom were White. Towards the end of her 11 years teaching in the department, a White man became the chair. He would routinely sexually harass her and the other women in the Math department.

> We had a chair that was a White guy. He was in his 50s then, maybe. Very intimidating… It wasn't only me that was subjected to that. It was other women in my division… At the time, it was three women at the end of the 11 years. There were only three of us… We <all> had a problem with him. He was as bully.
>
> He asked me to go out with him. <I would refuse>, then he would give me a bad schedule. He would yell and scream at me. If I didn't agree with something, then he would start yelling and screaming (*shaking her head in disbelief)*.

Participant Y alerted administration of the chair's abuse, but the college was unable to remove him. The department chair "was a powerful man" who was protected by the union and had more seniority than her and the other tenured women faculty because he had been at the college for decades. Participant Y provided evidence along with the help of the other victims, but the dean was dismissive and "didn't do anything to him." Participant Y recalled all the documentation that was required to the dean, "They got a lot of paperwork from it. I had letters from those two other women. I submitted <everything>". This is not only me. I told them, 'Look how he treats other women too!'" Frustrated by the lack of action, Participant Y filed a grievance with the union, which ironically was protecting her perpetrator too. Luckily, she was able to get an

administrative transfer to another college in the district because she was in a multiple-college district.

> I left because of sexual harassment. I asked to transfer and they let me transfer because of <the Chair> who was bullying me, sexually harassing me…<Administration> made me sign a release paper and let me transfer. I told them I wanted to transfer. I wrote a letter to the chancellor..and to the president of the college. They transferred me out.

Because she is faculty in a multiple-college district, Participant Y was able to transfer her tenure years to her current institution at Southwest Ocean College. Thankfully, she was finally able to breathe again and leave behind a perpetrator. Two of the other faculty victims were also transferred to institutions, with one staying within the district and the other leaving altogether for a new district in the northern part of the state. Lastly one left for retirement.

The structure of the college system may have allowed for administrative transfers for Participant Y and the other victims, but the perverse fact remains that the Chair was able to continue his abuse without punishment due to the nature of his tenure contract, which prevails at both single and multiple college districts.

Lastly, the community where the college district is situated played an important role in how participants experienced faculty life. Participant N, who is faculty at Northeast College, works in a suburban community of Los Angeles that is ethnically diverse, but socially conservative. The college itself tends to mirror the conservative values of the community. Because of this environment, she found it somewhat stifling and was not comfortable to be forthcoming about her sexuality.

> I moved east from the westside of [Los Angeles], especially here I would say, it's definitely socially conservative… I'm sure that there is homophobia but it's more sort of the heteronormative discourse that is so prevalent. Like I feel good about my choices in coming out the way that I want to and like I don't think it's required or necessary and my partner doesn't care. It's fine.
>
> Like if there's a potluck she'll cook whatever it is….people will ask, 'Did you make this?' I'm like…well no. [My partner] makes my lunch and stuff. So… I don't feel like it's me being dishonest, but it's not… like I'm fully me. In the past, I've been very open with who I am. So it's almost like a little experiment for me. But it would be nice for it to be a non-issue.

Unlike Participant H or Participant Y, the faculty experience of Participant N was influenced more by the socio-political demographic of the surrounding community of her institution rather than whether it was a single versus multiple community college district.

Subtheme #2: Culture of the Institution

Culture of the Institution emerged as the second subtheme for Community College Structure/Culture in the findings. Nearly half of the 37 participants, or 16, described the culture of their institutions as "political" in the demographic questionnaire.

Of the 37 interviews conducted for this study, Participant A is one of only two non-tenured faculty participants. Despite teaching at her current institution for 6 years, Participant A has still not earned a tenure-track position and attributed this to her race. She holds a full-time faculty position, but lamented that that every tenure-track position she applied to within the institution were met unfavorably. As an African American woman, she feels that her Black identity has worked against her at Southwest Ocean College, where there is a growing number Latino administrators. She qualified by stating that the administration is still more likely to favor White hires over minority hires.

However, if administration were to intentionally hire a minority faculty, they would favor a Latino/a candidate over a Black candidate.

Based on a recent experience with a faculty development project, Participant A was confirmed that politics and race continue to play a role in hiring decisions at Southwest Ocean College. Participant A, who holds a full-time non-tenured position with the Physical Education department, had applied for an additional adjunct position with the Faculty Development Office. (Assisting faculty with online courses has become an emergent passion of hers in which has developed extensive technology skills outside of her discipline). She and a White female full-time faculty from the English department were hired to collaborate on the training design for this project. They successfully obtained grant money for the project and consequently things changed dramatically:

> After we wrote the grant, we got the money. We went to <technology> conference in New Orleans. When we came back, the whole climate had changed. People were angry that we got the money. They were angry! The administrators were angry that we had gone to New Orleans and they didn't stop us before we went.
>
> At the same time I was involved in the basic skills retreat with the <community college district>. When we came back from <New Orleans> , the district had steps that we had to take before we set out <to the conference> and that we were supposed to come back and implement at the college.

Midstream of the project, a Latina administrator was assigned to supervise the two faculty members working on the project. Because of her technology background, Participant A informally held the lead in the project's design and execution; whereas her White faculty project partner ensured the online texts and directions were written with

correct grammar. Unfortunately, the first meeting between the administrator and the project hires started off with friction, especially with Participant A.

> This administrator revealed her <disdain for my outspokenness >, ‘Why am I speaking when the full timer should be talking? We had a meeting with the administrator. She, I, and a full timer. <My project partner> doesn't know how to express herself.
>
> I could tell that the <administrator> didn't really understand what we had done there and what we wanted to do here. I took over and I told her. Although <the administrator> understood what I said, it upset her that I had to say it and the full timer didn't.
>
> There started a whole bunch of stuff. It's kind of like if you’re assertive, that's not acceptable.

Participant A felt that the Latina administrator immediately stereotyped her as “the angry Black woman.” Participant A, who was intimately involved with the project and even went to extra training sessions on her own time to learn the new technology, wanted to convey that she knew the logistics and was not intending to “speak over” her project partner or the administrator. Upon reflection, Participant A thought she would neutralize any hard feelings and approached the administrator.

> I realized that maybe <the administrator> was a little put off by our conversation. So a couple of days later I went to her and said, ‘You know, I hope I didn't seem too aggressive but I was just passionately trying to convey what we had done while we were <at the conference>.” She said, "Oh no, no, no… there is no problem. I understood from what you had told me and from what you had done, what you all needed.’ It was supposed to be the end of it. But it wasn't.

When Participant A and her project partner returned from a training workshop, the administrator informed them that she had selected her own candidate to conduct the faculty development training.

> The <administrator> comes in… and she hires a full timer! A full-time, White woman who knows nothing at all… and she's supposed to be in charge?!? We're in a meeting and all that research, I was doing a lot of research, all the research and stuff I was doing, I'm thinking I don't think I'm going to do that anymore.
>
> Nothing was direct. What the administrator did was her and someone else decided…well there's this new full-time or we'll put her in that group so now it's tri chairs. The <newly selected hire> knew nothing about cultural equity, didn't care about cultural equity; really a dunce in the area. Even interaction skills, leading meetings, all this stuff she does not have any of those skills. All of a sudden they placed her in the <project> and didn't know what was going on.
>
> <Administration> slipped her in without telling either of us and at the same time the memo that we're not going to be trainers. My thing is okay I did all this preparation to be a trainer. I'm in the Teaching Learning Center and I'm training faculty. I didn't understand...
>
> I didn't know what to do. I knew one thing, and that is that if I went and talked to <to the administrator> and she approached me as she was approaching the other lady, I don't know if I could handle that so I decided I'm just not going to say anything. I made it known that I don't understand what's going on.

In this case, the culture of the institution was experienced as political to Participant A for several reasons. The overall management of the project showed there was tension between administrators and faculty, especially when the Latina administrator dismissed the knowledge and expertise, which Participant A (a non-tenured faculty) brought to the project. To further, the administrator attempted to establish her authority by selecting her own candidate to do the trainings, completely disregarding the extensive training that the two initial faculty hires had undergone. Lastly, during the entirety of the project, the administrator showed favoritism for the White faculty project partner as well as hiring another White faculty member to conduct the trainings over Participant A. For these reasons, Participant A has found the politics surrounding this project, many which are

perceived as racialized, too crippling and has as resigned to looking for a faculty position elsewhere. This was a hard decision for her especially when she had committed several years to seeking a tenure-track full-time position at her current institution.

Five of the 37 participants described the culture of their institution as "hostile," with Participant U expanding in the "Other" section on the questionnaire that she felt her campus was "Hostile, Political, Majoritarian – Eurocentric". Participant U, who is a faculty that teaches English and Chicano/a Studies at North College, mentioned that the culture of her institution was going through change and that there was tremendous resistance from the leadership to acknowledge that the student demographics had become increasingly Latino:

> The movement [for diversifying faculty] happened before [I] got here… students rallying - MECHA (The Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán) and stuff - to bring in more faculty of color. [My dean] got taken off of the hiring committee and then that's when we came in… I [learned] later [that] my dean was not on the hiring committee because she had a slap on the wrist for lack of…she did like not [like] people of color coming in to teach English.

Four participants described their institution as "neutral" on the demographic questionnaire. They later explained in their interviews that they selected that option to either stay politically neutral, or that, even though they felt the current college leadership at their institution was largely political, there were a few administrators who were providing good leadership.

In addition, all the senior faculty participants, who were age 50 years or older, spoke with conflicted sentiments about the institutional changes that have occurred during the arc of their faculty careers. Some mentioned that they have seen "things

change for the better" regarding the demographic of the administrators and/or faculty shifting towards a higher representation of minorities at their institutions.

When Participant P first started teaching at Central East College, she was one of two faculty of color in the Spanish language department. Over the course of 17 years at the institution, she remarked how vastly different the college has evolved. She is now part of the majority in her department. "During that time, I have obviously seen the school change, even the chairs change. The leadership and everything… even the president. I have <been here long enough> to see three presidents." She added that the diverse representation of faculty, and particularly administrators, have had a positive impact for the students, many of whom are students of color and the first to attend colleges in their families.

> The students are more aware. There are more programs. <We> have more programs for those who have come from high school. There are more ESL classes. There are a lot of ESL classes now, but at that time <when I was a student here>… no. There's also money. There's a lot of things now for the students who struggled like me.

Participant P concluded that with more programs, there is more access for students of color to succeed. "Inevitably, they will find the culture friendlier too."

However, there were others who felt that the recent increased focus given to the STEM disciplines and also to transfer students were superficial and fracturing the original mission of the community college. Lastly, while many of the participants viewed their organizational culture negatively, some segregated that perception to the institution and perceived their specific department or discipline as "warm" or "friendly".

Subtheme #3: Climate of Department/Discipline

For the third subtheme, *Climate of Department/Discipline* emerged from the findings for Community College Structure/Culture. Based on the findings, the 37 faculty participants were spread across a variety of academic disciplines with the highest concentration found in the Humanities: Arts (2), Counseling (8), Humanities (12), Library Science (7), Social Sciences (3), STEM (5). Over half of the participants noted that their discipline/departments were "friendly" on the demographic questionnaire.

For Participant G, who is tenured faculty in the Health Sciences teaching clinical nursing, she described her experience of being a faculty in the STEM field as pleasurable. Unlike other STEM fields, the faculty demographic of her department is all female. The senior faculty members are White women; however, the younger faculty tends to be more ethnically diverse. As a Filipina woman and one of two of the youngest faculty in her department, Participant G does not feel that her identity has any impact on her interaction with her colleagues, but rather with her students. Because she is petite and young looking, the students view her as "an equal," which can be problematic because it opens up more possibilities for being challenged. Participant G also stated that the contemporary culture of the students today is less observant of a teacher-student hierarchy than when she was a college student a decade ago.

> The students that I've experienced are more, you know, entitled. They are…entitled…yes, that is the best word <to describe them>. They rely on a lot of technology. They have no patience. They want it now, now, now. These are the younger ones; mostly the younger ones because in my program it's a very diverse group. Like right now, I currently have range of students who are from nineteen - right out of high school - to fifty-seven years, actually.

Participant G noted that her department culture is very warm and cohesive, attributing that it is because of the teamwork mentality of nurses. Even though some faculty are no longer clinical nurses, or practicing in the hospitals, they have been "hard-wired" with that mentality and bring the teamwork philosophy into their faculty work. In hospital nursing, it is always safe--especially when it is a patient's life on the line--to ask questions rather than assume if one does not know the answer. Participant G added that the culture of asking questions or seeking help is also inherent in nurse practitioners:

> I could always go to <my faculty mentor> and ask them, 'What would you do in this situation?' It wasn't always that person…anyone really. If I saw another faculty member walking down the hall, I would just say, 'Hey, what happens when this <occurs>… or can I tell you something?' <My faculty colleagues> are very open and willing to help out and offer opinions.

In the case of Participant G's experience, being in a STEM discipline, which is commonly associated as being a male-dominated field and unfriendly towards women, did not determine the culture of her department.

Based on the findings, those six participants who found the climate of their department "chilly" or "icy" were in the STEM, Social Sciences, Humanities and Art disciplines. They did not consider the climate friendly because they were either the only woman of color, among mixed faculty of White women and men, or because they did not have confidence in the leadership of the department. In addition, some disciplines are their own departments whereas some are grouped with other disciplines under a large division. As a result, some of the disciplines have a department chair, whereas others have a division chair. The faculty participants in the study considered this lack of consistency across all of the community colleges a huge source of frustration.

Theme #2: Faculty Identity and Status

From Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003), the aspect of *Faculty Identity and Status* informed the foundation for this second theme in the findings. This aspect asserts that the identity of the faculty is dependent on the roles and responsibilities that they hold in their academic positions. In addition, their status within the faculty hierarchy of community colleges influences the experience of women faculty of color. In this second finding of the thematic analysis, two subthemes emerged: (1) Tenure Status and (2) Faculty Hierarchy.

Subtheme #1: Tenure Status

Tenure Status emerged as the first subtheme for Faculty Identity and Status in the findings. Of the 37 participants, only two identified as "tenure-track" and one as "full-time non-tenured" in the demographic questionnaire. In addition, one of the two who were "tenure-track" requested that the interview not be recorded. This participant claimed that she still needed to "keep under the radar" until she was tenured. Even though the tenure and promotion process has been widely thought of as less strenuous and less political than those found in 4-year universities, the findings that emerged in this study indicated otherwise. For the 52 faculty candidates who were referred to the researcher as possible participants, nearly all who declined to participate were not tenured, even though they fulfilled the criteria as full-time faculty.

Moreover, all 35 participants who were tenured expressed the many advantages of their status. They felt that being tenured was a personal and professional achievement, especially for those who had been first generation college students. The other emotion

next to pride was also relief. Most importantly, their tenured status enabled them to be more active in how they supported their students.

Many indicated that prior to tenure, they did not openly challenge politically bad decisions or injustices they witnessed, claiming that they did not want to jeopardize their tenure reviews. Some added that they were fearful to reveal their positions on issues or voice dissent in meetings, knowing that this could potentially conflict with the views of their tenure committee members or those in power to influence the decision. For the rare few whom dared to voice their concerns prior to achieving tenure status, these participants experienced retribution and political abuses of power; thus, validating the fears of those participants in the study who chose to stay purposefully neutral.

In the case of Participant K, she experienced a professional whiplash in her tenure review process. In the beginning, Participant K was being courted by the institution to leave her current community college, in which she was already a tenured faculty. The senior male faculty who advocated for her --who also had the ear of the Dean --would eventually turn against her because she did not conform to his exclusionary teaching philosophy and pedagogical approaches of how field trips should be conducted in the department.

> So the way we teach field classes [in this department], no faculty ever go out on their own. They're always paired up. Some other faculty [may join] to keep [the field instructor] company…away from the students - that kind of thing. But I don't believe in that. I believe in merging with the students when they're gone. That's the point of the field trip!
>
> [Right there], [my approach] has really created a conflict. And so during my first field trip, the male teacher is going to come along, even though I didn't invite him. He was, 'I'm coming.' And then he immediately started dictating how I

> should choose students, [telling me that I should say]: 'This is a very special opportunity. Only the good students get to come.'
>
> In my view the good students don't need the help. It's the poor students that need this help. To me this is a way of really [helping them learn]… To me, teaching is social and you can't teach someone unless you have a connection with them. So to me, I want all the so-called needy, hopeless cases to come along.
>
> So he immediately went on to [say]: 'No, you can't let these people come.' And then I sat there and said: 'Is this is going to *my* field trip or [*your]* field trip?' But if I stand up and say this is going to be my trip, *I* decide what's going to happen.
>
> This is going to make my life hell here… So I made a choice. This is going to be *my* field trip. And he immediately said, 'I'm going to go, 'cause [you] don't want to eat what the kids cook.' And my attitude was everybody come and cook together. That's the connecting experiences.
>
> [This teacher] was a military operation. 'Everybody listen to me.' (*mimicking her colleague's domineering behavior*). I'm [insisting], 'No! We learn through chaos. This is a reflection of the real world.'

The field trip was a disaster and Participant K was the one to endure the wrath upon return. Not only did she confront her colleague's relentlessly domineering behavior during the trip, Participant K discovered he was having an affair with a student. Upon return, the colleague reported to the Dean that Participant K was "unprofessional and should never be allowed to teach field classes again." The Dean "just took his word", and as a result, her tenure review was an acrimonious battle. Participant K concluded: "So [the Dean] just tolerates me. It's a miracle I actually got tenured…that I'm actually [here]."

Another factor that influenced the tenure and promotion process is a participant's prior faculty experience as an adjunct. This was especially true for 20 of the 37

participants. These 20 participants had formerly been adjunct faculty, known commonly as “freeway flyers”, prior to attaining their current full-time faculty position. Based on the findings, previously-held adjunct positions provided situational contexts for how tough or easy a participant considered the tenure process to be in community colleges. For the 20 participants who had held adjunct positions, the average length of time they taught as part-time faculty was 5 years, with 2 years being the shortest length and 8 years being the longest length taught. For Participant Z, who had taught as an adjunct both at universities and community colleges for nearly 4 years, she remarked that it seemed fair for adjuncts to prove themselves noteworthy if they wanted to be considered for full-time positions:

> You know what, I think it goes back to the whole work ethic. Mind you, I feel like compared to a lot of the part time faculty here, I always went above and beyond. That’s my personality. For me, I didn’t face obstacles. If [adjuncts] consider working a lot and volunteering - [they] get a max 20 hours to work, [they] can’t work anymore than that or the district has to hire you full time…So when [I was an adjunct] and [it] came to training [opportunities], of course I wanted to get 20 hours of paid work… and then any training - I would go and do for free. It’s stuff like that that I think for some people it might be an obstacle. For me, it wasn’t. It was just something like, ‘Duh, you have to do that to get a job!’

Once appointed a full-time faculty position, Participant Z never diminished her time and efforts in helping students in the Counseling department. As a result, getting tenure was a smooth and predictable process for her:

> If there were 100 people going for the same job - who are they going to pick? The mediocre person or the person that went above and beyond? I didn’t face any issues with my tenure at all. It was real smooth and easy.

Lastly, an important factor that influenced the tenure experience was how the participant perceived the climate of their department. For seven of the 35 participants, who had extremely difficult experiences in attaining their tenure, they mentioned that they felt the climate of their department "hostile" and/or their department chair as "hostile." In these all of these extremely stressful tenure experiences, the department chairs were White men, and in one case, a White woman.

For Participant S, her faculty experience at Southwest Ocean College started smoothly, but then quickly descended from uncomfortable to an extreme case of bullying during her tenure. Like most faculty who first start with an institution, she was prepared to handle a heavy teaching load so that she could prove herself. However during her probationary period, Participant S noticed that she had been assigned a huge teaching load of six classes, with an average of 50 students in each class (the average full teaching load is usually five classes). In addition, she realized that she was the only full-time faculty in the Psychology department. Unfortunately, she suffered silently, acknowledging, "when you are probationary, you're afraid of pissing off people."

After she was offered the full-time, tenure track position, Participant S inquired about needing teaching support with the division chair and things suddenly went sour.

> It's unheard of for a department with only one faculty member - especially such a large department as the psychology department - and not putting in for a hire. And every time I requested a person - because I really needed help…<The chair would reply>, 'Oh no, we need to hire someone else.'
>
> I was <also> the SLO coordinator. I got this point six release time and I'm the only one working in the psychology department point four…<Yet>, I'm *still* doing all the work because the Chair person did not <see the need> to hire a faculty member.

Because the Chair was ignoring her multiple attempts at communicating the urgency of the situation, Participant S voiced her needs to a higher administration. The President of the college was in agreement with Participant S and ordered the Chair to hire another full-time faculty. The Chair viewed this action as Participant S directly challenging his authority. Particularly, as a former police officer, the Chair runs the division "as if it were a police department and all the new people are just rookies" and Participant S knew she was viewed as a "rookie." Furthermore, Participant S knew that her having a PhD threatened the Chair, who holds a master's degree, and it did not help that she was a woman and the only person of color in the entire division: "I know I don't fit the stereotype of that submissive Latino person saying 'Yes, Sir…Yes, Sir.' If he says something that I don't think is right, I will say, 'Well, that's not right.'" Knowing her rights and facts, she has stood her ground in every incident of retribution from the Chair.

Under these grueling circumstances, Participant S was able to earn her tenure based on her teaching excellence and ability to work across disciplines, helping faculty understand accreditation requirements as the Student Learning Outcome coordinator. The victory of achieving tenure for Participant S, however, was greatly diminished by that fact that there has been an emotional toll on her health and overall faculty experience in the division. After multiple incidents of dealing with the Chair's bullying, Participant S has decided to leave the institution where she loves the students and the community, but stated with resignation, "I just couldn't stand it anymore." Because there are currently no tenured psychology faculty positions available for her to transfer to in her

district, Participant S continues to endure the Chair's abuse of power and agenda to push her "out of the division."

Subtheme #2: Faculty Hierarchy

The second subtheme, *Faculty Hierarchy,* emerged in the findings for the Faculty Identity and Status theme. Unlike 4-year universities, community colleges consider counselors and librarians as academic faculty along with instructional faculty. Typically, since community college counselors and librarians are not in the classroom, they are considered "non-instructional faculty," and some are even derogatively referred to as "non-academic faculty." However, several issues emerged in the findings that challenge the "non-instructional" label, and ultimately, revealed that there was an established faculty hierarchy among community college faculty.

Based on the study's findings, faculty hierarchy exists between the instructional and "non-instructional" faculty, though contractually, they are all equally considered academic faculty by the their institutions and the faculty union. Nonetheless, all participants admitted that there was an implied ranking order in the community colleges: instructional faculty at the top, counselors in the middle, and librarians at the bottom.

While the participants who were instructional faculty acknowledged that the hierarchy was problematic, because they were placed at the top of the pecking order, they were not compelled to defend their status or dispel misunderstandings by their fellow "non-instructional" faculty. Not surprisingly, the participants who considered the hierarchy contentious were counselors and, especially, the librarians. For one, some participants who identified as counselors and librarians actually taught--though not full-

time. Furthermore, while some taught non-credit courses or workshops, there were also a few who taught credit courses. Participant V is a counseling faculty who also has a part-time teaching load as a Psychology instructor at North Ocean College. She affirmed the misunderstandings:

> Counselors and librarians are faculty, but since we're not in the classroom 100%, we can be viewed by those that are 100% instructional as 'non-instructional.' [Also], we do teach. Some of us in those same disciplines as the other 'instructional' faculty. It's confusing.
>
> We typically referred to [the labels] 'instructional / non-instructional' on campus. Part of that has to do with funding sources, and perceptions of what is considered 'faculty'. We are definitely not 'non-academic.' As for a slang, sometimes we're referred to (jokingly) as the 'step-children' or 'step-siblings.' Not really part of the family but we are, you know? (*laughing)*

In the case of Participant N, she took tremendous offense at the referral of librarian faculty as "non-academic," clarifying that librarians were equally academic in training and status as "discipline faculty" (or academic faculty): "It is true that discipline faculty often erroneously use the term "non-academic" for counselors and librarians and I will often correct them when they do." To add, she pointed out that the label "non-instructional" for librarians was also technically inaccurate:

> We aren't just teaching in the classroom- but we're also fulfilling our instructional mission at the Reference Desk - so it is *very* important to me that we turnaround the tendency to refer to librarians and counselors as non-academic. Although this is not true at all community colleges, here at [Northeast College], the Library is under the VP for Instruction – so [we are] firmly in the academic wing.
>
> If I'm working on a Library document (like our collection development policy) I refer to other faculty as non-Library faculty. I will also make the distinction by calling the Librarians 'Library Faculty.' Other terms like, non-classroom, or non-instructional, non-academic are not appropriate for describing Librarians and

Counselors - although they may be used frequently.

To further complicate issues about the faculty hierarchy, where the library or counseling departments are housed on the institution's organizational chart ("Academic Instruction" versus "Student Services") had important ramifications for those who were "non-instructional" faculty. Unfortunately, there was no consensus on which division was the better reporting structure. Whereas Participant N emphasized reporting to the Vice President of Academic Instruction, which cemented her librarian role as an instructional faculty fulfilling the mission of the college, Participant H's experience at Northwest College was the opposite. Participant H noted that her institution was transitioning the Library department from Student Services to Academic Instruction and that would be politically fracturing: "We will be the only group whose faculty does *not* teach a full load like the other instructional faculty, which I believe will have serious ramifications. These are to be seen though..."

Finally, Participant R, who is a tenured librarian at Central College, stated with resignation that counselors and librarians were definitely segregated from the discipline or academic faculty: "Of course, the whole time I am thinking, we don't want to be separate, but we are." For counselors and librarian faculty, they felt that the way in which each of their community colleges contractually grouped them was an indication of how much their academic supervision--and instructional help--was valued. And for some, issues surrounding faculty hierarchy was more than just about professional status or value--it was emotionally damaging. This was exemplified by Participant H: "The

politics surrounding our institution regarding this matter is profuse *and* frustrating, and personally stressful."

Theme #3: Help-Seeking Orientation

From Social Capital Network Framework (Lee, 2003), the aspect of *Help-Seeking Orientation* informed the foundation for this third theme in the findings. This aspect asserts that faculty may seek support in direct and indirect ways to strategically align with people or organizations that can help them navigate through obstacles as well as politicized situations. In this third finding in the thematic analysis, two subthemes emerged: (1) Mentoring Relationships and (2) Organizational Affiliations.

Subtheme #1: Mentoring Relationships

For the first subtheme, *Mentoring Relationships* emerged in the findings under Help-Seeking Orientation. Nearly all of the 37 participants emphasized that mentoring, whether formal or informal, was the most effective and powerful form of support that helped guide them through the tough times in their faculty experiences. There were two participants who did not experience mentoring. These two were immigrants who fled political persecution in their countries of origin and stated that their struggles were always experienced alone, for they believed that no one could intimately understand their issues and help them through the obstacles.

Formal mentoring. For the participants who received formal mentoring (or where a mentor was assigned to them) nearly all noted how they appreciated the structure of a formal mentoring program. The structure and planned meetings made them feel accountable to their mentor for learning because they knew they would be checked on

regularly. In addition, those who received formal mentoring participated in educational programs that focused on an interest or skill, which the participants were intentional about exploring or developing.

For Participant U, she always knew she wanted to pursue a career in teaching. As an undergraduate, she learned of a graduate teaching internship targeted specifically for master's students who were aspiring English instructors. This internship had a formal mentoring program incorporated into its curriculum, where the students could participate in a structured environment and receive the tools and guidance needed to be effective instructors. Participant U recalled how extremely excited she was about the prospect of being in one and enrolled into that masters program right after finishing her bachelor's degree:

> So we would meet with the person, the faculty member in charge. It was like a cohort of us and we had to create our assignments together. I just remember learning about that, and being really excited like, 'Wow, I'm going to be kind of held by the hand, and be able to teach here.' And then once I had that experience of teaching, <I'll be> having my own classroom…

From the formal mentoring, not only did Participant U gain valuable pedagogical skills, but she also discovered that she wanted to teach a student population that was not high school aged but older.

> I thought I wanted to do high school, but then once I had that exposure to teaching - just once I was in the classroom – <my interests> switched immediately to community college. The fact that the students were more mature…a little bit (*giggles*)…and that they wanted to be there…and that they were somewhat engaged with the instructor…and the topics. It felt like <the instructors> had a little more liberty to do what we wanted. We got to shadow another <instructor> there, and it seemed like he was able to do what he wanted in the class!

In addition to the hands-on experience from the formal mentoring, Participant U noted the importance of minority representation from the faculty. As the only graduate student of color in this teaching internship, she found great comfort in connecting with the faculty of color, even if there were only two of them and neither was assigned as her mentor. They would address difficult topics about "otherness," such as issues of race and gender, which the majority White faculty members and fellow students completely ignored in the internship.

> I remember two <instructors> that I really got attached to was Dr. <Lee>, who was Chinese, and Dr. <Choudry>, who was from India… They both had super thick accents, and they got really heavy into race…post-colonial studies…and identity. That's whom I gravitated towards naturally.

While all the other students and faculty discussed medieval English as quintessential to a syllabus on American Literature, Participant U was viewed as "complicating things" by bringing a "cultural focus" into her practice teachings and curriculum. This was considered a direct challenge to the discipline's discourse and did not belong in the academic discipline of English by the dominant majority. For Participant U, who strongly identifies as Chicana Indigena, it did not matter that these faculty of color were not Latino themselves. Their presence and inclusive pedagogical approaches validated that she was not alone in her views, emboldening her to be the singularly outspoken student.

Similar to Participant U, Participant R also emphasized the importance of having the presence of faculty mentors who are people of color. As a Chicana, Participant R was fortunate to have a Latino faculty mentor assigned to her when she started her Master's in Library Science (MLIS). Not only did <Raul> act as a formal mentor in the MLIS

program at the university, but he also participated as a mentor in Reforma, which is a professional association that supports libraries and Spanish speakers. Participant R attributed <Raul> as foundational in her persistence to complete the master's degree and connection with Reforma.

> He was my mentor and I still call him…I think going through the program and having not just Reforma, but having <Raul> there…*oh*…it meant the world to me. There were very dark times where I think, 'I'm done with this. I'm not going to do this. This is crazy. I don't know if I want to do this. I don't know; I don't know if this is for me.'
>
> I don't think it was really the course load. I don't think it was that. I think it was just the feeling of inadequacy… and not fitting in. It's funny because here you are, a graduate student, you're an adult and you're still having these sort of conversations like, 'I don't know if I fit in. I'm like the only one; me and <Flores> are the only <Latinas>. I don't know…'

Being one of two Latinas in her MLIS program, Participant R mentioned that <Raul's> mentoring helped her cope with pressures of racism she was not yet able to articulate at the time. He acknowledged the stark reality that she and <Flores> were dealing with issues of tokenism in the program. However, <Raul> also encouraged her to transcend beyond the immediate space of discomfort because her persistence would have a larger political impact than what she was aware of at the time.

> <Raul> would say to me, 'You can do this! I *understand* what you're saying, but you *need* to finish. *We* need you to finish…*You* need to finish. You need to go to school. You need to go to college.'…And I think, 'Okay. Alright…I think I can do this.'
>
> There are a couple things <about being different>. One was the obvious… that if I wasn't the only one… or me and <Flores>…or maybe even an African-American person…or even an Asian person…was in the classroom <of White students>…I just felt like I wasn't part of the conversation somehow. And we

> weren't even talking about anything that would exclude me. But I just felt… I can't really explain it. I just felt, 'Am I really here? This is kind of odd.'
>
> Then, you know, in passing <the White students> during breaks or sometimes when there is group work…and I'm talking, the response <from them> would be, 'Okay, so *we're* going to do this activity and stuff.' I'm thinking, '*We're* going to do activities!?'
>
> *They* seemed more awkward that I was there.
>
> It was interesting because I didn't get to that point for a while…And when I finally figured out: '*Ohhhh! They're* the ones that are uncomfortable -*not me*! Oh I get it! *That's* what <Raul> was talking about…' I really need to continue and I really need to push this through… It took me awhile to figure that out.
>
> Yeah, I was out of place or those feelings of an inadequacy, but that's typical <of graduate students>. It was the *other part* that I <realized>: '*Oh, I'm making the <White students> feel uncomfortable'*. Good luck with that, you know? So anyway, *a lot* of *that* was happening.

Because of <Raul's> patient but firm mentoring, Participant R arrived at this revelation herself, taking full ownership of the experience. Consequently, this discovery cemented her motivation to finish, for her accomplishment would not only be one of personal success, but it would be a success for all the Latino/as striving to break down the walls of segregation in the academic library field.

<u>Informal mentoring</u>. Unlike formal mentoring, where the relationship was established during graduate schooling, informal mentoring occurred at various points throughout a participant's educational journey. Also, with informal mentoring, the connection to the mentor is more casual and organic. Participants frequently remarked that the mentors were the ones who sought them out, intuitively knowing that they were struggling but did not ask for help. For most of these informal mentorings, the mentor

did not share the same race or gender as the participant. In some cases, the mentors in the informal mentoring relationships were short-term advisors, and eventually the relationships would evolve to them being external allies.

For Participant J, her introduction to informal mentoring started in high school. As an immigrant of a Vietnamese upbringing, Participant J started school in ESL classes. In the beginning, school was a struggle: "I failed everything in elementary school because English was my second language. I had just <arrived from Vietnam>, but then I started getting good grades. I knew I could do it… it kind of helped motivate <me>." Participant J eventually transitioned out of ESL courses in middle school, embracing new goals of attending a university rather than a community college like some of her former classmates. Though her family supported her aspirations, they did not have the language or cultural facility to help her navigate the college admissions process. She had an Honors English teacher, a Japanese American man, who was instrumental in guiding her through the process. This teacher dedicated his personal time to helping students with their college applications.

> There was this one teacher who brought us Krispy Kreme donuts and made us come on a Saturday - he didn't have to be there on a Saturday. He didn't have to, but he *wanted* to. He brought us Krispy Kremes. I still remember him…He was there so we could work on our personal statements to go to college. He wanted us not to just go to the community college. It's not that there is anything wrong with it, but he wanted us to apply broadly. He made us come so we could work on personal statements.

As a result of this teacher's mentoring, Participant J developed a solid personal statement, which landed her entrance at the University of California, Irvine.

For Participant V, her introduction to informal mentoring started in community college. She met her mentor purely by accident. Returning to community college as a mature student after a long hiatus, Participant V was able to successfully convert all her failed grades from her prior attendance to straight A's. Despite this, the academic counselor whom Participant V had seen regularly at the college advised her that a probationary record would only afford entrance into a California State University (CSU) because she "wasn't qualified" to attend a UC.

With a completed CSU application, Participant V returned to meet this counselor for an appointment. Participant V remembered, "I was sitting there, sitting there, sitting there. She didn't show up on time." Another college counselor, who had an appointment with a student who turned out to be a no-show, approached her and asked why she had been waiting so long. He then offered to assist Participant V. Little did she know that crossing paths with this super energetic Latino man would change the course of her academic career.

> He pulled up my records. He looked at me. He says, 'So you are applying to the universities? What are you doing?' I said, 'I am a bio major and… I don't know, I'm thinking maybe medical school. I was thinking nursing, but now I am doing well in these bio classes, so maybe medical school?' He says, 'Why are you holding a Cal State application?' I said, 'Well, because that's where my other counselor told me I could go.' He says, 'Where do *you* want to go?' I said, 'Well, I wanted to go to UCLA, but she said I wasn't good enough.' He leaned over, picked up a brochure and smacked me on the head (*participant mimics the counselor's motion by dramatically striking the air with an invisible brochure*).
>
> I looked at him and thought, 'What the *hell* is this guy doing?!?! I was so freaked out! I didn't know what to do!' He said, 'Are you crazy?!?! You can go *anywhere*.' I didn't believe him. He asks <incredulously>, 'She told you couldn't go to UCLA?!? Look at these grades! You can go to UCLA.' I said,

> ‘*Really*?’ He said, ‘Yes. Pick a UC campus.’ I said, ‘I don’t even know what UC campuses are.’ He <repeated>, ‘You can go *anywhere*…Here, fill out this application.’
>
> He gave me the UC application. Again, this was still the paper form. We had to fold them and stick them in envelopes. Then he said, ‘Bring this back to me, but don’t come over *here*. Go over *there*. I am normally over there…in the Transfer Center.’ I got lucky and hit the Transfer Center Director.

Awakened and bewildered by the suggestion, Participant V boldly asked the director if he believed UCLA would accept her as a transfer student. When he quickly affirmed, she inquired if it was considered the best UC campus. Participant V then discovered that not only did Berkeley top as the most elite of all the UC campuses, but also was one of the best in the nation. Grasping the magnitude of this moment, she selected Berkeley along with other UC campuses because the director thought “not only could I get into UCLA, but there was one better. I <decided to try> for that too.”

After Participant V submitted her UC applications, the Transfer Center Director sought her out again and asked her about her plans to afford college and financial aid. Clueless, Participant V responded, “What’s financial aid?” Shocked by her naiveté, he instructed her to quit her job at the mall, then immediately offered her to be his student assistant. This position exposed her to crucial information and equipped her with the tools to succeed later in college:

> He hired me probably in November because it was application time, so it must have been the end of the fall semester and all of spring. I was his student assistant in the transfer center. That’s when I learned what colleges and universities were. That’s how I learned about what financial aid and scholarships were because he made me do all of his flyers. He made me help in his workshops. He made me call buses for campus tours. I knew nothing about that stuff.

When Participant V received her acceptance into Berkeley in the mail, her world changed. Suddenly, she was faced with the reality of potentially leaving Los Angeles and her family for a school that was far from anything she had ever known up until then. Frightened with this prospect, Participant V shuffled backwards and decided that she would rather attend UC Irvine to be closer to home. Again, her mentor directly intervened. “He called to former students that he knew at Berkeley. He had them call me and talk to me. That was my connection.” Knowing that there would familiar people, Participant V had a change of heart and enrolled at Berkeley. Because of the vigilance of her informal mentor, Participant took risks and made prudent choices, which ultimately changed the trajectory of her life.

For Participant P, her introduction to informal mentoring started during her undergraduate education at the university. Participant P, who identifies as Mexicana, immigrated to the United States after completing high school in Tijuana. Though she was set to start her studies in chemistry at a university in Mexico, she headed for the United States to escape the growing violence that prevailed in her hometown. Participant enrolled into a community college in Los Angles and discovered that though the standard of academics were inferior to what she had received in Tijuana:” High school over <in Mexico> is really different than here <in the U.S.>. <Mexican> high school is like two years of community college over <here>.” Despite her academic excellence and ability to understand English, Participant P speaks with a heavy accent and recalled being treated

“as a servant” instead of a student in community college. After completion at the community college, she transferred to the nearby CSU.

Unfortunately, she discovered that racism and deficit approaches towards Latino students were not exclusive to 2-year institutions. Though she was a hard-working student who loved learning, professors did not expect her to excel at the university - all but one who became her informal mentor. He was a faculty member who taught Spanish Literature. This professor was a man of Polish Jewish descent, who was fluent in Spanish, and was notoriously known as “the most difficult professor…No one liked that professor.” However, Participant P sincerely wanted to learn and her desire to achieve did not go unnoticed by this professor.

> There was someone - a good professor… I remember him, <a White man>. I think he was Jewish. He believed in me. He gave me all of the opportunities. He wrote me a perfect letter of recommendation. He guided me to scholarships…He saw something in me. He was the one who was my mentor until I finished.

Recognizing her academic talent, this mentor urged her to consider a PhD in Spanish Literature. He helped her research graduate programs that were suitable to her interests and offered solid fellowship money. In addition, this mentor assisted in finding scholarships to help ease her financial burden, which she alone would have to carry because her family did not have the means.

> He was the best person over <at the university>. He cared for me and <helped me> with *everything*. I <got> a fellowship at the State University of New York to become a doctor in Spanish Literature…He liked me very much because I liked to study. I was a good student - That’s why! He helped me in *everything*. Even to apply for the scholarship and the fellowship there... I got it and I went there!

While the mentor provided tremendous support, Participant P concluded the mentoring was a success because she was keen for the mentoring. In other words, she was self-motivated and acted on his suggestions, creating opportunities from them. Participant P attributed that the source of her motivation was her deep love of learning: "Only because I was a good student. Only because of that. If I wasn't that good, I think it never would have happened."

Finally, for all of the participants who had mentoring relationships, whether formal or informal, they mentioned that mentoring is most optimized when the motivation for the mentee (participant) to succeed is mutually desired. Because of these mentoring experiences, they have provided the blueprint for how these participants would come to see themselves as mentors. Not surprisingly, these faculty participants currently act as mentors in varying degrees to their own students. Furthermore, they added that participating in a mentoring relationship is an empowering experience, yet it is absurd that its salience is still so unrecognized.

Subtheme #2: Organizational Affiliations

The second subtheme of *Organizational Affiliations* emerged in the findings under the Help-Seeking Orientation theme. Participants who were associated with organizations, where membership was based on identifying with the culturally or racially specific experiences of the group, benefitted greatly from the coalition of support and resources that were provided from these groups. They felt comfortable to talk about sensitive issues that they confronted as women of color on their campuses and professional lives. This was especially important for women faculty of color who were

visibly underrepresented in their institutions, where in some cases, they were the only person of color in their departments. Memberships in these organizations helped reduce the isolation that they experienced in their faculty life.

For some participants, they used their experience and leadership skills to provide advice in their organizational affiliations. As an African American faculty, Participant F lives in Los Angeles County, but works as an academic counselor in north Orange County where African American representation is noticeably sparse. With resigned candor, she commented on the current situation: “It’s a small world in higher ed when you look at women. And when you look at African-Americans… or whatever <minority> group… it’s a small world in this thing.” In order to seek alliances with other African American educators, she has carved out her own support system through various memberships with organizations holding leadership roles. As a board member of the Southern California Council of Black Affairs (SCCBA), she collaborated with other organizations that promote the professional development of Black faculty, staff and administrators.

In addition, Participant F is currently the president of the Black Faculty and Staff of North Orange County. She noted that in her long-time affiliation with this association, sadly, issues of discriminating practices continue to persist despite organized efforts to combat them: “I just called a meeting yesterday. We had it at the district…and we’re *still* talking about the *same* hiring practices and the *same* stuff we were talking about nine years ago.” As long as these issues prevail, Participant F is determined to create change through her membership with these organizations.

For participants who were less senior, their organizational affiliations provided a platform for where they not only found community, but also sought guidance. For Participant R, a Chicana librarian faculty, her membership with Reforma helped increase her sense of belonging as well as professional worth on her campus. She joined the group as a student member based on her mentoring relationship with <Raul>, who was assigned as her formal mentor in graduate school and is also a Reforma mentor, and "has been a member ever since." Because Reforma's mission is specifically targeted to promoting libraries to the Spanish-speaking and the Latinos in the United States, Participant R benefitted from this affiliation as a graduate student because it "also brings in people like me to become librarians." Furthermore, now as a faculty member, she noted that Reforma provided niche support that she would not be able to find otherwise from fellow colleagues or her own family:

> I think Reforma has been there (for me). With Reforma, it's a professional <library> organization, but at the same time <it is> like family.
>
> I think there are some individuals where I feel like I could share things with…like <Raul>. I wish that I could share very specific things with my parents, but I think it's not that they would not appreciate it -- I think it would just be like something that they wouldn't…I don't know, maybe not understand in terms of how they've never experienced anything like that.

In summary, the subtheme of *Organizational Affiliations* emerged as a finding that echoes the mutual benefits of mentoring. In mentoring, the relationship was optimized when the mentor and mentee were committed to the success of the mentee. In organizational affiliations, the relationship was optimized because the participants were

committed to the cause of the group, and in return, the cause allowed them membership to a closed community that created opportunities for both leadership and support.

Theme #4: Matrix of Domination

The *Matrix of Domination*, the first feature of the Multiracial Feminism Theory, was used to inform the fourth theme of this study's findings (Collins, 2000). The *Matrix of Domination*, was utilized to critically frame the way in which current hierarchies of power impact women faculty of color. Furthermore, Collins's concept asserts that the range of inequalities found in socially constructed entities and dominant cultures are all interconnected for women of color. Where the participant's social location falls on this "matrix of domination" is based on the intersections of race, gender and class and life choices (Collins, 2000).

From the application of this theoretical feature, two subthemes emerged from the findings: (1) Educational Journey and (2) Family Status. The institutionalized significance of an education tremendously influenced a participant's journey into higher education. The emphasis of marriage and motherhood--reinforced by dominant and non-dominant cultures--had an impact on the lives of the participants.

Subtheme #1: Educational Journey

For the first subtheme, a participant's *Educational Journey* was influenced by the institutionalized significance of an education and the value it brings to their sense of personal achievement and also to their faculty careers. Many also mentioned that they felt they were viewed as a possible threat in a dominant White, male society because they are highly educated women of color. Furthermore, for the participants who started their

academic life in community colleges, they showed the greatest empathy for their students. Especially for those with families who did not have the financial means to afford a university education, it was assumed that they would need to make educational sacrifices, which ultimately translated to attending community college. In addition, some participants intimately understood the deficit approaches toward a student's worth as they had confronted this discrimination themselves in their own community college experiences.

Attended community college. For the 37 participants, 21 had attended community colleges at one point during their educational journey. Of the 21 participants who attended community college, 14 of the participants attended full-time and were transfer students. The other 7 participants who attended community college were part-time students who were enrolled, on average, for less than a total of four semesters. Nearly all of the participants who attended community college were the first to attend college in their families. For these participants, navigating through the educational process without guidance from home already had its logistical worries. Financing a college education further amplified the stress already experienced as first-generation college students. As a result, they often saw reflections of themselves in the multitude of community college students whom they served that shared similar backgrounds.

For Participant R, attending community college was considered the affordable option to a university education. Though she had been accepted to a California State University, financing a 4-year college degree was never discussed explicitly with her parents, both of whom did not have a college degree. As a first-generation college

student, Participant R had the support of her parents but knew that they did not have the knowledge or experience to help navigate through the financial logistics. “We hadn't had that conversation yet about money and how much this whole thing was going to cost. I know it's going to cost some money.” Participant R worried about how her parents would be able to afford her education as well as support her two younger siblings.

Based on the advice of her boyfriend at the time, Participant R decided on the less expensive path towards a college education by completing her General Education (GE) requirements in a 2-year college first. This choice created tremendous friction between Participant R and her parents, particularly her father. Her father believed that she should enroll directly at the university. Furthermore, he considered the local community college a “vocational school” that lacked prestige since he had taken courses there at one time. For Participant R, however, prestige was overshadowed by her worries about being a financial burden for her family:

> There were a lot of different things that were going on. I'm worried about finances still even though it's community college. At the time--I was 19--so things were still economically okay. I was <thinking that> I don't want to burden my parents even if it is community college. I don't want to burden them. They still have two kids at home. I'm still going to stay at home. I'm going to work. I'm going to work part time and take the full class load--you know, the 15 units - to finish in two years…work…have the boyfriend… live at home, you know?
>
> My dad was <perplexed>: ‘ What is all this? I don't understand.’ He didn't say ‘I have gone through it so I know what it is.’ He just saw that he was a dad and I had all this stuff going on. To him, it was like, ‘I don't see how you're going to do this.’

Ironically, it was Participant R who was unable to fathom how her parents would manage it all. Thus, she carried the financial burden herself and sacrificed a university

entrance for four years spent at the community college. As a community college alumnus who successfully transferred to the university, Participant R shares this experience with her students to show empathy. She intimately understands what it is like for many of her students who enter onto a college campus with hopes and desires but without a working plan that sets them up for success.

Master's degrees. Of the 37 participants, an overwhelming majority held a master's degree as their highest degree. Eleven participants held a Master of Arts degree. Ten participants held a Master of Science degree; 5 participants held a Master in Library Information Science. Three participants held a Master of Fine Arts degree. One participant held a Master in Education. Lastly, several participants held multiple master's degrees with one participant holding a total of 3 masters' degrees. For many of the participants, their love of teaching, especially working with adult learners or non-traditional students, provided the motivation for earning a master's degree. Because teaching was their main focus, many participants intentionally eliminated the idea of obtaining a doctorate because they did not desire faculty work that revolved around research.

For Participant X, a career in teaching was never questioned. She started as a teaching assistant during her undergraduate studies and enjoyed the rewards of helping students. After college, she continued with teaching in various capacities, which included working at tutoring centers, substituting at high schools, and holding part-time classified staff positions at a community college. Of all those experiences, Participant X gravitated most towards working with college students: "I wanted to be with college

students…I wanted to work with adult students. I didn't want to deal with parents…I wanted to be in a college setting." Eventually, Participant X landed a full-time position as an instructional assistant at the community college where she was currently employed. She assisted in the learning laboratory, which was multi-disciplined and was exposed to a variety of student needs. Helping remedial students learn how to read was a pivotal turning point: "That's when I knew what I wanted to teach, what subject I wanted to teach." She found it tremendously rewarding to empower students by helping them learn to read.

As a result of her instructional experience in the learning laboratory, Participant X determined that she would attain a Master in Education that focused on reading. Fortunately, she found a graduate program that was the right fit and received meaningful mentoring from her advisor:

> It was a great program…The main advisor of the reading program was wonderful. I was the only one in the program who wanted to focus on adult level reading; everybody else was grade level…because that program also prepared elementary and high school teachers to get their reading credential and that's not what I was in it for. I just wanted the Master's so I could teach reading. Even though I took the final comprehensive exam at the end, <my advisor> said to take it just in case I ever wanted to get a reading credential so it's on file that I passed the test…
>
> The advisor of the master's reading program was wonderful. I mean she was so instrumental. She knew what I wanted to do. She knew I wanted to work with adults and so she really helped me find material, find the literature, and focus on adult reading.
>
> The master's was always my focus. I wasn't really interested in a doctorate although my advisor recommended it and a couple of other people did too. They said well don't forget about a PhD and I said okay. My goal was just to get the master's so I could start teaching.

Participant X's dedication to teaching and working with adult learners is a sentiment that is shared by many of the participants who sought a master's degree. Not only did they specifically determine that the nature of their faculty work would be teaching, but also the student populations that they desired to work with in the college setting would be the underserved at the community college.

While most participants attained their master's degrees through a traditional Master's program, though there were a few who received their terminal master's degrees as a result of interrupting their PhD studies. Of the participants who held terminal master's degrees, there were two main reasons for leaving their PhD programs. For a few participants, one reason that attributed to the disruption of their PhD schooling was due to political unrest. These participants started their PhD programs in their country of birth, however, they were not able to continue their academic studies at the same level once in the United States because of language barriers as well as the lack of transferability of their graduate work to the American higher education system. For other participants, another reason for their departure from a PhD program was due to alienation and isolation that was experienced in their graduate education. In some cases, these experiences were a direct response to confronting repeated microaggressions and even overt racism.

For Participant P, she painfully discovered that while she was ripe to learn in her PhD program, she did not anticipate that her Mexicana identity would be a source of turmoil and cause for hostile confrontations. Participant P was accepted in a doctoral language program at a research university in upstate New York. Even though there were

graduate students of different nationalities, ethnicities and cultures in her PhD program, there were few Chicanos and Mexican Americans. Many of her fellow graduate students treated her with degrading behavior, which revealed their deeply embedded belief that stereotyped Latinos as house cleaning labor. Participant P recalled confronting such racist treatment:

> There were only two Mexicans over there. There was a lot of Dominican and Puerto Ricans, but <almost none who were> Chicano or Mexicano. I struggled in the dormitory. I remember one Russian student came over to my room. She said to me, 'Oh, you are Mexican? Every Mexican has AIDS!' She told me that. 'Every Mexican has AIDS…' Oh my gosh…(pause). Then she ordered me, 'Clean my room… Clean this…Clean that!'
>
> I tried to be nice, so I cleaned it. That was at first. She was new and she came from Russia. I felt probably she wants some time to get familiar with the system. Well, at the end of the first week, I had a fight with her and said, 'I don't want you anymore in my room. I took her out of my room'. She was treating me very badly…She did not like Latinos!
>
> I remember another girl, a White girl…she was American. I remember she made food and she left everything really messy. I wanted the space to do my own food, so I cleaned everything. She told me, 'Oh, you are *very* good at cleaning!' The first time I was...(*shaking head to motion dismay*). She tried to say it <again> to me. I thought <to myself>, 'I will never clean again…I decided I would not clean anything anymore. I will leave it just like that'…
>
> They think Hispanics are only for cleaning…<The graduate students> thought I was the one who was cleaning the kitchen, cleaning the room, and cleaning everything. They knew nothing about me. Only the Taiwanese and the Black-American students <were my friends>. They were the only two. That's it.

When Participant P was alerted that her family was having serious financial troubles, she decided to take a year off from her PhD studies and return to Los Angeles to search for work and help them out. Though she had intended to finish her doctoral

degree, Participant P recognized that she was actually relieved to escape the isolation and hostility she felt in her doctoral program. She had come to associate graduate school, and the predominantly White town in which the university was located, as unwelcoming.

> I was walking by myself and I remember this <White> guy…They were driving by and screaming at me: 'Where are you from? Don't be here!' After that, I was really afraid to walk by myself out of the school just to go to the market or any place. It was really bad for me. I don't feel comfortable over there <in rural New York>. Probably that's why I decided to not return because I felt really bad.
>
> When I arrived home <to Los Angeles>, I remember I was sitting in the middle of the street just feeling fine…safe.

Participant P asserted that she has no regrets for making the temporary leave into a permanent one. She lost her desire to study in that particular PhD program and was reluctant to return to a place where she felt threatened. Luckily, her return home to Los Angeles coincided with a tenure-track faculty opening at Central East College, which is where she remained and has taught Spanish for the last 17 years. In this environment, Participant P is not considered the maid, but rather, respected as the caring professor.

Doctorates. Of the 37 participants, a total of 7 had doctorates. Five participants had PhDs and 2 had EdDs. Of these 7 participants who held doctorates, 4 previously held a university faculty position and then transitioned to community college work. Contributing to this pool of doctorates, there was one participant who is currently working on her PhD while concurrently employed as a tenured, full-time community college faculty.

Overwhelmingly, all participants with doctorates shared a common sentiment that faculty work in a university was simply "not the right fit" for them. Despite the fact that

most had positive experiences in their doctoral programs, these participants stated they did not want to pursue an academic career in research and writing. For a few with PhDs that had negative experiences in their graduate programs, they displayed pride in their hard-earned degrees; however, they also felt that the politics surrounding what is deemed as noteworthy scholarship was exclusionary or dismissive of their research interests.

Before embarking on a PhD program, Participant M strategized on which program would suit her academic interests and needs. She got accepted into a prestigious PhD program in Ethnic Studies at UC Berkeley, but was deterred because of the small financial package. In addition, several people who were intimately familiar with the program cautioned her: "You are going to be unhappy. There's a lot of politics involved in that whole program." Instead, she chose to attend the PhD program in English at UCLA, where she thought there would be more flexibility to include her other disciplines of interest, which were Feminist/Women's Studies and Asian American Studies.

Unfortunately, the PhD program in English did not have as much latitude with other disciplines has Participant M had wished to be the case. She discovered that the theories that were accepted within her department were traditionally Eurocentric: "They were familiar with the canon, the British canon and the American canon, which is predominantly White male." Her explorations of Asian American authors and feminist interpretations were widely dismissed because they did not belong to the dominant canon. As one of five students of color, Participant M was an ethnic minority among her cohort as were her intellectual views. Participant M questioned her self-worth. Her sense of belongingness spiraled further downwards when a dissertation committee member, who

differed in socio-political views with her, disparagingly stated: "You are not going to get any jobs. Your dissertation is not good enough." He used this as justification to refuse her a reference letter.

While there were major "heartbreaking" obstacles faced within her PhD program, Participant M was determined to complete her degree. Through all the discouragement and doubts, she developed a love of teaching. Being a Teaching Assistant (TA) fueled her to finish:

> I was enjoying the teaching. When I started doing the research for my dissertation, I thought, 'I am going to finish this. I have to do this'. I don't want to stop at a Master's. I kind of already knew that I didn't like research. This is not fun. A large part of it, I think, is because I never really wrapped my head around theory - that was the hardest thing for me. The Chicano studies professor (a member of her committee) said, 'I know where you are going with this. I totally understand it.' These other people don't know because they are not in Women's Studies.

After Participant M finished her doctorate, she originally intended to apply to both university and community college faculty positions. However, a fateful day at a community college job fair cemented her decision. Participant M was excited to talk about her teaching philosophy and discussions with hiring faculty about the types of students who attended community college. "In the end, I am really actually glad that I am with the community college route. I don't think I would have been happy doing research."

Subtheme #2: Family Status

For the second subtheme of *Family Status*, the emphasis of marriage and motherhood had an impact on the lives of the participants. Simply because they were

women, the participants felt that their gendered identity could not void the fact that marriage, and particularly motherhood, were inherent and had to be addressed in their life choices. When including the intersections of race and class, and the cultures in which these factors overlapped, the participants felt that they had to be strategic about their academic career choices. All of those participants who were mothers made the intentional choice to work as faculty in the community colleges where the (assumed) flexibility of teaching or serving students was considered more forgiving than being subjected to the "publish or perish" pressures of university faculty work.

Married/With a partner. Of the 37 participants, the majority were married or had partners. Specifically, a total of 21participants were married, 2 were widowed (but formerly married) and 4 had partners. There were 10 participants who identified as being single.

For those participants who were married, many indicated their spouses as essential to their support network. In particular, for the participants who had spouses that were non-educators, they mentioned how their spouses' views provided helpful contexts and enabled them to gain refreshing perspectives on how people behave outside the confines of academic life--which can often exist in its own organizational bubble.

For Participant V, her partner is a key supporter in helping her keep balance. She is reluctant to refer to herself as a doctor: "It almost feels pretentious. That's not *who* I am, but it *is* what I am." The culture of her community college campus always addressed qualifying administrators as "doctors," but rarely do they refer to faculty with that title unless "it's warranted." In other words, usage of the title would add more

credibility and political weight to a decision made by the faculty when a view was questioned as uninformed or inferior. Rather than perpetuate that perspective of negative association of the doctorate degree, Participant V's partner counters it by celebrating her:

> He's a mechanic. Complete opposites. He celebrates. Because, again I still get that humble, 'You're not supposed to brag, you are not supposed to push'…I <get to celebrate> with my partner. He's a champion. He jokes around and refers to himself as, 'I am the blue-collar guy, but I got the nerdy girl.' He really celebrates. He introduces me as, 'She's the PhD!'

In the case of Participant D, she affirmed that her non-educator husband's demanding work schedule gave him empathy over her faculty commitments on and off campus. She also stated that his professional background was extremely useful in helping her hone her interviewing skills when she was seeking full-time faculty work:

> My husband and has a very busy career and so it wasn't like he was waiting for me at home and <remark>, 'Oh, when are you gonna get home from this job? Or why are you grading papers? Or whatever…That was never an issue. But the main thing is he was very supportive in helping me prepare for <faculty> interviews. Like really supportive in helping me practice and that was valuable!

In addition, the participants who were married to spouses who were of a different ethnicity or nationality than them displayed a cultural fluency in talking about race from a different perspective. As an African American woman, Participant F attributed her African husband as the motivating force behind her comeback after she derailed from her educational path. Participant F started her university education with tremendous promise, but dropped out to follow an unhealthy relationship, which would become her first marriage. Eventually, Participant F enrolled in community colleges to restart her education plans, all the while caring for her young children. She successfully transferred to a university and was close to the completion of her undergraduate degree when her

education plans were jeopardized again. Unfortunately, her marriage had fallen apart due to drug addictions and “school was on the backburner.” She left her husband and struggled to care for her sons on her own.

Experiencing dire financial times, Participant F sought to supplement her work income and reached out to a former university professor from Uganda, whom she knew sold African arts and crafts as a side business. Even though she helped him with his business, their friendship was more than a professional transaction--he saw her intelligence and potential. Participant F recalled him relentlessly urging her to finish and blocking any excuses she had for delaying her degree attainment.

> He asked, ‘You know, what’s going on with your education? And I said, ‘Oh, I have five classes to go to and I’m going to be fine. I work at the school district. I’m just fine.’ And he looked at me and he said, ‘No, you’re not. No, you’re not. You need to go back to school.’ And I looked at him and I said, ‘But you know, I’m cool.’ He said, ‘No, you’re not. I want you to meet me in my office on this day and I’m going to take you to Financial Aid...’ Next thing I know, I had enrolled back in school, girl. He got me back in school!
>
> He encouraged me to get back in school. He gave me all the in’s and out’s with the Financial Aid office. I had the babies. He got me on financial aid. You know, I was getting some financial aid. I was even able to upgrade my car. I finally got a <reliable> car, you know? I was staying with my mom and he said, ‘You know what? You’re going back to school.’ I said, ‘Well in the evenings, my mother works evenings.’ Because I was still working, he said, ‘You’re going to take this class. You’re going to take that class and I’ll come over and I’ll watch your kids.’

The friendship between Participant F and the professor evolved into one of mutual support, academic interests and then a loving marriage. Unlike her first husband who had Black American roots entrenched in a cycle of poverty, Participant F’s African husband viewed the struggles of race differently than her first husband. Participant F noted that

because her second husband is not an American, he holds a very different perspective on opportunities, privilege, freedoms, and ultimately, on the value of an education.

> He's from Uganda. And for them education, you know, there's no public education in Uganda. So they have to pay for all their education and he came over here just to get a Master's degree at UCLA…but <the Ugandan dictator> Idi Amin had messed up everything, so he ended up staying. And he ended up getting his PhD and teaching <at the University>. He's been there for almost 40 years.

Rather than sabotage her goals for an education like her first husband, Participant F's Ugandan husband continued to advocate further education with graduate school and for her to fulfill her academic potential. As a result of his encouragement coupled with her self-determination, Participant F earned her tenure as faculty counselor at Southeast Community College, while also lecturing in Africana Studies at the university.

Children/No children. Of the 37 participants, the majority had children, regardless of their marital or partner status. For those participants who were married, 13 had children and 8 did not have children. Of the 4 participants who had partners, 3 had children and 1 did not have children. Of the 2 participants who were widowed, 1 had children. Of the 10 who were single, 5 were divorced and had children from a previous marriage(s).

All participants with children specifically chose to work in the community colleges so that they could achieve a work-life balance that they felt would be more accommodating than if they were faculty at the university. For some participants, their idealized belief that being a community college faculty would provide a flexible schedule for motherhood was met with disappointment. This disappointment was mainly

attributed to the climate of their department and whether it was viewed as acceptable for them to prioritize their children and family responsibilities as equal to faculty responsibilities. Conversely, some of the participants who had previously worked in a university environment had firsthand experience of how much less forgiving faculty work can be at 4-year institutions, especially with the pressures to research and publish. For these participants, being a community college faculty was acknowledged as instrumental in allowing them the schedule to spend time with their children.

After finishing her PhD program successfully while raising her four children, Participant K wanted to be available as a mother, which she felt she was not able to be while conducting her research. She stated that:

> I was not available to <the children> very often. Even though I'm *there,* I mean I'm emotionally not. I'm so stressed out. I ran all the time… even my advisor's husband asked, 'Do you ever walk?' 'Cause I ran everywhere and I knew this was not fair to my kids.
>
> And <getting the PhD>, I had to start teaching…that's what was freaking me out. I felt like that's not fair to my kids. I cannot make that choice…I felt like I have to be able to be available to my children again. So <community college> was really the base of my choice. It had nothing to do with the schools…I wanted to have time with my children.

For the participants who did not have children, but had spouses or partners, they spoke about how there was no desire to start a family because they enjoyed their married/partnered life child-free, or that they thought it would be stressful to manage the additional responsibilities. For Participant D, she recalled the amount of time and effort that was required to build her teaching portfolio:

> …If I had more personal responsibility, I think it would have been impossible to navigate all the different <adjunct positions> and make sure I can be present and

> make myself known…I can't imagine how that would have been possible…with all that stuff…with having little kids at home.

In addition, though some of these participants were not mothers themselves, they came from cultural backgrounds where being a caretaker for family was a role that was assumed. Therefore, being child-free did not equate to being free of familial duties or ease financial concerns. For Participant S, she and her husband seriously honor their role as the primary caretaker of her elderly mother-in-law who lives with them. Because they do not have their own children to care for, this allows them to also send money home to support her family in Uruguay. The reality of financially supporting family resonated with nearly all of the participants who immigrated to the United States. These participants regularly sent money home to ensure that their family members, who remained in the countries of their birth origins, were provided with comfortable living arrangements and health care.

Finally, whether they were married, partnered or single, a few of the participants who did not have children mentioned that they felt as if they worked harder in their faculty work than their colleagues who did have children. They also acknowledged, however, that faculty work at the community college ultimately has its perks due to the flexible academic schedule and that they would not exchange for other professions.

Theme #5: Women's Agency

According to the Multiracial Feminism theoretical framework, the third feature called *Women's Agency* (Mohanty, 2000) is applied with the intersectional implication that within the constraints of race, class, and gender oppression, women of color create viable lives for themselves, their families, students, and communities. Despite

institutional inequalities that women faculty of color confront, they can concurrently challenge deficit interpretations of being a minority female due to the nature and the organization of their opposition.

Furthermore, women faculty of color display agency by employing the richness of their own experiences as a means to oppose and exploit dominant structures. In this fifth thematic analysis, two subthemes emerged in the findings under *Women's Agency:* (1) Work outside of the community colleges and (2) Ambassadors of change.

<u>Subtheme #1: Work Outside of the Community Colleges</u>

In this study, *Work Outside of the Community Colleges* is a subtheme that appeared in the findings under Women's Agency. For most of the participants, their academic aspirations to be a community college faculty was not the result of a linear approach to higher education, or to life in general. Some held positions at 4-year universities, which ranged from administrative duties to academic teaching, before they decisively transitioned to academic faculty work in community colleges. Others held employment in the private sector, or even had long-term professional careers that tremendously influenced their decisions to later serve students as community college faculty.

<u>University work</u>. Nearly a third, or 11 of the 37 participants held jobs as either faculty or administrators at 4-year universities prior to becoming a community college faculty. Specifically, 4 of the 11 participants held administrative positions; 7 of the 11 held either adjunct or full-time tenure-track faculty positions at universities.

For Participants who had experiences as university faculty, the findings revealed that they displayed tremendous professional clarity as to why they chose to teach in the community colleges. In particular, participants who had completed their PhD conveyed that aspiring to be university faculty was really the only choice that was offered to them in their graduate programs--it was "by default", due to the nature of the degree. However, there was a tremendous lack in addressing the realities of working in either a research or comprehensive university--especially, *how* to handle teaching loads while researching and publishing. For example, one participant recalled to her days as a tenure-track junior faculty at a major California State University in the Bay Area: "I wasn't dedicating myself to anything--*I was spread out*-- in many directions…And I saw that the full-time professors…(seemed to be in a similar situation)...There was a lack of meaning in my actions. This was *not* what I wanted." To add to her misery, she also noted that the salary was so abysmal that she was forced to seek additional work to "make ends meet." As a result, this participant found adjunct faculty work at a nearby community college. That experience revolutionized her life--it provided a new way of framing the identity of being a professor.

For Participant Y, who migrated from Iran to the United States to attain a college degree. She later progressed to graduate school at the University of Kansas, her first introduction to extensive university teaching was as a TA during her PhD schooling. Since she was teaching in the Math and Technology division at the university, the majority of her colleagues were foreign-born, or immigrants. "My colleagues were nice…but the students, they were *terrible."* She taught nighttime courses to older,

mature students. Even though there was diversity in the age and experience of the students (they were not traditional-aged students), there was lack of ethnic diversity among them. This took its toll on her as an instructor, explaining she was the "other": "[The students] are mostly White Americans. Maybe a couple of Blacks…Midwest, you know." Though an experienced and knowledgeable instructor, Participant Y recalled how the students questioned her competence:

> One of them was so rude. He went and complained. Actually a bunch of them. Not even just one, a bunch of them complained about me. I don't remember what they said, but they complained and the chair sent somebody to sit in my class and make sure that I'm teaching okay. There were a lot of complaints. I stopped at the end of the semester.
>
> They would say that I [didn't] know what I am doing…They didn't do well on the test, I remember that. The test was *this* (*motioning that it was concrete*). I said, 'I'm sorry, but this is what it is.' Then they went and complained about the test. [They would probably not do this] if I was a White woman…definitely [not]. I was really young too…I guess they resented it too, probably somewhat. Some of the people in the night classes were much older than me.
>
> Some of the [the students] from the business companies, they were actually okay. Not too bad, but my trig at night… [there was] this one older [White] guy. He was *nasty*. I will never forget it. [He said to my face], 'You don't know what you are doing. You should be out of the classroom!'
>
> If it was now, I would kick him out of my class. Right now, I will not allow something like that.

Though her first time teaching experience may not have differed from those who look young or are novice TAs, it was clear that Participant Y attributed the intimidation she received to her being a woman of color. She left that hostile environment with a terminal masters and packed her bags for a place that hopefully would be friendlier. When Participant Y came to California to look for faculty work, she looked for opportunities at community colleges. She found the explosion of ethnic diversity among

the students refreshing: "It was an experience. It was different. I think people were more welcoming here. I didn't feel that intense feeling that I felt in Wichita, Kansas…the students were much nicer here [in Los Angeles]. They didn't make fun of my [Farsi] accent." She added that she also appreciated the community college student demographics, noting that many of them also had come from humble, immigrant backgrounds and had accents themselves: "They had a good attitude. You didn't feel like you were a foreigner there. They appreciate what you do for them. They were very nice. They would never complain."

For those participants who held administrative jobs at the university, most were in positions where they offered services to help underrepresented students. The reasons for leaving those jobs were mainly due to a change in leadership in their particular division or program.

For Participant L, she found her work at the Counseling Center at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) extremely rewarding. Participant L's duties encompassed serving low-income and minority students alongside a diverse demographic of fellow colleagues. This environment perfectly aligned with her personal and professional commitment to social justice:

> I really wasn't that interested in working with other offices on campus. You know I probably could have worked at the Admissions office or worked maybe at the career counseling office, but because of the focus of the program--I was working with low income and minority students, that was--to me--that was the best job ever!
>
> Plus, the other thing is that…when I started <at the Center>, there were six counselors…They were purposely hired… there were two Latino counselors, a man and a woman, two Asian counselors, a man and a woman, and two Black counselors…My boss happened to be a Native-American woman too.

> I just really loved working with that population. That was the group that I wanted to work with. So I wouldn't find that any place else on campus…That was the group that I knew needed the services. Because I had kind of lived through that and I saw it that that was a group that was underserved and that it was really important to help particularly low income and minority students to go through college… Because I know it makes such a *big* difference in terms of their income, their ability to earn income, and their ability to get jobs where they could serve their community and influence their children to go to college.

Participant L first started there as a counselor and and eventually became Assistant Director over the span of the 13 years she was with UCLA's Counseling Center. During her time there, she also received her Master's degree and started tinkering with the distant idea of working in community colleges, like many of her counselor friends who had switched over to two-year institutions before her.

Towards the end of her tenure at the Center, a change in leadership caused a "huge political upheaval," spurring her to make the transition. The culture and direction of the Center, which Participant L once cherished was no longer congruent with her ideals of helping students, "it was just really different. The tone had changed." As a result, Participant L resolved to make her move to community colleges, "So, then I knew for sure. I had my Master's. Okay… It's definitely time to go now."

Participant L was able to land a position with Central College effortlessly. Though the student population was different--more diverse--she possessed both the counseling and administrative experience that was desired at the community college. Particularly, she had intimate knowledge of about "all the different universities that everybody is going to." The work experience of Participant L exemplifies how previous employment as a university administrator provided her the framework in which she was able to continue her commitment to social justice at the community college level.

Private sector jobs and professional careers. Of the 37 participants, 6 held jobs that were in the private sector or had professional careers prior to seeking community college faculty work.

For the participants who held private sector jobs, they were in mainly hourly-waged employment, with some eventually leading to managerial positions. Namely, these were participants who came from backgrounds of lesser financial means. Working a steady job and making stable income were prioritized as important for these participants.

For Participant V, holding a full-time job as a full-time student attending community college proved to be too much. She informally left school and chose to pursue her career as a professional photographer, only to face the consequences of that decision later in her job.

> My second semester, I enrolled in a full load, five classes, so probably 15 units, and was working full time. Again, because I didn't have the understanding of college--I left! I didn't formally drop. I didn't formally…I didn't do anything. I just thought, 'Well, I am not going to school anymore.'
>
> I was working as a photographer for seven and a half years, and that's what I was doing professionally. I hit a point where I was doing some commercial work. I did some weddings (and that was horrible)! I ended up taking a position with Olan Mills, the portrait people. What I did I was I worked out of their Brea studio, training their new photographers. I hit a point where I was training these people, bringing them in, and taking them to the studio that they would be assigned to, [giving] them new techniques… I had the whole district that I would run around in and retrain and advanced and trained [more] people in. And these people were moving up into management positions.
>
> I questioned, at one point,' Why are these people that I hired and trained moving into positions above me?' The response was: 'Because they have a college degree and you don't.'

> After three people became my supervisors, I questioned them: 'Why are these people that I trained--I am better than them, they are coming to me for questions…why are they now my supervisor?' The response was: 'You don't have a college degree.' We can't move you into these management positions because, *again*, the qualifications are a college diploma, a college degree. In my prissiness, I said, 'Fine! I will go back to school and I will get that stupid degree and I will show you!' I ended up leaving the photography field.
>
> I worked for about one and half years doing freelance photography plus a full time job with the Marriott Corporation just doing reservations all day long and it was because it was an early morning position from 5am to 2pm or 5am to 3pm, so I had my evenings and weekends free to continue the photography piece. That's when I was needed--it was evenings and weekends, so I was doing both. I paid off every piece of debt that I had to go back to school. I went back to school at 25.
>
> You know, I tell people that I took the scenic route! (*Jokingly chuckles.*) I don't recommend it, but it is what it is. But, I went back [to school]…

Also coming from a background of meager financial means, Participant S shared a similar story that involved a wayward path to attaining her college degree and to becoming community college faculty. When military dictatorship rule crushed the economy in her home country of Uruguay, Participant S left in the midst of her university education and migrated solo as a young adult to Argentina. Alone in a large city, Participant S not only achieved financial stability for the first time in her life, but she also learned the joys and responsibilities of independence:

> Well in Argentina I actually met very good people--this Armenian family, the owner of a very fancy jewelry store. [I] got work there and ended up being the manager of the store. *I learned a lot.* I really learned a lot there. It was *very*, *very* good. Because of that job I rented a cute little apartment in Cordoba. I mean I was able to sustain myself... *It was very good.*

As the Argentinian dollar was strong at that time, she was able to save enough money from five years of working at the store and earned herself a "*big* vacation to the United States." Participant S arrived in California and hit the restart button for the

second time. She found work as a nanny and smartly hired an immigration attorney to help her obtain a green card for permanent residency. Shortly after, she met her husband and started the discussions of college again:

> I wanted to do and this and that and the other. And I *really* wanted to go to school. I knew that I wanted to go to school and so when we got married, we lived really close to <Southwest Ocean College> and I went there for two years and I worked too. That's the beauty of this educational system--at least to me--it worked very nicely for me that I paid for my education.

Whereas Participants V and Participant S worked in the private sector as a means to afford their education, Participant O worked in the private sector to explore a career in education. Participant O initially thought she wanted to teach in the elementary schools and had finished all the coursework in her Masters program except student teaching. A summer in Japan teaching English to adults dramatically shifted her thinking: "When I came back, it really peaked my interest on this whole field of linguistics and ESL (English as a Second Language) and the whole thing." While in the graduate program, Participant O started teaching ESL. After she completed her Master's, she began work at a for-profit college and was devastated to learn about their unscrupulous educational practices:

> I did the private business college. I actually liked the smaller classrooms there, but part of what made me move on was realizing that they were somewhat unethical in their recruitment and processing through of students. I never realized that… I was very naive.
>
> I thought, 'Oh, the students just come and they are taking classes. Then they go to finish someplace else or they finish with their business part of the college. I think it was during one [of my classes]…after I had been teaching there for about a year, I was talking with one of the students, and he actually explained to me how he came to be in the classroom. I thought he walked by [to share], 'Oh, I want to learn English and I want to work on a business degree or whatever.'

> He was saying actually that he thought he was applying for a job and [the for-profit school] said, 'Well, you can do a job, but first you have to learn your English, and then you have to learn your English while we have these classes. What you can do is you can sign up for financial aid. Then you can do this… and then you can do [that].' Basically, they got the students into either the grant program or whatever these federal programs are and they ended up taking out loans or grants….or something, but just kind of much more entangled than [the students] would have wanted.
>
> After I heard that, the next day or within the week, I just resigned. I talked with the people [at the for-profit], 'How are students coming here? And what's happening?' The answers were sufficiently vague… then I realized that it's probably true, so I resigned.
>
> About that time, I had gotten married and we were living in <a town in OC>, so I just opened up the phone book…and it was like, 'Where can I teach?' I saw, 'Oh they have a college here!' So, I called the coordinator. She interviewed me that day and classes began that night. I got hired. That was a long time ago and I haven't left basically!

For Participant C, her entrance into community college teaching arrived in the later chapter of her career. Primarily, her professional identity as a journalist carved out a significant chapter in her life. She was able to channel her passion for writing and traveling into a professional career that lasted for decades. Though it proved to be an exciting journey, it was not sustainable:

> I spent most of my life as a professional writer and I wrote for *everyone*. Like I said, I started with NPR and then I did the OJ Simpson trial with the *New York Times*. I wrote for *USA Today*, *LA Times*, *Premiere*, and *Variety*…anybody that would buy it. It was wonderful…*but* it was freelance. It was epic how they were paying me. I had a house, and by the end, I was just crazy…Then I went and broke my leg without health insurance and that was it.
>
> That was it. My daughter was, like, 'You have to get a job!' My daughter is an attorney; she's a real stern kind of person. '*You have to get a job*.' I said: 'Okay *(laughing)*. I will…I *will*!'

After dealing with the expensive medical treatments for her accident, Participant C knew her carefree days were over and that she needed to reposition her skills set to a salaried position that had benefits. Teaching writing became the natural choice for her. Participant C felt that if she could teach students how to write and tell a story, which was a powerful tool for them to have in life. Even though her Master's degree is in the Fine Arts (MFA), Participant C acknowledged that her institution, "mostly hired me because of my writing career… because many people here are teachers whereas I have a more practical [background]…" She acknowledged that her MFA would have been more desirable at a university because community colleges are teaching institutions. At the hiring, the Dean expressed to Participant C that she did not need any more creative writers: "She wanted rhetoric; people who majored in composition and rhetoric and want to teach because that's what they need at the community college."

Subtheme #2: Ambassadors of Change

The second subtheme, *Ambassadors of Change*, also emerged in the findings under Women's Agency. The participants viewed themselves as activists and felt a deep sense of responsibility to their students, and community at large. Rather than accept the rhetoric of tokenism and other deficit interpretations that expound their experiences of being representative of their gender, race or ethnicity, these participants subverted those narratives and embraced that they were ambassadors of change. The various roles in which they displayed this agency were through being an advocate, role model or mobilizer. As ambassadors of change, the participants did not feel that performing--or being--these roles was a burden.

Advocates. These were the participants who were tireless student advocates. In the findings, nearly all the participants performed this role in their faculty work. Some do the advocacy with the students' knowledge, egging them on to persist. Others do background advocacy in the committee meetings and boardrooms, where they serve as the voice that fights on the students' behalf.

When Participant E discovered a former student of hers did not enroll for classes due to lack of money, she automatically "did the right thing" and offered to help. The student, who was a struggling single mom and an undocumented Haitian immigrant, was unable to find stable income to provide for both her children and her schooling. Sacrificing her education was the natural choice for the student. Participant E had tremendous compassion for this student's situation and personally financed the fees for this student for the remaining time she was at the community college. Defending this act of goodwill, Participant E contended: "Life is not about money. If you're able--*in any way*--to help…it's only money. It was not a lot of money…but I knew it would help." Participant jokingly commented that she had to hide this from her husband because he would be annoyed that she was funding "yet another charity case," something she apparently does often in her faculty work. Advocating for students is not an option for Participant E, rather, it is a duty she takes seriously.

For Participant X, essential to being an advocate is being an accessible faculty member. In order to help her students, she stated that they must first know that she is genuine about her concern for them: "I like my students. I feel like they can come to

me--and they do." In one case, a student who was continually bullied by another student sought help by confiding in Participant X.

> She came to me because I try to incorporate different literature in the classroom and we had just finished reading a story about bullying. She said, 'I didn't know who else to go… I really didn't and this girl is bothering me.'
>
> <This bully> was doing this and doing that <to the student>. I had to call student services and she was crying. I used the support of the student services to help me help <the student> with her problem. Well, she was just being bullied a lot and I talked to student services <about it>. What they did was they actually had to remove <the bully> from her class…Student services had the student <victim> file a complaint, an anonymous complaint. <The bully> was removed and had to <meet with> the vice president of student services, whom she had to talk with <about the situation>.

As a student advocate, Participant E provided not only emotional support for the student, but also handled the logistics on the student's behalf by alerting the administration about the bully.

Unfortunately, advocating for students is not always met with support from the administration. Participant V, a counselor who assists students on a day-to-day basis, experienced tremendous resistance from the college leadership at North Ocean College when she advocated for students in the background. When she found out that a majority of students were not graduating due to a mandatory computer competency class, Participant V raised this issue with administration, but they disregarded her concern. Without hesitation, she knew she had to fight "tooth and nail" on the students' behalf. Using her doctorate training, she compiled evidence to highlight the negative impact on students that resulted from this institutional policy: "I did the research. I brought in statewide numbers. Here's what the trends are. Here's how many degrees (are

affected)…" Still, administration was not convinced, but that did not dissuade Participant V from her advocacy work:

> I have been fighting this and fighting this and fighting this. Now, *finally* the light bulb has gone on because we are now looking at numbers and completers. 'Oh my gosh - you're right! That *is* stopping students from graduating. Maybe we should take that away.' (*Sarcastically mimicking administration's response.*) That has been a long battle…since 2008. Six years…2008 to now!
>
> But it's finally come around to where <administrators> are talking, 'Let's get rid of it.' We have to produce outcomes and that's a barrier.' I said, '*Yes*…I go into records all the time and <computer competency> is the one last thing they need to clear.'
>
> I do counselor clearance. I just take a stack of them and go, 'All right--are these all the ones that are not going to get proceeded because of computer competency? Give them to me.' I sign them and I sign them and I sign them. I write 'Counselor Approval! Counselor Approval!' I said, 'If anybody questions it, come back to me and I will tell them--Do you want the kid to have a degree or not?!?'

Many of the students who have benefitted from Participant V's advocacy probably will never know that she had been tirelessly championing their successes behind-the-scenes. For Participant V, recognition is not her aim. Participant V considered being a student advocate as not only integral, but actually the definition of her role as faculty:

> I am here to be an advocate. I was taught, and the whole reason that <my doctorate program graduated me> was based on the philosophy that you are an agent for change. You are a student advocate. You do no harm. That is still my philosophy. I push to make change whether it's on the change of the student or the change of the institution. I am a student advocate and I do no harm to the student whether it causes harm to someone else. That's not my problem. I was hired to serve the students and that's what I do.

Role models. These are the participants who are actively behaving in ways that challenge deficit perspectives and stereotypes towards their gender, race, class and

cultural backgrounds. In the findings, it emerged that participants were aware of the power and impact they had in a situation, especially when it came to sharing their own lives as examples of persistence to their students.

For Participant Q, being a role model to her students was simply about being authentic. As an immigrant from Costa Rica, she arrived alone to Los Angeles as a young adult. She had very little means other than a family member with whom she was able to temporarily stay with and was forced to figure things out on her own, which included learning the language and customs of a new place. She married young and became a mother shortly after, which created tremendous difficulties in her quest for an education. Participant Q spent several years earning her bachelor's and master's degrees while also raising her two children.

Participant Q stated that her most memorable classes were teaching math in a federal-funded program that was designed for single, unemployed mothers, many of whom were women of color:

> I really *loved* teaching these courses. It was for welfare moms. They were a very *tough* student population to teach. But I was very successful with them. They had nails and were <always ready to fight> (*Mimics her students, motioning gang sign language and fighting stance*). Their attitude was: 'Yeah? You think I'm gonna do this?!? *Watch me*!'
>
> They were *very* defiant and acted like 'I'm here because the government says I have to be here. I don't wanna be here. You think you're gonna teach me?!?!? *Watch me!*'

Participant Q found that sharing her life story was her most effective weapon in connecting with this demographic of students because she intimately knew their story: "I was able to communicate with them and earn their respect. *Of course…of course* I shared

my story!"

Participant Q declared that teaching to young mothers, many who are single parents struggling within the educational system, is always a challenge but also the most rewarding. Just the mere fact that she could stand in front of these students and prove that motherhood and attaining a college education do not have to work against each other was an act of role modeling. To her, inspiring these students was a joyful responsibility and not a burden:

> Even to this day, when I get my students who are young moms…who use their kids as an excuse…(*She shakes her head and raises palm in the air as an act of blocking the excuse.)* I say, 'I've done that…been through that. If you want it, you will make it happen!' So, I encourage them…but <tell them> don't use that as an excuse. Two totally different things…And, you know, that *always* gets through to them.

While Participant Q's source of role modeling was based on her own experience as a young mother in college, Participant M's source of role modeling was based on her ethnic and cultural representation. Participant M is a Thai American professor in the English department at North College. She is a visible member of the local community both on and off campus. Her father, an immigrant from northern Thailand, was one of the first Asians to settle in the area and attended the local community college in the 1950s. This is the same college in which Participant M currently teaches and holds a leadership position. Her father left a legacy of success at North College because he continued with his schooling and earned a doctorate and then practiced at the local hospital. In addition, Participant M and her siblings also attended the community college and continued onto higher education, each carving out their own successes with graduate

degrees. Lastly, her family owns and operates a prominent nursery business in the area, which augments their visibility even more in the community.

Even though the ethnic demographic of the community has gotten a lot more diverse since her father first arrived decades ago, there are still not that many Thai people in the area. Therefore, any representation of Thai culture or image leaves a lasting impression. Participant M had won a teaching award one year and her name and picture was displayed on North College's large campus marquee.

> I had this one student, he's in two of my classes. He said, 'I really want to be in your class, not just because I need to have this class... I was driving on <Main> Blvd… and I saw your face and your name <on the marquee>'. He exclaimed, 'Oh my god, there's <actually> a Thai person!'

Though Participant M is humbled about this award recognition, she is acutely aware of the visual power of her image and its impact on those who identify as Thai Americans. She explained that this student's reaction was familiar to her because she understood his curiosity: "<This student> is Thai himself. He's really trying to find his identity. I told him, I don't speak Thai. I speak a little bit. I can understand if you speak to me, but I am going to respond in English." Rather than feel tokenized, Participant M saw that her achievements were inseparable from her ethnic identity and bicultural upbringing and that she was viewed as a role model to Thai American students. Specifically, these students sought to connect to someone who is similar to them--someone who identifies as being "Americanized yet still Asian." Participant M especially understood how validating her public image can be for she had sought Thai American role models growing up, but instead her family were the only visible Asian

minorities in the area. In her faculty position, she serves as a role model to Thai American students and has become the role model she wished she had in childhood.

Mobilizers. These are the participants who challenge authority and are fearless about it. They are non-conformists and will not allow individual naysayers, dominant traditions, or organizational resistance to prevent them from marching forward with new ideas to improve situations for their students as well as for themselves. Despite the barriers that they often confront, these participants are eternally optimistic and motivated to change the world around them.

For Participant S, a psychology professor at Southwest Ocean College, mobilizing awareness of the experiences of undocumented students is one of her passions. Even though she was able to establish her United States citizenship fairly quickly after arriving from Uruguay, Participant S recognized that the ease of becoming a legal resident from decades past cannot be compared to the current political climate now. She has great sympathy for undocumented students, for they must bear the emotional strain of keeping their status a secret and so often endure prejudice and mistreatment, which goes unreported. Provoked to battle this discrimination, Participant S brought speakers to her campus with the goal of creating urgency and activism among the students. She was very pleased that it was "a well attended" event. However, that was just the beginning. Motivated to share the cause with a larger audience, Participant S wrote to the *Los Angeles Times* newspaper "based on the story of two students of mine." Positioning herself as an educator in higher education, she wanted to provide "firsthand the predicament of undocumented students" and mobilize the public to view their

experiences as a social concern for all. Her editorial piece titled, *Legal or not, these students deserve a chance* was published in 2011:

> Offering a clear path to the legalization of our undocumented students is no longer just a political issue; it is also about individual human rights and the best use of our human capital for the benefit of society as a whole.

By doing this, Participant S gave voice to those who were not in a position to do so and created agency for them by way of her own agency.

For Participant F, she used her own agency to create a unique career path in higher education where she can exist both as a practitioner and a scholar. As one of only three African American faculty women at Southeast College, Participant F is a tenured counselor who finds fulfillment in her work despite the lack of diversity, especially representation from African American colleagues and students at her community college. In addition, the students whom she serves are in the Fine Arts and are mainly from suburban and middle class Orange County. To fulfill her thirst for scholarly discussions with a predominantly Black student demographic, Participant F concurrently works as full-time lecturer in the African American Studies department at a nearby university. For her, the "otherness" of her university teaching provides an outlet, while simultaneously enabling her to merge both of her interests:

> You know, you can have the best of two worlds. I think so. <As a lecturer>, I got a chance to see from a different perspective. I've been at <this university> now for seventeen years…So you know, I get to *see*. You know, I have that too.

Unwilling to be boxed into one position, Participant F's agency challenged dominant traditions of academia, proving that faculty work does not have to be

exclusively in either the community college or at the university, but rather it can encompass both types of institutions.

Similar to Participant F, who refused to professionally exist in a singular institution, Participant A refused to exist in a singular discipline. Participant A started her academic career as faculty in Physical Education (PE). However, as technological advancements emerged and became incorporated into online tools and instruction at the various community colleges where Participant A worked as an adjunct, she found herself drawn to the digital revolution of learning, especially those tools designed to help faculty.

> When I started work at <a Los Angeles community college>, that's where I started learning about things…because at that time there was a lot of basic skills going on--a lot of workshops. Talk about computers being something that everyone should learn! At that time I didn't know computers at all.
>
> I don't know where all the stuff comes in my head. I decided that I needed to learn computers right now and I needed to learn very well. You know, how you put things in the air and things just start to happen? Somebody donated computers to a church in Malibu and a friend of mine's mother <helped me get one>…I got a computer but it was an old thing. It was the old IBMs with the floppy disk. I had the computer, the printer, the monitor…everything for like 50 bucks or something.
>
> That same time all the schools were trying to teach faculty about computers. I took everybody's workshop at all the schools, any kind of basic skills workshops and things that were going on at that time…I did all of that and I wasn't thinking about why I was doing it…where it was leading to. The computer thing I thought about because I said, 'I need to learn because this is where everything is going!'

Despite holding an adjunct position, which meant she had less privileges and resources as the full-time faculty, Participant A was never deterred from learning about technology and new ways to teach.

> <The community college> was pushing faculty instruction. All the full timers either got a laptop or a desktop. The part-timers, you could get a laptop, but you had to pay for it but they broke it up in your paycheck. Of course I got a laptop

> but I had already had that old one and I learned on that computer…So I learned everything about computers. I was involved in basic skills; all of that stuff. I guess I always want to learn everything.

Unfortunately, Participant A was immersing herself in new technology that had no direct application to her current discipline. How was she to jump from the physical world to the digital world? At her current institution of Southwest Ocean College, where she is a full-time non-tenured faculty, Participant continues to teach Physical Education (PE) courses while developing her academic interests in faculty development and online instruction.

> I taught PE and health and I taught racquetball…I think as far as opportunities, I always looked for opportunities in what workshops and what faculty development was happening.
>
> My chairman in the PE department here always told me from the beginning to get involved. He said that's the best way if you get involved people will know your name, people will know your department and if any opportunities come around they'll think of you.

Being a mobilizer of her own personal evolution, Participant A has agency to act on her interests in technology, taking advantage of opportunities to assist in faculty development initiatives. Not only does she teach PE courses, but she also teaches faculty how to design hybrid online courses and create their e-portfolios.

Theme #6: Diverse, Lived Experiences

According to the Multiracial Feminism theoretical framework, this feature asserts that Asian American, Native Americans, Latinas and Blacks are comprised of many different national, cultural and ethnic groups. Furthermore, each group is engaged in the process of testing, refining and reshaping its own image (Anzaldua, 1990; Chow, 1987; Roth, 2004). In this last thematic analysis, three subthemes emerged under *Diverse,*

Lived Experiences: (1) Birth Origins, (2) Cultural Fluidity and (3) Connection to Social Movements.

Subtheme #1: Birth Origins

In this study, *Birth Origin* is a subtheme that appeared to be the most prominent factor that shaped a participant's lived experiences, and, ultimately her sense of identity. Country of origin is the starting point which sparks connection to other characteristics that shape their identity as women of color, which includes: how long they lived in the country of origin, how they arrived in the U.S, and whether they had the ability to speak their native language. Notably, these characteristics manifest in how the participants experienced forms of "otherness," adding layers of complexity to the intersections of race, class and gender that is embodied in their experiences in the United States. As faculty members, these early experiences of understanding and creating identity provide the backdrop to how participants were able relate to students and fellow colleagues who might share a similar background.

U.S.-born. Over two-thirds, or 25 of the 37 participants, identified as having been born in the United States on the demographic questionnaire. For the participants who were born in the United States, their connection to cultural heritage and how far removed they were from being the first-generation of immigrants in their families influenced their sense of identity. Language proficiency in a language other than English was a significant identifier of connection to cultural identity. Though English was their native language, the majority of U.S.-born participants identified as being proficient in speaking other languages, with some being able to read and write in these other languages as well.

The reasons for speaking a second or third language depended greatly on the circumstances of their family background.

Some participants grew up in households where their parents and other family members were first-generation immigrants and did not have a strong facility speaking English; thus, being bilingual was by default. These participants needed to speak another language other than English because it was the only way they could communicate with their parents, and eventually, help translate information on their behalf. This was exemplified in Participant H's childhood experiences.

Participant H explains that both her parents were born in China and are first generation immigrants to the United States in their respective families. Though her parents met in California, they spoke the same Chinese dialect of Toisanese and would communicate with each other in it. Participant H was raised also speaking Toisanese. However, she also spoke English fluently out of necessity because her parents often relied on her to translate and navigate in English for them.

For some U.S.-born participants, the multilingual upbringing they had reflected the fact that they had parents who were of mixed immigrant status. This was particularly true for a majority of those who were U.S. born Latinas, namely the Chicana or Mexican American participants, whose parents were of different immigrant or national statuses. For example, one would have a parent who was a second or third generation immigrant and acculturated as American; the other parent would be a first-generation immigrant.

The experiences of Participant R's upbringing exemplified this ability to code-switch. That is, she was able to alternate between Spanish and English in a single

conversational context seamlessly. Her father was born in Mexico and came to the United States at 17, eventually helping his entire family immigrate to the United States. Her mother, who was born in the United States, grew up in southern California with her family. For Participant R, speaking Spanish was associated with communicating to her father and "her *Abuelitos,*" and conversely, speaking English was associated with communicating to her mother and "her grandma and grandpa."

> My mom's side of the family, they all understood Spanish to speak it. But my grandparents, it depended on the situation…they would throw in Spanish… or depending on what it was…but they were American. They were like any other family, but they still…well, the [Mexican] culture--they valued it and they loved their roots and their heritage--but primarily they're American.

For Participant R, implied in her ability to code-switch was also the ability to translate and perform between the two cultural identities of being Mexican and being an American.

Lastly, for some participants, being raised to speak another language was intentional. For Participant X, who was born in the United States to Pakistani immigrant parents, speaking Urdu was strictly enforced at home. This is despite both parents being college-educated and fluent in the speaking, reading and writing of English. Her parents valued Urdu because they wanted her to be connected to her Muslim culture and way of life as well as to have the ability to communicate with the Pakistani community at the mosque:

> So my family…my parents really did want us to learn Urdu at the same time [as English] so my parents would only speak [Urdu] with us only when we were at home. They knew we had to know our English as well so they would help us with our English, with our homework and our studies and everything. We would read in English…We read together in English but they spoke to us Urdu.

Lastly, it should be noted that of those who identified as U.S.-born on the demographic questionnaire, 2 participants clarified in the interview that they were born on the island of Guam, with one participant who identified as Filipina and the other participant who identified as a Pacific Islander. The only technical fact of being born in Guam is that it determined the United States citizenships of these two participants. On the other hand, Guam is a country that shares more similar customs, culture and histories closer to other neighboring Pacific Islands, including the Philippines, than that of the dominant cultures associated within the continental United States.

For Participant G, a Filipina born in Guam and raised in California from the age of six months old, speaking Tagalog validated this duality of having a Filipina identity that is viewed as being "un-American" or "non-American" identity (despite her nationality, which is American):

> Coming from a Filipino background…both my parents, who were born and raised in the Philippines, and who then migrated to the United States. They're [raising] their children here [in California]--of course they wanted to maintain these strong Filipino traditions. I, on the other hand was--I think--a little bit unusual and I don't why or how this occurred.
>
> I'm the oldest and maybe that's why, but out of three girls…They would want to ensure that okay you stick with this Filipino tradition of trying to speak the language so [that my] sisters will show respect by calling [me] this instead of [my] first name. I was very defiant. I said, 'No!' I would challenge them and said, 'No, I don't want to.' For me, personally, it was embarrassing because I was in America with other Americans and other White people, Black people, Mexicans, even other Filipinos who are pretty darn Americanized…Yeah, they wanted me to speak the language. They would talk to me in Tagalog, but I would answer back in English.

In Participant G's experience, she associated speaking Tagalog as part of her Filipina identity and speaking English as part of her American identity. Yet based on her birth origin, she was American.

Immigrated for better opportunities. Of the 37 participants, 12 identified themselves as immigrants on the demographic questionnaire. A majority of these 12 participants migrated directly to California to seek educational opportunities that were not offered in their countries of origin or residence. The socioeconomic backgrounds of these participants were equally unique as they were varied. Furthermore, the financial ability and class status of the participants' parents greatly determined the ease in which they were able to migrate to the United States for these educational opportunities.

For example, Participant I was born into a highly educated Chinese family that was financially comfortable. Even though she grew up in rural Philippines, where her plant pathologist father was conducting scientific research, she was bussed into Manila daily to attend an American-based private international school. Revealing her social class, she recalled, "Everybody went to college." Furthermore, it was expected that the students who attended this private school would go onto a university abroad, where the education opportunities were considered more developed, and simply better. After high school, Participant I applied to UCLA and got accepted. Although her aunt lived in Los Angeles, Participant I transitioned directly into the dormitories, acknowledging how fortunate she was that her parents could afford it. "The family was economically okay with this. My parents--I repeat--were wonderful and they really thought that it was time for me to grow and experience life." Due to the unconditional support of her parents,

Participant I did not have to worry about attaining a legal residence in the U.S. or affording college.

Similar to the aspirations of Participant I, Participant Q loved learning and desired a quality, comprehensive education. Unfortunately, during her childhood in Costa Rica, poor socioeconomic conditions created a dire financial situation and many families struggled to survive, including hers. After her parents separated, it was a common occurrence in her family for herself and her siblings to go hungry because there was not enough money for food. While she had her mother and father's individual blessings for her to seek better educational opportunities, only her father was able to provide some financial help to afford her a ticket to Los Angeles where she could stay with some family to find her own way. Due to her working class background, Participant Q migrated to California to seek a university education with little support other than a family connection and a place to stay. Upon arrival in the United States, finding legal residential status and affording college burdened her throughout her educational career.

Lastly, all but one of the 12 participants who immigrated to the United States arrived before her adolescence. Typically, first generation immigrants are defined as individuals who are foreign-born and relocated to a new country in their adolescence or later. Unlike the other participants who immigrated as young adults or in their 20s, Participant J's introduction to California began at age 8. She did not consider herself a "1.5 immigrant," but reflected that arriving young gave her an advantage acculturating to American ways more easily as well as a disadvantage of maintaining her Vietnamese identity:

> I was born in Vietnam. I came when I was eight to the United States, so I think I do have strong cultural ties to my culture and my background…although I am more fluent in English reading and writing since I came here when still young.
>
> My parents are older…so they do not speak English at all, maybe a few words, so that helps me maintain my verbal skills at least…I spoke 100% Vietnamese at home with my parents until I moved out. When I see them I still speak 100% Vietnamese to them, so I value that. I am the youngest [of a big family with older siblings who grew up in Vietnam], so [it is expected] they would know more [Vietnamese] than me. They were older when we came here so they are a lot more fluent than me. They can read and write [Vietnamese]. I can make it out, but I am slower.

Participant J concluded that because of her proficiency in English and early exposure to American culture, she was able to take advantage of opportunities in which her siblings did not get a chance. For that, she felt a deep sense of responsibility and did not want to take it for granted.

Immigrated due to political oppression. It should be noted that of the 12 participants who self-identified as immigrants, 5 explained that they migrated to the United States to escape political oppression or religious persecution in their countries of origin. However, none of these five participants selected “I am a refugee,” which was an answer choice on the questionnaire (See Appendix D).

True to the definition of a refugee, these five participants sought refuge in the U.S. because they were fleeing a war or, also, for their sexuality, gender, race, religion and ethnicity. The harrowing experiences of these participants heavily influenced how they contextualize both struggles and opportunities once they arrived to the U.S. For the women faculty of color of this background, the concept of persistence is not a way of handling obstacles or social injustices, but rather, it is built into their way of being. Simply, it is survival.

Born in Nigeria, Participant B grew up knowing nothing other than the adversity and the realities of war. Even her own parents' relationship reflects one of adversity because her father and mother dared to marry, despite belonging to different ethnic groups and regions and having different cultures and languages. "In the olden days--I call it the olden days--like around the time [my dad] married my mom, there wasn't that much inter-tribal marriage in Nigeria. It was rare. My mother was from the eastern part; my father is from the western part."

The Nigerian civil wars ravaged her hometown, forcing her entire family to uproot continuously throughout her childhood in order to find safe places to sleep, eat and go to school. Her family was often fragmented as a result.

> I started school… but the problem was that it was kind of interrupted with the Nigerian Civil War. We became refugees and everywhere we went was so (*shaking her head to indicate sadness*)… I mean school would start in the villages so I mean everywhere we ended up we would enroll in school until it was time 'move again'. My father was cut off in the west so for those years we didn't see him. Right after the war we met up with him again.
>
> I think it was 1960s, late 60s, so I don't think I was a teenager yet. I have to think in terms of years. I have to think back, but I was pretty young. One thing I remember then was everybody… [us included]… the refugees--everybody became friends. We got to meet people because I mean you have a common enemy, so to speak. Everybody became friends and found ways to at least, you know, survive and all that…
>
> We have villages back home and people were able to run to [the next safe] village. It doesn't have to be 'your' village… because [yours] or their village might be under attack. We were able to go to other people's village and they were friendly enough to accept and they made room and a space for the refugees.

Despite the nomadic life and violence endured, Participant B emphasized that her cultural upbringing deemed education as extremely important and that it was a collectivistic effort enforce this priority.

> One thing about Nigerians is that they value education. I mean [for all] Nigerians…that *is* one thing we all have in common. We have several tribes. [But] one thing that Nigerians have in common is education. The thing about them too is that they want to be doctors and lawyers or teachers and engineers…They want you to be a doctor, so from childhood you know that you're supposed to go to college. You're supposed to go to school.
>
> I remember also in elementary school--after the war--one of my teachers then would actually physically come to our house and give my parents a report (*mimicking a teacher*): 'Oh yeah, she's doing very well. She did this every week or every other week.' So you have this support from your teachers trying to tell your parents and tell you that we know you can do it. You can verify…just keep going, keep going whether you like it or not.

Similarly, Participant W shared that the backdrop to her life is defined by civil wars. The violence of civil wars in Lebanon raged outside the home while the civil war of an unhappy marriage raged between her parents inside the home. Participant W was born into Sunni Muslim family that was "not very religious, but very socially conservative." Therefore, even though her parents separated, they endured living together under the same roof along with extended family members. Participant W's mother had to work as a result of the separation, forcing her to be absent from the home. This brought not only cultural shame to the mother's status in their Muslim community, but also required Participant W to play the mother figure to her two younger siblings at an early age. "I had to be responsible since I was 12. I had to stand up and be responsible because I'm the oldest."

For Participant W, coming of age was burdening for there was no innocence to transition from. As a teenager, she helped raise her siblings and was responsible for protecting them in an environment that was marked with disrupted schooling, bombs and bloodshed:

> We had a civil war in Lebanon that lasted 20 years. So most of my teenage years were through civil war. Schooling wise, I had to go to a Christian Baptist school all through from pre-school all the way through the second baccalaureate [first year of college]…Unfortunately all through that we had civil war. Sometimes we went to school, sometimes we didn't go to school.
>
> We had a bomb shelter…oh….there were a whole lot of a bloody awful things…which is weird is that [there's] so many things I don't remember. I think you block things out is [when] bad things happen…

Ironically, attending a Christian Baptist school as a Muslim was the least troubling of events in her childhood. Participant W commented that the "conflict in religions wasn't that big because… it wasn't my family." The school had students of other faiths--Jews, Catholics and Christian Orthodoxes--attending too. Her parents felt that the school offered a good education, but always reminded her that she was Muslim. She viewed school as the one of the few stable force in her life despite the "confusing" religions found in the student body and the frequent closings due to war.

Participant W's comfort in the multiplicity of faiths was exemplified in her falling in love and marrying a Maronite Christian, a medical doctor whom she met while working on her PhD in graduate school. Unfortunately, their interfaith relationship--and what it symbolized--could not peacefully coexist as the religious violence between the Christians and Sheikh Muslims worsened in Beirut. Pregnant with their first child, Participant W and her husband determined that it was too dangerous to stay. They relinquished that they would leave their families behind and escape immediately. They managed to leverage her husband's medical expertise to obtain an emergency green card with the American Embassy. They left without preparation:

> So we left by a miracle. The airport was closed. It just opened that day literally for a few hours. To get to the airport was, oh my God…(*shaking head*)… We

> didn't have our clothes. [The American Embassy] had to somehow manage to get our clothes from the other side [of the demarcation line] and put them in suitcases… So [the Embassy] had to get another taxi, pay somebody at that demarcation line to get our stuff…
>
> By a *miracle of miracles,* we went under snipers, whatever (motioning bullets and shooting with hands), we went to the airport. The airport got bombarded. We were on the next plane to take off --literally.

Participant left not only her home country, but also her own family and her PhD studies all behind. She claimed that after she left, she knew she would have to start all over again in the United States.

Participant S also shared a similar story of an educational journey that was disrupted due to political oppression. Originally from a small town in Uruguay, she went to capital city of Montevideo to study law at the university. She was the first in her family to attend college and knew many sacrifices were made for this opportunity. Unfortunately, after her first year of studies, the military dictatorship came into rule and created oppressive conditions at the universities.

> That was the first year I did law school was very traumatic. You know, it was the first time I was separated from my family. We didn't have money to be going back and forward to visit my parents. I spent months without seeing my parents so it was very, very hard. I was very young.
>
> So it was very bad, [especially] the politics part. That was the year, a very unfortunate year that we had. [That was the start] of an awful history of military dictatorship. And so the military wiped out the first year because apparently the first year in all careers was very much… According to them, they thought the first year was [full of] indoctrination and so it was a waste, a complete waste of time, money and everything.

Wars leave an enduring legacy disruption, trauma but also persistence. For many of those refugees who have fled such events, the instinct to survive is ingrained and never to be forgotten. For Participant B and Participant W, the experiences of surviving civil

wars from their home country are embodied in their entire beings. Consequently, the way in which they contextualize struggle or hardship as they experience them in the U.S. is diminished, or considered inferior in its potential harm, compared to what they have known in their country of origin. For this reason, when they confront sexist, racist or classist situations in their faculty life, they are able to persist because, for them, these experiences seem trivial in comparison to their earlier lives.

Subtheme #2: Cultural Fluidity

In this study, *Cultural Fluidity* is a subtheme that appeared to be a significant finding that shaped a participant's racialized experiences of "otherness," but also the ability to operate in hybrid existences. In particular, this subtheme addresses the experiences of participants who identified as mixed race.

Hybridization of a multiracial identity. Of the 37 participants, 3 of the women faculty of color identified as being two or more races, or mixed race. How these participants react to traditional, and often misinformed, social constructions of their identity ultimately brought to light the microaggressions that they had to continually contend with in their daily lives.

As a mixed Japanese and Dutch-Irish, Participant N acknowledged that identifying oneself as a woman of color is a political choice that has consequences. This is further complicated by the fact that she is often mistaken as a White woman, yet uses her Japanese middle name as her primary first name. The intersections of multiple races that result from her assumed identity, as well as her Asian name, result in confused reactions from both students and colleagues.

When referring to students' reactions, Participant N was resigned to expecting the barrage of personal questions:

> Because I have light skin privilege, a lot of people don't read me as being a woman of color. But then my name is <Japanese name> and so people are like, 'What is *that*'? I've had students who are like… it's almost like they exoticize [my name]. In terms of like they want to know all about my background, they want to know where my name is from, or they want to…you know… that kind of thing. Whereas, I [am thinking], 'I just want to help you with your research and I don't want [to exchange intimate details about myself].'

In addition, Participant N has also confronted racism by her colleagues. For example, the microaggressions can come in the form of inter-racist behavior from her Asian colleagues (who are not of mixed race), implying that she is "not Asian enough":

> That's been through my whole life, *for sure*. I would say for the most part. Well I would say a lot of [that] happens in the library, not from other librarians as much but as people get to know me…I don't know what it is…
>
> lf they see me and I'm eating with hashi or they see what I bring with my lunch, they'll be like, 'Oh, look - you *really* are Asian!' You know, that kind of thing.
>
> I have one of those teapot things that has the net at the top…right, you know? There's a Chinese woman who works in the library [with me]…and when she saw this, she seemed really surprised that I have that. *She*--of course--has one.

Another example of microaggressions, which Participant N experienced, was a time when she had to contend with a White colleague's dismissal of her professional and academic expertise on issues of diversity.

> So I think on campus probably people don't…recognize [my commitment to race work]. I don't think people think of me as a faculty of color. But my work at the national level has been on the diversity side. That's an interesting thing. So my department chair knows about the work that I've done and what I've been involved in and what I present on at the national level and there are people in my department who just haven't paid attention to that as much.
>
> So we had an interesting faculty meeting where there's a White woman in the department, who is married to an African-American man…I have had problems

> with [working] on this database, which is [called] 'The African American Experience'…When you search for 'racism,' you don't get a definition of racism. [This White colleague] was like, 'That's not even a term that African-Americans use!'
>
> I wanted to cancel the database because I felt that the interface was poor and she accused me of devaluing resources for students of color and not collecting in those areas. I have totally worked on collecting [resources] in those areas--I mean, that's my focus! I graduated with a focus in Multiculturalism and Critical Race Theory. So I'm like, 'What?!?!' And so in that incident, I think I was just so surprised, I didn't say anything.

Essentially, this colleague accused Participant N as lacking sensitivity on issues of race, yet was unable to see the hypocrisy in the privilege of her own White views.

Unlike Participant N's political construction of self-identity, Participant T is mixed race, but does not explicitly identify as a woman of color. Rather, she acknowledged that she was mixed Mexican and White. This stance, however, did not diminish her experiences with microaggressions. Participant T, who is fair-skinned, has often been assumed as a White female. Because of this assumption, Participant T has been exposed to racist comments about minorities that were made in her presence because these people thought they were in "safe" company. Here, she recalled the forming her racial identity during her childhood.

> I don't really look really Mexican, so I blend in a lot of different cultures. I can go to Turkey and they think I'm Turkish if I keep my mouth shut. I can go to a lot of places. My hair's lighter than it used to be. You know, it used to be a little darker so that kind of basic medium skin tone and whatever. I can kind of blend. That was never really anything.
>
> I think having the last name of <Spanish name>, I always had to kind of say my dad was Mexican. I remember saying that he was Spanish because I thought it sounded better than Mexican in the early years. Then as I got more rebellious, I would clearly say that he was Mexican because I got kind of fed up with a lot of the racist talk and jokes and things that you begin to hear as you grow up.

> Terms like ‘wetback’ and things like that begin to come into your consciousness. The more rebel, social justice side of me, which developed pretty early I just would say, ‘No, I’m Mexican.’ So then I would love it if people would make a joke and I’d say you know I’m Mexican, right? Does that apply to me?
>
> I’d love to sort of stir the pot. That was kind of a fun thing. I went through a phase of a lot of that.

After finishing her Master’s in Science degree in Counseling, Participant T worked at a community college where the entire counseling staff consisted of Latina/os. Rather than experiencing inter-racism as Participant N did with her Asian colleagues, Participant T recounted that it within this environment, her Latina identity “was nurtured” by her colleagues. “All the secretaries, all the support people, they were all Latina. They were the ones who just embraced my Latina-ness.”

Unfortunately, Participant T held a part-time faculty position at this community college and eventually left to work at the current one where she is tenured faculty. At South College, Participant T recalled that she constantly had to brace herself for racist remarks. When they first hired her, there was a big push to get more diversity in their hiring practices since the college leadership was predominately White and “they were trying to improve their reputation.” Defending that their department was more ethnically diverse than any other department, her supervisor claimed that there were two who were of Native American descent (including himself) and that they just hired a Latina (referring to Participant T). Her supervisor recounted that the vice president blurted: “Who’s the Latina?!? You don’t have a Latina in there.” When her supervisor mentioned her, the vice president exclaimed, “Couldn’t you have hired someone that looked more Mexican?”

Similar to Participant N's experience of "otherness" because she was not considered "Asian enough," Participant T remarked that she was not seen as being "Latina enough" in the eyes of the college administration. As a result, her supervisor--whom she considered an ally and a mentor--suggested that she hyphenate her name so that the Spanish maiden name could help qualify her as being a minority and "help [me] down the line." Reluctantly, she took his advice though she mentioned that she was completely satisfied with her Turkish surname as a standalone, which she inherited from her husband who is from Turkey.

Reflecting back, Participant T concluded that she was glad she took her supervisor's advice to hyphenate her name for strategic purposes.

> I think by that time I was learning the system enough to know that it was a lot easier to get a job in some ways if you were a person of color. I remember hearing…I mean over the years, I've heard lots of comments that it can be hard for a White, blonde woman to get a job in counseling when they need diversity. In some ways, in [the counseling] field, there's almost a reverse discrimination in that respect. I've known people that have been really good counselors [that were not people of color].

Both Participant N and Participant T, who identified as mixed-race with one parent being White, have been mistaken as White women due to being fair-skinned. Furthermore, they each experienced variations of "otherness," such as "not being Asian enough" or "not being Latina enough," yet that was the fluid state of being and depended on the circumstances or the social context.

Subtheme #3: Connection to Social Movements

In this study, *Connection to Social Movements* emerged as a significant influence that shaped a participant's image of self and often gave them renewed purpose as to why

they are serving as faculty members. Of the 37 participants, 13 of the women faculty of color who identified as aged 50 years or older on the demographic questionnaire, vividly referenced an important social movement, which they remembered. The participants recalled these social movements as defining events that had political and historical significance in positively changing the world to become a better place. For these 13 participants, social movements occurred during the arc of their academic studies and intellectual explorations. Not surprisingly, most participated, protested and charged in these social movements while they were undergraduate or graduate students. These participants spoke passionately about how these experiences continue to help globalize their views of social change as well as fuel their critiques regarding the politics found in college leaderships.

American Civil Rights movement (1954-1968). The beginnings of the American Civil Rights Movement, which aimed to legally address the gross injustices that African Americans endured in our society, had its start in the South of the United States. Eventually, the movement spanned across the nation, gripping the attention of Americans everywhere. The success of this movement is indicated in the experiences of two participants in this study who embraced this movement and lived through it; one hailing from the west coast and the other from the east coast.

As an African American woman who has dedicated her life to education for over 30 years, Participant E was not only the most senior of all the faculty participants, but also held the longest record of service to her community. A native of Los Angeles who grew up during segregation, Participant E recalled the insurmountable pressure she felt to

succeed and to lead by example for her African American community: “This generation, these last twenty years ago or whatever years, they have all these Jack in the Box’s, MacDonald’s…[we] didn’t have that when I was coming up! You either went to college or you went to work for people…cleaned their houses! [We] didn’t have options...” Notably, Participant E was accepted as one of three Black students from her all-Black high school to help initiate desegregation efforts, at University of California, Los Angeles.

Indignantly, she remarked that she often reminds her students--particularly the African American students--of the legacy of desegregation when they come to her class: “You don’t have the right to fail. You’re standing on the bodies and shoulders of the people who went before you. ”

Hailing from the east coast of the United States, Participant C recalled her experience of participating in the Civil Rights Movement. Even though she attended Howard University and was aware that it was regarded as a prestigious HBCU, Participant C talked about her true political awakening as being inspired by Malcolm X:

> Swirling around in that…I’m looking at television, there’s Malcolm X. I get there… there’s Stokely Carmichael on campus. We’re having a *revolution*!!! Oh my God, were those *delicious years*! (*laughing*) Oh my God! The dichotomy of what was the largest society, what was going on at Howard and at Kent State? I was in all that swirl that was going on. It was incredible. I got so involved my freshman year [at Howard University] I almost flunked out.
>
> Oh my God! It was so wonderful. I had a big argument with my mother about my activity… and she was like, ‘You can’t get involved?!?’ And I said, ‘Okay, this is the bargain. You read the autobiography of Malcolm X and if you think I’m wrong, I’ll stop.’ [My mother] read it and she said, ‘I’ll join you!’…[My mother] didn’t physically join, but mentally she was there. I remained *active* through those years.

East Los Angeles walkouts (1968). The East Los Angeles Walkouts, also known as the Chicano Blowouts, was a movement where Mexican American students boycotted schools to bring about change in the poor and discriminating conditions in which they were receiving their education in the public schools of East Los Angeles. This social movement was initiated by Chicano high school students at the four high schools of Garfield, Roosevelt, Wilson and Lincoln, but organically grew into dozens of massive walkouts throughout the city, where thousands of students participated en masse in the protest.

During her time as a student at Lincoln High School, Participant L noticed that the standards were different for the Mexican American students who were her classmates. They were not receiving equal treatment by the schools as opposed to the other students, including that towards Japanese American students who lived in the East Los Angeles community, like her family. "I felt like [students] were really working to their potential or they were really working hard. There [weren't] like a lot of behavioral problems in the classrooms or anything like that." Later, as an undergraduate at UCLA, she would come to learn that this mistreatment was the school board's tracking of students was unethical and racially-motivated. She was inspired to get involved.

> The year that I graduated in 1968 [from UCLA], that's when we had the [Chicano] blowouts--that's when we had the walk outs. And Lincoln [High School] was one of the schools that was, you know, that walked out. I think our school was really one of the leaders in that movement. Because Sal Castro, who was a teacher at Lincoln, he was very instrumental in the walkouts and so I think by my participating in the walkouts and learning more about the issues then I became more aware about the tracking and about the discrimination that students were faced with.

Participant L commented that, "My mom knew…she knew that I had walked out but she didn't say anything. And I think now she looks back and she's proud of me because of what I did."

As a Japanese American woman, Participant L's boycott and protesting in the Chicano Blowouts proved that one's commitment to social justice can encompass issues that transcend beyond one's own ethnic group or personal identity. While she did not experience the negative outcomes of tracking, Participant L fought and was alongside those whom she believed deserved the rights to a fair education.

Asian American rights in San Gabriel Valley (1980s). During the 1980s, the San Gabriel Valley (SGV) of California started to undergo a dramatic demographic change. Once a predominantly White bedroom community to Los Angeles, the cities of Monterey Park and Alhambra in SGV started to experience a population boom and saw a huge influx of people of Chinese descent. It was at this moment in time that Participant I expanded her awareness of Asian American rights beyond the academic bubble of activism at the Asian American Studies Center at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) where she worked during her undergraduate and graduate studies. While finishing her master's thesis on the Asian American Women's movement, Participant I commuted from the UCLA campus to Alhambra where her mother resided. She recalled that it was a crucial moment in history where she witnessed growing sentiments of bigotry towards Asians from the Whites who resided in the area:

> About that time, Monterey Park was starting to grow along with the anti-Chinese feelings in Monterey Park. [There was] a whole lot of anti-Chinese backlash around that time in the mid 80s…and I was sitting right in the middle [of it].

> Monterey Park was a White suburban community but it's very close to Chinatown so by the 1980's there were more and more Mandarin-speaking Chinese coming in mostly from Taiwan. They were moving in - they wanted a bedroom community. They didn't want to live in Chinatown because they [where they wanted social mobility].
>
> Plus, [Chinatown] had bad schools and nobody wanted to go to LA Unified School District, so Monterey Park became the [place]. It still is the largest Chinese population so it started around that time and the White people were very against it.
>
> There was…there's lots of written literature on this now. There were fights in city council…Monterey Park wanted to pass a law that English was the official language of the city of Monterey Park. There were lots of incidents. White flight was not going to happen without a fight. Alhambra was better off.

As a displaced Chinese immigrant whose family left main land China to live in Taiwan and then to the Philippines in her childhood, Participant I was grateful to have settled in the SGV as an adult and had firmly considered the area as her home. Inevitably, she became engrossed in a movement that not only represented her home, but the preservation of her identity. Not only did she actively participate in meetings against racist city proposals to marginalize Asians, she also worked tirelessly to shed light on the needs of the students who come from this community at the local institutions where she taught as an adjunct instructor.

<u>Environmental conservation</u>. There are times when social movements, such as the environmental conservation movement, is motivated by a cause that does not explicitly address the discriminations experienced by one's race, gender or class. Rather, the modern environmental movement started as one that pushed for the public's awareness that there was a civic duty to protect natural environments from human

development and has now evolved to address a variety of issues, such as climate change or providing equal access to water and food sources.

Despite experiencing racism and sexism throughout her academic life as a Chinese immigrant, for Participant K, the most important movement of social justice is about honoring the health of the planet. In graduate school, Participant K dared to challenge traditional findings of some major geological research, which proved the dominant approach of White male scientists' wrong. She confronted tremendous resistance--even threats--from the men and women (all White) in her department to discredit her PhD work. These experiences have compelled her to globalize her own scientific research from geology to earth science throughout the arc of her academic career. For the last three decades, Participant K has continued to use her Environmental Science courses as platform to raise an acute awareness of how the human disconnection to the health of the earth is a social injustice that requires attention:

> Ultimately, I had to recognized that I had my own personal journey to make--to recognize the environmental problems…or any human problems…is an expression of a spiritual bankruptcy. It is an expression that the *inside is not quite right*. The fracturing within ourselves is expressed in the external world.
>
> So really, it's a journey towards growth. Consciousness expansion. That's what [environmental awareness] needs to be… so to me, [teaching] Environmental Science is a *perfect way* to deliver the message as I look at all these problems.
>
> And then ultimately what is causing all of these problems? Why do we have these problems? We have these problems ultimately… we act like separate individuals. We compete with each other and we want things. So we are ultimately living at a very low level of consciousness and not really recognizing *everything* is connected. We are all connected. We're connected to trees, life… it's a complex web of life. If one part is not well, then the whole is not well, you know? So that [Environmental Science] classes are a perfect place to demonstrate that!

Unlike the other social movements mentioned in this study, the Environmental Conservation movement has no historical ending but rather is one that continues to evolve. There are advantages and disadvantages to this movement's characteristics. On the one hand, the Environmental Conservation movement is ongoing, and therefore, relevant to contemporary life. On the other hand, it consists of multiple conflicting philosophies and interventions on how to create a better society for all. By championing this somewhat faceless and disparate movement, Participant K noted that it is a very lonely fight. She tried to mobilize a group of environmentalists at talk she was giving and suggested that role modeling as stewards of the earth has to start with confronting one's own hypocrisies. In the talk, she suggested: "Unwrap the lie that you tell yourself every day. We tell ourselves lies all the time. So unwrap a lie every day." This statement did not fare well with her fellow scientists on the panel and she has since been marked an outcast from the group. Determined but tired, Participant K concluded:

> So that's gone… And then I reached out to the spiritual committee, thinking that I could [garner] support there. It's the same thing there. Ultimately, it's like that book *The Road Less Traveled*…You're not going to find support…for me I've not been able to find support… (*tearing up with steely determination, she whispers*)…but I can't stop [doing what I do].

In closing, whether these social movements have ranged from causes that were racially motivated to ones that were more global in nature, the participants' involvement were always intentionally political. These participants found elements of social justice in these movements, which struck a chord with their political identity as a woman of color. And with time and wisdom on their side, these women of color have continued to digest the memories that spawn from their bite into a moment in history. Most importantly,

each participant has realized her own unique legacy. As women faculty of color, these participants have repurposed their memories as a vehicle to inspire, motivate and empower their students to be the agents of change for their own future as they have done for themselves when they were students.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Introduction

Community colleges play a crucial role in the United States, serving nearly half of the undergraduate population. They rarely receive the research focus or funding attention that 4-year colleges and universities get in higher education literature. Furthermore, community colleges have a far higher representation of marginalized groups, which includes women, minorities, and those from lower socioeconomic levels in their student body. Unfortunately, community college faculty are not representative of the student demographics whom they serve and the research on the minority faculty experience in community colleges is emergent.

Summary of the Study

Critical research on the intersections of gender, race and class on women faculty of color largely addresses the experience of those in 4-year universities. In addition, the available research on community college faculty mainly addresses the perceptions of culture and climate by those of White women faculty. To date, the scholarship on the experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges is nearly non-existent. This study offers in-depth insight into the experiences of women faculty of color at 2-year institutions, contributing to the emerging body of critical research. Bringing the perspectives of women of color faculty at 2-year institutions to the forefront validates not

only their presence in academe, but also acknowledges and celebrates their work as committed educators.

This qualitative interview study used Lee's (2003) Social Capital Network Framework as well as Zinn and Dill's (1996) Multiracial Feminism Theory as the conceptual framework to examine the experiences of women faculty of color in southern California community colleges. Addressing the gap in literature, the purpose of the study was to initiate research on an overlooked but important faculty population in higher education. The qualitative study was guided by these research questions for women faculty of color:

1. What are the influences that shape their decision to teach at a 2-year collegerather than a 4-year university?
2. What are the various roles which they perform on and off campus?
3. What are the barriers and factors faced in their academic positions?
4. How do they seek support to navigate through those challenges?

Review of Methodology

Because the purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges and how they perceive the culture and climate of their institutions, the qualitative approach to these questions was through in-depth interviews (Seidman, 2006). Because there is scant scholarship on the experiences of women faculty of color, capturing their stories becomes even more crucial because it is rarely done. According to Seidman (2006), interviewing is an effective method to extract

data when there are stories to be told: "At the heart of interviewing research is an interest in other individuals' stories because they are worth it" (p. 9).

Three instruments were used to collect the data. The first instrument was the researcher. Acknowledging that qualitative research is inherently interpretive, the researcher has the ability to shape the work as an interviewer and should be acknowledge as a tool of analysis (Creswell, 2009). The second instrument was the demographic questionnaire, which consisted of 18 items. The third instrument used was the interview protocol. For the interview protocol, the questions were initially adapted from the interview protocol used in Lee's study (2003), which examined the role of race and gender in the academic promotion of university faculty. Then, the research questions and demographic questionnaires were refined through pilot interviews with two full-time community college faculty who identified as women of color. One was a Chicana faculty who taught in a single community college district; the other was an African American woman who taught in a multiple community college district. According to Lincoln and Guba (1995), piloting instruments is one way to establish credibility.

Those eligible to participate in the study were women faculty of color who met the following criteria: (1) identified as a woman of color and (2) worked as a full-time faculty member in a southern California community college.

Prior to conducting the study, the researcher obtained IRB approval and provided detailed explanations of the following: how the participants would be recruited, the purpose of the research, and how the confidentiality of the participants would be protected. Pseudonyms were used for the participants as well as the institutions in which

they were employed as faculty. Not only were participants offered the opportunity to opt out of being recorded for the interview, they were also given the chance to review their transcripts and revise or omit any statements made during the interview. Lastly, participants were also notified that they could opt out of the interview, or the research, at any given time.

For this qualitative interview study, strategic sampling was used to recruit the participants. Purposeful sampling allowed the researcher to select participants who met the criteria (Cohen at al, 2007). Fifteen individuals, all educators in either community colleges or universities in southern California, who personally knew the researcher, were asked to recruit potential participants through their professional and personal connections. Through snowball sampling (Patton, 2002), a total of 52 eligible participants were referred to the researcher. The researcher contacted all potential participants via email, providing a summary of the purpose of the study. Those who were interested responded via email or phone call. A consent form along with the demographic questionnaire was sent to these willing participants to complete prior to the interview. The interview time and location were also mutually agreed between the researcher and the participant.

The snowball sampling resulted in a total of 37 interested participants who all met the criteria. The participants represented 11 different community colleges in the urban/suburban regions of Los Angeles and Orange Counties in southern California. The participants were self-identified as African American/Black, Asian American, Filipina/Pacific Islander, Latina, Middle Eastern and Mixed Race. They currently

worked as full-time faculty members as: instructional faculty, counselors and librarians. Of the 37 participants interviewed, all but 2 were not tenured. Two of the three non-tenured faculty asked for their interviews to not be recorded. Twenty-six of the recorded interviews were used as exemplars in the findings. These interviews were selected because of the ethnic representation of the participant as well as the richness of their stories.

Utilizing the interview protocol and demographic questionnaire, one-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with all participants. All of the 37 in-depth interviews were conducted in person, with four interviews followed up with phone recordings due to time constraints from the initial interview meeting. All but three of the recorded interviews were sent to professional transcriptionists. The researcher personally transcribed three of the recorded interviews because they were unusually lengthy, with the longest interview lasting five hours. After all the transcriptions were completed, the researcher thoroughly reviewed each of the 37 transcripts for accuracy. Trustworthy measures included member checking with the participants for transcription accuracy (Lincoln & Guba, 1995). As a result, five of the participants elaborated on their responses; also, two participants asked that the sensitive information shared in the interview not be used in the exemplars.

For this study, the conceptual framework informed the initial thematic analysis of the data resulting in six major themes. In addition, the researcher conducted several readings and re-readings of the transcriptions to derive the coding for the subthemes. For the coding process, the researcher used large diagrams and posters to physically arrange,

categorize, group, and cluster the raw texts. All transcripts were uploaded to Nvivo to assist with text management of the exemplars. Nvivo is qualitative data analysis software that has been approved by the IRB. In addition, all demographic questionnaire responses were managed by utilizing SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey is an online survey tool that enables for the safe and secure storage of survey materials. Trustworthiness measures included peer debriefing of the subthemes.

Summary of the Results

Findings revealed that women faculty of color experience multiple forms of marginalization, as well as agency. The intersections of gender, race and class manifested themselves in the findings, and thus confirmed that the experiences of women faculty of color can be unified as a collective minority experience to contrast dominant groups. They are simultaneously diversified because of the unique differences in ethnic identity and lived experience amongst each other. For many, the institutional culture and climate perceived by women faculty of color in community colleges validated that it was "chilly" and not as "warm" as those from research findings that sampled White women faculty. In addition, the type of the community college district, academic discipline and status in the faculty hierarchy were factors that influenced their experiences of climate. Despite many expressing the culture of their institutions as political, these women of color were overwhelmingly satisfied in their faculty work. Their commitment to serving underrepresented students, and sense of responsibility to the community at large, mediated--or melted--the chilliness.

Implications

We live in a dynamic time where policy, praxis, and funding meet at a crossroads in higher education. All these factors force scholars, politicians, administrators, and the public at large, to question the role and purpose of higher education in the United States. What is the utility of a college degree? What is the role of the community college? How can we best help students succeed? And most importantly, as it relates to this study, what are the experiences of faculty? Faculty members--who are in the frontline making the most direct impact on students--play a significant role in the system of higher education. If our community college faculty are not equipped with resources and authentically supported, how are they to provide a meaningful learning experience for our students?

This concluding section provides recommendations that cover future research, policy and practice. Due to the gap in literature on community college faculty and the experiences of women faculty of color, an expansion of future research was prioritized as the highest recommendation. Understanding the issues surrounding the community college faculty experience is crucial for educators to make more holistic policy decisions as well as practice. Consequently, the recommendations for policy and practice are based on the findings of this study and potential future studies.

Recommendations for Future Research

As referenced in the literature review, the current research on women faculty of color in community colleges is nearly non-existent. Critical research on the experiences of women faculty of color in 4-year institutions has revealed that the culture and climate experienced is considered hostile, if not toxic (Harris & Gonzales, 2012; Turner, 2002).

The available research on community colleges constitutes only 8% of overall scholarship from the top five major journals of higher education (Townsend, Donaldson, & Wilson, 2005), with on a small slice of that focusing on community college faculty (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Currently, the scholarship on issues of equity in community colleges suggests that the climate is less chilly, or even warming up (Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007). Yet the discussions and findings of these studies aggregate the views of women faculty, often ignoring the critical intersections of gender, class and race. In other words, the scholarship that directly addresses the narratives of women faculty of color in community colleges is muted.

This qualitative research study sought to create an academic space where these voices of women faculty of color in community colleges are no longer obtuse, but acutely acknowledged. Using the data in this study as a starting point, there are two future analyses which are recommended. Lastly, the third recommendation suggests expanding this study to other regions statewide and nationally.

Future Research Recommendation #1: Disaggregate the Data by Ethnic Groups

Isolating the data to a specific ethnic or racial identity would enable for a more in-depth understanding of how one faculty group experiences the community college climate and culture in southern California. A deeper examination of a specific group enables the narratives of its individual participants to impact the findings within a more distilled context, possibly establishing new, diverse themes and subthemes particular to the group. Findings from such an analysis can provide detailed information that would contribute to the larger body of research on community college faculty. In addition, these

findings can inform faculty hiring committees on how to specifically support the needs of particular ethnic groups as they seek to diversify their institution's faculty demographic.

Future Research Recommendation #2: Create Case Studies by Institution

Isolating the data to a specific site--or a case study--would enable for a more in-depth understanding of the climate and culture as experienced by women faculty of color at a particular institution. In this study, six of the nine institutions had more than one participant, with some of these institutions consisting of multiple participants from a variety of disciplines. Findings from a case study can be transformed to an executive summary report that would be of great interest to the college's leadership.

Community college administrations are weighted with an abundance of data and often seek the most efficient ways to receive packaged information. An executive report can provide a snapshot, or even shed a light of truth, onto ongoing events that may have missed the administration's attention. In particular, the unethical and abusive behaviors towards faculty (and students) that occur on their own campuses should not be ignored for there are potential legal ramifications for such oversight. A case study on the overall climate and culture, which might also identify problematic issues in specific departments, would be considered invaluable to any college leadership as they work to improve their institutional environments.

Future Research Recommendation #3: Replicate Variations of the Study

It is recommended that a similar study is conducted in other regions throughout the state of California, where rural or more homogenous communities exist. The minority faculty experience in non-urban or less diverse communities may create findings

that amplify or diverge to those of this study. The criteria of this study were restricted to individuals who were full-time faculty members in the urban and suburban Los Angeles and Orange counties, one of southern California's most racially diverse regions. Future research on community college faculty might also include the perspectives of adjunct faculty who are women of color. Ultimately, the findings of such studies can only add much-needed breadth to this critical research topic. The more we understand about the experiences of women faculty of color, the more we can generate a momentum of change that progresses not only the scholarship, but responsibly influences decisions on the policy and practice of faculty hiring, retention and development.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Throughout the landscape of change, community colleges in California are experiencing the "graying" of their faculty and administrators (J.P. Murray, 2010). Predicting the financial impact of this retiring population and how lean budgets are to replenish new faculty members promise great policy challenges ahead. Unfortunately, replacing retiring faculty becomes more than simply an issue of hiring and promotion. Who will be the new faculty? How can administration better promote and support the current ones? Lastly, how do institutions instill values of diversity that have long-lasting benefits? Transforming these opportunities into ones of meaningful change relies on effective faculty development policy and practice.

Policy and Practice Recommendation#1: Strive to Achieve Critical Mass

Based on the findings from this study, the first recommendation reinforces the assertion that critical mass (Opp & Gosetti, 2002; Turner et al., 2008) is a foundational

necessity to create better campus environments for women faculty of color in community colleges. Furthermore, this recommendation also echoes the assertion that representation does matter in terms of tenure and promotion for women faculty of color in community colleges (Oakes, 2008; Turner, 2002).

Diversifying faculty begins at the top. The strongest predictor of representational growth of minority women faculty was when there was a critical mass of women of color administrators. Opp and Gosetti (2002) suggested that when such a critical mass is achieved, it not only physically reflects the institution's commitment to diversity and inclusivity, but it actually decreases the isolation and alienation felt by women faculty of color. They are comforted with the notion that there are administrative allies in the college's leadership; thus, perceiving a less chilly climate. Also, women faculty of color perceive that an increased representation of others who look like them, particularly those who are senior administrators or tenured faculty, creates a space that does not disadvantage them in the tenure and promotion process. College governing boards and hiring committees should take note of this fact and intentionally open their institutions to taking risks on the hiring of administrators and faculty of color, even though potential candidates may not conform to dominant ideals of success and or be as established (as their White counterparts).

Policy and Practice Recommendation #2: Establish Formal/Structured Mentoring

The study findings suggest that mentoring relationships are essential to how women faculty of color navigate through the complex terrain of both their academic and professional aspirations. Specifically, faculty mentoring, both informal and formal,

produced positive outcomes that were two-fold. The mentoring increased the faculty's individual self-efficacy and enabled her to persist even in times of adversity or oppression. Furthermore, faculty mentorings that were established on campus helped women faculty of color to increase their engagement with the institution.

It is recommended that institutions provide structured opportunities for women faculty of color to find potential mentors or to be mentors themselves. One key component for the success of a structured mentoring paradigm is that it needs to be co-constructed (by both the mentor and mentee), so that compatibility can be assessed and goals can be mutually established (Boice, 2000; Boyle & Boice, 1998). Another component is that the mentor provides feedback and assistance that are continuous. In addition, the faculty mentee should participate in key meetings where they can be mentored on strategic initiatives and practices that expose them to administrative decision making outside their departments.

As participation is voluntary, structured mentoring opportunities should be open to part-time faculty as well since they comprise the majority of faculty populations in community colleges (Kezar & Sam, 2010). The interaction with other faculty that the adjuncts receive can be viewed as a form of institutional grooming and act as a low-risk investment for the college. In the case study of a continuous mentoring model among part-time faculty and full-time faculty at a community college, Nehrebacki (2013) found that including part-time faculty along with full-time faculty in professional development meetings increased teaching effectiveness and faculty engagement among the adjunct

faculty. This exposure increased their faculty engagement, despite being adjuncts, and in some cases it solidified their chances of full-time employment due to positive exposure.

Policy and Practice Recommendation #3: Encourage Faculty Learning Communities

Based on the findings from this study, women faculty of color in community colleges rely and yearn for support that expands beyond what is offered in mentoring relationships or membership in professional organizations. They seek to share and collaborate with like-minded colleagues about their experiences. The intersections of race, class and gender frame not only their experiences as individuals, but ultimately as faculty members with intersecting teaching practices, research interests and other institutional commitments. This type of support is best attained through engagement in ongoing conversations within a community of other women faculty of color with whom they feel safe to share and seek advice.

It is recommended that institutions offer incentives and resources that support cohort-based Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs). As Milton Cox (2004), one of FLCs founding fathers appropriately asserts: "Cohort-based FLCs address the teaching, learning, and developmental needs of an important group of faculty or staff that has been particularly affected by the isolation, fragmentation, stress, neglect, or chilly climate in the academy" (p. 8). Particularly, women faculty of color desire a protected space where sensitive dialogue about politicized confrontations and microaggressions experienced on campus can be exchanged in protected environments.

It is ironic, after all, that community colleges strive to offer a sense of community to support its students, but not necessarily for its faculty. Unlike one-time faculty

development workshops--where the support is experienced as a burst of inspiration or short-term motivation at most--FLCs parallel a similar structure to that of student learning communities in that they consistently meet in an ongoing basis, creating a sense of community for the members. Typically, FLCs are organically created and organized by the faculty themselves, though they are structured and require a facilitator to organize the meetings. College leadership should offer incentives such as grant money for seminars, guest speakers, and interdisciplinary projects started with fellow faculty. In addition, resources such as allocated meeting room space and brown bag luncheons should be allocated to alert women faculty of color of the support for FLCs.

Concluding Statement

Community colleges continue to serve diverse populations and have a far higher representation of marginalized groups among their student bodies, yet the faculty who serve in these institutions are not representative of the students they serve. There is established evidence that a diverse faculty benefits diverse student populations. As leaders of higher education, if our concern is student learning and achievement, then preparing, supporting and championing the faculty who empower our community college students should be included in the overall strategic plan. How is it that women faculty of color, who are in the frontline helping students, not be recognized for their efforts? This study's findings established that they are ambassadors of change for institutions, serving as advocates, role models and mobilizers.

It is critical that college leaderships commit to the diversifying of their faculty populations in their faculty development initiatives. Most importantly, these objectives

should aim to attract qualified candidates from the top down, rather than bottom up. Reaching a critical mass of diversity in administration has proven to be foundational. When administration consists of diverse perspectives from different backgrounds, especially those from women of color, there are positive ripple effects of diverse hiring throughout the institution. Not surprisingly, women faculty of color deem the climate less isolating, less hostile, when they are not the only ones.

The culture and climate of community colleges does not have to be chilly for women faculty of color. Utilizing critical research to inform policy decisions is a start. College leadership can encourage collaboration and collegiality across disciplines by implementing formal structured support for such ongoing mentoring opportunities and Faculty Learning Communities.

The opportunity to make authentic, meaningful change is now. For perhaps the loss of opportunity is not as great as the loss of our students' belief that good will come from their community college education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER

APPENDIX A

Dear Friends,

I hope this letter finds you well.

I have really appreciated your genuine enthusiasm in my research and wanted to reach out to you for support. I believe you mentioned that you know of colleagues and other professional contacts at your institution or other community colleges who may be interested in participating in my research?

Please consider your personal and profession networks and let me know if there is a possible participant who fits my criteria:
1) Self-identified as a woman of color
2) Works as a full-time faculty in southern California community colleges.

Attached is a formal letter of introduction and information about my study that you can forward to these potential participants.

I look forward to their response and hope that you know women faculty of color who are willing to share their valuable stories with me.

Thank you so much in advance!

Truc
(XXX) XXX-XXX
XXX@student.csulb.edu

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT LETTER

APPENDIX B

Dear Faculty Member,

Thank you for taking the time to read this email about possible participation in my dissertation study. The purpose of this study is to explore the different and unique experiences of women of color who are full-time faculty members in Southern California's community colleges.

There is a growing body of literature that specifically addresses the status of women faculty of color. Their experiences differ in a variety of ways from those of White women faculty and also to minority men. More recent research critically speaks to the intersections of race, class and gender, revealing the multiple marginalizations as experienced by faculty who identify both as a minority and a female. These studies, however, focus solely on the accounts of women faculty of color at 4-year universities.

Currently, scholarship on the status and experiences of women faculty of color in community colleges is nearly non-existent. My study initiates this focus on an overlooked, but important faculty population – and that is you!

Participation in this study will consist of completing:

1) A demographic questionnaire that will include basic background information (including: age, race and/or ethnic identity, marital/partnership status, educational history, previous teaching experience, etc.), and;

2) A one-on-one interview with me in person, or if necessary, through a telephone conversation. The recorded interview will last approximately 1.5 hours and will ask about your experiences as a community college faculty member. (You may opt out of having the interview recorded.)

The interview will take place between January and March 2014. I will also offer you a copy of the interview transcripts, which you may find interesting to listen to after-the-fact as well as the chance to read my summary of your perspective and the final report if you are interested.

I have attached a consent form that provides a full description of the expectations for participants in the study, including your rights and responsibilities and the safeguards I have in place, including the confidentiality of all information that you share with me.

Your real identity will not be disclosed in the study and your participation will not affect your employment with the community college in any way. If you decide to participate, please read and complete the consent form and return it to me in person when we meet or as a PDF attachment with a scan that includes your signature.

Should you have any questions regarding participation in the research, please feel free to contact me by phone or email.
(XXX) XXX-XXXX
XXXX@student.csulb.edu

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request for your participation. It would be a great honor to hear your story and I look forward to meeting you!

Respectfully,

Truc

Truc HaMai
Bryn Mawr College, BA Urban Studies
CSU Long Beach, MA Organizational Psychology
Doctoral Candidate, Educational Leadership Program, CSU Long Beach
Board Member, Council on the Study of Community Colleges

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM

APPENDIX C

Title of Study: ***The "Other" Women: What About Women Faculty of Color in Community Colleges?***

Consent to Participate in Research

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Truc HaMai, BA, MA, a doctoral candidate from the department of Educational Leadership at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB). The results of this study will contribute to her dissertation requirement for an Ed.D. degree from this institution. You were selected as a possible participant for this study because you meet the following criteria: a) you identify as a women of color, minority and/or mixed race; b) you are employed as a full-time faculty member (which includes counseling position) in a southern California Community College; and c) you are a U.S. citizen (native or naturalized).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to explore how women faculty of color perceive the culture and climate of community colleges in southern California. Namely, this study seeks to understand how the intersections of race, class and gender of a woman faculty of color's experience influences her ability to navigate through this chosen career path. By providing the faculty member a platform to speak about her personal history, teaching experiences and support network, this study looks to give voice to what is currently a voiceless population in the scholarship on faculty work as well as on community colleges.

Procedures

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will do the following things:

1. Agree to meet with the researcher for an approximately 1-hour interview that also includes filling out a demographic questionnaire. The interview will be conducted at a mutually agreed location that is convenient and safe for you.
2. Please reserve the time and date for the interview with the researcher.
3. Agree or not to have the interview taped. While I prefer having the interview taped, I will take handwritten notes if you want to participate but do not want to be audio taped.
4. Agree or not to review the interview transcripts for accuracy.
5.

Potential Risks and Discomforts

The possible risks to you are that you will have to recall experiences that you have had working in the community college as a faculty member. Some of these experiences may involve conflicts or difficult situations. Another potential risk of your participation is that your comments could potentially be linked back to you and they may have adverse implications for your reputation or relationships with colleagues or supervisor(s) at your institution. Another potential risk is that the recorded interview files are heard by

someone else besides the researcher and the professional transcriptionist.
To minimize the risks indicated above, you have the right to decline to respond to any questions and may stop your participation in the study at any time. With regards to the second potential risk, I will make sure that we meet at a quiet and private location to maintain your confidentiality and comfort. In addition, you will be given a pseudonym from the beginning of the study so that only I, the researcher, will have information that links you to the study. With regards to the third potential risk, the researcher will ensure that the transcriptionist sign a confidentiality agreement before releasing the files to be transcribed.

The audio files will be kept in a password protected home computer and the home computer is protected under firewall and virus protection software. The demographic questionnaire will be stored in a locked file cabinet at the researcher's private residence (home). Only the researcher will have access to the locked file cabinet. Any hard copies will be stored and locked in the researcher's home office in a file cabinet. These files will be kept for three years after the research is completed. Thereafter, the files will be destroyed.

Your participation in the research is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time during the study.

Potential Benefits to Participate in Study
There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the research study. However, the potential benefits to higher education are tremendous. The findings will contribute to the scholarship on community college faculty and can potentially be used to improve faculty development programs.

Confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this study and can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

The demographic questionnaire will be locked in a file cabinet in the researcher's home and only the researcher has access to it. The recordings from the interviews will be transcribed by a transcription professional. A confidential agreement between the researcher and professional will be signed before releasing the audio files. Once the transcripts from your interview are completed, you have the right to request a copy to review or edit the information you provided during the interview. The only individuals with access to your interview transcripts are the transcriptionist, yourself, and the researcher. The original audio files and final transcripts will be kept for three years after completion of the study. Thereafter, the files and documents will be destroyed.

Rights of Research Participant

You can choose to participate in this study or not. If you volunteer to participate in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participation or non-participating will not affect your employment or any other personal consideration or right you usually expect. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact the Office of Research & Sponsored Programs, CSU Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840; Telephone: (562) 985-8147 or email at IRB@csulb.edu

Researcher Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researcher, Truc HaMai at (XXX) XXX-XXXX, XXX@student.csulb.edu, or Dr. John Murray, CSULB faculty and dissertation chair of this study at (562) 985-2458, jmurray@csulb.edu

Signature of Research Participants

I understand the procedures and conditions of my participation described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form

Name of Participant: ______________________

Signature of Participant: _____________________ Date: _____________________

If you agree to an audio recording of the interview, please sign your name below:

Name of Participant: ______________________

Signature of Participant: _____________________ Date: _____________________

Name of Researcher: ____________________________

Signature of Researcher: ______________________

Date: _______________________________

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect basic demographic information of each participant so that I can better understand the overall experiences of women of color faculty at community colleges. The results of this survey will be held completely confidential. The survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete.

Please **CIRCLE** the letter that best answers the question; **WRITE IN** answers when needed. Please hand this to me when you are done and we can begin the interview. Thank you!

1. Which category below includes your age?
    a. 18-20
    b. 21-29
    c. 30-39
    d. 40-49
    e. 50-59
    f. 60 or older

2. What do you identify as your race/ethnicity?
    a. African American/Black
    b. Asian American
    c. Filipina/Pacific Islander
    d. Latina/Hispanic
    e. Native American/American Indian
    f. Two or more Races
    g. If Other, please describe: _________

3. Were you born in the U.S.?
    a. Yes
    b. No, I am an immigrant
    c. No, I am a refugee
    d. If Other, please describe your nationality: ________________

4. Do you speak another language other than English?
    a. No
    b. Yes, please specify language(s) _________________________________
        - Proficiency reading? _________________Writing? ____________

5. What is your marital/relationship status?
    a. Single, no children

b. Single, with _____# of children
c. Unmarried with partner, no children
d. Unmarried with partner, _____# of children
e. Married with spouse, no children
f. Married with spouse, _____# of children
g. If Other, please describe: _____________

6. Did you attend community college(s)?
   a. Yes
      - If full-time, how many __________?
      - If part-time, how many__________?
   b. No

7. What is your highest degree(s) attained? (Please circle all that applies.)
   a. Bachelor
   b. Master of Arts (M.A.)
   c. Master of Science (M.S.)
   d. Master of Business Administration (M.B.A)
   e. Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)
   f. Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.)
   g. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
   h. Other. Please specify_________

8. What best describes your current faculty position at your campus?
   a. Full-time Non-Tenure
   b. Full-time Tenure Track
   c. Full-time Tenured

9. Describe your current faculty duties?
   a. Yes, I currently teach classes only:
      Please specify department/division

      ____

      Please specify courses/units currently
      teaching____________________________

   b. Yes, I teach and hold an administration position
      too________________________
   c. No, I do NOT teach and have the following
      duties_______________________

10. If you are currently NOT tenured, do you wish to be tenured?
    a. Yes
    b. No. Please state why___________________________________
    (examples: primary caretaker, children young, wanting to leave academia etc.
    c. Unsure. Please state why________________________________
    (examples: waiting for a position at a 4-year institution, own my business, hold FT job, etc.)

11. Did you hold multiple adjunct positions at more than one institution – or was a "freeway flyer" – prior to coming to this institution? If No, Skip to question #13.
    a. Yes – I taught as an adjunct only at community colleges.
    b. Yes – I taught as an adjunct only at universities.
    c. Yes – I taught as an adjunct at both community colleges and universities.
    d. No
12. When you were a "freeway flyer", please answer the following:
    a. How many institutions total/semester: _____(2-yr colleges) _____ (4-yr colleges)
    b. How many sections total/semester: ___________
    c. For how long: ___________ (years) __________(months)

13. Did you hold an adjunct position at this current institution before advancing to a full-time faculty position?
    a. Yes. Please note how long _____(years) and/or _____ (months).
    b. No

14. Did you apply for this full-time faculty positions more than once?
    a. Yes. Please specify how many times:_______
    b. No

15. Do you live in the residential community where you teach?
    a. Yes
    b. No

16. Which of the following best describes the culture of your institution? (Choose one)
    a. Friendly
    b. Neutral
    c. Political
    d. Hostile
    e. Other ________________________________

17. What word below best describes the “climate” of your department? (Choose one)
    a. Warm
    b. Tepid
    c. Chilly
    d. Icy
    e. Other ________________________________

18. In terms of your overall job satisfaction, please select one that best describes how you feel about your faculty work:
    a. Very satisfied
    b. Satisfied
    c. Neutral
    d. Unsatisfied
    e. Very unsatisfied

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

APPENDIX E

Introduction (script)

A. Introduce myself
B. As you know, I am engaged in a study concerning the experiences of women of color faculty in the community colleges in California. You are being interviewed because you hold a full-time faculty position and identify as a person of color who is American, or a U.S. citizen.
C. I'll be giving you a short demographic questionnaire that will touch on these questions -- how you identify as a woman of color as well as your academic history. More importantly, however, I'd like to get to know you better as a person and the cultural background which you come from. I will ask about this in more-depth at the start of the interview.
D. In addition, the others goals of this study is to identify what are some of the obstacles, opportunities and moments of agency you have experienced in your position. Today's interview should last approximately 1 hour.
E. I would like to record our conversation in order to allow me to listen more carefully to what you say, rather than trying to write down all your responses. Do I have your permission to administer the questionnaire and to use the digital recorder for the interview part?
F. Present consent form. Would you mind taking a minute to sign the consent form?
G. The format of the interview will be in three sections. I will proceed in the following manner:
    - **PART I**: To begin, I will ask you to share your personal history, which includes your family background as well as your educational experiences. These experiences may include going to school as a kid, then college and graduate school. What are some of the memorable moments you recall – both good and bad?
    - **PART II:** For this section, I will ask you questions specifically about your academic position as a faculty member.
    - First, I will be asking you to identify the opportunities that you have experienced prior to or during your time as full-time faculty member. These opportunities may include how you arrived at teaching at a community college.
    - Second, I will also ask you to identify challenges you have confronted prior to and during your time as a full-time faculty member. By challenges, they can encompass anything from obstacles that were either implied or explicit, but experienced as uncomfortable, discouraging, or oppressive during your time as a full-time faculty member.
    - **PART III:** In this last section, I will ask you questions about your support network and to identify the providers who have helped you navigate

through both the opportunities and obstacles. Specifically, I am interested in the nature of the support (informational, emotional, professional, cultural, spiritual, etc.) and the nature of that relationship with each provider.

E. Finally, I want to assure you that everything you share will be held in the strictest confidence. The results will be summarized and presented using pseudonyms so that no individual can be identified. Do you have any questions? Let's begin!

PART I – PERSONAL HISTORY

SAY QUESTION NUMBERS OUT ALOUD
For this section: Remind participant to consider both positive and negative aspects.

1. What was it like growing up in your family?
   - Probe: Were you raised with strong cultural influences? Speaking a language other than English?
   - Were the authority figures a parent or parents? Did they also include other family members, guardians from the community, spiritual leaders, etc.?

2. Was going to school prioritized as a value in your family, your culture? If so, why or why not?
   - Probe: Did your parents go to college?

3. Did these values match what you experienced in school as a kid?
   - Probe: If your parents expected you to attend college, did your teachers in school share the same expectations?

4. What was it like going to college?
   - Probe: Did you attend a community college first?

5. How did your graduate experiences differ from your experiences as an undergrad?
   - Probe: Were you rewarded for your academic achievement?
   - Probe: Did you feel a sense of belonging in your discipline?

PART II – BEING A FACULTY MEMBER

Opportunities

In one's academic journey to finding faculty positions, there are opportunities that arise, enabling a faculty candidate a chance to prove her abilities, test her potential or advance from her current position. Examples of academic opportunities may come in the form of an internship program, participation in a research and experiential learning project, or a collaboration in publishing. In addition, some strategize and seek for opportunities such as attending conferences; while others land them unintentionally such as starting off as an adjunct faculty in which the position became full-time.

For these next questions, I'll be asking you questions about opportunities that came your way in your academic career.

For this section: Remind participant to consider opportunities that opened up prior to as well as during current position.

6. How have you experienced opportunities in your search for faculty work?
    - Probe: Were the opportunities made available to you by an individual, membership on a listserve, mass emailer, etc.?

7. Did you seek opportunities to research and publish when you were in graduate school? If not, where did you seek these experiences?
    - Probe: How have these experiences influenced a career in research and publishing for you?

8. Did you seek opportunities to teach when you were in graduate school? If not, where did you seek these experiences?
    - Probe: How have these experiences influenced your career in teaching?

9. In your experience teaching as faculty at a community college, how has this experience differed from your own experience having been a student at the university?
    - Probe: Was the pedogagy used different?
    - Probe: Diversity of classes? Campus?

10. What other opportunities does teaching at a community college offer that you feel you would not be able to find - or have - at a university?
    - Probe: Ability to obtain tenure?
    - Probe: Ability to have a family or maintain work-life balance?
    - Probe: Chance to work with a different student demographic?

Oppression

For many, one's academic journey to finding a faculty position has not come without some sort of struggle. Whether it is a struggle to access those opportunities (which we spoke of earlier), or a struggle to progress in them once obtained, a faculty member often confronts these challenges in both implicit and explicit ways. In particular, women of color face these challenges differently than White women or under-represented minority male.
For these next questions, I'll be asking you about the obstacles that you confronted, which you feel interfered with your access to opportunities as well as created a negative experience for you.

For this section: Remind participant to consider obstacles that she has experienced prior to as well as during her current position.

11. In what ways do you think your access to or awareness of such opportunities differed from other faculty who were not women of color?
    - Probe: Can you give me an example?

12. When confronting an issue in your department, did you feel you had your chair or other senior colleagues to support you? Why or why not?
    - Probe: Can you give me an example?

13. Have you ever experienced a racist or sexist situation created by a student in or out of the classroom?
    - Probe: For example, a student in a classroom behaved in such a way that questions your competence as an instructor, but would never act that way towards other professors who are not women of color.

14. Have you ever experienced a racist or sexist situation made by a faculty colleague or administrator that made you feel uncomfortable?
    - Probe: For example, you might have overheard some senior faculty, all White colleagues, make a dismissing comment about a minority

candidate they just interviewed as not being the “right fit” for the department.

15. Have you ever experienced a racist or sexist situation that was made to you outside of the campus regarding your faculty position?
    - Probe: Was it someone you knew from the community?

PART III– SUPPORT

During the tenure review, there are times when critical pieces of information can make your experience easier such as saving you time or energy, etc. In our lives, we know of individuals we could *technically* go to by virtue of their role or responsibility. For example, junior faculty are constantly encouraged to talk to their department chair if they need anything. Nevertheless, many times, junior faculty do not approach their department chair for a variety of reasons due to personality, accessibility, or convenience issues.

I would like you to think about the people whom you felt comfortable with and could consistently count on for informational, emotional or career support if and/or when you needed it. Please identify the individuals that provided support that was helpful to you. You can describe them in detail and please be assured that I use pseudonyms for each person too.

For this section: Remind participant to also consider people outside the institution.

Informational Support:

These people might have provided helpful information only once but they are individuals you could go to without reservation.

16. Was there anyone who provided information on how to teach and handle the heavy teaching load at a community college?
    - Probe: From graduate school?
    - Probe: From previous adjunct positions?

17. Was there anyone who you were able to get assistance from regarding administrative details such as forms, paperwork, committee work, or other departmental requirements?
    - Probe: Was there a faculty orientation?
    - Probe: Someone who was able to explain what certain “requirements” mean in detail that might be different than what is written?

18. Did anyone help you to understand the culture of the campus and the ways in which professors interact, socialize, or collaborate within each department?
    - Probe: Can you give me an example of cultural information?
    - Probe: Can you give me an example of the climate in the department

Emotional Support:

Please think about those individuals you felt you could really trust and be vulnerable with, without fear of judgment or blame. Someone who listened first, spoke later – someone who really just let you be you.

19. Was there someone, on a moment's notice, you could go to vent, complain, or discuss the challenges associated with your position at the community college and who would listen and offer support?

20. Was there anyone who believed in your talent as an academic, saw the value of your perspectives and authentically encouraged your teaching? Someone you felt was genuine in his or her support of you and always willing to help you out?

21. Was there anyone who provided personal support to address any issues that related to your racial and/or gender identity that came up as a result of your goals to achieve tenure?
    - Probe: For example, was someone who you could go to discuss a sexist comment you heard about the women in your department or to get an explanation as to why you might be on committees that only dealt with "diversity" issues?

Career Support

As you think about your adjunct positions or those days before you achieved full-time faculty status, certain relationships probably stand out as being very important in successfully achieving tenure-track status. Receiving clarifications on tenure-track guidelines from a colleague can be very helpful. However, many other forms of support can assist faculty in being successful in their career.

Can you identify the individuals you had relationships with that were very helpful to you in your quest to receive tenure?

22. Was there anyone who provided introductions to other key individuals such as senior faculty, deans, and other key administrators (name of institution)?
    Probe: Was there anyone who taught you how to network, meet other people, "work a room", etc.?

23. Was there anyone that encouraged or enlisted you to do committee work, which is considered an asset in your tenure dossier?

24. Did you feel that your gender or racial identity played a role in the development of relationships or networks during the tenure process? If so, in what ways? (Positive and negative)

25. Mentoring is often described as a relationship with another individual who provides you with various aspects of support. Someone who provides career guidance but also someone you could rely on for emotional and personal support. Was there anyone in your core network whom you considered a mentor?
    Probe: Please describe in detail the nature of the relationship

Closing up on this interview:
Is there any question I did not ask that you think I should have to get a better picture of what your faculty experience is like being a woman of color? Is there anything else you want to discuss or comment on regarding networks and relationships?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Aguirre, A. (2000). Academic storytelling: A critical race theory story of affirmative action. *Sociological Perspectives, 43*(2), 319-339. doi: 10.2307/1389799

Alger, J. R., & Carrasco, G. P. (1997, August). *The role of faculty in achieving and retaining a diverse student population.* Paper presented at the AACRAO Policy Summit, Denver, CO.

Ambrosino, R. (2009). Mentors as fellow travelers. *Adult Learning, 20*(1-2), 31-34.

American Association of Community Colleges (2004). *Teaching by choice: Community colleges expand K-12 STEM pathways and practices.* Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED503487.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2012). *Compensation and benefits of community college CEOs: 2012.* Retreived from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Documents/CEOCompensationResearchBrief.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2013). *Postcollege workforce outcomes measures: Issues facing policymakers, analysts, and researchers*. Retrieved from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/Reports/Documents/WorkforceOutcomes_2013.pdf

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2011). Performance-Based funding: A re-emerging strategy in public higher education financing. *A Higher Education Brief.* Retrieved from http://www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/Performance_Funding_AASCU_June2011.pdf.

Amey, M. J., & Twombly, S. B. (1992). Re-visioning leadership in community colleges. *Review of Higher Education, 15*(2), 125-150.

Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to Scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(5), 582-602. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2002.0043

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(4), 373-397. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2000.0015

Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science, 15*(8), 507-510. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976. 2004.00710.x

Anzaldúa, G. E. (1990). *Making face, making soul/Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by feminists of color*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Armenti, C. (2004). May babies and posttenure babies: Maternal decisions of women professors. *The Review of Higher Education*, *27*(2), 211-231.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2012). *Shared futures, difficult choices: Reclaiming a democratic vision for college learning, global engagement, and success*. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/ liberaleducation/le-su12/index.cfm

Bernacchio, C., Ross, F., Washburn, K. R., Whitney, J., & Wood, D. R. (2007). Faculty collaboration to improve equity, access, and inclusion in higher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(1), 56-66. doi: 10.1080/1066568 0601066511

Berry, B., Daughtrey, A., & Wieder, A. (2009, December). *Collaboration: Closing the effective teaching gap*. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Teacher Quality.

Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil nimus*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bonner, F. B., & Thomas, V. G. (2001). Introduction and overview: New and continuing challenges and opportunities for Black women in the academy. *The Journal of Negro Education, 70*(3), 121.

Bowden, J., & Marton, F. (2004). *The university of learning: Beyond quality and competence*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bower, B. L. (2002). Campus life for faculty of color: Still strangers after all these years? *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2002*(118), 79-88. doi: 10.1002/cc.66

Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Best practices for enculturation: Collegiality, mentoring, and structure. *New Directions for Higher Education, 1998*(101), 87-94. doi: 10.1002/he.10108

Bridges, P., Cooper, A., Evanson, P., Haines, C., Jenkins, D., Scurry, D., ... Yorke, M. (2002). Coursework marks high, examination marks low: Discuss. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 27*(1), 35-48. doi: 10.1080/02602930 120105045

Burgess, R. G. (1984). *The research process in educational settings: ten case studies*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2013). *Data mart*. Retrieved July 1, 2013 from http//www.cccco.edu.

California Study of Higher Education. (2013). *Data mart*. Retrieved July 1, 2013 from http//www.cshe.edu.

Carey, P. (2013). Student as co-producer in a marketised higher education system: A case study of students' experience of participation in curriculum design. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 50*(3), 250-260. doi: 10.1080/147032 97.2013.796714

Carr, P. L., Bickel, J. W., & Inui, T. S. (2003). *Taking root in a forest clearing: a resource guide for medical faculty*. Boston University School of Medicine.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal And informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(3), 619-636. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00863.x

Chow, E. N. (1987). The development of feminist consciousness among Asian American Women. *Gender & Society, 1*(3), 284-299. doi: 10.1177/089124387001003004

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clutterbuck, D., & Lane, G. (2004). *The situational mentor: An international review of competences and capabilities in mentoring*. Aldershot, England: Gower.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, L., Manion. L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Cole, S., & Barber, E. G. (2003). *Increasing faculty diversity: The occupational choices of high-achieving minority students*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science, Engineering (U.S.), Committee on Science, & Public Policy (U.S.). (2007). *Beyond bias and barriers: fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, D.C. : National Academy Press.

Cox, A. (2008). *Women of color faculty at the University of Michigan: Recruitment, retention, and campus climate*. Retrieved from http://www.cew.umich.edu/ sites/default/files/AimeeCoxWOCFull2_3.pdf

Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2004*(97), 5-23. doi: 10.1002/tl.129

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 140,* 139-167.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, J. (2007). Assistive learning and research mentoring schemes. *New Directions, Issue 3*, 45-48. doi: 10.11120/ndir.2007.00030045

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, *87*, 2411-2441.

Diegel, B. L. (2010). *Similarities and differences in perceptions of adjunct faculty and division chairpersons regarding teaching support, mentoring, and professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty at a community college.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. *(*ATT 305251122)

Donnelly, R., & Mcsweeney, F. (2011). From humble beginnings: Evolving mentoring within professional development for academic staff. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(2), 259-274. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2010.509933

Dougherty, K. (2003). The uneven distribution of employee training by community college: Description and explanation. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 586*(1), 62-91.

Drake, E. (2008). Literature conceptualizing women in community colleges: 1997–2007. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 32*(10), 762-777. doi: 10.1080/10668920802325705

Drucker, P. F. (2008a). *The essential Drucker: The best of sixty years of Peter Drucker's essential writings on management*. New York, NY: Collins Business Essentials.

Drucker, P. F. (2008b). My three mentors: Lessons for leading people. *Leader to Leader,* 9-11. doi: 10.1002/ltl.40619960204

Dunsheath, B. (2010). *Searching for an A+: Techniques for implementing a successful student learning outcomes process in california community colleges.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (ATT 757947918)

Etzkowitz, H., Kemelgor, C., & Uzzi, B. (2000). *Athena unbound: The advancement of women in science and technology.* Cambridge University Press.

Finkel, S. K., & Olswang, S. G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *Review of Higher Education*, *19*(2), 123-39.

García, M. (2000). Weighing the options: Where do I want to work? In *Succeeding in an academic career: A guide for faculty of color* (pp. 1-26). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Gardner, S. K. (2012). "I couldn't wait to leave the toxic environment": A mixed methods study of women faculty satisfaction and departure from one research institution. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5*(1), 71-95. doi: 10.1515/1940-7890.1079

Geller, H. A. (2001). A brief history of community colleges and a personal view of some issues (Open admisions, occupational training and leadership). In *National Center for Community College Education at George Mason University* (pp. 1-34). Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED459881)

Gibson, S. K. (2004). Being mentored: The experience of women faculty. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(3), 173-188. Retrieved from http://www.vamentoring.org/images/uploads/resources/Being_Mentored_The_Experience_of_Women_Faculty.pdf

Glazer-Raymor, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, J. K. (2002). *Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development, and evaluation*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grubb, W. N., Badway, N., & Bell, D. (2003). Community colleges and the equity agenda: The potential of noncredit education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 586*(1), 218-240. doi: 10.1177/0002716202250226

Grubb, W. N., & Cox, R. D. (2005). Pedagogical alignment and curricular consistency: The challenges for developmental education. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2005*(129), 93-103. doi: 10.1002/cc.189

Hagedorn, L. S., Chi, W, Cepeda, R. M., & Mclain, M. (2006). An investigation of critical mass: The role of Latino representation in the success of urban community college students. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(1), 73-91. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9024-5

Hagedorn, L. S., & Laden, B. V. (2002). Exploring the climate for women as community college faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2002*(118), 69-78. doi: 10.1002/cc.65

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1982). *The campus climate: A chilly one for women?* Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1984). *Out of the classroom: A chilly campus climate for women?* Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Harris, A. P., & Gonzalez, C. G. (2012). Introduction. In G. G. Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. Gonzalez, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 1-19). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Hilton, M. E. (1935). Dean of women: A growing profession in coeducational colleges. *Occupations: The Vocational Guidance Journal, 13*(8), 701-703. doi: 10.1002/j.2164-5892.1935.tb02174.x

Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 207-216. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.001

Hu, R., & Smith, J. (2011). Cultural perspectives on teaching and learning: A collaborative self-study of two professors' first year teaching experiences. *Studying Teacher Education, 7*(1), 19-33. doi: 10.1080/17425964.2011.558347

Hudson, P. (2010). Mentors report on their own mentoring practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(7). doi: 10.14221/ajte.2010v35n7.3

Hurtado, S., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Allen, W. R., & Milem, J. F. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education, 21*(3), 279-302. doi: 10.1353/rhe.1998.0003

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clay-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 26*(8), 1-116.

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(5), 538-563. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0063

Jedele, R. E. (2010). A faculty 'C' change: Inspired by learning communities. *Thought and Action,* 107-114.

Johnson, S. D., Benson, A. D., Duncan, A. D., Shinkareva, O. N., Taylor, G. D., & Treat, T. (2003). *Distance learning in postsecondary career and technical education.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED482530)

Johnson, W. B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kane, T. J., & Rouse, C. E. (1999). The community college: Educating students at the margin between college and work. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13*(1), 63-84. doi: 10.1257/jep.13.1.63

Kay, M. (2008). The loss you can't afford in a down economy. *Institute for Corporate Productivity: Trendwatcher, 3*(433), 307-311. doi: 10.1007/s10967-011-132 9-y

Kaye, B., & Jacobson, B. (1996). Mentoring: A new model for building learning organizations. *The OD Practitioner*, *23*(3), 35-44. Retrieved from http:// careersystemsintl.org/PDF%20Files/Mentoring-A%20New%20Model% 20for%20Building%20Learning%20Organizations.pdf

Kerka, S. (1994). *Self-directed learning, myths and realities*. Retrieved from ERIC Database. (ED435834)

Kezar, A. J., & Sam, C. (2010). Experiences of non-tenure-track faculty. In K. Ward & L. E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.), *Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action* (4th ed., Vol. 36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Krueger, A., Rothstein, J., & Turner, S. (2006). Race, income, and college in 25 years: Evaluating Justice O'Connor's conjecture, *American Law and Economics Review*, *8*(2), 282-311.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. In *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *1*, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lee, F. J. (2003). *Social capital and tenure: The role of race and gender in academic promotion.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ATT 305293526)

Lerum, K. (2001). Subjects of desire: Academic armor, intimate ethnography, and the production of critical knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *7*(4), 466-483.

Levin, J.S., Haberler, Z, Walker, L., Jackson-Boothby, A. (2014). Community college culture and faculty of color. *Community College Review*, *42*(1), 55-74.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lovell, C., & Trouth, C. (2002). State governance patterns for community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117*, 91-100.

Lucas, C. J. (2006). *American higher education: A history*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malmgren, R. D., Ottino, J. M., & Amaral, L. A. (2010). The role of mentorship in protégé performance. *Nature, 465*(7298), 622-626. doi: 10.1038/nature09040

McGrath, D., & Spear, M. B. (1991). *The academic crisis of the community college*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mohanty, C. T. (2002). "Under Western Eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28*(2), 499-535.

Morse, D. (2011, May 15). Training new or potential faculty: Whose responsibility is it? *Rostrum for Academic Senate for California Community Colleges*. Retrieved from http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Rostrum/Rostrum_May11.pdf.

Murray, J. (2005). Re-addressing the priorities: New teacher educators and induction into higher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), 67-85.

Murray, J. P. (2009). New faculty members' perceptions of the academic work life. In D.R. Buckholdt & G. E. Miller (Eds.), *Faculty Stress* (pp. 108-127). New York, NY: Routledge.

Murray, J. P. (2010). Preparing to hire the best in the perfect storm. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *152*, 5-13.

Murray, M. M. (2001). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring process.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Degrees conferred by sex and race*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72

Nehrebecki, E. (2013). *Improving student learning through structured adjunct and full-time faculty support*. Paper presented at the 2013 AACC Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Niemann, Y.F. (2012). Lessons from the experiences of women of color working in academia. In G. Gutierrez y Muhs et al. (Eds.) *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 393-407). Boulder: University of Colorado.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, *41*, 457-479.

Oakes, J. L. (2008). *Tenure and promotion differentials for women faculty and faculty of color at public two year colleges in the United States* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ATT 3310920)

O'Banion, T. (1997). *Creating more learning-centered community colleges*. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. In *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *34*(3) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Opp, R. D., & Gosetti, P. P. (2002). Women full-time faculty of color in 2-Year Colleges: A trend and predictive analysis. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(7-8), 609-627. doi: 10.1080/10668920290102743

Orland-Barak, L., & Hasin, R. (2010). Exemplary mentors' perspectives towards mentoring across mentoring contexts: Lessons from collective case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 427-437. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2009. 05.009

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry a personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative Social Work*, *1*(3), 261-283.

Perin, D. (2002). The location of developmental education in community colleges: A Discussion of the merits of mainstreaming vs. centralization. *Community College Review, 30*(1), 27-44. doi: 10.1177/009155210203000102

Perkins, L. (2011). The African American female elite: The early history of African American women in the Seven Sister colleges, 1880-1960. In S. Harper & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Racial & Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education* (3rd ed., ASHE Reader Series, pp. 18-44). Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.

Perna, L. W. (2003). The status of women and minorities among community college faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2, AIR Forum Issue), 205-240.

Robinson, B., & Schaible, R. M. (1995). Collaborative teaching: Reaping the benefits. *College Teaching, 43*(2), 57-59. doi: 10.1080/87567555.1995.9925515

Rogers, J. (2012, November 13). Women and minority presidents outearn their peers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/ article/WomenMinority-Presidents/135744/?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_ medium=en

Rojas, M. (2009). *Women of color and feminism*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2005). The adult learner of color: An overlooked college student population. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 53*(2), 2-11.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285-309. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000019591.74425.f1

Roth, B. (2004). *Separate roads to feminism: Black, Chicana, and White feminist movements in America's second wave*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ryu, M. (2010). *Minorities in higher education: Twenty-fourth status report*. New York, NY: American Council on Education.

Sands, R. G., Parson, L. A., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 62*(2), 174.

Schonwetter, D. J., & Nazarko, O. (2009). Investing in our next generation: Overview of short courses, and teaching and mentoring programs for newly-hired faculty in canadian universities. *Journal of Faculty Development, 23*(1), 54-63.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shaw, K., Valadez, J., Rhoads, R. (1999). *Community colleges as cultural texts: Qualitative explorations of organizational and student culture*. Albany, NY: State University Press of New York.

Shulman, J. H. (2004). From inspired vision to impossible dream: The dangers of imbalanced mentoring. *Journal of teacher education*, 55(4), 393-406.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

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., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical Race Theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 60-73.

Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23-44.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(4), 701-736.

Stanton-Salazar, R. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children of youths. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 1-40.

Stanton-Salazar, R. (2002). *Peer social capital among working-class minority students: Prospects for applying a new concept to peer influences on achievement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. Chicago, IL.

Sue, D.W., Capoduilupo, C., Torino, G., Bucceri, J. Holder, A., Nadal, K., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286.

Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Tenuto, P. & Gardiner, M. (2012, April). *Transition into the professorate: Finding balance between challenge and success*. Paper presented at the 2012 AERA Annual Meeting, Vancouver, B.C.

Thomas, D. A. (2001, April). The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*, 99-107.

Thompson, B. (2002). Multiracial feminism: Recasting the chronology of second wave feminism. *Feminist Studies, 28*(2), 336-360.

Tillman, L. C. (2001). Mentoring African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(3), 295-325.

Tolutiene, G., & Domarkiene, J. (2010). Learning needs and the possibilities of their satisfaction: The case of prospective andragogues. *Tiltai Bridges, 50*, 147-158.

Townsend, B. K. (2009). Community college organizational climate for minorities and women. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(9), 731-744. doi: 10.1080/10668920903022458

Townsend, B. K., Donaldson, J., & Wilson, T. (2005). Marginal or monumental? Visibility of community colleges in selected higher-education journals. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(2), 123-135. doi: 10.1080/10668920590524265

Townsend, B. K., & Lapaglia, N. (2000). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. *Community College Review, 28*(1), 41-48. doi: 10.1177/009155210002800103

Townsend, B. K., & Twombly, S. B. (2007). Accidental equity: The status of women in the community college. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(3), 208-217. doi: 10.1080/10665680701334777

Turner, C. S. (2000). Defining success: Promotion and tenure-planning for each career stage and beyond. In M. García (Ed.), *Succeeding in an academic career: A guide for faculty of color* (pp. 111-140). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Turner, C. S. (2002). Women of Color in Academe: Living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1, Special Issue: The Faculty in the New Millennium), 74-93.

Turner, C. S., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 139-168.

Turner, C. S., Myers, S. L., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1), 27-59.

Twombly, S. B. (2005). Values, policies, and practices affecting the hiring process for full-time arts and sciences faculty in community colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 423-447.

Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. K. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need to know. *Community College Review, 36*(1), 5-24. doi: 10.1177/0091552108319538

Umbach, P. D. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(3), 317-345.

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Performance-based funding of higher education: A detailed look at best practices in 6 states*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED535548)

Vakalahi, H.F., & Starks, S.H. (2011). Health, well-being and women of color academics. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *1*(2), 185-190.

Valdez, J. (1996). Educational access and social mobility in a rural community college, *Review of Higher Education*, *19*(4),103-108.

Vargas, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Women faculty of color in the White classroom: Narratives on the pedagogical implications of teacher diversity*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Vega, W., Yglesias, K., & Murray, J. P. (2010). Recruiting and mentoring minority faculty members. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2010*(152), 49-55. doi: 10.1002/cc.427

Welsh, J. F., & Metcalf, J. (2003). Faculty and administrative support for institutional effectiveness activities: A bridge across the chasm? *The Journal of Higher Education, 74*(4), 445-468. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2003.0032

Williamson-Lott, J.A. (2003). Quacks, quirks, agitators, and communists: Private Black colleges and the limits of institutional autonomy. *History of Higher Education*, Annual edition, 49-81.

Winkler, J. A. (2000). Faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion: Barriers for women. *The Professional Geographer, 52*(4), 737-750. doi: 10.1111/0033-0124.00262

Winkle-Wagner, R. (2009). *The unchosen me: Race, gender, and identity among black women in college*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2006). Academic life and motherhood: Variations by institutional type. *Higher Education, 52*(3), 487-521. doi: 10.1007/s10734-005-0364-4

Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Twombly, S. B. (2007). Faculty life at community colleges: The perspective of women with children. *Community College Review, 34*(4), 255-281. doi: 10.1177/0091552107300282

Yosso, T., Ceja, M., Smith, W., & Solorzano, D. (2009). Critical Race Theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review, 70*, 659-690.

Youn, T. I. (1988). Studies of academic labor markets and careers: A historical oveview. In D. W. Breneman & T. I. Youn (Eds.), *Academic labor markets and careers* (pp. 8-27). New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Zellers, D. F., Howard, V., & Barcic, M. (2008). Faculty mentoring programs: Reenvisioning rather than reinventing the wheel. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 552-588. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40071137?ref=search-gateway:16737e58d06c9970c7ff85c56d7a765d

Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (1994). *Women of color in U.S. society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies, 22*(2), 321-331.